



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/W/25/3366021

Site of 19 Maurice Drive, Nottingham NG3 5GF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr T Rickard against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00040/PFUL3 (PP-13362206).
 - The development proposed is a new build dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site was previously occupied by a bungalow which has since been demolished. The site is not located within a conservation area. Maurice Drive is a residential cul-de-sac with primarily single and two-storey dwellings of various designs, and many dwellings have been altered and extended.
4. The proposed massing, scale and building line would respect that of dwellings within Maurice Drive. The appellant highlights that the different window proportions are proposed to suit internal functions while also animating each façade. They also state that the scheme draws from Nottingham's design vernacular and draw my attention to paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
5. The site forms part of a row of bungalows and gable roofs is the predominate roof type. The proposed contemporary designed dwelling, with a flat roof, larch cladding, and varied window designs, would be at odds with the roof design, fenestration and material palette of dwellings within Maurice Drive. The overall design of the proposed dwelling fails to respect or enhance the street scene or character of the area, and the dwelling would appear incongruous in the street scene. Thus, the proposal fails to create a cohesive and harmonious contemporary design. The development would therefore not represent high-quality design in the context of Maurice Drive.
6. The appellant highlights that numerous Inspectors have upheld similar schemes where a varied local context allows for innovation¹. They have also highlighted

¹ Including APP/L3245/W/23/3326630, APP/P1940/W/22/3291193, and APP/L3245/W/21/3289722

local examples² which they consider have set a precedent. I do not have the full details of these cases and so cannot directly compare them. Two of the local examples do not show fully flat roofs as proposed. The appeal and local cases relate to different roads and the character of the streetscene cannot be directly compared to the character of Maurice Drive. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits and the other cases have not set a precedent.

7. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies: Part 1 Local Plan (2014), and Policies DE1 and DE2 of the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document: Local Plan Part 2 (2020). These seek, amongst other things, to ensure new development respects and enhances the streetscape and character of the area. They also support innovative design which could greatly enhance the built environment, unless a scheme is within an area of homogenous architectural style or where a coherent and predominant character exists, which is of merit and is important to retain.
8. The proposed development would also conflict with paragraph 135 of the Framework. This states that development should be sympathetic to local character and history, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).

Other Matters

9. Planning permission was previously granted for a pitched-roof replacement dwelling³ and this permission remains extant. From the evidence before me, it is a realistic fallback position. The appellant asserts that the proposed dwelling's height and massing are comparable or lesser than the fallback scheme.
10. Based on the evidence submitted, the approved dwelling would be in keeping with the character of the area, and as such complied with planning policy. In contrast, I have found that the proposed dwelling would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and conflict with the development plan. The proposed development therefore does not cause less harm than the fallback position. The proposed scheme offers improved sustainability, refined massing, and biodiversity enhancements, and therefore overall, I give limited weight to the fallback position.
11. The appellant highlights that the proposal meets all relevant amenity standards, and sets out the proposals sustainability credentials as well as ecological enhancements. However, the other matters, including the fallback position, would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR

² Including Woodthorpe Road, Lucknow Drive, The Crescent, Morley Avenue, Tapestry Close, Bladon Close, Victoria Crescent

³ 23/00710/PFUL3