



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by Helen Hockenhull BA(Hons) B.PI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th of August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/25/3361830

53 Lindfield Road, NOTTINGHAM, NG8 6HL

- 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 Lukasz Czapla against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01931/PFUL3.
 - The development proposed is two and single storey side extension; and a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are:
 - 1) The effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area
 - 2) Whether the proposal would impact the living conditions of No. 46 Coleby Road with regard to outlook and overshadowing.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. 53 Lindfield Road is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Lindfield Road and Coleby Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. To the south-west is 46 Coleby Road, and to the north is adjoining property 55 Lindfield Road. An existing gap can be seen between No. 46 and the appeal site which creates a sense of openness surrounding the junction. This orientation and positioning mirrors that of the properties opposite to the southeast of the junction.
5. Properties within the surrounding area are similar in design, and all feature hipped roofs, except for the semi-detached properties at 64 Lindfield Road and 102 Deepdene Way which each have two gable ended roofs set at opposite orientations.

6. The proposal seeks to construct both single and two-storey side extensions to the southern side elevation of the appeal property. The proposal also includes the addition of a porch. The materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling.
7. The proposal sits within a generously sized plot and benefits from being set back a suitable distance from the highway. Whilst the two-storey element itself only measures 3.85m in width, this combined with the adjoining single-storey extension results in the width of the existing host property doubling.
8. Criterion 'b' of section 2 of Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014) (LP1), sets out that development is assessed in terms of its treatment of massing, scale and proportion. The overall width resulting from the single and two storey side extensions combined with the front porch results in additions that cumulatively lead to an excessive increase in floor area and volume, disproportionate in scale to the host dwelling.
9. I acknowledge that the staggered set-back of the proposed single and two-storey extensions retains the existing building line seen along the west side of Lindfield Road. However, this set back is not sufficient to give the proposal a subservient appearance.
10. The matching materials proposed will, to an extent, help the extensions to assimilate with the host property. However, the lack of difference in ridge height, the limited set back of the two-storey extension, combined with the cumulative bulk of the extensions unacceptably alters the character of the host property. The combined scale would be exacerbated by the flat roof design of the single-storey extension which would be discordant within the street scene.
11. I have paid regard to the existing gap between No. 46 Coleby Road and the appeal site, which is highly visible due to them both being corner plots. The appeal proposal would reduce this gap and due to the site's prominence, would have a negative impact upon the street scene.
12. Whilst I have paid regard to the examples of other extensions in the locality provided within the appellant's statement, I note that these developments differ from the appeal proposal. The two-storey extension seen to 182 Withern Road features a lower ridge height and is set back a greater distance from the front elevation, presenting as a subservient addition to the host property.
13. 182 Withern Road, 107 Deepdene Way and 13 Exbourne Road do not feature single-storey side elements adjoining their two-storey extensions. Therefore, they do not provide extensions of the same scale as proposed to the appeal dwelling.
14. In conclusion, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal does not accord with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014), and Policy DE1 and DE2 of the Nottingham City Council Local Plan Part 2 (January 2020).

Living Conditions

15. The proposed extension would be sited approximately 0.7m from the common boundary with No 46 Coleby Road.

16. There would be approximately 5m between the rear elevation of the proposed two-storey extension and the rear garden space used by the occupants of the neighbouring property.
17. From visiting the site, I noted the presence of a shed in the area of garden to the side of No 46, indicating that that this area of the garden's primary use is for storage rather than enjoyment of the garden space. The proposed extension would have no impact on this part of the neighbouring garden.
18. The two-storey element of the appeal proposal would not project forward of this area and would not extend to the rear part of the neighbouring garden. Bearing in mind the separation distance between the rear elevation of the proposed extension and the neighbouring rear garden, approximately 5 metres, the two-storey extension would not represent an overbearing structure and would not unacceptably impact the outlook from this part of No.46's garden.
19. The Council acknowledge within their Officer report that the degree of overshadowing likely to occur within the morning is limited. I concur with that assessment. The occupants of No. 46 would continue to benefit from sunlight within the end part of their garden during this time. Therefore, I do not consider the level of overshadowing to be harmful enough to the living conditions of the occupants of No. 46 to warrant the appeal being dismissed.
20. In conclusion, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable level of harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 46. Consequently, the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard and accords with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014), and Policy DE1 of the Nottingham City Council Local Plan Part 2 (January 2020).

Other Matters

21. The appellant's statement refers to covenants within No. 46's deeds, however these are not material considerations when assessing the planning merits of a case. It is therefore unnecessary for me to consider this matter further.

Conclusion and Recommendation

22. I have found that the appeal proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property. Whilst this weighs in favour of the scheme, it does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.
23. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

24. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the dismissed.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR