



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref. APP/P3040/D/25/3365703

18 Repton Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7EJ

- 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 Dr M Culshaw and Dr P Deering against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/00019/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: "*Resubmission of planning application ref: 21/00071/FUL following the expiration of the planning approval. Extend existing loft conversion including construction of a hipped to gable front roof extension and side dormer window.*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for *Resubmission of planning application ref: 21/00071/FUL following the expiration of the planning approval. Extend existing loft conversion including construction of a hipped to gable front roof extension and side dormer window* at 18 Repton Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7EJ in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 25/00019/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced/numbered: Location Plan; Block Plan; GA359/01; GA359/02; GA359/03; and GA359/04.
 - 3) The materials specified in the application shall be used for the external walls and roofs of the development hereby permitted and no additional or alternative materials shall be used.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and visual amenities of the area.

Reasons

3. Like many of the dwellings that follow regular building lines along Repton Road, no. 18 is a detached 2-storey house, seemingly dating from the interwar period.
-

4. The houses typically have hipped roofs aligned at right angles to the road with lower 2-storey advanced bays in hipped or gabled formats. Many of the houses have, however, been altered and extended over time especially at roof level.
5. No. 18 is a case in point. It has been enlarged by 2-storey and single-storey rear extensions, an entrance porch and a loft conversion facilitated by a dormer window in the north-facing side roof slope, a rear hipped to gabled roof extension and a triangular-shaped window in the top part of the front 2-storey gabled bay.
6. It is now proposed to provide extra space in the loft by adding a dormer window to the south-facing side roof slope to match the one on the opposite roof slope and a front hipped to gabled roof extension which would have a partly glazed finish.
7. This case is unusual as it concerns an identical scheme to that permitted in March 2021 (application ref. 21/00071/FUL). This permission expired in March 2024.
8. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There have been no changes to the development plan since March 2021, which includes the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy December 2014 (LPP1) and the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies October 2019 (LPP2), or for that matter to the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document March 2009 (RRDG).
9. The National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) is a material consideration in planning decisions. Although it is not set out with any clarity in the “Note” to the decision notice, where some text appears to have been missed out, the Council evidently considered that the version of the NPPF published in December 2024 put further emphasis on good design when compared to the 2019 version under which the previous application was considered.
10. Good design has been a key aspect of sustainable development since the first publication of the NPPF in 2012. The officer’s report on the 2021 application listed paragraphs 11 and 127 of the 2019 NPPF. Those paragraphs are not materially different to the equivalent paragraphs (11 and 135) in the 2024 NPPF.
11. The officer’s report on the subject application says that paragraph 139 of the 2024 NPPF was not included in the 2019 version. However, the content of that paragraph was largely covered under paragraph 130 in that earlier version. This said, equally to the point, that: *Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.* The subtle differences in the precise wording of the respective paragraphs of those 2 versions are not sufficient, in my mind, as to produce a sea change in the outcome for the appellants’ proposals. I agree with them that the Council’s stance that the changes to the NPPF, in themselves, justified a different decision, was misplaced.
12. The Council did not object to the proposed side dormer window. It would not dominate the roof slope, reach the ridge line or result in a vertical extension of the wall face. It would be a suitable addition, reflect many similar roof-level additions along the road and accord with the advice on loft conversions in the RRDG.

13. Surprisingly, that advice does not extend to cover the inclusion of hipped to gabled roof extensions which are common in loft conversions. It must be a moot point as to whether the proposed front hip to gable roof extension can be classed as a front extension for the purposes of the RRDG, as the Council appears to imply, because it would reach no further forward than the roof over the existing advanced gabled bay and would be set well back from the entrance porch. Even if it should be so classed, it would not infringe the building line or give the host dwelling a markedly unsympathetic or radically different building presence. The inclusion of glazing is not an inappropriate innovation in itself especially as it would simply reflect the finished treatment towards the top of the existing advanced gable.
14. I consider that the proposed front hip to gable roof extension would complement, rather than slavishly copy, the existing street character where gabled front projections of varied sizes and character are evident; for instance those at nos 5, 7, 13, 15, 21 and 25 depart from the more typical smaller advanced gables found elsewhere along the road and currently at no. 18. The one at no. 18 is not as visually distinct as it may have been originally given the size and projection of the subsequent entrance porch which tends to draw the eye first.
15. More importantly, in appraising the design of the appeal scheme, the proposal needs to be considered as a whole. Whilst the proposed front hip to gable roof extension would undoubtedly add additional bulk to the roof, it would not be overly large in any dimension and the overall roof shape would be balanced out by having a gabled finish to the front and the rear. That the original hipped end is missing from the rear can be readily detected in views from the road, especially in the gap between nos 18 and 20. Moreover, I consider that the existing side dormer is not ideal as it comes uncomfortably close to the front hipped ridge line and prominently unbalances the roof of the property. The appeal scheme would rectify this by firstly providing a matching dormer and secondly by having the existing and proposed dormers well set back along the side roofs that would come about from the proposed front hip to gable roof extension.
16. Taken as a whole, the proposed development would be sufficiently complementary to the parent building in terms of its design, appearance, siting and location, including materials, roof profiles and the style, detailing and proportions of the windows. Rather than having an unsympathetic impact on the surroundings, it would make a visually positive contribution to its context and the public realm and be respectful of the area's character and appearance and the aims of the RRDG.
17. I find on the main issue that the proposed development would not harm the character and visual amenities of the area. It would display the building and urban design quality, with appropriate attention to massing, scale, proportion, height, layout and materials and the respect for local context, including the character and appearance of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area, that are required by LPP1 Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) and LPP2 Policy 1 (Development Requirements). These policies are relevant and not out-of-date and are consistent with the NPPF's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

18. I have reviewed the 3 conditions suggested by the local planning authority in its questionnaire. I shall impose conditions setting the standard time period in which

the development is to commence and requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings to provide certainty. A condition to secure the use of the external materials that were specified in the application is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, including the enhanced living conditions the scheme would offer for occupiers of no. 18 and the lack of objections from local residents, I conclude that this appeal should succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR