



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/Q3060/D/25/3368327

1 Wellesley Crescent, Nottingham NG8 6PN

- 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 Sameh Zidan against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/00430/PFUL3.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above the garage; 2-storey side extension; and erection of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension above the garage; 2-storey side extension; and erection of front porch at 1 Wellesley Crescent, Nottingham NG8 6PN in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. 25/00430/PFUL3, 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 numbered/referenced: 24-106-P11; 24-106-P12; 24-106-P13; 24-105-P14; 24-106-P100; and PP-13837551v1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached 2-storey house with a single-storey side wing. It is situated on a corner plot next to the junction of Wellesley Crescent and Lancaster Way and almost opposite the junction between Halifax Court and Lancaster Way.
 4. This locality is residential in character and takes in many houses of a similar design to the appeal property.
-

5. The main dispute between the parties concerns the proposed 2-storey side extension which would be about 3.5m wide and added to the eastern flank of the house. I accept that the cumulative impact of the proposed extensions to the dwelling should also be considered even though this matter is raised in the delegated report, rather than being explicitly stated in the decision notice.
6. Planning permission was granted on 7 February 2025, under ref. 24/01946/PFUL3, for the first floor extension above the garage on the dwelling's western flank and the erection of the front porch. That extant permission also provides for a single-storey side extension to the eastern flank of the house, where the 2-storey side extension is now being proposed.
7. The extensions, viewed as a whole, would substantially enlarge the appeal property and increase its visual impact on the surroundings. However, whilst the dwelling is sited on a prominent corner plot, I am not persuaded that the proposals would result in the dwelling appearing overly bulky or being otherwise unacceptable.
8. The 2-storey side extension would be set back from the front of the house, set down from the ridge and no wider than about 65% of the width of the existing 2-storey front and rear walls. These factors, in combination, would ensure that this part of the scheme would appear reasonably subordinate to the original dwelling.
9. The Council's concern about the resulting rear elevation appearing broad on the approach northwards along Lancaster Way seems to me to be misplaced. This is because the first floor extension above the garage on the western flank would be set back 2m behind the adjoining rear elevation. It would not be viewed in the same plane and it would be set well away from Lancaster Way. I am convinced that the form of the original dwelling would remain legible. The development would appear sufficiently subservient to the existing building, when viewed as a whole, in terms of scale and massing.
10. The amenity space that would be taken up would be no greater than in the approved scheme. The proposed 2-storey side extension, when compared to that extant scheme, would certainly provide a harder built-up edge facing Lancaster Way and increase the prominence of the dwelling on this corner plot. However, the space between the side wall of the extension and the fenced boundary to Lancaster Way would be sufficient to avoid an overbearing impact on, or any harmful loss of spaciousness in, the Lancaster Way street scene. The plot would not appear overdeveloped or unduly cramped in itself or in comparison to the closest similarly sited roadside properties at 2 Wellesley Crescent and 1 Halifax Court. There would be no serious closure of the vista up and down Lancaster Way.
11. There is a consistent staggered positioning of the houses between 19-27 Lancaster Way to the south of the appeal site. That the appeal property currently follows that staggered arrangement is not immediately obvious to observers on Lancaster Way given its notable separation from no. 27, its different orientation and the screening effect of an evergreen tree in its rear garden. Still, if anything, the appeal scheme, by extending out towards Lancaster Way at 2-storey level would reflect and enhance that staggered pattern rather than erode it for any reason.
12. I consider that the proposed development would be sufficiently complementary to the parent building in terms of its scale, massing and design including the use of

matching materials, roof profiles and windows. Rather than having a dominating and detrimental impact on the surroundings, it would make a visually positive contribution to its context and location and be respectful of the character and appearance of the area.

13. I saw the 2-storey side extension at 9 Wellesley Crescent referred to by the appellant but from the information in front of me, it appears that this received planning permission in 2004 under a different development plan regime. Accordingly, I have attached very limited weight to this other example in determining this appeal. In any case, it is an established planning principle that each case should be considered on its own merits.
14. I find on the main issue that the proposed development would not give rise to any harm to the appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene. It would display the building and urban design quality, with appropriate attention being paid to massing, scale and proportion and the respect for local character, context, townscape and place making, that are required by Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy Local Plan Part 1, adopted in September 2014 and Policies DE1 and DE2 of the Land and Planning Policies Local Plan Part 2, adopted in January 2020, when read in the round. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

15. 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 is also necessary to secure the use of external materials that match those of the existing building so that the development respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised and the lack of objections from local residents, I conclude that this appeal should succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR