



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/25/3369980

289 Oakdale Road, Carlton, Nottingham, NG4 1BP

- 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 Samathy Barratt against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0211.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable second floor conversion with dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable second floor conversion with dormer at 289 Oakdale Road, Carlton, Nottingham, NG4 1BP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2025/0211, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Numbers: Existing site and location plan WD-088-001; Proposed site plan WD-088-101; Proposed ground, first and second floor layout WD-088-102 rev A; Proposed second floor layout WDD-088-103 rev B; Proposed Elevations WDD-088-104 rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those specified in the submitted application.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, which is situated in a residential area. A particular feature of the property is an irregular shaped dormer addition, which has been constructed on one of the sides of the dwelling. This existing dormer is a feature which detracts from the appearance of the property, although the Council acknowledges that it was granted planning permission in 1990.
4. The proposal is to construct a hip to gable extension at the rear with a new side facing dormer that would replace the existing structure. The new dormer would be larger than the existing, being slightly taller and longer. The appellant states that

the extension would provide greater thermal insulation and improved internal living arrangements.

5. The Council considers that the proposed dormer would be an incongruous feature that would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the area. It cites a conflict with Policy 10 of the Council's Aligned Core Strategy 2014 and with Policy LPD43 of the Gedling Local Plan 2018. These policies seek (amongst other things) to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the area and that extensions to dwellings are in keeping with surrounding character. Further detailed guidance on extensions is given in the Council's Extensions and Alterations Design Code.
6. In isolation, I consider that the appeal proposal conflicts with the policies of the current Development Plan, as referred to above, because of the overall size and bulk of the dormer. However, a comparison between the proposed dormer and the existing dormer is a material consideration, which needs to be taken into account in reaching my decision.
7. The existing dormer is not a feature that enhances the dwelling, nor are such dormers common along this section of Oakdale Road. Nevertheless, it is now part of its established character and appearance, and I have no indication that it would be removed, irrespective of my decision.
8. Whilst the proposed dormer would be larger than the existing, I am not persuaded that its effect on the host dwelling or on the character and appearance of the area would be significantly greater or different when viewed from the front of the property. Consequently, I consider that this material consideration outweighs the conflict with the policies of the Development Plan that I have referred to above.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition relating to the period in which to commence the development, a condition listing the approved plans is necessary. A further condition requiring the use of external materials as specified on the submitted plans is also imposed. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR