



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/25/3363828

136 Wilford Crescent West, Nottingham NG2 2FS

- 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 Matthew Holland against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02266/PFUL3.
 - The development proposed is described as “convert roof terrace to a sun room.”
-

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 issue is the effect the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is at the end of a row of four terraced units and amongst a contemporary and noticeably uniform block type infill residential development of two and three storey dwellings. They are in a mix of red brick and contrasting grey render/cladding with a mono pitched roof. The appeal building and its row have open roof terraces accessed by the second floor. The rear elevations of which are visible from Hobart Close. The wider area is also residential but much more traditional in its use of pitched roofs, longer terraces and street frontage development.
5. Notwithstanding a single storey rear extension, the appeal building retains much of the designed modern consistency of the group, and the strong cohesiveness they display contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. To facilitate the scheme, the footprint of the roof terrace will be retained, and the existing roof would be continued. Each side elevation will be bricked up and will meet the extended roof at the top. The existing low brick terrace wall would remain the same height however glazing will be added above to meet the roof eaves. Two roof lights are proposed within the extended roof.

7. The roof terraces form a key part of the cohesive character seen to the row of modern terraces. The proposal would, by virtue of its design, scale and location, unacceptably disrupt this. An effect exacerbated by both its position and prominence in the street scene.
8. The single storey extension to the appeal building has already changed the feel of the terrace in the above respects but in a much less obvious and arguably less harmful way. It is noticeably recessive in the street scene and partially obscured by boundary treatment. Should a temporary canopy be installed over the terrace, this would more than likely be open sided and by its very nature not a permanent fixture. Any effects can therefore be easily reversed. The same cannot be said of the appeal scheme.
9. The proposal would therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Such that it would not accord with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (2014) and Policies DE1 and DE2 of the Nottingham City Council Land and Planning Policies- Local Plan Part 2 (2020). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure high quality design that respects local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. Condition 7 of planning permission 13/02951/PVAR3, which approved the 33 dwellings the appeal site forms part of, only prevents the buildings from being brought into use as anything other than a C3 dwellinghouse. There is nothing to suggest that the appeal property does not benefit from the potential to make certain alterations under the permitted development regime but given the appeal works would evidently not be within its limitations, and express planning permission is being sought under this appeal, my findings do not change.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR