



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/25/3372097

57 Parkside, Nottingham NG8 2NQ

- 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 and Mrs Grudzinski against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00458/PFUL3 (PP-13855153).
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with associated ancillary works and garden terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension with associated ancillary works and garden terrace at 57 Parkside, Nottingham NG8 2NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00458/PFUL3 (PP-13855153), subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL100 Rev A Proposed Ground Floor Plan, PL101 Rev A Proposed First Floor Plan, PL102 Rev A Proposed Elevations, PL103 Rev A Proposed Elevations, PL106 Proposed Storage Room and A002 Rev A Block Plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary matters

2. During the planning application process the appellant revised the proposals. The amendments related to the side extension and included a different roof design, lowered eaves height, introduction of dormer windows and alternative positioning of the solar panels. The Council made its determination against these revised plans. The appellant has requested that the appeal be considered against the plans originally submitted with the application, rather than the later revised scheme determined by the Council.
3. The Procedural Guidance for Planning Appeals - England is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. The original scheme is substantially different to that formally assessed by the Council and they have not had the opportunity to comment. Consequently, in this case, it would be procedurally unfair to revert to the original scheme. Therefore, my decision is based on the development proposals upon which the Council made its decision.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a 2 storey detached dwelling with attractive architectural features to the front elevation including white render with black timber boarding to the first floor and a steeply sloping roof to one side. The surrounding residential area is characterised by large traditional detached dwellings, set relatively close together, to present a frontage of varying designs with a limited number of more modern dwellings. There is a cohesiveness to the layout and pattern with many repeating house types that have predominantly retained their original character and form. Whilst incorporating some of the same features, the host dwelling is of a different design to others in the vicinity but it broadly reinforces the pleasant, sub-urban character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposals include a first-floor side extension with hipped roof above the existing garage, replacing the existing steeply sloping roof. The eaves of the extension would be lower than the existing dwelling and would introduce dormer windows to the front and rear elevations. Alterations to the rear of the dwelling include enlarging the raised terrace and the installation of glazed balustrading. Solar panels are proposed to roof slopes on all elevations.
7. It is acknowledged that the loss of the striking steeply sloping roof feature would result in a significant alteration to the overall appearance of the host dwelling but it does not follow it would be harmful. This precise house design is not repeated in the vicinity and there are other dwellings in the street scene which do not feature steeply sloping roofs. As such, the resulting appearance would not be incongruous. The inclusion of black and white timber boarding across the extended frontage, reduced eaves height and use of dormer windows within the front and rear roof slopes would also serve to assimilate the proposed extension into the surrounding area.
8. Given the topography, the adjacent dwelling at No 55 Parkside sits at a slightly lower level than the appeal property and has a single storey side element with a steeply sloping roof alongside the boundary. The proposed side extension would therefore be viewed as a larger built form closer to the boundary line. Nevertheless, the lowered eaves height of the proposed side extension would relate well with the main eaves height of the neighbouring dwelling such that it would not have an unbalanced relationship. Indeed, in the locality there are examples of 2 storey elements sitting alongside steeply sloping roofs without appearing discordant. Furthermore, as the area is not characterised by significant openness between dwellings, the proposed configuration between No 55 and the appeal property would not be sympathetic to the visual rhythm and pattern of development.
9. Taken together these factors would result in an attractive and positive addition to the street scene. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposals would complement and not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. They would therefore accord with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies (September 2014) and Policies DE1 and DE2 of the Nottingham City Land and Planning Policies (January 2020) insofar as they seek to secure attractive development that considers the impact on the surrounding townscape and

neighbouring properties, reinforcing and enhancing positive characteristics of the local environment.

Conditions

10. Conditions specifying the time for commencement and requiring compliance with the approved plans are necessary for reasons of clarity and certainty. A further condition requiring materials to match those used on the existing dwelling is necessary to integrate the appearance with that of the original building.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions specified.

K Mee

INSPECTOR