Report to Planning Committee

Application Number: 2025/0544

Appeal Ref: 6000924

Site Address: 2 Welham Crescent, Arnold, Notts, NG5 7LF

Application description: Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension

Case Officer: Amy Schofield

The planning application was refused permission on the 26th September 2025 for the reasons outlined below:

1. The proposal would include elements of unacceptable design, through failing to maintain adequate spacing between the built form of adjacent properties, that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

   As such the proposal fails to accord with Policy 10 of the ACS, Policy 43 of the LPD, the Gedling Design Code and the aims set out in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed ground floor lean-to extension, through reasons of proximity to neighbouring patio area and neighbouring windows, through its position on higher land, and by being angled towards the adjacent neighbour, would also create a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the property at 2a Welham Crescent.

   As such the proposal fails to accord with Policy 32 and 43 of the LPD, the Gedling Design Code and the aims set out in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling.

Main Issues

   1. Effect of the proposal of the character and appearance of the area

The Inspector noted that the area was characterised by dwellings mostly set away from the neighbouring property, particularly at 1st floor level, providing gaps between houses which provide a sense of spaciousness that contributes positively to the area's character and appearance. The Inspector noted that due to its two storey height and substantial width the proposed side extension would significantly close the gap between the appeal property and its neighbour at 2a.

The Inspector noted that the proposal would fail to provide the 1m separation between properties along the full length of extension, as stipulated in the Gedling Design Code. This, combined with the curvilinear alignment of the two dwellings and the elevated position of number 2, means the narrow gap that would be retained between dwellings would not be discernible and would create the impression of one continuous frontage.

Even accounting for its set back, slightly lower ridge height and hipped roof the Inspector concluded the proposal extension would have an unduly dominant appearance.

The Inspector noted other examples of similar side extensions in the area but nevertheless noted that these did not represent the prevailing character of the immediate vicinity, nor were the site conditions directly comparable, further noting that some examples demonstrate the harm that can arise from incongruous development.

2. Impact of the proposal on living conditions

The Inspector found that due to its close proximity and the difference in site levels, the proposed rear extension would be a dominant feature from the house and garden of the adjacent dwelling and would breach the '45 degree rule' outlined in the Gedling Design Code in terms of impact to neighbouring ground floor windows. The Inspector also found that the proposed rear extension would have an unacceptable enclosing effect to the neighbour's rear garden. While noting the potential benefit of removal of an existing garage the Inspector agreed that the proposed rear extension, being closer and taller than the extension, would still have an unacceptable impact to the quality of the outlook from No 2a.

Inspector conclusions

- The proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- The appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 2a, with particular regard to outlook, and would cause a significant adverse impact on amenity of nearby occupiers.
- The proposal conflicted with the Local Plan and NPPF

The appeal was dismissed.

Recommendation: To note the information.