

21/02484/FUL

Applicant Mr Tanvir Hossain

Location 2 Cambridge Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire

Proposal Two storey side and rear extension.

Ward Abbey

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site refers to No.2 Cambridge Road, West Bridgford which is a two-storey detached dwelling with private amenity space to the rear. The application site benefits from a front driveway which can accommodate at least two cars.
2. The surrounding area can be classified as predominately residential with two-storey detached dwellings with private amenity space to the rear. The application site is located within the main settlement of West Bridgford.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a 'Two storey side and rear extension' at No.2 Cambridge Road, West Bridgford.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would have a maximum height of 8.3m dropping to 5.1m at the eaves. The width of the extension would be 2.25m and would have a depth of 10.35m. One rooflight has been proposed to the front and rear roof slope.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would have a maximum height of 6.7m dropping to 5.1m at the eaves. The width would be 6.6m and would have a depth of 2.3m.
6. The applicant has annotated on the planning application form that the proposed material finish of the property would be as follows:
 - Walls - Brick to match existing
 - Roof - Tiles to match existing

SITE HISTORY

7. 15/02225/FUL – Planning permission was granted for a 'Two storey side and rear extensions' on the 24th March 2016. – This permission was not implemented.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

8. One ward member, Councillor Buschman, raised no objection to the

development. One ward member, Councillor Penny Gowland raised an objection to the development on the grounds of overlooking.

Town/Parish Council

9. No Town/Parish Council for this area.

Statutory and Other Consultees

10. No statutory/other consultations required.

Local Residents and the General Public

11. Four neighbouring properties have been consulted with regards to the proposed development. Two objections have been received; these are summarised below:
 - a. Cause overshadowing and loss of privacy.
 - b. Existing extension stretches 9m along shared boundary. Beyond the size allowable for an extension. Unclear the width of the extension.
 - c. Site plan is incorrect.
 - d. Existing single storey is poor quality, concerns that this will be repeated if approved.
 - e. Impact on noise levels and parking.
 - f. Likely to be a 5/6 bedroomed property.
 - g. Inadequate living space and not enough rear garden space.
 - h. Inadequate maintenance of property will occur.
 - i. Contrary to planning policy.
 - j. Risk of creating a precedent.

PLANNING POLICY

12. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1) and the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021), the National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

13. The relevant national policy considerations for this proposal are those contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the proposal should be considered within the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development as a core principle of the NPPF.
14. The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

15. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways, so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.
16. As such, the following sections in the NPPF with regard to achieving sustainable development are considered most relevant to this planning application:
 - Chapter 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development
 - Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places

A copy of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 can be found [here](#)

A copy of the Planning Practice Guidance can be found [here](#)

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

17. The LPP1 sets out the overarching spatial vision for the development of the Borough to 2028. The following policies in the LPP1 are relevant:
 - Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy 10 - Design and Enhancing Local Identity

A copy of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1) can be found [here](#)

18. Under LPP2, the following relevant policies are pertinent to highlight in relation to the proposal:
 - Policy 1 - Development Requirements
 - Policy 17 - Managing Flood Risk

A copy of The Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LLP2) can be found [here](#)

19. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide states that extensions to existing dwellings need to adhere to many design principles, notably those addressing scale, proportion, building and roof lines and privacy. Extensions should be designed so they are not readily perceived as being merely 'add-ons' to the original building. As a general rule, the style and design of the original dwelling should remain the dominant element with the extension subordinate to it.

A copy of the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide can be found [here](#)

APPRAISAL

20. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan

should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

21. The main material planning considerations in the determination of this planning application are:
 - a. Principle of Development
 - b. Design considerations
 - c. Amenity considerations
 - d. Flood Risk

Principle of the development

22. The overarching Policy 1 in the LPP1 reinforces that a positive and proactive approach to decision making should be had which reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. In this instance the proposed development comprises extensions to an existing dwelling within the main settlement of West Bridgford. As such, it is considered to be a sustainable development and therefore is acceptable in principle subject to other material considerations being acceptable.
23. It should also be noted that that the proposal is the resubmission of an identical application previously granted permission in 2016 and was therefore accepted in principle at that time.

Impact upon the character of the area

24. Core Strategy policy 10, Design and Enhancing Local Identity, states that development should make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place and should have regard to the local context and reinforce valued local characteristics. Development should be assessed, amongst other things, in terms of its massing, scale, proportions, materials, architectural style and detailing. This is reinforced under policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2, which also states that development should be sympathetic to the character and appearance of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.
25. Chapter 12 of the NPPF concerns achieving well-designed places. Specifically it requires that development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just in the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Development should also be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping and should be sympathetic to local character and history and maintain a strong sense of place.
26. The Residential Design Guide SPD (2009) states that 'Extensions should be designed so that they are not readily perceived as being merely "add-ons" to the original building and therefore scale, proportion and roof form are very important. However, as a general rule the style and design of the original dwelling should remain the dominant element with the extension subordinate to it'.

Two storey side extension

27. With regards to the proposed two storey side extension, officers note that the development has not been set below the ridgeline of the main dwelling, nor

has it been set back from the front building line at first floor level. However, officers note that planning permission was approved under 15/02225/FUL for a 'Two storey side and rear extensions' on the 24th March 2016. Therefore, it appears that this is a resubmission of a previously approved scheme. Within the delegated report, the case officer noted that following:

'Although it would be preferable to include a setback from a terracing impact, it is not considered reasonable to insist upon in this case. The narrowness of the extension would add an element of subserviency and this is further strengthened by prominence of the existing two storey bay window on the front façade. Furthermore, the terracing would only be on the western side as the host dwelling is first on the street, and the proposal could not be replicated along Cambridge Road due to different style of properties and the comparatively small gaps between each pair of semi-detached dwellings.'

28. With regards to the current application, officers note that the two-storey side extension has been set level with the ridgeline of the main dwelling, and while it would be preferable to have this part of the development set below the ridgeline, taking into the size, scale and location of the proposal, it is considered to be acceptable. The extension has been designed taking into account the existing design traits and characteristics of the main dwelling which has incorporated a pitched roof element which would reflect sympathetically upon the main dwelling. Therefore, due to the size and scale of this element of the proposal, it is considered to be a subordinate addition, maintaining the existing front gable and bay feature as the dominant feature to the road.
29. Officers note that the current proposal would be visible from Cambridge Road, therefore it occupies a prominent site and the proposal would be highly visible. Officers are of the view that as the development is considered to be a sympathetic addition to the main dwelling, it would not result in an incongruous form of development which fails to relate sympathetically to the existing street scene along Cambridge Road. Therefore, it would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area.
30. Therefore, taking into account the previously approved permission on the site and the above information, officers are of the view that the development does not have a detrimental impact upon the property or the character of the area.

Two storey rear extension

31. Similar to the two-storey side extension, officers note that planning permission was approved under 15/02225/FUL for a 'Two storey side and rear extensions' on the 24th March 2016. Therefore, it appears that this is a resubmission of a previously approved scheme. Within the delegated report, the case officer noted that following:

'To the rear, the extensions would largely be out of view from the public realm due to the proximity of neighbouring properties. The extensions would add a significant amount to the rear elevation; however, the design and massing would reduce the visual impact, breaking up the rear elevation into a number of smaller parts. The single storey rear projection is already in position and flanks the western boundary. On balance, although the level of extension is significant, it is not considered to represent over-development and would be sufficiently sympathetic to the character and the appearance of the property,

site and street scene'.

32. Officers are of the view that the proposed two storey rear extension would add a significant amount to the main dwelling, however, this element of the proposal has been designed in a manner which would reduce the visual impact of the proposal. As such, the extension is considered to relate sympathetically to the main dwelling
33. This part of the development would not be visible from Cambridge Road however, notwithstanding this, officers are of the view that this element of the proposal has been designed to relate sympathetically to the main dwelling with a subservient double hipped form. Therefore, this element of the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area.
34. Overall, the scale and design of the development proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 10, Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 and the NPPF.

Impact upon residential amenity

35. Core Strategy policy 10 states that development should be assessed in terms of its impact on the amenity of nearby residents. This is reinforced under policy 1 of the Land and Planning Policies document, which states that development should not be granted where there is a significant adverse effect upon the amenity of adjoining properties.
36. Under the previously approved planning application 15/02225/FUL, the case officer noted that the following within the delegated report,

'The two-storey extension would extend just 2.3 metres to the rear. Given the relatively shallow depth and the existing extension to the rear of No.4 the extension would not have an overbearing or overshadowing impact upon this property. The outlook from the neighbouring property would also be limited given the limited depth and the extension would incorporate a lower ridge height. Although the single storey rear kitchen element appears deep this is already on the site and would be remodelled. Due to the angle with No. 16, the development would not have an overshadowing or overbearing impact upon No.16. The amenity would again be preserved by reason of the limited depth of the two-storey extension. The single storey extension would abut the boundary with No.16; however, this would be of a limited height and depth and on balance it is not considered a refusal could reasonably be defended.'

Two storey side extension

37. The proposed two storey side extension would be constructed flush with the shared boundary with No.4 Cambridge Road. No windows are proposed on the side elevation, therefore, no direct overlooking/loss of privacy would occur upon No.4. It is noted that on the first-floor rear elevation, a degree of overlooking may occur from the windows, however, as these would face primarily upon the rear garden of the application site, it is not considered to be significant as to warrant refusal of the application. Officers acknowledge that a degree of overshadowing/loss of sunlight would occur upon the private amenity of No.4, however, it is considered that this would not result in a level of harm to warrant a refusal of planning permission. With the development being constructed flush with the shared boundary, it has the potential to appear as

an overbearing and visually dominant addition, however, It is noted that No.4 has a rear garden with a depth of 26.15m, which is considered to be sufficient to mitigate any detrimental impact. Furthermore number 4 has an existing single storey rear extension as well as permission for further extension (20/01503/FUL) further limiting any dominance of the proposed works.

38. Whilst the side windows at 4 Cambridge Road are noted, these features are noted to appear to represent bathroom and landing windows at first floor level, thereby representing 'non-habitable' spaces to which limited weight can be given. Whilst these windows would be impacted by the development, they would retain a 0.8m gap across the neighbours' side access in separation from the scheme, and the impact of overbearing and loss of light on these non-habitable windows would not be considered any significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. At ground floor level the windows at 4 Cambridge appear to represent secondary features for rooms also served by rear windows, and as such any loss of light to these features would not be so significant to the amenities of adjacent occupiers so to as represent any significant amenity impact sufficient to warrant refusal.
39. Due to the siting and location of the proposed two storey side extension, it is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the private amenity space upon No.16 Abbey Circus. The two-storey side extension would be 23m from the shared boundary with No.73 Gordon Road, which is considered to be sufficient separation distance to ensure that this element of the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon their amenity.

Two-storey rear extension

40. The proposed two storey side extension would be constructed flush with the shared boundary with No.16 Abbey Circus. No windows are proposed on the side elevation of the extension therefore, no direct overlooking would occur. While it is noted that a degree of overlooking would occur from the first-floor rear windows, as the windows would face primarily upon the garden of the application, it is not considered to be significant as to warrant refusal of the application. Officers acknowledge that a degree of overshadowing/loss of sunlight would occur upon the private amenity of No.16, however, it is not considered to be significant as to warrant refusal of the application.
41. Due to the siting and location of the proposed two storey side extension, it is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the private amenity space upon No.4 Cambridge Road. The two-storey rear extension would be 23m from the shared boundary with No.73 Gordon Road, which is considered to be sufficient separation distance to ensure that this element of the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon their amenity.
42. Therefore, taking the above information into account, officers are of the view that the proposed alterations would not have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining properties.

Impact upon highway/parking

43. Policy 1 (2) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) notes that all development must provide suitable means of access can be provided to the development without detriment to the amenity of adjacent properties or highway safety and the provision of parking is in accordance with

advice provided by the Highways Authority, while policy 11 (g) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) states appropriate provision for access and parking is made.

44. In accordance with the Nottingham County Council (NCC) Highway Design Guide it states that a dwelling with 4 or more bedrooms it must be able to provide a minimum of three parking spaces. The proposal seeks to provide 4 bedrooms.
45. Nottingham County Council (NCC) Highway Design Guide further states that 'The minimum single driveway width is 3.0m or 3.6m when access is needed to both sides of the vehicle. A width of 3.6m is also appropriate if a driveway is located between two dwellings or other width restriction. A further 3.0m is required for a double width driveway with no physical separation between spaces and then a further 2.4m for each additional vehicle to be parked at 90 degrees to the carriageway side by side'. Officers note that the applicant currently has a hardstanding area to the front of the property with a depth of 5.58m and a width of 8.77m.
46. Therefore, taking into account, the above information into account, officers are of the view that there is sufficient parking to the front of the property to accommodate the additional demand, as such the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to highway safety/parking.

Third Party Representations

47. During the consultation process, a number of objections have been received regarding the proposed development. Objections have been received from a ward councillor and members of the public. The objections have been summarised below and will now be addressed:
48. Cause overshadowing and loss of privacy/Impact on noise levels and parking.
 - As noted within the 'Impact upon residential amenity' section of the report, the proposed extension would result in a degree of overshadowing and overlooking however these are not considered to be significant as to warrant refusal of the application.
49. Existing extension stretches 9m along shared boundary. Beyond the size allowable for an extension. Unclear the width of the extension.
 - Officers believe that the objector is confusing what is the permitted depth of an extension as set out under Class A – enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse of Part 1 Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
50. Site plan in incorrect.
 - Officers have not found any information to suggest that the plans submitted are incorrect.

51. Existing single storey is poor quality, concerns that this will be repeated if approved.
- Officers would like to note that the Council has no control over who builds the extension and how the extension is built. Conditions can be attached regarding the proposed material finish to ensure that the development would be in keeping with the character of the area. Any developer would need to meet the requisite building regulations specifications controlled under separate legislation.
52. Likely to be a 5/6 bedroomed property.
- The proposed development seeks to implement 4 bedrooms within the property. It is noted that stairs provide access to the loft space which could provide additional accommodation however the development represents a use class C3 dwelling, and additional bed space would not alter the assessments as made above.
53. Inadequate living space and not enough rear garden space.
- Officers are of the view that sufficient living space has been provided internal for the development. Officers have measured the rear garden area which amounts to 161.31sqm. Officers note that this would comply with the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide (2009) which states that detached dwellings should provide 110sqm of amenity space.
54. Inadequate maintenance of property will occur.
- Officers are of the view that the above comment is not a material consideration for the assessment of the application. Maintenance and liability represent a private legal matter.
55. Contrary to planning policy.
- Officers have carried out a complete assessment against all of the relevant planning policies for the Council and are of the view that the development is considered to be acceptable.
56. Risk of creating a precedent.
- Officers would like to note that each application must be assessed based on its own merits.

Conclusion

57. The proposal would be visually acceptable, would not impact on residential amenity and would not be harmful to highway safety. There would also be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As set out above, the proposal was also considered acceptable and granted planning permission previously. Since the granting of that permission there has been no significant change in planning policy that would justify a variance to that earlier recommendation, which is a material planning consideration. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to conform with the objectives of Policies

1 and 10 of the LPP1, Policy 1 of the LPP2 and the Design Guide. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

58. The application was not the subject of pre-application discussions. The scheme however is considered acceptable and no discussions or negotiations with the applicant or agent were considered necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be granted subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

[To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004].

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following approved drawings, received on the 27th August 2021:
 - Floor plans and elevations
 - Planning application form
 - Plans as existing
 - Site location plan
 - Site plan

[For the avoidance of doubt having regard to policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies]

3. The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be in strict accordance with those specified in the application.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory having regard to policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies]

NOTES TO APPLICANT

Please be advised that all applications approved on or after the 7th October 2019 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Borough Council considers that the approved development is not CIL chargeable. Further information about CIL can be found on the Borough Council's website at <https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningandgrowth/cil/>

This permission does not give any legal right for any work on, over or under land or buildings outside the application site ownership or affecting neighbouring property, including buildings, walls, fences and vegetation within that property. If any such work is anticipated, the consent of the adjoining landowner must first be obtained. The responsibility for meeting any claims for damage to such features lies with the applicant.

The owner of the neighbouring property claims that there is a legal right of access to

your ground in order to maintain that property. You may wish to seek legal advice as to whether that is the case. This grant of planning permission does not override or supersede any such right.

This grant of planning permission does not alter the private legal situation with regard to the carrying out of any works involving land which you do not own or control. You will need the consent of the owner(s) involved before any such works are started.

The provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996 may apply in relation to the boundary with the neighbouring property. A Solicitor or Chartered Surveyor may be able to give advice as to whether the proposed work falls within the scope of this Act and the necessary measures to be taken.

You are advised to ensure disturbance to neighbours is kept to a minimum during construction by restricting working hours to Monday to Friday 7.00am to 7.00pm, Saturday 8.00am to 5.00pm and by not working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. If you intend to work outside these hours you are requested to contact the Environmental Health Officer on 0115 9148322.

It is possible that the roof space, and/or behind the soffit, fascia boards, etc. may be used by bats. You are reminded that bats, their roosts and access to roosts are protected and it is an offence under the Countryside and Wildlife Act 1981 to interfere with them. If evidence of bats is found, you should stop work and contact Natural England on 0300 060 3900 or by email at enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk.