

22/00774/FUL

Applicant Dr Kashif Chauhan

Location 18 Mountsorrel drive, West Bridgford, Nottingham, Nottinghamshire, NG2 6JL

Proposal Construction of two-storey front extension, first floor side extension, first floor rear extensions, single storey rear extension and application of render to all elevations.

Ward Abbey

Full details of the application can be found [here](#)

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application property is a 1970s two-storey detached dwelling, with adjoining garage. It is constructed from red brick with red hanging tiles to the first floor (seen to the front and rear elevations), and a concrete interlocking pantile roof. It is located within an established residential area of West Bridgford and lies within a cul-de-sac arrangement of properties dating to a similar age.
2. Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two-storey front extension, a first-floor side extension, first-floor rear extensions and a single storey rear extension. The proposed application of render to all elevations also forms part of the application.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. During the course of determination, the proposed scheme was amended to include a rendered finish to all elevations (as opposed to the application of render to part of the front elevation only). The description of development was revised and statutory consultees/ neighbours were re-consulted for a period of 14-days.
4. A revised Block Plan was also submitted during the course of determination due to the originally submitted plan being inaccurate.
5. For the avoidance of doubt, the description below is based on the latest scheme iteration (i.e. Proposed Plans [Elevations and floor Plans] received 25/05/2022).
6. The proposed two-storey front extension would measure circa 4.7m in height, with a width of circa 2.9m (side, south elevation) and circa 1.4m (side, north elevation), and a length of circa 4.6m.
7. The proposed first-floor side extension would measure circa 5.1m in width (front, west elevation) and circa 4.5m (rear, east elevation) and circa 7.7m in

length. The gable-end roof would measure circa 4.9m to eaves and 6.9m to ridge.

8. The proposed first-floor rear extensions would measure circa 1.8m in width and 10.9m in length. The gable-end roof would measure circa 4.9m to eaves and 6.9m to ridge.
9. The proposed single-storey rear extension would measure circa 3.6m in height, with a length of circa 5.8m, and a width of circa 3.3m.
10. Alterations are to be carried out to two existing first-floor windows to the frontage of the property. The landing window is to be blocked up and the bathroom window is to be reduced in size.
11. A white rendered finish is proposed to all elevations. All new windows and doors are proposed to be in woodgrain UPVC (confirmed in e-mail from agent dated 23/05/22).
12. In December 2021, planning permission was granted for the construction of a two-storey front extension and a single storey rear extension, with identical dimensions as proposed in this application, and the application of render to part of the front elevation of the dwelling. This application differs to the previously permitted scheme in that it also proposes a first-floor side extension, first floor rear extension and the application of render to all elevations (as opposed to part of the front elevation only).

SITE HISTORY

13. The full site history can be found on the Council's website. The most relevant planning history is set out below.
 - 21/02329/FUL - Construction of two-storey front extension and single storey rear extension, with rendered finish to first floor to replace clay hanging tiles and render to replace stone cladding to ground floor window – permission granted December 2021.
 - 84/00645/A1P - Two storey side extension – permission granted May 1984.
 - 84/00020/A1P - Single storey side extension – permission granted January 1984.
 - 83/06523/HIST - Single storey rear extension to kitchen, dining room and lounge – permission granted November 1983.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

14. Councillor B. Buschman does not object to the scheme.
15. Councillor P. Gowland responded to the originally submitted plans as follows:

"I find it hard to compare the plans because they are on such different scales - I realise it should be simple but it is quite hard to get a sense of the massing. I have a feeling this will be a large building on a small plot and it likely to be

overlooking/ overcrowding neighbours and Rufford Way but I am happy to take more advice from officers.”

16. In respect of the revised scheme (which proposed the application of render to all elevations (received 25/05/2022)), Councillor P. Gowland provided the following comments:

“I do think this is probably massing on the site...because of the location it will impact on a lot of houses I think.”

17. Following receipt of the above response, the Planning Officer sought clarification from the Councillor as to whether it should be regarded as comments only or a formal objection. Councillor P. Gowland provided the following response:

“I have reviewed the plans and considered the impact not only on the neighbours but also on the view from Buckfast Way. I object.”

Statutory and Other Consultees

18. None sought.

Local Residents and the General Public

Comments can be found in full [here](#).

19. Three representations have been received from neighbouring occupiers/ local residents objecting to the proposal. The concerns raised are summarised as follows:

- a) The existing and proposed side extensions would result in a house which is essentially twice as wide as the original house. The resultant massing would be quite out of character with the rest of Mountsorrel Drive. This would also be the case viewed from Abbey Park, a key element of the public realm of the estate.
- b) The proposed rear elevation is formed from 4 gables of varying widths. The houses on Mountsorrel Drive all feature simple gable ends. There are no instances of multiple gable ends arranged similar to those proposed. This arrangement would be quite uncharacteristic of the estate. These gables, combined with the additional massing, would present a very large and overbearing elevation when viewed from Abbey Park.
- c) The previous extensions have significantly reduced the private garden area. The development scheme will further pressurise the already inadequate amenity space.
- d) The proposals seem to be a significant over development of the site.
- e) The resultant 7-bedroom property would likely result in a greater number of cars. Inevitably this would result in some on street parking. On-street parking will negatively impact on this positive characteristic of the street and impact not only on the properties adjacent but also the whole of this part of Mountsorrel Drive.
- f) For this size of property, a total of two off-street parking spaces appears insufficient. There is no garage parking as this has been previously converted to form habitable space. Nottinghamshire Highways

residential parking guidance is for a minimum of 3 spaces for properties with 4 or more bedrooms. On street parking is not an option due to the location of the property at the turning head of the cul-de-sac.

- g) The first-floor extension will overlook my front door and garage and put them further in the shade, reducing light in the porch, hallway and garage.
- h) The view from my front windows, including the lounge, landing and front bedroom, will be much diminished by such an extension with the consequent reduction in light.
- i) The path at the side of my house will be much more shaded should this extension go ahead with the accompanied reduction in light/ sunlight causing moss/ algae to build-up making the paving slippery and dangerous.
- j) The first-floor extension will reduce light into my garden and sun-lounge and also reduce my privacy.
- k) The extension will 'box-in' my front drive which is not how the area was designed. The single storey garage provides light between the houses giving an open and more aesthetic appearance. The extension will also create a vortex affect when its windy causing leaves and rubbish to accumulate at my front door.
- l) Extending No. 18 to the degree proposed will reduce the value of my property and reduce its kerb appeal.
- m) The proposed side extension would dominate no. 20 and create significant loss of light, being on the south side of the boundary. The extension over the garage appears to breach the 45° line in plan and elevation to the windows on no. 20's front elevation at ground and first floor, the living room and bedroom respectively. The proposed first floor would appear to be around 5m in front of the main house of no. 20, being closer to the road than even the garage of no. 20. It would therefore be overbearing and create a tunnelling effect on the front windows and entrance of no 20.
- n) We have noted the correspondence published on 25th May stating that the proposal is now to fully render the house and that the new windows/ doors will be brown UPVC. These proposed changes will have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the house and will be out of keeping with the area. No other houses are fully rendered which will remove all character and interest from the front elevation and have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
- o) We object to the house being fully rendered and the proposal for the windows/ doors to be brown UPVC as this is not in keeping with the area and is poor design which neither matches the original nor is contemporary. The colour of the fascias and soffits needs to be confirmed as this will also impact the appearance of the house.
- p) The current proposals for the first-floor extensions are simply built over previous ground floor extensions which creates roof forms and eaves lines that are awkward and not in keeping with the local area.
- q) Previous extensions have already extended the property resulting in an elongated form. The proposed first floor extension further elongates the house which is out of keeping with the surrounding houses and the Abbey Park area.
- r) The proposed design/ materials do not seem to be in accordance with the NPPF requiring developments to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping and be sympathetic to local character.

- s) The current proposals also do not appear to be in accordance with Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide SPD. The rear elevation in particular reads as a number of 'add-ons' which are not subordinate to the style and design of the original dwelling and almost fully enclose the original structure.
- t) The proposal is contrary to the NPPF, Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy Policy 10, Local Plan Part 2 Policy 1, and the Residential Design Guide SPD.
- u) It is not possible to assess the massing of the proposals as the plans and elevations are at different scales and the block plan appears to be inaccurate. The outline of the property on the block plan does not appear to match those of the existing or proposed plans and the site boundary is not outlined on the block plan.

PLANNING POLICY

20. 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

21. 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.
22. 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

23. The LPP1 sets out the overarching spatial vision for the development of the Borough to 2028. The following policies in the LPP1 are of particular relevance:
- 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](#)

24. Under LPP2, the following relevant policies are pertinent to highlight in relation to the proposal:

- Policy 1 - Development Requirements

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

APPRAISAL

25. 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.
26. The main material planning considerations in the determination of this planning application are:
 - a. Principle of Development
 - b. Design/ character and appearance of the street scene
 - c. Residential Amenity

Principle of the development

27. This application seeks planning permission for the construction of a two-storey front extension, first-floor side extension, first-floor rear extensions, single storey rear extension and the application of render to all elevations.
28. In principle, extensions and alterations to dwelling houses are generally acceptable, provided that schemes are compliant with the criteria outlined in Policy 1 'Development Requirements' of the LPP2.
29. In this instance, the proposed development comprises of extensions to an existing dwelling within the main settlement of West Bridgford and, as such, constitutes sustainable development. Therefore, it is acceptable in principle, subject to it meeting all other relevant policies of the Development Plan.

Design/ character and appearance of the street scene

30. Core Strategy Policy 10 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 and materials. 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.
31. 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.

32. The property has been altered and extended over the years, most notably with two-storey side and rear extensions, and single storey side and rear extensions.
33. The proposed two-storey front extension would be clearly visible from the public realm. Front alterations and extensions are visible in respect of other nearby properties along Mountsorrel Drive. In light of its siting/ design/ materials, the front extension would not appear unduly prominent nor would it be at odds with the character of the street scene. It is noted that the proposed two-storey extension has previously been granted approval under planning application Ref. 21/02329/FUL, which remains extant.
34. The proposed first-floor side extension would also be clearly visible from the public realm, both to the front of the property (Mountsorrel Drive) and to the rear of the property (Rufford Way). The extension would be located over the converted garage and would follow the line of the existing first floor (which is set-back from the protruding westernmost part of the front elevation at ground floor). Whilst the first-floor extension would elongate/ increase the massing of the property at first floor, it is not considered that it would appear unacceptably overbearing nor would it appear unduly prominent in the street scene. Whilst the Council generally require extensions to appear subservient to the host property in respect of eaves/ ridge height, in this instance the eaves and ridgeline of the extension (which match that of the existing house) are considered appropriate as they assist in assimilating the extension into the main dwelling/ providing a uniform appearance so that it does not appear as an 'add-on'. The gable to the front elevation adds interest to the frontage and is not considered to be overly prominent.
35. The proposed first-floor rear extensions would not be visible from the public realm to the front of the property (Mountsorrel Drive) - however, they would be visible in respect of the public realm to the rear of the property (Rufford Way). Whilst the proposed extensions would extend a significant part of the rear elevation at first floor, the width of the extensions (at circa 1.8m) is considered relatively modest and would not result in built-form being brought any closer to the rear boundary than existing. The gable ends at varying heights, whilst not particularly characteristic of the surrounding area, is not considered to be so incongruous with the street scene or so unduly prominent to justify refusal.
36. The rear single-storey extension would not be visible from Mountsorrel Drive. However, as the rear boundary backs onto Rufford Way, there would be views of the extension from the public realm. In light of its siting/ design/ materials, the rear single storey extension would not appear unduly prominent nor would it be at odds with the character of the street scene. It is noted that the proposed single-storey rear extension has previously been granted approval under planning application Ref. 21/02329/FUL, which remains extant.
37. The proposed application of white render to all elevations is not typical of properties in the immediate locality. However, there are many examples of properties that are partially rendered and properties where other materials (e.g. wood cladding, stone cladding) have been utilised nearby. The existing dwelling features a number of different facing materials (including hanging tiles, brickwork and stone cladding). In this context, it is considered that the proposed render would result in a more coherent and visually pleasing aesthetic than the existing situation. Whilst the concerns of neighbouring

occupiers regarding the proposed materials (including the installation of woodgrain UPVC windows. Doors) are noted, it is not considered that permission could be reasonably refused on these grounds.

38. Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that the property has been previously extended and that the proposed extensions, subject of this application, would increase the scale/ massing of the property, it is not considered that the extended property would be so substantially larger than those in the locality as to render the proposal unacceptably out-of-character or incongruous with the surrounding area. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene is considered acceptable and the proposal is considered to accord with local and national policies in that regard.

Impact upon residential amenity

39. Core Strategy Policy 10 states that development should be assessed in terms of their 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.
40. In respect of the proposed two-storey front extension, from the side (north) elevation of the front extension there would be a distance of 9.6m from the boundary with 20 Mountsorrel Drive. When measured from the side (south) elevation there would be a distance of 3.2m from the boundary line with 16 Mountsorrel Drive, and from the extension's front (east) elevation it would measure 2.9m, with the nearest point of the extension measuring approximately 1m from the shared boundary with 16 Mountsorrel Drive. The front extension would be seen from 16 Mountsorrel Drive's ground floor window (seen closest to the application site); however, the proposed front extension would not project forward of the built form of its adjacent neighbour. It is noted that the depth of the front extension would be sited close to the shared south-eastern boundary with 16 Mountsorrel Drive. However, it is carefully considered that due to the scale, design, siting, form, and mass of the front extension, and when taking into account the orientation of the sun, it is unlikely that the proposed front extension would cause undue overbearing effects, or lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy, overshadowing, or loss of sunlight to neighbouring property, 16 Mountsorrel Drive that would warrant a refusal of the application. It is noted that the proposed two-storey extension has previously been granted approval under planning application Ref. 21/02329/FUL, which remains extant.
41. In terms of the proposed first-floor side extension, whilst it would not result in built-form being brought any closer to neighbouring properties than existing, the introduction of first floor accommodation above the converted garage, adjacent to the northern boundary, requires careful consideration. At closest approach, the side extension would be located circa 1.5m from the northern boundary (i.e. the boundary with No. 20 Mounsorrel Drive) and circa 3m from the nearest facing elevation of the neighbouring property. The extension would follow the line of the existing first floor and be set-back from the protruding westernmost part of the ground floor front elevation by circa 1.3m. No additional windows are proposed in the side (north) elevation. Concerns have been raised that the extension would breach the 45-degree line in respect of the front windows of No. 20 and would result in unacceptable overshadowing/

loss of light to the front windows/ rear sun-lounge and garden. Due the respective orientation of the properties, No. 20 will already receive some level of overshadowing/ loss of light from the host property. Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension would result in some additional overshadowing/ loss of light to the nearest ground floor window of No. 20 and to the garden space to the side of the property, bearing in mind the separation distances and the scale/ design of the extension (which is set back from the protruding ground floor front elevation), it is not considered that this additional impact would be so severe as to justify refusal. Concerns have also been raised regarding potential overlooking/ loss of privacy. Given that no new windows are proposed in the side elevation and bearing in mind that the windows proposed to serve the extension in the front/ rear elevations would be located close to existing windows and would only provide angled/ oblique (rather than direct) views towards neighbouring properties, the level of overlooking is not deemed to be unacceptable. Finally, concerns have been raised that the extension would be overbearing and would create a tunnelling effect to the front windows and entrance of No 20 Mountsorrel Drive. Whilst the extension would increase the massing of the host property adjacent to the northern boundary, it would not bring built form any further forward in the plot or any closer to the neighbouring property. Given the scale/ design of the extension it is not considered that it would be unacceptably overbearing in respect of the neighbouring property.

42. The proposed first-floor rear extensions would be located circa 6.9m from the southern boundary and circa 7m from the rear boundary. Windows already exist in the rear elevation and whilst the proposed windows serving the first floor rear extension would be located circa 1.8m closer to the rear boundary, given the distance to the nearest sensitive receptors (across Rufford Way) it is not considered that the extension would be unacceptably overbearing nor would it lead overlooking/ loss of privacy.
43. There would be a 16.8m separation distance from the proposed rear single storey extension and that of 16 Mountsorrel Drive, and a separation distance of 6.3m from the nearest point of the rear extension to the northern boundary with 20 Mountsorrel Drive, and no openings are proposed to the side (north) elevation. Therefore, it is considered that, due to the scale and siting of the rear extension, it would avoid causing any undue impacts in terms of overbearing, overshadowing, or loss of privacy to the neighbouring amenities. It is noted that the proposed single storey rear extension has previously been granted approval under planning application Ref. 21/02329/FUL, which remains extant.
44. The property benefits from a relatively large rear garden and it is considered that sufficient residential amenity space would remain.
45. Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would significantly impact upon residential amenity such that refusal on these grounds would be justified.

Third Party Representations

46. 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:

47. The design/ massing of the proposal would be overbearing/ out of character with the rest of Mountsorrel Drive.
- This is covered in the section titled 'Design/ character and appearance of the street scene'.
48. The development proposal would be over-intensive development of the site and would lead to insufficient outdoor/ private amenity space.
- Based on the submitted plans, the level of private amenity space would continue to accord with the Council's recommended level (i.e. a minimum of 110sqm in respect of a detached property with over 2-bedrooms). The dwelling occupies a relatively large plot and, in light of this, and bearing in mind the scale/ siting of the proposed extensions, the scheme is not considered to comprise over-intensive development.
49. Following the extension, the level of car parking that would be afforded to the property would be insufficient and there would be increased on-street parking.
- The additional extensions proposed in this application would not in themselves reduce current parking provision and it is not considered that the proposed extensions necessitate the provision of additional off-street parking. It is not considered that refusal on highways grounds could be reasonably substantiated.
50. The extension would result in overlooking/ loss of light/ overshadowing/ overbearing impacts/ a tunnelling effect/ unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.
- This is covered in the section titled 'Impact upon residential amenity'.
51. The extension would impact on adjacent property values/ their kerb appeal
- These are not material planning considerations and are not, therefore, relevant to the determination of the application.
52. The proposed design/ materials do not seem to be in accordance with the NPPF requiring developments to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping and be sympathetic to local character.
- This is covered in the section titled 'Design/ character and appearance of the street scene'.
53. Concerns have been raised regarding the accuracy of the submitted block plan.
- A revised block plan has been submitted at the request of the Planning Officer. Notwithstanding this, a site visit was carried out to inform this report and the above assessment.

Conclusion

54. On balance, having assessed the development proposal against the policies set out in the development plan for Rushcliffe and considering the material matters discussed above, I consider the proposal would be in accordance with relevant local and national planning policies. Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission is granted for this proposal.
55. In reaching this view, regard has been had to the extant planning permission (Ref. 21/02329/FUL) for 'Construction of two-storey front extension and single storey rear extension, with rendered finish to first floor to replace clay hanging tiles and render to replace stone cladding to ground floor window' granted December 2021.
56. There were no perceived problems with the application and therefore no requirement for negotiation with the applicant/ agent or the need to request any amendments.

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/ information:
 - Block Plan (Ref. 22-2358-1, dated 24/01/22) – received 17/06/2022;
 - Proposed Plans [Elevations and Floor Plans] (Ref. 22-2358-2, dated 24/01/2022) – received 25/05/2022.

[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. For the avoidance of doubt, this includes the information provided in the Application Form; 'Proposed Plans [Elevations and Floor Plans] (Ref. 22-2358-2)' and E-mail from agent dated 23/05/2022.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policies 1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land & 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, as the additional floorspace being created is below the relevant thresholds. 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.

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.

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 roofspace, 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.