

# 22/01081/FUL

**Applicant** Mr Andrew Broxholme

**Location** 59 Dunster Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire. NG2 6JE

**Proposal** Demolition of Existing Garage, Single Storey rear and side extension; Extended raised patio to rear; Loft Conversion including side hip to gable and rear dormer. (Resubmission of 21/01993/FUL)

**Ward** Abbey

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

## THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application property is a two-storey dwelling of which is one of an attractive semi-detached symmetrical pair. 59 Dunster Road has a hipped roof with a front projecting gable which overhangs a two-storey bay window. The dwelling is predominantly finished in brick with secondary elements of white smooth render, whilst the roof is finished in a red/brown rosemary tile with ridge tiles.
2. To the rear, the application site has a detached garage adjacent to the North-West boundary with 57 Dunster Road, a raised patio which extends to the rear of the detached garage and a lengthy rear garden which shares its rear boundary with 60 Rodney Road. The boundary treatments consist of a stepped brick wall adjacent to the South-East edge of the patio and a c.2.00m hedge beyond on this boundary, whilst the North-West boundary consists of a c.1.60m close-boarded timber fence.
3. The property is the North of its pair, located on the East side of Dunster Road within the Abbey Ward of West Bridgford where the ground level slopes down towards the North-East (rear). The majority of properties within proximity are of a similar age and style.
4. Several properties within the area have been previously altered with an effect on the street scene, where works include hip-to-gable roof extensions, side dormers, front rooflights, single-storey side extensions and two-storey side extensions.

## DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

5. Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a single-storey side and rear wraparound extension that would be facilitated through the removal of the existing detached garage, an extended raised patio and a loft conversion, facilitated through the construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear box dormer, 1no second floor side window and 3no front rooflights, to serve a master bedroom and en-suite.

6. The single-storey side/rear wraparound extension would appear as a lean-to side extension when viewed from the front, projecting from the side elevation by c.2.55m with an eaves height of c.2.96m and a ridge height of c.3.37m.
7. The rear element of the extension would be stepped, with a length of c.7.40m alongside (0.3m inset) the boundary with 57 Dunster Road, with a ridge height of c.3.17m, and a length of c.4.00m alongside (0.2m inset) the boundary with 61 Dunster Road, with a ridge height of c.3.58m. Both parts of the rear extension would have shallow pitched gables with rooflights on both roof planes.
8. The extensions would be finished in a facing brick to match the host dwelling, a roof tile of colour to match the roof tiles of the host dwelling, and all external windows/doors would be of an anthracite grey colour finish. Fenestration would include a rear 4-pane bifolding door and gable window, a rear French door and gable window, and a door and obscure glazed window in the front elevation.
9. Beyond the rear of the extensions, it is proposed for a raised terrace that would extend c.3.00m further to the rear than the existing raised platform. The existing raised terrace is c.0.90m above ground level, and the proposed terrace would be c.0.60m above ground level. The platform would be accessed from each rear door of the extension through 2no steps onto the terrace. The extension of the raised patio would see the erection of fencing up to the edge of the proposed patio, infill fencing between the brick pillars on the boundary with 61 Dunster Road to a height of c.1.73m, and an additional c.1.08m of fencing adjacent to the boundary with 57 Dunster Road to a total height of c.2.40m above the patio level for the length of the proposed patio.
10. The hip-to-gable roof extension would make use of the existing ridge height, eaves height and roof pitch such that it would appear as one continuous roof plane with the roof tiles to match the host dwelling. It is identified that the existing roof tiles will also be replaced as part of the works. The new gable wall would be constructed in brick to match the house.
11. The rear dormer would be of a flat roofed design, projecting from the roof plane horizontally by c.4.29m and vertically by c.3.09m, being inset from the eaves by c.0.46m, from the ridge by c.0.31m, inset from the gable by c.0.24m and from the attached neighbour by c.0.33m.
12. The dormer cheeks would be finished in a vertical hung tile to match the host dwelling, the flat roof would be a GRP flat roof system, and the dormer would include a frosted Juliet Balcony consisting of a French door and 2no side windows.
13. The roof works would also see the insertion of 3no front facing rooflights and 1no obscure glazed side window.

## **SITE HISTORY**

14. The most relevant planning history is set out below.
  - 21/01993/FUL - Demolition of Existing Garage, Single Storey Extension over demolished garage and rear of dwelling. Loft Conversion.

WITHDRAWN – due to Officer concerns with regards to the length of the proposed extension against the boundary with 61 Dunster Road.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Ward Councillor(s)**

15. One Ward Councillor (Cllr. B Buschman does not object.
16. One Ward Councillor (Cllr P Gowland objects to the proposal as summarised below.
  - Loss of amenity space.
  - Future maintenance due to narrow gap between buildings.
  - Queries of elevation of site in relation to neighbours, and the resultant effects with regards to the scale of the extensions and level of overlooking.
  - Overlooking as a result of Juliet Balcony.

### **Statutory and Other Consultees**

17. No representations have been requested or received by other consultees.

### **Local Residents and the General Public**

18. Six representations have been received from, and on behalf of, neighbouring occupiers/local residents objecting to the proposal throughout the course of the application. The concerns raised are summarised as follows:
  - Privacy/Overlooking of rear and side neighbours due to the size of the rear dormer windows/Juliet balcony, whilst the rear neighbours are particularly concerned due to the site topography. Side neighbours also have concerns regarding the proposed raised terrace.
  - Dominant/Out of keeping design. It is considered by neighbours to be out of proportion to the existing house due to the scale, and the loss of the hipped roof for a gable end not being in keeping with the area. Concerns have also been raised regarding the material finish facing any neighbouring property.
  - Damage to neighbouring tree. The proposed extension would be located within close proximity of the neighbouring tree and therefore likely to have root damage and require pruning.
  - Overshadowing/Overbearing – to side neighbours as a result of the proposed extension and boundary treatments.

## **PLANNING POLICY**

19. 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).
20. Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 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:
  - Principle of development.
  - Design/ character and appearance of the street scene.
  - Residential amenity.

## **Principle of the development**

27. The development proposes householder extensions to an established residential property within the West Bridgford area and accordingly, the principle of these works in this location is considered acceptable subject to compliance with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1 and The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2.

## **Design/character and appearance of the street scene**

28. The properties on Dunster Road are predominantly of a similar age with some variations of style between semi-detached and detached properties and some more modern infill. The properties are for the most part generously spaced between detached and pairs of semi-detached houses.
29. Concerns have been raised with regards to the effect of the hip-to-gable extension on its semi-detached pair and therefore the street scene, given that its symmetry would be reduced. This type of extension can impact on the character of an area and careful consideration must be given in relation to the surrounding area. In this particular case the proposed hip-to-gable extension would make use of a brick to match the host dwelling in the new gable end and a roof tile to match on the roof planes, whilst maintaining the eaves height and ridge height of the existing hipped roof. There is no alteration to the overall ridge height and
30. Several properties within the vicinity have been altered through the conversion and enlargement the roof space, or recently had permission granted to do so.
31. Additionally, it is noted that both immediate side neighbours, 57 and 61 Dunster Road, have undertaken roof alterations, with 57 Dunster Road having a side facing dormer visible from the street.
32. It is also noted that under Permitted Development (Class B, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (As Amended)) the roof space may be enlarged by up to 40 cubic metres on a semi-detached dwelling, subject to other limitations. The proposed hip-to-gable extension would make up c.27.2 cubic metres.
33. The flat roof rear dormer would not be easily visible from public domain given that it would be inset from the eaves, the eaves maintained, and set down from the ridge and the dormer cheeks would be finished in a vertical hung tile that would be of a similar appearance to the roof tiles of the roof. Thus, it is considered to be subservient and sympathetic to the host dwelling. It is noted that a flat roof dormer (albeit a smaller sized one) could also be constructed under Permitted Development provided it did not exceed 40 cubic metres in combination with the hip-to gable extension.
34. Therefore, in this specific case it is considered that a hip-to-gable extension would not be detrimental to the host dwelling, its attached neighbour, or street scene in terms of design and thus, sympathetic to the surrounding area, whilst any glimpse of the rear dormer would be sympathetic to the host dwelling.
35. The proposed side extension would be a subordinate addition, being single storey with a lean-to roof, located c.3.88m from the front elevation. It would

project from the side elevation by c.2.55m and be offset from the side boundary by c.0.30m. It would be finished in a brick to match the host dwelling, whilst the roof tiles would be of a similar colour to the host dwelling. As such, it is considered that it would be a subordinate and clearly secondary addition, with no concern of a terracing effect whilst being sympathetic to the host dwelling.

36. The front facing rooflights and insertion of a side second-floor window are not considered to have a significant impact on the street scene, given that they would be of a typical size and type for the residential area.
37. Concerns have been raised with regards to the overdevelopment of the site, given that the works would include a hip-to-gable extension, a rear box dormer and a single-storey side/rear wraparound extension. Although a notable increase in footprint, the application property would retain a rear garden measuring c.229 square metres and the existing parking arrangement would not be unduly altered. As such, the proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.
38. In light of the above, 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 Policy 10 of the Core Strategy, Policy 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **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.

### **Side/Rear Wraparound Extension:**

40. The application property is the North-West of its semi-detached pair on the North-East side of Dunster Road. As such, the proposed single-storey extension would project towards the North-West (side) and North-East (rear).
41. The extension would be located c.0.30m from the boundary with 57 Dunster Road and have a length of c.13.66m, extending c.7.40m to the rear of the host dwelling. It would be facilitated through the removal of the existing detached garage.
42. The extension would have a length of c.4.00m offset c.0.20m from the boundary with 61 Dunster Road, and a further length of c.3.40m inset from the boundary by c.3.00m.
43. The extension would project significantly further to the rear than the rear elevation of 57 Dunster Road. However, the proposed extension would extend no further than the existing detached garage that is to be removed, of which has a greater eaves and ridge height than the proposal, whilst sited immediately adjacent to the boundary. The side element of the extension would be single-storey and predominantly located to the North of the two-storey host dwelling. It would have an appropriate eaves height and distance to the

neighbouring property. As such, there are no significant overshadowing or overbearing concerns as a result of the extension, on 57 Dunster Road.

44. The proposed extension would be of a stepped design nearby to 61 Dunster Road, projecting c.4.00m in length inset from the boundary by c.0.20m, and a further c.3.40m in length located c.3.00m from the boundary. Due to being predominantly located to the North of the neighbouring property, there are no overshadowing concerns. Due to the stepped design and appropriate height, there are no significant concerns that the extension would be of an overbearing nature.
45. The proposed extension would include a significant increase in rear facing glazing, consisting of a 4-pane bifolding door and gable window and a rear French door and gable window.
46. It is considered that the outlook would be predominantly contained within the rear garden, but also with an increased level of overlooking to the rear parts of the side neighbouring properties garden and the rear gardens/elevation of the properties on Rodney Road.
47. However, given that that the boundary treatments are c.1.60m-c.2.00m in height, and any outlook being towards the lawn area, there are no significant overlooking concerns with regards to 57 and 61 Dunster Road. Given the distance to the rear elevations of Rodney Road, of which is approx.45m, there are no significant overlooking concerns.

#### Roof Extensions:

48. The proposed roof extensions which increase the built form of the property consist of a hip-to-gable extension and rear box dormer.
49. The proposed hip-to-gable extension would be located to the North-West of the existing roof form and c.4.30m from the neighbouring property. As such, any likely overshadowing or overbearing effect would be towards 57 Dunster Road. However, given that the extension would maintain the existing eaves height and ridge height of the host dwelling, it is not considered to be a significant increase in overshadowing or be of a significant overbearing nature.
50. The new gable end would include 1no window facing towards 57 Dunster Road. Given that it would be obscure glazed and secured by condition, there are no significant overlooking concerns.
51. The proposed rear box dormer would be sited on the North-East facing roof plane, and extend from the roof plane by a maximum of c.4.29m and vertically by c.3.09m. Given that the built form would increase, there is considered to be a potential impact on 57 Dunster Road. However, given that it would be subordinate to the roof plane, set down from the ridge, inset from the eaves and of an appropriate height, there are no significant overshadowing or amenity concerns.
52. The proposed dormer would include a 4-pane rear facing window and Juliet Balcony. Evidently it would result in a new level of overlooking, with there being no existing second floor windows, with concerns raised for the privacy of both flanking neighbours and rear neighbours.

53. Given the oblique angles of sight which would be possible from the proposed Juliet balcony, the patio areas to the immediate rear of the two side neighbouring properties would not be significantly overlooked. And given the distance to the rear elevations of Rodney Road, of which is approx.52m, there are no significant overlooking concerns.
54. It is also noted that Juliet balconies and rear dormers are possible without planning permission subject to limitations set out in the General Permitted Development Order (2015)(As Amended). As such, although the dormer and Juliet balcony would provide a new outlook, it would not be out of character for built up residential areas, or to a level significant so as to warrant refusal of the application.

#### Other alterations:

55. It is also proposed for the creation of a raised terrace to the rear of the proposed side/rear extension which would extend c.3.00m to the rear of the extension. It would be accessed via the rear doors on each rear elevation of the stepped extension, and down 2no steps. Thus, it would be c.0.40m lower than the existing patio – which is raised c.1.00m above ground level.
56. Screening would be provided on the boundary with 61 Dunster Road through infilling the existing brick wall and columns with fencing, which would be to a height of c.1.70m above the proposed patio. Given the height of the proposed fencing, not increasing the height of the brick wall but in-filling the existing voids, it is not considered to be of an undue overbearing nature. It is also noted that hard boundary treatments could be implemented under Permitted Development to a height of 2.00m.
57. Additional screening would be provided on the boundary with 57 Dunster Road to a height of c.2.00m above the top step and c.2.40m above the proposed patio. As such, there are no significant concerns with the level of overlooking from the rear patio. It is considered that the fence would be of a significant height and have potential overbearing impacts. However, given that the height of the fence would be significantly lower than the eaves of the existing garage, and extending c.3.00m further to the rear, there are no significant concerns.
58. The proposal would also include 3no front facing rooflights. Given that the outlook would be towards public domain, there are no significant concerns.

#### **Amenity of occupier**

59. Concerns have been raised with regards to overdevelopment of the site, with the footprint of the site significantly increasing.
60. The rear garden as a result of the proposed extensions would be approx.229 square meters (including the patio area), significantly greater than the required amount of 90 square meters for semi-detached properties.

#### **Car parking**

61. Although the proposal would include the loss of the existing garage, it is considered that the garage is not of an appropriate size for many modern cars.



County Council's residential parking guide advises that a dwelling of 4 or more bedrooms should have 3 or more car parking spaces.

62. It is considered that the dwelling is at present a 4-bedroom dwelling and the application proposes for a 5-bedroom dwelling and as such, still within the same required level of car parking (4 or more bedrooms).

### **Trees**

63. It is noted that the proposed extension would be located near to a neighbouring tree which is not protected through either a tree preservation order or being in a conservation area. The tree is not in a prominent location with significant public amenity value.
64. Thus, it is a private legal matter to prune any overhanging branches and remove any roots within the application site.

### **Other matters**

65. None.

### **Third Party Representations**

66. 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. Those objections/issues are considered to be covered within the Officer Report.

### **Note**

67. It is noted that under permitted development, i.e. without the need for planning permission, a hip-to-gable extension could likely be completed, in addition to side and rear extensions and the retention of the garage, with potentially greater amenity impacts.

### **Conclusion**

68. 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.

### **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:
  - 1010\_BS\_XX\_ZZ\_DR\_A\_0300. Proposed General Arrangement Plans. Received 25 July 2022.
  - 1010\_BS\_XX\_ZZ\_DR\_A\_0601. Proposed Rear Boundary Treatments. Received 15 August 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 exterior of the development hereby permitted must be constructed using only the materials specified in the submitted application form. If any alternative materials are proposed to be used, then prior to the development advancing beyond damp proof course level, the details of all alternative external materials must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. Thereafter the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved, alternative materials.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory having regard to policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

4. The second floor window in the side elevation of the development hereby permitted must be;
  - a) non-opening to a height of 1.70m above finished floor level, and;
  - b) fitted with glass which has been rendered permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent.

Similarly, the balustrade of the Juliet balcony in the rear elevation of the rear dormer, hereby permitted, must be fitted with glass which has been rendered permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent.

Thereafter, the window and balustrade must be retained to this specification throughout the lifetime of the development.

[To preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties, having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

5. Prior to the raised terrace hereby permitted being brought into use, boundary fencing/screening must be installed as per the approved plans, above, on both side boundaries, to a height as depicted in the approved plans. Thereafter, the fencing should be retained for the lifetime of the development.

[To preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties, having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019).]

## NOTES TO APPLICANT

Please be advised that all applications approved on or after the 7<sup>th</sup> 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.