

22/01980/FUL

Applicant

Mr Matthew Wolloch

Location

46 Stanhome Drive, West Bridgford

Proposal

Raised roof, loft conversion with dormer to rear

Ward

Lutterell

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

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application relates to a two-storey detached dwelling faced in brick with a hipped pitched roof faced in rosemary tiles. The frontage has a double- height bay window with a forward- projecting pitched roof over. A lean-to garage/ car port adjoins the side elevation. There is a single storey rear extension linked into a brick outbuilding. There is a c. 20 metre deep rear garden. The dwelling sits within a row of similar detached mid-century properties.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

2. The current application seeks planning permission for a loft conversion with a dormer window which is to be clad in dark grey cedar cladding along the side and rear elevations. The proposal also includes the extension of the roof space with a hip to gable roof extension and each side of the original roof structure, the insertion of 2 velux roof lights to the front elevation. The proposal includes the raising of the roof height of the original dwelling from approx. 7.3 metres to 7.916 metres.

SITE HISTORY

3. There is no relevant site history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Member

4. One Ward Councillor (Cllr B. Gray) supports the proposal. A summary of the comments is set out below (the full response is available to view on the Council's website [here](#)):
 - The application is similar externally to an application approved four doors down within the last two years
 - The style of roof alteration would be allowed under permitted development, therefore raising the roof height should be the only planning concern
 - Neighbouring properties have had their roof raised by a greater amount

- The proposal has a lower impact on the street scene than side dormers and multi-storey side extensions.

Parish Meeting and Adjacent Parish Councils/Meetings

5. No representations have been received.

Statutory and Other Consultees

6. No representations have been received.

Local Residents and the General Public

7. One representation has been received from neighbouring occupiers/ local residents objecting to the proposal. The concerns raised are summarised as follows:
- The proposed design, particularly the rear dormer window and the proposed dark cedar cladding, would not conform architecturally with other properties within the vicinity
 - The proposal would create a three floor dwelling that would be seen in office or commercial developments.

PLANNING POLICY

8. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of the adopted Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (December 2014) (LPP1) and the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies - adopted October 2019 (LPP2). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide 2009.
9. The full text of the Council's policies are available on the Council's website at: <https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/>.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

10. 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.
11. 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
 - Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

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

12. 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
- Policy 17 – Biodiversity.

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

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

- Policy 1 - Development Requirements
- Policy 38 - non-designated biodiversity assets and the wider ecological network.

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

APPRAISAL

14. 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.

15. 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
- Highways considerations
- Ecological matters.

Principle of the development

16. This application seeks planning permission for the construction of roof extensions including the raising of the roof height, hip to gable extensions to either side elevation and a rear dormer window.

17. 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.

18. 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.

Impact upon the character of the area

19. 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.
20. Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2021) 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.
21. The Residential Design Guide SPD (2009) states that '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'.
22. The proposed loft conversion seeks to remove the existing hipped roof and would replace this with a pitched roof structure, with the addition of a hip to gable extension to both sides of the roof and an overall increase in the ridge height of 0.6m.
23. Officers note that the main architectural roof style within the immediate vicinity along Stanhome Drive is a hip style roof with some properties benefitting from a front gable projection. Stanhome Drive has a strong characteristic, and whilst there have been multiple roof and dormer extensions along Stanhome Drive, most of the additions retain the original hipped roof form which is a strong characteristic of the area. The proposed hip to gable extensions on either side elevation would be highly visible from Stanhome Drive and would create a pitched roof structure that would increase the ridge height by 0.6 metres. Officers consider that the removal of the hipped roof element of the existing dwelling would fail to allow for the existing design traits and characteristics of the existing dwelling to be understood. The proposed dormer window would also add a large amount of bulk to the rear of the property, and this would be intervisible from the side elevations of the dwelling.
24. Therefore, due to the size, scale and massing of the proposed loft conversion, officers consider that it would not result in a subordinate addition and would significantly unbalance the host dwelling. Officers also consider that the proposed removal of the existing hipped roof would cause harm to the character of the area.

25. Officers note the comments submitted by the agent and Ward Councillor in relation to a previously approved loft conversion scheme that was permitted on 4th February 2021 under planning permission 20/02404/FUL for a property at 54 Stanhome Drive. Whilst the proposed development would be very similar to that previously approved, The NPPF has since been updated (20th July 2021) to put further emphasis on good design and the changes to the NPPF have to be taken into account when assessing the current application. The NPPF paragraph 134 (which was not included within the 2019 version of the NPPF) states that 'Development that is not well designed should be refused'. Paragraph 134 also states that significant weight should be given to development which reflects local design policies'. 'taking into account supplementary planning documents such as design guides'. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide states that 'dormer window design should generally reflect the character of the building in terms of roof form'.
26. Officers note the comments made by the Ward Councillor in terms of the proposed roof extension being permitted development other than the raising of the roof height. Whilst officers appreciate that some hip to gable extensions benefit from permitted development rights, the current application requires the submission of an application due to it not meeting the requirements set out in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015, Class B. Class B (a) states that development is not permitted if 'any part of the dwellinghouse would, as result of the works, exceed the highest part of the existing roof'. As the proposal includes the raising of the ridge height of the existing dwelling, the proposal requires planning permission. As such, the current application in its entirety has to be assessed in line with national and local planning policies.
27. Officers are of the view that in this particular area of West Bridgford the character of the housing stock makes a positive contribution to the streetscene and should be preserved where possible in the interests of good design. The current proposal under this application would result in a form of development fails to relate sympathetically to the character of the area and does not relate sympathetically to the existing street scene.

Impact upon residential amenity

28. 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.
29. In terms of neighbouring amenity, the property to the north-west, known as No. 48 Stanhome Drive, is positioned approx. 4.5 metres from the application dwelling. The proposal would not extend beyond the side or rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The proposal includes the raising of the ridge height by 0.7 metres. Due to the orientation of the dwellings, there is potential for overshadowing impact to No.48. However, due to the ample separation distance between the dwellings, officers consider that the proposal would cause undue harm in terms of overshadowing or overbearing impacts to No. 48.

30. There are no window openings proposed on the north-western elevation or south-eastern elevations. There are doors and window openings proposed on the rear elevation of the dormer window. However, officers consider that the proposed dormer would not cause any further undue looking than what already exists from the first-floor windows. As such, officers consider that the proposed development would not cause undue overlooking impacts to No.48.
31. The neighbouring property to the south-east, No. 44, is positioned approx. 2.8 metres from the application dwelling. The proposed extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of No.44. Due to the orientation of the properties, and the separation distance at first floor level, officers consider that the proposed development would not cause undue impacts to No. 44 in terms of overshadowing and overbearing.
32. The proposed rear dormer would be located circa 31. metres from the north-eastern (rear) boundary. The north-eastern boundary consists of dense shrubbery and trees which would provide ample screening of the proposed development from the properties located on Waddington Drive. The proposal includes the addition of doors and a window opening to the rear (north-eastern) elevation of the dormer window. Due to the separation distance and screening on the north-eastern boundary, officers consider that the proposed roof extensions would not cause undue impact to the properties along Waddington Drive in terms of overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing impacts.
33. As such, officers consider that the proposed additions would not cause undue impacts to neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing impacts.

Impact upon highway/parking

34. With regards to the impact the development would have upon the existing highway/parking on the site/ wider area, it is noted that the development seeks to increase the number of bedrooms in the property to from 3 to 4. The Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Design Guide 4.1 Residential Parking states that 4 bedroomed properties should have parking provision of ≥ 3 spaces for 4 bedroomed dwellings. Officers note that the property has off road parking for at least two vehicles, and there is sufficient on street parking available along Stanhome Drive. Officers consider that this level of provision is acceptable of the size of the resulting dwelling.

Ecological matters

35. Given that the current dwelling has not been subject to a previous loft conversion and the site is bound by trees to the north, the ecological implications of removing the current roof space need to be assessed. No ecology survey has been submitted as part of the application. As such, officers consider that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on protected species. We have responsibilities as the local authority in relation to European protected species. Planning authorities are considered to be competent authorities and are exercising a function in deciding whether or not to grant planning permission. It must be considered whether the development if permitted would be likely to offend Article 12 (1) by, for example, causing disturbance of a

species. In which case the likelihood of a license being granted must be considered in relation to the three tests established in case law. At this time the Borough Council as Local Planning Authority cannot have due regard to our responsibilities as it has not been demonstrated.

36. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 12.23 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies which states: "Applications which may affect priority habitats or species, or nationally or internationally protected species will require an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), which will usually be supported by a preliminary ecological appraisal (also known as an extended phase 1 habitat survey) and/or protected species survey, all of which should be carried out prior to determination".
37. Of relevance is policy 38 of the Local Plan Part 2 (non-designated biodiversity assets and the wider ecological network)
 - 1) Where appropriate, all developments will be expected to preserve, restore and re-create priority habitats and the protection and recovery of priority species in order to achieve net gains in biodiversity.
38. The proposal is contrary to Policy 17 (Biodiversity) of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, specifically the following criteria:
 - c) seeking to ensure new development provides new biodiversity features, and improves existing biodiversity features wherever appropriate;
 - e) ensuring that where harm to biodiversity is unavoidable, and it has been demonstrated that no alternative sites or scheme designs are suitable, development should as a minimum firstly mitigate and if not possible compensate at a level equivalent to the biodiversity value of the habitat lost.
39. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 180 a) of the National Planning Policy Framework local planning authorities should apply the following principles: : "a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused".
40. Paragraph 182. States" The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site".

Conclusion

41. Officers consider that the current proposal under this application would result in a form of development fails to relate sympathetically to the character of the area and does not relate sympathetically to the existing street scene. Consequently, officers consider that the proposed development does not accord with the national guidance and local planning policies which aims to ensure that development is well designed and does not have adverse impacts on the character of the area.
42. Officers also consider that the application has failed to demonstrate that there would not be an adverse impact on ecology/ protected species.

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be refused subject to the following reason(s)

1. The proposed loft conversion, by reason of its design, appearance, siting and location would not be sympathetic to the prevailing pattern and character of development in the immediate area. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policies 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies, and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), specifically Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places.
2. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on protected species. The proposed development is, therefore, contrary to Local Plan Part 1 Policy 17 (Biodiversity), Policy 38 (Non-designated biodiversity assets and the wider ecological network) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. and the National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 in particular paragraphs 180 and 182.