

23/00348/FUL

Applicant Dr's Gaia & Patrick Rossetti & Highton

Location 6 Main Street, Stanford On Soar, Nottinghamshire, LE12 5PY

Proposal Erection of new single storey side and rear extension. Provision of 1.8m high boundary fence. Construction of retaining wall and steps to rear.

Ward Leake

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

23/00349/LBC

Applicant Dr's Gaia & Patrick Rossetti & Highton

Location 6 Main Street, Stanford On Soar, Nottinghamshire, LE12 5PY

Proposal Demolition of existing lean-to side extension and erection of new single storey side extension. Erection of 1.8m high boundary fence. Works to parapet; replacement of tiles to ground floor and insertion of fire-break to loft space

Ward Leake

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

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. 6 Main Street is the end property of a short, terraced row numbered 6-9 Main Street. The whole terrace is protected via a single grade II listing (GII) and the terrace forms a group along with Village Farmhouse (GII), a number of its barns (some with separate GII listing) and outbuildings and a similar terraced row numbers 2-5 (also GII listed) which bookends the former farm along with the terrace subject of this application. This group is on the opposite side of Main Street from the church and lychgate (grade I (GI) and GII respectively). The church itself is near due west of number 6 but set well back from the roadside in a churchyard with mature trees and planting which limits its prominence from Main Street.
2. The terrace, like its northern neighbour, has undergone a number of changes over time, including changes to the number of dwellings into which it is divided. The rear elevations are generally less well preserved having been affected to a greater extent by fenestration changes and the installation of services

including soil stacks which have generally lessened the architectural character of the row from the rear, and the consistency between its component dwellings.

3. The terrace row has a square bracket plan form with each of the end terraces projecting forward with a gabled frontage. The properties have a striking character from the roadside and contribute via group value with other listed buildings in the village.
4. The application property is located on a large plot, consisting of both garden and an off-street parking area with timber detached garage to the north east of the property. The garage and off-street parking are accessed from Village Farm Close which also serves a number of other residential dwellings. The garden area extends back from the rear elevation of the dwelling by more than 40 metres to agricultural land beyond the rear boundary. The southern boundary of the site shared with 7 Main Street is enclosed with a mix of 1.8 metre high timber close boarded fence towards the rear of the site with lower (1.5 m) woven fence and established vegetation closer to the rear elevations of the dwellings. The garden is separated from the parking area by established hedging.
5. The application site has a single storey lean-to extension to the rear section of the side elevation comprising a utility and WC. There are also a number of outbuildings within the rear garden.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

6. This application is seeking full planning permission for the erection of a contemporary style, flat roof, single storey side and rear extension, the provision of 1.8m high boundary fence to the southern boundary and the construction of retaining wall and steps to rear.
7. Listed building consent is sought for the demolition of the existing lean-to side extension and the erection of a new single storey side and rear extension. The erection of 1.8m high boundary fence attached to the rear elevation of the application property. Works to the parapet to prevent water ingress; replacement of modern tiles to the ground floor and the insertion of a fire-break wall to the loft space.
8. The proposed single storey side and rear extension would be positioned perpendicular to the host dwelling and set back from the front elevation by 4.6 m in line with the existing lean-to extension which is to be demolished. It would have a comparable width to that of the host dwelling, a floor area of nearly 50 m² and would comprise a kitchen/living area linking through to the existing kitchen which would become a dining area. Beyond the kitchen/living area there would be a utility and WC and an en-suite bedroom. The proposed extension would project out from the side elevation by 3.661m at the front, then angled to follow the existing contours of the site before straightening out as it projects back into the site. It would have an overall depth of 9.675 m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The proposal would have an overall height of 2.96 m and would be attached to the host dwelling by a fully glazed link with a height of 2.28 m.

9. The proposal would be cut into the raised ground alongside the dwelling which is currently retained by timber sleeper walls. A length of hedgerow to the northeast of the rear corner of the host dwelling measuring approx. 12 m and running parallel to the boundary with Village Farm House would be removed. The loss of this hedgerow is proposed to be mitigated through the planting of a total of 21 linear metres of new hedgerow along the northern boundary, adjacent to an existing close boarded timber fence, extending up towards the existing detached garage. Further hedgerow is also proposed to infill a space of 1.5 m along the front boundary of the site.
10. The submitted Design and Access Statement at para. 6.6 states that: 'the proposal has been designed as a modern addition to the listed building'. It would be finished externally with the following materials:
 - vertical timber cladding;
 - bronze coloured aluminium windows;
 - standing seam roof, comparable in colour to St John the Baptist Church opposite the site;
 - clerestorey glazing below soffit;
 - external paving to be retained and reused elsewhere on the site;
 - modern rainwater and drainage goods to be replaced with heritage style, cast aluminium.
11. The description of the planning application has been amended during the course of the application following the initial comments from the Conservation Officer to include the provision of the 1.8 m high boundary fence which would be along the shared boundary with 7 Main Street.
12. The description of the Listed Building Consent application has been amended during the course of the application following the initial comments from the Conservation Officer to include the provision of the works to the parapet; replacement of tiles to ground floor, insertion of a fire-break to the loft space and the erection of a 1.8 m high boundary fence which would be along the shared boundary with 7 Main Street.

SITE HISTORY

02/00913/LBC - Form 1.5m wide break in wall on road frontage; erect wrought iron gate – PERMITTED February 2003.

16/02887/LBC - Installation of bathroom, replace fibre cement roof sheets with slate, remove concrete floor and replace with heated limecrete floor, replace fireplace with wood burning stove – GRANTED December 2016.

18/00275/FUL - Construct detached wooden garage – PERMITTED March 2018.

18/00841/LBC - Replace 4no windows – GRANTED May 2018.

22/00066/FUL - Single Storey Side/Rear Extension – WITHDRAWN May 2022.

22/00067/LBC - Application for listed building consent for a single storey side/rear extension to existing listed building – WITHDRAWN May 2022.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

Ward Councillor (Cllr Thomas) objects:

13. **Original Plans:**

- Mindful of comments of Parish Council
- Acknowledge redesign from previous proposal
- Remains too large
- Out of character with row of cottages
- Proposal looks more like a public utility or holiday park home
- It will remain visible at the rear
- Holding objection pending specialist policy & design input from Design & Conservation Officers.

14. **Amended Plans:**

- Maintain objection notwithstanding inclusion of beneficial repairs
- Note that the graveyard of the Grade I listed church opposite is elevated from the road and clear view of the site is available – has this been fully considered?
- Scheme is reliant on hedge outside the red line for screening
- Higher hedge is being removed
- Concern about appearance remains. Modern design could be acceptable, but this has no beauty at all to my eye.

Ward Councillor (Cllr Way) objects:

15. **Original Plans:**

- Despite changes from previous application extension is out of character for the area
- Appears to be larger than the existing property
- Will negatively impact neighbouring properties
- Concerns about the loss of existing hedgerow
- Await report from Conservation Officer.

16. **Amended Plans:**

- Maintain objection
- Concerns about using frontage on Main Street as access for construction
The road is narrow and visibility will be severely compromised
- Support comments of Parish Council.

Town/Parish Council

17. Stanford On Soar Parish Council objects to the proposal. Summarised comments are shown below. The full response is available to view through the link to the application above.

18. **Original Plans:**

- Recognise amendments from previous submission (22/00066/FUL) but unable to support them
- vertical wood cladding and bronze coloured windows would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the row of listed cottages
- Note the statement that this has been designed so as not to be 'pastiche', however the extension at 9 Main Street was considered to be appropriate.
- Concern regarding overlooking
- Acknowledge that: size has been reduced; it is perpendicular; visibility from the road will be minimal; foul drainage matters have been explored; roof would have similar appearance to church roof; reduction in windows at rear; detailed Heritage Statement has been prepared
- If permission is granted there should be a condition requiring the construction of a taller fence and replanting of hedge between 6 and 7 Main Street.

19. **Amended Plans:**

Maintain objection. Revisions do not address the majority of the points raised originally. In addition, concerned about the safety risk of having vehicles parked unloading materials close to the bend in the road where visibility will be poor.

Statutory and Other Consultees

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Conservation Officer (Summarised comments are shown below. Full response is available through the link to the application above).

20. **Original Plans:**

- The design of the extension is contemporary, seeking a scheme which would obviously read as a later addition and one which is architecturally 'of its time'
- Seeks to take greatest advantage of existing screening including the front boundary wall and hedge which runs from the end of the terrace (after a narrow gateway) to the corner of Village Farmhouse
- Number 9 has a recent side and rear extension
- In my view proposals which make use of existing features to limit impact are being designed in a way as to minimise harm, whereas proposals which need to rely on adding further screening must concede that they do cause harm and need to mitigate against it
- If it is concluded that permission should be granted and that the effect of hedges on prominence is a key factor in favour of the proposal then I would recommend a condition requiring that the hedges be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development and that they not be pruned to below 2 metres in height
- There would be no cumulative impact upon historic fabric compared to the existing effect of the later lean-to
- The extension would still be of substantial scale, however, every reasonable step to minimise impact has been taken, what remains would

be some minor harmful impact arising from the scale of the proposed extension

- Some of the identified works to the fabric of the building could be added to the LBC as beneficial to further reduce scale of harm
- If all of the positive works referenced above were added to the proposal then the remaining harm would be minor and at the lower end of the less than substantial harm scale. It would remain to apply the test within paragraph 202 of the NPPF and it would still be necessary for public benefits of the proposal to outweigh harm not just as a simple balance but sufficiently to justify a departure from the statutory presumption against granting planning permission and listed building consent that would arise from sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

21. **Amended Plans:**

- The result of these additions to the (LBC) application and clarifications as to the works to replant hedges would be that the overall proposal would result, as previously suggested, in minor harm at the lower end of the less than substantial harm scale
- The remaining harm would itself be minor and therefore even relatively modest public benefits would significantly outweigh that harm and could allow the scheme to be approved. Note that the agent has suggested a number of potential wider public benefits which the proposal could be said to generate within the additional covering letter dated 3 April 2023.

Historic England

22. Do not wish to offer advice.

Local Residents and the General Public (Summarised comments below. Full responses available by following the links above.)

23. **Original Plans** – 6 representations have been received making the following comments:

- a. Impact upon the visual appearance of the terrace of 4 cottages, and the grade 2 collection of houses along Main Street as a whole
- b. Impact on the privacy and outlook of the remaining cottages along the terrace
- c. Difficult task to balance the preservation of the historical value of these buildings against the desire of their owners to improve and extend their living accommodation
- d. The proposal fails to meet the guidelines set out in RBC GP2 Design and Amenities Criteria
- e. The new proposal still represents an increase in the footprint of the original dwelling from circa 37m² to 86.5m², an increase of 134%
- f. Not sure that 2 doors are required in the west elevation – further damage to the fabric of the building
- g. Stanford Village Farm Management Company Ltd. (hereafter SVFMC) comment that Village Farm Close is a private roadway which the applicant's enjoy right of way over. No attempt to seek the permission of the existing owners of the access roadway has been made

- h. The proposal is in conflict with The National Planning Policy Framework (Para 53) which states that inappropriate development on residential gardens should be resisted
- i. This proposed dwelling would sit on gardens belonging to a Grade 2 listed cottage and in fact from the plans removes an well established privet hedge
- j. Section 66 of the Planning(Listed Buildings and Conservation areas)Act 1990 places a duty on planning authorities to ' have special regard' to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of architectural or historical interest which they possess. The above proposal by its nature is therefore contrary to section 66 of the Planning Act 1990.

24. **Amended Plans**: 1 further representation has been received:

- a. There has been no dialogue with the applicants regarding the boundary fence between 6 and 7 Main Street since the submission of the application.
- b. If this is to be granted permission against the Council's policy then as a minimum the circa 10 metres of damaged fence should be replaced with a 1.8m high vertical feather board fence to match the other surrounding gardens of the area and at least provide some degree of privacy.

PLANNING POLICY

25. The development falls to be determined in accordance with the Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy and the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. Other material planning considerations include Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide would be material considerations.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

26. The following sections of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) are relevant to the current proposal:
- Part 12 -Achieving well-designed places
 - Part 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

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

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

27. The following sections of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy are relevant to the current proposal:
- Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy 10 - Design and Enhancing Local Identity
 - Policy 11 - Historic Environment.
28. The following sections of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies are relevant to the current proposal:
- Policy 1 – Sustainable Development

- Policy 28 - (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets).
29. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide (RRDG) states that extensions to existing dwellings need to adhere to many design principles, notably those addressing scale, proportion, building and roof lines and privacy. As a general rule the style and design of the original dwelling should remain the dominant element with the extension subordinate to it.
 30. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990) requires Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
 31. The full narrative of the above can be found on the Rushcliffe Borough Council website [here](#).

APPRAISAL

The main considerations when assessing this proposal are the Principle of Development, the design of the development and its impact on the character of the surrounding area including heritage assets and impact upon Residential Amenity.

Principle of Development:

32. 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.
33. The proposed development comprises extensions to an existing residential property within an established residential area, as such the proposal is considered to be sustainable development and acceptable in principle, subject to the other matters in this report being considered acceptable.

Design of the development and its impact on the character of the surrounding area including heritage assets:

34. 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 landscape character of the surrounding area. Section 12 (para. 126) of the NPPF states: "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities".
35. Core Strategy Policy 11, Historic Environment, states that: "proposals and initiatives will be supported where the historic environment and heritage assets

and their settings are conserved and/or enhanced in line with their interest and significance. Planning decisions will have regard to the contribution heritage assets can make to the delivery of wider social, cultural, economic and environmental objectives".

36. Para. 190 of the NPPF states that: "Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account: (a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; (b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring; (c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and (d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place".
37. The NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment with much emphasis on 'significance'. This is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: "The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting." Setting is defined in Annex 2 as: "The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral." The definition of Conservation (for heritage policy) in Annex 2 is: "The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance".
38. The proposal is seeking full planning permission and listed building consent for the erection of a contemporary styled single storey side and rear extension including the removal of an existing lean-to extension on the side elevation, erection of a short length of 1.8 m high fence to the shared boundary with 7 Main Street and the carrying out of beneficial works. The proposed extension would have a footprint greater than the host dwelling, however, on account of its positioning within the generous garden area, 4.6 metres back from the front elevation and the highway, the incorporation of the modest glazed link to the host dwelling and the clerestorey glazing together with the lightweight roof structure the proposal would have a subordinate appearance. It is noted that the extension at 9 Main Street at the southern end of the terrace within which the application site is located also has a footprint greater than the host dwelling and has only a minimal set back from the front elevation. This extension has been constructed of materials to more closely match the existing dwellings and with a lean-to tiled roof. The applicants wish to develop a contemporary styled extension and as is defined in Annex 2 conservation is a process of maintaining and managing change not preventing it.
39. It is considered that the proposed external materials would be complementary to both the existing dwelling and the wider area including the terrace of cottages which are listed for their group value. A benefit of using contrasting yet complementary materials and in this instance the use of glazing to link the proposed extension to the original dwelling is that the original property maintains its original character and is not overtaken by an addition.

40. On account of the siting of the proposed extension, predominantly to the rear of the dwelling, and by virtue of the presence of existing vegetation and the proposed planting of further hedging it is considered that the impact on the wider streetscene would be minimal. It is accepted that the boundary, formed of wall with hedging to a height of approx. 2.75 m, immediately north of the site and running alongside Main Street is outside the red line of the application site and as such its retention cannot be controlled. However, it bounds part of the private garden of Village Farm House and as such there is a high likelihood that it would be retained for purposes of privacy due to its close proximity to Main Street. The proposed replacement hedging to the northern boundary of the site, which the applicant's agent has confirmed will be encouraged to grow to a height of 2.75 m, would screen the site from the streetscene. The Council's Conservation Officer makes reference to best practice in considering proposals affecting Heritage Assets and concern that screening can raise. In this instance existing established hedging is to be removed and as such the planting of boundary hedging, whilst providing screening from Main Street should the hedging which is outside of the control of the applicant be removed, it would also improve the visual appearance of this boundary of the site, which is currently formed by a timber close boarded fence and be in the interests of biodiversity by providing replacement hedgerows. In this instance it is considered that the siting, scale and design of the extension together with proposed landscaping of the site has been designed in a way as to minimise harm on the streetscene.
41. Concern has been raised through the consultation process that the proposal would be visible from the Churchyard opposite on account of it being set at a higher ground level. The site has been viewed from the pathway to the church and it is considered that on account of the presence of established vegetation, within and on the boundaries of the churchyard, along with the proposed planting within the site and the set back of the proposed extension that it would not be highly visible. It must also be noted that something being visible does not necessarily harm the *special significance* of a building church via its setting. The proposed rear extension would not be seen in context with the church, or its lychgate which is also listed, due to the proposed hedge planting.
42. The proposal has been amended through the consideration of the application to include the provision of a 1.8 metre high fence to the shared boundary with 7 Main Street adjacent to the rear elevations for a length of 1.8 metres (1 panel). There is other fencing further down the garden and to other shared boundaries within the terrace. The immediate neighbour has commented in their letter of representation that the fencing should be provided to the length of the entire garden, however, this is not considered to be necessary for amenity purposes as discussed below and would result in the removal of established vegetation. The boundary treatment as proposed would not limit intervisibility between the terraced row and their outbuildings allowing the relationship of structures to continue to be understood and appreciated.
43. Further clarification of works to improve and enhance the structure of the listed building have also been provided during the consideration of the application. These include the replacement of the floor tiles in the existing kitchen with tiles in keeping with original examples elsewhere in the property, the construction of a fire break studwork and plasterboard wall within the loft area for safety

purposes and repairs to the parapets to prevent water ingress which is causing damp within the property.

44. On the basis of the above it is considered, overall, that the proposal would result in minor harm at the lower end of the less than substantial harm scale. It is therefore necessary to apply the test at para. 202 of the NPPF weighing this harm against the public benefits of the proposal. The applicant's agent in association with their Heritage Consultant have responded on this as follows:

"Para. 20 of the Historic Environment guidance 'Historic Environment – GOV.UK states the following:

The National Planning Policy Framework requires any harm to designated heritage assets to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 8). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits, for example, works to a listed private dwelling which secure its future as a designated heritage asset could be a public benefit.

Examples of heritage benefits may include:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting*
- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset*
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation.*

The proposal in our view enhances the setting of the building and allows a long-term use for a family home, rather than short term starter home occupancy or rental tenancy, where significant investment into the property might be harder to realise. Enhancements to the property as described in the application, that provide this benefit include;

- replacement of flooring tiles in the kitchen;*
- alterations to the parapet wall to prevent damp and deterioration of the brickwork;*
- creation of the firebreak in the roof void to protect the application property and the neighbouring property from the risk of fire spread across the open roof void.*

The above should be deemed as public benefits in accordance with para. 20 of the guidance".

45. As the remaining harm would itself be minor the public benefits outlined above would significantly outweigh that harm and therefore the scheme would comply with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and guidance in the NPPF with regard to design and heritage assets.

Impact upon Residential Amenity:

46. In addition to matters of design, policy 10 of LPP1 and policy 1 of LPP2 also requires that new development proposals be assessed in terms of their impact on the amenity of occupiers and nearby residents. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide advises that extensions may be overbearing if the extension wall is too high or too close to the boundary or it projects a long way beyond the neighbours dwelling. It also advises that extensions may be considered to overshadow if they result in loss of daylight or sunlight to windows or gardens.
47. The proposed extension would be single storey in scale with the principal side elevation located to the north and in excess of 5 metres from the shared boundary with 7 Main Street. The layout of the proposed extension has been designed so as to limit any direct overlooking of the private rear garden area of 7 Main Street with the scheme also including the provision of new 1.8 metre high fencing to this boundary projecting 1.8 metres from the rear elevation. This, together with the proposed layout of the extension, with principal windows either close to the rear elevation of the existing dwelling, or to the rear elevation of the proposed extension would prevent any significant loss of amenity through overlooking or loss of privacy to and from the neighbouring properties within the terrace. The proposal would have an overall height of 2.96 m and be positioned to the north at a distance of just over 5 m from the shared boundary with the immediate neighbouring property at 7 Main Street. As such the proposal would not result in significant overbearing impact or loss of natural light to neighbouring occupants.
48. There is considered to be sufficient distance between the proposed extension and the neighbouring properties to the north on Village Farm Close for there to be no loss of residential amenity.

Other Matters:

Concern has been raised within letters of representation regarding access to the site and private rights. This is not a material planning consideration; however, the applicant's agent has provided a response on this matter stating that the applicant will enter into discussion on this.

Conclusions:

49. In conclusion the erection of an extension to a residential property in an established residential area is acceptable in principle. The design and appearance whilst contemporary would not cause harm to the significance of the principal listed building and its setting, nor to the special interest of the other listed buildings to which it is attached and in close proximity to. In addition, it would not result in significant adverse impact to neighbouring occupants. As such the proposal would comply with the objectives of Policies 10 and 11 of the LPP1 and Policies 1 and 28 of the LPP2 and Chapters 12 and 16 of the NPPF (2021).
50. The application was not the subject of formal pre-application discussions. However, proposal was subject to discussions with the agent following the withdrawal of the previous application and advice was offered on the measures that could be adopted to improve the scheme.

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 must be carried out strictly in accordance with the following approved drawing(s):

- Site Location Plan – dwg. no. 8409_03_001 – received 23 February 2023
- Proposed Site Plan - dwg. no. 8409_03_004 - received 23 February 2023
- Proposed Ground Floor Plans - dwg. no. 8409_03_005 rev. C - received 5 April 2023
- Proposed Elevations - dwg. no. 8409_03_006 rev. C - received 5 April 2023.

[For the avoidance of doubt having regard to Policy 10 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)].

3. The exterior of the development hereby permitted must be constructed using only the materials specified in the submitted application form and dwg. no. 8409_03_006 rev. C received 23 February 2023 and 5 April 2023 respectively. 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 Policies 10 and 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 and Policies 1 and 28 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies 2019].

4. The development hereby permitted must not be occupied or first brought into use until a Landscaping Scheme (LS), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The LS must provide details of all hard and soft landscaping features to be used and include the following:

- Detailed plans showing the location of all new trees, hedgerows (including details of the replacement hedging to the northern boundary of the site) and shrubs to be planted, including the number and/or spacing of shrubs in each shrub bed or hedgerow;
- A schedule of the new trees and shrubs (using their botanical/latin names) to be planted including their size at planting (height or spread for shrubs, height or trunk girth for trees);

- Plans showing the proposed finished land levels/contours of landscaped areas;
- Details of all proposed hard surfaces areas, retaining structures, steps, means of enclosure, bin store, surface finishes and any other hard landscaping features;
- Details of the protection measures to be used of any existing landscape features to be retained.

The approved LS must be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved details no later than during the first planting season (October – March) following either the substantial completion of the development hereby permitted or it being first brought into use, whichever is sooner.

The approved replacement hedgerow on the northern boundary shall be retained and maintained for the life of the development and encouraged to grow to a height of no less than 2.75m and thereafter not reduced in height below 2.75m without the written permission of the Borough Council.

If, within a period of 5 years of from the date of planting, any tree or shrub planted as part of the approved LS is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or become diseased or damaged then another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted must be planted in the same place during the next planting season following its removal.

Once provided all hard landscaping works shall thereafter be permanently retained throughout the lifetime of the development.

[To ensure the development creates a visually attractive environment and to safeguard against significant adverse effects on the landscape character of the area having regard to Policies 10 and 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014); Policies 1 and 28 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) and Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)].

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). Further information about CIL can be found on the Borough Council's website at <https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningandgrowth/cil/>

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.

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 provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996 may apply in relation to the boundaries with the neighbouring properties. 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 can find more information about the Party Wall Act here:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/523010/Party_Wall_etc__Act_1996_-_Explanatory_Booklet.pdf

It is RECOMMENDED that listed building consent 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.

[In accordance with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.].

2. The development hereby permitted must be carried out strictly in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

- Site Location Plan – dwg. no. 8409_03_001 – received 23 February 2023
- Proposed Site Plan - dwg. no. 8409_03_004 - received 23 February 2023
- Proposed Ground Floor Plans - dwg. no. 8409_03_005 rev. C - received 5 April 2023
- Proposed Elevations - dwg. no. 8409_03_006 rev. C - received 5 April 2023
- Heritage Statement – Prepared by Manorwood – received 23 February 2023
- Letter from HSSP Architects detailing repair and renovation works – dated 3 April 2023.

[For the avoidance of doubt having regard to Policies 10 and 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policies 1 and 28 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

3. The exterior of the development hereby permitted must be constructed using only the materials specified in the submitted application form and dwg. no. 8409_03_006 rev. C received 23 February 2023 and 5 April 2023 respectively. 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 Policies 10 and 11 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 and Policies 1 and 28 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies 2019].

4. Prior to the material completion of the extension hereby approved the following works shall have been completed and photographic evidence submitted to the Borough Council:

- the alterations to the parapet wall to prevent damp and deterioration of the brickwork; and
- creation of the firebreak in the roof void to protect the application property and the neighbouring property from the risk of fire spread across the open roof void.

[To ensure the public benefits are implemented in line with guidance in Section 16 of the NPPF (2021)].