

25/00594/FUL

Applicant Mr Mark Ferris

Location 9 Seatoller Close, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire NG2 6RB

Proposal First floor side extension and single storey rear extension

Ward Gamston

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site of 9 Seatoller Close is a two storey detached dwelling of traditional construction, being red brick with a dark tiled roof. The dwelling has an attached single garage to the side and a block driveway with some planting to the front. There is a fair sized private garden to the rear.
2. The property is located within a large housing estate to the east of West Bridgford and sits among dwellings of a similar size and age.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. The current planning application seeks approval for a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension. The plans and details of the proposal can be found [here](#).
4. The proposed first floor extension would have a width of c.2.6m, the same as the existing garage, and a length along the side elevation, including above the existing ground floor utility room, of c.7.1m. It would have an eaves height of c.4.7m, the same as the host dwelling and ridge height of c.7.5m, a set down of c.400mm from the ridge of the host dwelling.
5. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a projection off the rear elevation of the host dwelling of c.4m and a width across the rear elevation of c.5.5m. It would have a dual pitched roof with a maximum ridge height of c.2.2m and an eaves height of c.3.5m.
6. When the planning application was validated it was stated on the application form that the applicant and/or agent was not:
 - (a) a member of staff
 - (b) an elected member
 - (c) related to a member of staff
 - (d) related to an elected member.
7. Consequently the LPA was informed that this was incorrect and the applicant was related to a Rushcliffe Borough Council employee. A new application form correctly completed was requested and received. A full consultation period was subsequently undertaken as a result.

8. The Director of Development & Economic Growth advised that this relationship did not warrant the need for the application to be heard at Planning Committee, however as a Ward Councillor objected to the application, thereby opposing the officer recommendation, the requirement for the application to go before the Planning Committee was triggered.
9. The initial error on the submitted application form should have no influence on the application process, the assessment of the proposal, nor the final recommendation of the proposal.
10. The proposal was amended during the course of the assessment to reduce the size of the first floor extension by setting it in from the rear elevation of the host dwelling and setting the ridge height down from the ridge of the host dwelling.
11. Further revised plans have been received amending the original internal layout of the first floor to provide one bedroom only and omitting the proposal to convert the garage to habitable accommodation.

SITE HISTORY

12. There is no relevant planning history on the application site.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

13. One Ward Councillor (Cllr J Wheeler) objects to the proposal, stating:

"The loss of light and privacy will have an impact upon the neighbouring property. Many roads in Gamston were designed in a staggered formation deliberately, and so extensions like these can have more of an impact than in other areas."

Local Residents and the General Public

14. One representation from a neighbour (no 7 Seatoller Close) was received raising the following matters:
 - a. first floor extension will cause a loss of light to our dining room and patio, which was installed specifically to benefit from the morning sun
 - b. garden is north facing, and only gets the sun in the morning, and the dining room as a result is already the coldest room in the house
 - c. it is the council's responsibility to ask the applicant for a full daylight/sunlight assessment of the impact of the first floor extension
 - d. if a first floor extension is to be added, this will result in a lack of privacy to a bathroom window, which would be extremely close to the proposed window at the front of the first floor extension
 - e. object to the first floor extension at the back as the proposed bedroom window would directly look into a summerhouse, causing a loss of privacy.
15. As a result of the neighbour re-consultation on the first version of revised plans, a further 2 representations were received from the neighbouring property. The following comments were made:

- a. objection about the loss of light remains due to the staggered positioning of the two properties
 - b. the revised plan will have an impact on light into the dining room the main upstairs bedroom and onto the specially-designed patio which was created to enjoy the morning sunshine
 - c. there has still been no loss-of-light assessment submitted
 - d. the revised plan will still have an impact on the privacy of our summer house due to the additional back window of the new first-floor extension which would have a direct view into the summer house
 - e. revised plan will have an impact on the privacy of our en-suite bathroom when the windows are open as the extension's first-floor bedroom window at the front will have a view of the inside of the en-suite
 - f. the revised plan will mean a brick wall will impact the view from our main bedroom window.
16. As a result of neighbour re-consultation on the final version of revised plans a further 2 representations were received from the neighbouring property raising the following additional points:
- a. first-floor extension results in an overbearing nature contrary to policy and Rushcliffe Design Code (September 2025)
 - b. first-floor extension results in an over-shadowing and loss of privacy impact
 - c. first-floor extension adversely impacts access to light (into dining room and bedroom), contrary to Rushcliffe Design Code (September 2025). Using the illustrative guidance contained in the design code, the staggered positioning of the neighbouring properties accentuates the adverse effect of the first-floor extension on our property in terms of over-shadowing
 - d. staggered position of the two properties means the proposed first-floor extension built towards our property and the impact of the new rear and front windows will have a significant detrimental impact on both light and privacy
 - e. the application containing an overbearing and over-shadowing first floor extension should be rejected.

PLANNING POLICY

17. The decision on any application should be taken in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and the Rushcliffe Design Code (2025) (RDC).

Relevant National Policies and Legislation

18. 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.
19. The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and work proactively with applicants to secure

developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

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

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

Relevant Local Plan Policies and Guidance

22. The following policies of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy are considered to be relevant to the current proposal:
 - Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy 10 - Design and Enhancing Local Identity.
23. The following policies of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2) are considered to be relevant to the current proposal:
 - Policy 1 - Development Requirements.
24. The Rushcliffe Design Code (2025) sets out rules and guidance for extension design and assessment of amenity impacts.
25. The policies in the Core Strategy, Local Plan Part 2 and the Rushcliffe Design Guide are available in full along with any supporting text on the Council's website [here](#).

APPRAISAL

26. 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.
27. The main considerations of this proposal are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact on streetscene
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenity
- Parking and Highways safety
- Biodiversity Net gain.

Principle of development

28. 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.
29. In this instance the proposed development comprises extensions and alterations at an existing dwelling within the main settlement area of West Bridgford. As such it is considered to be a sustainable development and therefore is acceptable in principle subject to other material considerations being acceptable.

Design

30. Policy 10 of LPP1 and Policy 1 of LPP2 require matters such as the scale, height, massing, design and layout of a proposed development to be carefully considered to ensure that a) it respects the appearance of the existing building and b) remains subservient to it. In addition, the policies require new developments not to harm the character of the wider area either.

First Floor Side Extension

31. The first floor side extension above the existing garage would be set down from the ridge of the roof of the host dwelling. It would sit flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling, which itself is 'set-back' from a front canopy which runs along the front elevation as a continuation of the garage roof. This set-down and perceived 'set-back' would ensure the side extension maintains a subservient relationship with the host dwelling and would not become the dominating factor within the street scene on Seatoller Close.
32. The dwellings in this part of Seatoller Close do not sit in a constant straight line and are staggered, being set back from one another. The first floor extension would not impact this stagger, being set back c. 4.3m from the front elevation of no. 7, as per the existing dwelling. This would ensure that there would be no undue terracing impact created.
33. The Rushcliffe Design Code (Sept 2025) also advises that side extensions can have a significant impact on character and continuity of a street. Any proposed extension should respect the street pattern and elevation. Overshadowing, loss of privacy, loss of light and any overbearing impact on the existing building and neighbouring buildings are the key issues when determining applications for extensions. Over development of a site can result in long term damage to an area.
34. Particularly relevant are Design Codes C5.1 and C5.2:

C5.1 Side extensions must not result in development within 1 metre of a common boundary with a neighbouring house or where terracing would result.

C5.2 Where there is a consistent rhythm to the street scene, in terms of setbacks, heights and separation distances, this must not be interrupted.

35. It is acknowledged that the first floor side extension would not meet the code C5.1 in that there would be a separation distance of 900mm from the common boundary, not the 1m specified in the code. However, in this case the extension would follow the separation distance that is currently created by the garage bringing the host property no nearer to the common boundary than is currently the case.
36. In terms of code C5.2 it is considered that first floor side extension would sit flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling, which itself is 'set-back' from a front canopy which runs along the front elevation as a continuation of the garage roof. The extension would also be set down from the main ridge. This set down and perceived 'set-back' would ensure that there remains a consistent rhythm to the street scene.

Single storey rear extension

37. The single storey rear extension would be screened from the public realm and Seatoller Close by the host dwelling itself, having no undue impact on the streetscene or surrounding area.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers

38. Core Strategy Policy 10 requires 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.
39. The nearest neighbouring dwelling to the first floor extension would be no. 7 Seatoller Close to the west. The existing separation distance of c.1.7m between the host dwelling and no. 7 would be maintained at first floor level. There is one small window in the first floor of the side elevation of no.7 facing towards the application site, which is obscurely glazed, serving an en-suite bathroom and whilst there may be some loss of light to this window, given the nature of the window and the room it serves, this would not be considered to warrant a refusal of permission on these grounds.
40. No.7 Seatoller Close sits forward of the application dwelling, meaning the rear elevations are staggered, with the application dwelling's rear elevation projecting further than that of no. 7. In order to limit any over-shadowing or over-bearing the rear of the first floor extension would be set in from the rear elevation at ground floor by c.1m.
41. The Rushcliffe Design Code advises in its guidance that "extensions should not adversely impact neighbouring homes access to daylight. To determine the impact, a 45degree line should be drawn from the centre-point of the closest neighbouring window towards the proposed extension. Proposed two storey

extensions should not intersect this plane as it will likely result in overshadowing”.

42. The 1m set-in from the rear elevation would ensure that when the 45degree guidance is applied to the nearest first floor rear window at no. 7 there would be no intersection of the 45degree plane, and as such, indicating that any over-shadowing would not be unacceptably harmful and thereby adhering to the guidance within the Rushcliffe Design Code.
43. The lack of a daylight/sunlight assessment raised by a neighbour is noted, however such an assessment is not considered necessary for a householder residential extension as the statutory guidance available for such a proposal is considered ample for a fair assessment of the application. The design code does not require the submission of such an assessment.
44. The impact of the view from a bedroom window raised by a neighbour is noted, however impact on a view is not a planning consideration.
45. There would be an existing element of over-shadowing experienced on the rear patio area of no. 7 given the height of the existing garage at no. 9 and given that the dwellings lie on a west-east orientation it is not considered that first floor extension would lead to significant additional over-shadowing harm during the afternoons/evenings.
46. The first floor side extension would be screened from the neighbour to the east, no. 11 Seatoller Close, by the host dwelling itself and would have little impact.
47. A new first floor window in the rear elevation of the side extension would have similar impacts to the existing first floor windows and would not create any new over-looking where none currently exists. The concern raised by the neighbour in relation to potential loss of privacy into their ensuite bathroom is noted. This window is obscure glazed with a top opening light only. Views towards this window would be oblique and it is not considered that any potential loss of privacy to this non habitable room would be so significant to warrant a refusal on these grounds.

Single Storey Rear Extension

48. The single storey rear extension would sit c.800mm off the shared boundary with no. 11 to the east. Following the pattern of the street layout, no.11 is set back from no. 9, resulting in the rear extension at no. 9 facing a blank side elevation of the front gable of no. 11. The intervening boundary is made of a c.2m high close boarded fence. The design of the dual pitched roof, pitching away from the boundary with no. 11 would result in the highest point, the ridge, being c.3.5m away from the boundary thereby reducing any over-bearing impact.
49. It is not considered that the single storey rear extension would have any undue impact on the amenities of no. 11 in terms of over-looking, over-bearing or over-shadowing.
50. There would be a separation distance of c. 4.3m between the single storey rear extension and the boundary with no. 7, a distance considered ample so as to ensure there would be no undue impact on no. 7.

Highways and Parking Impacts

51. The existing dwelling has 3 bedrooms and the proposal would result in the creation of a four bedroomed dwelling. As per the Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide, a dwelling with four or more bedrooms should provide 3 off road parking spaces. The existing dwelling has 2 off road parking spaces, which would not be impacted by the proposal. As such there would be a potential shortfall of 1 parking space.
52. However, the proposal would not necessarily result in an increase in the number of cars at the property, and the site is in close proximity to public transport links and local services and amenities. Existing off road driveway/parking would be retained and there is on street parking available in the surrounding area. Given the nature of the proposal and the surrounding area it is considered that any increase in on road parking as a result of the proposal would be limited and would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
53. Therefore, whilst the proposal would not provide 3 off road parking spaces in accordance with the highway design guide, the level of parking to be provided is considered to be justified and acceptable in this instance and a refusal of permission on these grounds would not be justified.

Biodiversity net gain

54. Under Regulation 5 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024 the statutory biodiversity gain condition required by Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) does not apply in relation to planning permission for development which, inter alia, is the subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Conclusion

55. The proposed development is not considered to result in any significant overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impacts due to the height and distance to neighbours, scale and form of development and the nature of the works that form part of this application.
56. Given all the matters as considered above and having assessed the development proposed against the policies set out in National Guidance, the development plan for Rushcliffe and the Rushcliffe Design Code, it is considered to be acceptable. Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.
57. Discussions have taken place during the assessment of the application and amendments have been made to the proposal, and further information has been provided to address relevant planning policy and the identified impacts, thereby resulting in a more acceptable scheme and a recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

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 in accordance with the following approved plans:

- 24-2972-2 Amended plans and elevations, received on 28 August 2025
- 24-2972-1 Amended block plan, received on 3 June 2025

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with Policy 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].

3. The extension(s) hereby permitted shall be constructed in suitable facing and roofing materials to match the elevations of the existing property.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policy 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 -

Amendments have been made to the proposal during the consideration of the application to address adverse impacts identified by officers thereby resulting in a more acceptable scheme and the grant of planning permission.

Biodiversity Gain Condition

The development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan, or
- (c) the development is exempt from the biodiversity gain condition

Based on the information submitted in the planning application documents, the Planning Authority considers that this permission is exempt from biodiversity net gain under Regulation 5 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024 (householder exemption), and as such does not require approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun.

Having regard to the above and having taken into account matters raised there are no other material considerations which are of significant weight in reaching a decision on this application.

NOTES TO APPLICANT

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 land owner 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.

Swifts are now on the Amber List of Conservation Concern. One reason for this is that their nest sites are being destroyed. The provision of new nest sites is urgently required and if you feel you can help by providing a nest box or similar in your development, the following website gives advice on how this can be done : <http://swift-conservation.org/Nestboxes%26Attraction.htm>