

# 25/01188/FUL

**Applicant** Dr. K Missan

**Location** Hilton Dental Surgery, 1 Hilton Crescent, West Bridgford

**Proposal** Internal alterations and first floor extension over existing single storey dental surgery to provide additional dental services and facilities.

**Ward** Gamston

## THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site of 1 Hilton Crescent is occupied by a single storey, flat roof, brick building, located on the corner of Valley Road and Hilton Crescent. The building is currently used as a dental practice with three surgery rooms. The building is approximately 3.4m in height, rendered white on the southern and western elevations, and the entrance to the building is formed of blue glazed window panels, fronting the highway boundary.
2. The footprint of the building covers a majority of the application site, with the building extending to the northern, eastern and southwestern boundary. A paved area is situated to the west of the building providing bin storage. To the south is a paved area providing one car parking space.
3. The application site is located in what is primarily a residential area, approximately 60m south of the Hilton Crescent Centre of Neighbourhood Importance. To the north of the application site there is a flat roof car port that is associated with the adjoining two storey pitched roof dwellings (no. 63 and 64 Hilton Grange) which have dormer windows on the rear elevation overlooking the application site. Beyond to the north is Leawood Manor care home. To the east of the application site is no. 1 Grange Park, a two storey pitched roof dwelling, centrally positioned within its plot, with a balcony wrapping round its front and western side. Well established trees, hedgerow and fencing form the boundary with no.1 Grange Park. To the south and west of the site, on the opposite side of Valley Road and Hilton Crescent, are two storey pitched roof dwellings.

## DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

4. The current planning application seeks approval for a first floor extension and internal alterations to the building to provide additional dental services and facilities, including three additional surgery rooms. The plans and details of the proposal can be found [here](#).
5. The proposed first floor extension would create an additional floor to the dental practice and would extend to the same extent as the existing building to the east, south and west. To the north, the two storey element of the proposal is set back from the site boundary by c3.3m, except for a small element to house the staircase to the first floor, which would measure c4.4m in width and c3.3m in depth.

6. The proposed first floor extension would have a flat roof, increasing the height of the building to c6.3m at the building entrance and c6m for the main body of the building, except over the staircase, which would have a hipped and pitched roof. This element would have a ridge height of c5.7m and an eaves height of c4.2m.
7. As a result of consultation responses from Nottinghamshire County Council Highways, additional information has been submitted which has been considered as part of the assessment below.

## **SITE HISTORY**

8. 14/00843/DISCON – conditions 3 (facing and roof materials), 5 (landscaping) and 6 (bin storage) of planning permission 13/02342/FUL were discharged in June 2014.
9. 13/02342/FUL – permission was granted in February 2014 for the partial demolition, internal and external alterations, single storey rear and side extensions, rendering of external walls and glazed entrance lobby to the existing dental surgery.
10. 13/01167/VAR – permission was granted in August 2013 for the variation of condition 5 of planning permission 12/01335/FUL to allow commencement of work prior to completion of 278 Highways Act Agreement and the variation of condition 10 to allow submission of details of any solar pv panels prior to their installation.
11. 12/01335/FUL – permission was granted in October 2012 for the partial demolition; internal and external alterations; single storey rear extension; two storey side extension; rendering of external walls to existing dental surgery; construct first floor over dental surgery to form 2 flats with independent entrance; dropped kerb and off-street parking; bin stores.
12. 12/00586/FUL – an application was withdrawn in June 2012 for the partial demolition; internal and external alterations; single storey rear extension; two storey side extension; rendering of external wall of existing dental surgery; construct first floor over dental surgery to form 2 flats with independent entrance; dropped kerb and off-street parking; 1.8m high fence to east boundary

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

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

13. Ward Councillor, Cllr D Virdi, supports the proposal, stating:

*"Hilton Dental Practice is a long-established NHS dental services provider within the Gamston Ward and has served the community for over 20 years. It is a successful and much-valued local health facility that plays a vital role in meeting the oral health needs of residents.*

*The proposed extension will enable the practice to increase capacity, responding directly to rising demand from both Gamston and neighbouring communities,*

*particularly in light of recent housing growth and the ongoing need for NHS and specialist dental provision. This represents an important investment in local health infrastructure.*

*The application demonstrates clear alignment with sustainable development principles and planning policy:*

- *Community benefit: There is strong public support, reflecting the importance of the practice as a trusted community asset.*
- *Sustainable transport links: The site is within walking distance of Alford Road bus routes and other public transport options, reducing reliance on car travel.*
- *Accessible location: Situated alongside a local shopping precinct with public parking, the practice is easily accessible for patients of all ages and abilities.*
- *Planning compliance: The proposed extension accords with permitted planning regulations and does not raise issues regarding accessibility or parking. There has been no audit/trail of parking facilities causing any issues for the practice.*
- *Health and wellbeing outcomes: The expansion directly supports the objectives of the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework to promote healthy, inclusive communities and accessible healthcare provision.*

*In summary, this application represents a proportionate, sustainable, and policy-compliant response to local healthcare needs. It will strengthen an established and well-used NHS service, deliver significant community benefit, and should be supported.”*

14. Ward Councillor, Cllr J Wheeler, supports the proposal, stating:

*“I note the public support for expansion of the dental facilities at Hilton Grange and I support this in principal. What is crucial is that the application meets the planning criteria especially that of NCC Highways and I would encourage discussions with Highways and the applicant to facilitate this. It is clear it is not feasible to increase parking at the site but there is provision nearby. I hope a resolution can be met to meet the needed expansion and to satisfy highways and RBC.”*

### **Statutory and Other Consultees**

15. **James Naish MP** (Member of Parliament for Rushcliffe) provided comments following contact by several residents. He encouraged the Local Planning Authority along with the Highways Authority to think creatively to find potential solutions to the significant ask for parking. He requested for all on and off road parking options to be fully considered and explored, given the significant desire to see NHS dental provision expanded to serve local people. With regards to this, he noted that the applicant has tried to do this by securing six parking spaces at Leawood Manor Care Home for staff to use. He also raised that very few residents have raised concerns about on-road parking.
16. He welcomed the positive approach to an application in Bingham (ref: 24/00714/FUL) which has recently moved and expanded, despite a central local and no dedicated parking. He hoped that a similarly pragmatic outcome could be reached with this matter, given the obvious wider public benefit.
17. **Rushcliffe Borough Council Environmental Health Officer** advised that they had no objections on environmental health grounds, and recommended

the inclusion of four conditions covering the following to minimise potential nuisance and to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties:

- Hours of use
- Delivery and waste collection times
- Submission of details regarding noise levels of any externally mounted plant or equipment and internally mounted equipment which vents internally
- Submission of specification and noise assessment for any air source heat pumps.

18. **Nottinghamshire County Council Highways** detailed conversations with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have been had over the course of the application. Full copies of their responses can be found [here](#). In summary, they found that the proposal presents a considerable shortfall in off-street parking, and as such, would likely generate a significant increase in on-street parking in the vicinity. This would likely have an adverse impact on access for vehicles, including service and emergency vehicles, restrict junction and access visibility splays, and could also obstruct footways and be a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians, all to the detriment of highway safety. For these reasons, the Highways Authority recommended the refusal of the application.
19. A site meeting with the Highways Officer was offered. However, the Highways Officer did not see the benefits, given that they had visited the site and had set out within their various responses the highways concerns.

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

20. 32 written representations have been received with 31 supporting the application, including representations from neighbouring properties, and 1 objection to the application from a neighbouring property. It is noted that 9 of the supporting comments were received from members of the public that reside outside of the Borough. The comments are summarised as follows.

### **Support**

- a) The proposals will improve access to healthcare services
- b) A lot of new homes have been built in the area with no extra provision for dental services
- c) The practice provides a valuable service to the area
- d) The proposals are of a good design
- e) The proposals have been designed to include a lift and accommodate wheelchairs, supporting the elderly population
- f) Planning permission has already been granted for a first floor extension, and this design is almost identical
- g) The proposal will lead to job creation
- h) The practice provides good care
- i) The practice is the most easily accessible practice in the area from a public transport and parking point of view
- j) There are two nearby free car parks with many nearby roads with on-street parking
- k) The expansion of the practice is needed to meet demand
- l) There are no parking issues

- m) This is one of only two practices in the West Bridgford area that provides NHS dental care and specialist NHS dental care
- n) Alford Road playing fields generates more parking/traffic issues than the dental practice could
- o) I can see that every care has been taken to minimise the impact to us from a privacy, light and shadowing perspective
- p) The cricket/rugby club on Stamford Road generate traffic levels which the dentist practice couldn't, and this is tolerated
- q) This practice offers NHS dental care which is difficult to access
- r) Cannot see how the proposals will impact on the levels of traffic
- s) The practice has been growing for years and it's not resulted in adverse parking or traffic
- t) It's rare to find this level of parking at a dentist
- u) The extension to the practice would provide more benefits than any traffic/parking issue
- v) The current set up causes no issues so don't think the extension will cause issues
- w) Castle Healthcare Practice was an amalgamation of three GP surgeries across West Bridgford, with additional facilities provided, making it far busier than this dental practice could ever be, yet it doesn't have a very big car park. There shouldn't be one rule for one facility and one for another
- x) Plans to recently approve the City Ground have recently been approved by Rushcliffe but they only have about 100 car parking spaces
- y) I have always travelled to the practice by bus. There is a bus stop 100 years from the practice so it is well served by public transport.

### **Object**

- a) Since the enlargement of the current dental practice, the traffic has become very bad with cars parked everywhere, including the pavements on both sides during the daytime. The entrance to Grange Park and Valley Gardens has become more dangerous from 8AM to 5:30PM because of the parking. The plan to let the proposed new rooms to other dentists to work there will potentially cause chaos in such a small residential area.
- b) If another floor is put on the existing building, which is taller than normal, the two houses on the side will be deprived of daylight. The two houses are facing the wall of the old people's home and a very narrow road at the front of their homes. The only daylight they get is from the windows at the back.

### **PLANNING POLICY**

21. 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 (LPP1) 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 Planning Policies and Guidance**

22. 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.

23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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 8 - Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities
  - Section 9 - Promoting Sustainable Transport
  - Section 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places.
  - Section 15 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment.
26. Full details of the NPPF can be found [here](#).

## **Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance**

27. 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
  - Policy 12 - Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles
  - Policy 17 – Biodiversity.
28. 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
  - Policy 38 - Non-Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network
  - Policy 39 - Health Impacts of Development.
29. The Rushcliffe Design Code is a supplementary planning document (SPD) that has been adopted by the Borough Council on 1 September 2025. The Design Code sets out the design requirements for new development in the Borough and will be used in the determination of planning applications.

30. The policies in the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2 and the Rushcliffe Design Code are available in full along with any supporting text on the Council's website [here](#).

## APPRAISAL

31. 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.

### Principle of the 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. Chapter 8 of the NPPF provides that planning decisions should aim to enable and support healthy lives through both promoting good health and preventing ill-health, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs.
33. Policy 12 of the LPP1 states that the provision of new, extended or improved community facilities will be supported where they meet a local need. Policy 39 of the LPP2 reiterates this, stating that development proposals should promote, support and enhance health by supporting the provision and access to healthcare services.
34. The proposal relates to a first floor extension to an existing dental practice at 1 Hilton Crescent to provide additional dental services and facilities, including three additional surgery rooms. The dental practice provides NHS dental care to adults and children. The dental practice also provides specialist NHS dental services with referrals received from the wider Nottinghamshire and Newark area. The proposed extension would allow the practice to provide additional NHS dental care to local residents and the wider Nottinghamshire area. It is also noted that a number of comments submitted by members of the public state their support and refer to a need for the expansion of an NHS dental practice.
35. Taking the above into account, the principle of the development may be acceptable subject to the following additional considerations:-

### Design and Impact on the Character of the Surrounding Area

36. Section 12 of the NPPF states that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
37. Policy 10 of the LPP1 requires development to be assessed in terms of massing, scale and proportion as well as materials, architectural style and detailing, with Policy 1 of the LPP2 requiring matters such as the scale, density, height, massing, design, layout and materials of the proposal to be sympathetic

to the character and appearance of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area. Policy 1 of the LPP2 states that proposals should not lead to an over intensive form of development or be overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties.

38. Code 2.1 of the Rushcliffe Design Code states that proposals must have regard to the relevant Area Type vision and worksheets, taking into account the development pattern of the local area, such as building lines, plot structure and grain.
39. The application building is currently a single storey, flat roof building. The application proposes a first floor, predominantly flat roof extension to the building. The proposed flat roof extension would increase the height of the building to c6.3m at the building entrance and c6m for the main body of the building. A small element of the first floor extension, which houses the staircase, would have a hipped and pitched roof with a ridge height of c5.7m and an eaves height of c4.2m. The application building neighbours two storey dwellings on all sides, and the surrounding area is predominantly characterised by two storey dwellings. The proposed first floor extension is considered to be of a height that would be appropriate and in keeping within the context of the area. A flat roof is not typical of the surrounding area, but is unique to the application building. Maintaining a predominantly flat roof design allows the unique character of the building to be retained.
40. The proposed first floor extension would extend to the same extent as the existing building to the east, south and west. To the north, the first floor would be set back from the site boundary by c3.3m, except for a small element to house the staircase to the first floor, which would extend to the site's northern boundary. It is considered that the first floor extension would not increase the mass or scale of the building in a way that would result in a built form that would appear incongruous with the surrounding area.
41. Whilst amenity impacts are considered further within the report, it is noted that the design of the first floor extension has included a c3.3m setback from the northern site boundary and the nearest dwellings on Hilton Grange, except for a small element to house the staircase to the first floor. This element would extend to the northern site boundary and would have a width of c4.4m. This element has been designed with a hipped and pitched roof, with a ridge height of c5.7m, and the pitched roof sloping down towards the northern boundary, resulting in an eaves height of c4.2m. This element is reduced in height compared to the main body of the building, and the hipped and pitched roof ensures this element of the proposal does not create a large mass next to the neighbouring dwellings on Hilton Grange. It is considered that the design of this element has been informed by the context of the neighbouring dwellings and would be of an acceptable scale and proportion.
42. Regarding external materials, the existing building is red brick with white render. The entrance to the building is formed of blue glazed windows. The proposed first floor extension would use red brick on the eastern elevation to match the existing, and white render on the north, south and west elevations to match the existing. At the building entrance, the blue glazing at ground floor level would be retained, and the first floor extension would be clad in a grey metal standing seam. Additionally, the element of the extension which houses the stairs to the first floor would be clad in a grey metal standing seam. A single

ply membrane would be used for the flat roof, and a grey metal standing seam would be used for the hipped and pitched roof.

43. The continued use of red brick and white render is considered acceptable. The introduction of grey metal standing seam cladding is not a typical material used in the surrounding area. However, the existing building is unique through its use of blue glazing at the building entrance. Retaining the blue glazing at ground floor and cladding the proposed first floor extension above the building entrance, and the small element housing the staircase, in a grey metal standing seam would enhance the contemporary appearance of the building. This is not considered to harm the character of the area. National and local policies allow for innovation, change, and contemporary solutions. The proposed external materials would add variety to the local vernacular of the area and would represent a modern design that would contribute to the quality of the area's character.
44. It is noted that a number of supportive comments received from members of the public raised that the proposals were of a good design.
45. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposed first floor extension would cause no undue harm to the street scene and would not have any undue impact on the existing property or the wider character of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with local and national policy and the Rushcliffe Design Code.

#### Impact on Amenity

46. Policy 10 of LPP1 requires new development proposals be assessed in terms of their impact on the amenity of occupiers or nearby residents. Policy 1 of LPP2 sets out that permission may be granted for development provided it does not result in significant effects upon the amenity of adjoining properties or the surrounding area by reason of levels of activity and traffic movements on the site, loss of privacy or noise pollution.

#### *Impact from increased activity and traffic*

47. The application building is located in a primarily residential area, on the corner of Valley Road and Hilton Crescent. Approximately 60m north of the application building is the Hilton Crescent Centre of Neighbourhood Importance, which provides a range of local retail and service stores. At this Centre is a free car park.
48. The surrounding residential properties would be accustomed to a level of activity in the area due to people travelling to visit the existing dental practice and the Hilton Crescent Centre. The proposed first floor extension would expand the dental practice through the creation of three new surgery rooms, increasing the number of people visiting the dental practice throughout the day. However, it is not considered that the proposed first floor extension, and the associated increase in visitors to the dental practice, would lead to a significant increase in activity compared to what already exists and would therefore not cause any undue harm to the amenity of nearby residents.
49. The proposal would lead to an increase in the number of people visiting the dental practice throughout the day, due to the expansion and creation of three

new surgery rooms. It is noted that there is one existing car parking space on site, with no additional car parking provided as part of this application. It is also recognised that the application site is located in a residential area, accessible by walking and cycling for nearby residents, and located near bus stops on Alford Road which is served by services which connect West Bridgford and Edwalton to Nottingham City Centre. The application site is therefore accessible for some via non-car modes of transport.

50. Whilst the impacts of parking provision in terms of highway safety is discussed separately in this report, when considering residential amenity, it is not considered that the proposed first floor extension, and the associated increase in visitors to the dental practice, would increase parking on street to such an extent as to have any undue impact to the amenity of nearby residents.

#### *Impact from the built form*

51. The proposed first floor extension would not increase the built footprint of the existing building, with the proposed first floor extension extending to the same extent as the existing building to the east, south and west. To the south and west, the first floor extension would have a separation distance of over c20m with the nearest residential properties. To the east, the nearest element of the habitable dwelling of 1 Grange Park is c18m from the application building, with established trees and hedgerow forming the boundary of the site. It is considered that the scale and massing of the proposed first floor extension would not have any undue impact on residential amenity to the east, south and west of the application building in terms of overbearing or overshadowing due to the separation distance and boundary treatment between the application building and the dwellings.
52. Located to the north are the two nearest dwellings to the application site - no. 63 and no. 64 Hilton Grange. The rear elevations of the two dwellings face the application building, with first floor dormer windows on their rear elevations overlooking the application site and their rear gardens extending to the application site's northern boundary. The existing application building and no. 63 and no.64 Hilton Grange are separated by c9.9m.
53. A resident from the eastern neighbouring dwelling, no.1 Grange Park, raised concerns about the proposed first floor extension due to the potential loss of daylight to no. 63 and no. 64 Hilton Grange. In contrast, a resident from no. 64 Hilton Grange provided supportive comments stating, "I can see that every care has been taken to minimise the impact to us from a privacy, light and shadowing perspective".
54. In order to reduce any over-shadowing or over-bearing, the proposed first floor extension to the north would be set back from the site boundary by c3.3m, except for a small element which houses the staircase to the first floor, which would extend to the site's northern boundary. This element would have a width of c4.4m, and has been designed with a hipped and pitched roof, with a ridge height of c5.7m, with the pitch sloping down towards the northern boundary, resulting in an eaves height of c4.2m.
55. Whilst not a householder application, the Design Code provides guidance within its householder chapter at Section 5.2 regarding the principle of the 25 degree rule which is relevant to the consideration of this application. To

determine the impact on a neighbouring dwelling's access to daylight, a 25 degree line should be drawn from the centre point of the closest neighbouring ground floor window of a habitable room towards the proposed extension. Development should not intersect the 25 degree line, as this would indicate the obstruction of daylight.

56. The c3.3m set back of the first floor extension from the site's northern boundary, combined with the roof design of the small element which houses the staircase, ensures that when the 25 degree rule guidance is applied from the nearest habitable ground floor window at no. 63 and no. 64 Hilton Grange, there would be no intersection of the 25 degree line. As such, indicating that any obstruction of daylight would not be unacceptably harmful and thereby adhering to the guidance within the Rushcliffe Design Code.
57. It is considered that the set back of the extension, and the design of the hipped and pitched roof, ensures that the proposal does not create a large mass next to the neighbouring dwellings at no. 63 and no. 64 Hilton Grange, so as to cause no undue harm to amenity in terms of overbearing and overshadowing.

#### *Impact from new fenestration*

58. First floor fenestration is proposed on the south and west elevations. However, it is considered that the separation distance of over c20m between the application building and the nearest residential properties to the south and west would ensure there is no undue impact to amenity with regards to overlooking.
59. No fenestration is proposed to the eastern elevation, with the elevation remaining blank. There is therefore no impact to amenity with regards to overlooking.
60. First floor fenestration is proposed on the northern elevation which faces the rear of no. 63 and no. 64 Hilton Grange. The submitted Design and Access Statement confirms that this fenestration is to be obscurely glazed and fixed closed. It is considered that should planning permission be granted, the inclusion of a condition requiring the fenestration on the northern elevation to be obscurely glazed and non-opening would be reasonable to safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings from any overlooking impact.

#### *Noise impacts*

61. The Borough Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the application and the submitted details as technical advisors. Whilst they had no objections to the proposal, they recommended a number of conditions, which are considered below.
62. The submitted Proposed Plans and Elevations indicate the installation of two outdoor units for the air conditioning system on the southern elevation. The units would be located at ground floor level behind the existing boundary wall, so are not considered to impact upon visual amenity. However, the Environmental Health Officer recommended the inclusion of a condition should planning permission be granted that requires the submission of noise levels for any externally mounted plant or equipment, together with any internally mounted equipment which vents externally, and the location of such

equipment, prior to the commencement of development. It is considered that the inclusion of such a condition upon any grant of planning permission would be reasonable to protect residential amenity.

63. Additionally, the Officer recommended the inclusion of a condition that required the submission of full details and a noise assessment prior to the installation of any air source heat pumps. The submitted Design and Access Statement indicates the inclusion of air source heat pumps within the proposal. In the interests of safeguarding residential amenity, it is therefore considered reasonable to include such a condition upon any grant of planning permission.
64. The Environmental Health Officer also recommended the inclusion of conditions with regards to hours of operation and delivery and waste collection hours. It would be considered reasonable to include such conditions to protect the amenity of nearby residents.
65. Taking the above into account, area, it is considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenity of residents in the vicinity and the application is in accordance Policy 10 of LPP1 and Policy 1 of LPP2 and the guidance of the Rushcliffe Design Code.

#### Impact on Highways

66. Chapter 9 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
67. Policy 1 of the LPP2 sets out that planning permission for extensions will be granted provided that the provision of parking is in accordance with advice provided by the Highways Authority.
68. The application seeks permission for a first floor extension to expand the existing dental practice through the creation of three new surgery rooms. The existing dental practice has one off-street car parking space and its dimensions complies with the current parking standards set out within the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide (NHDG). No additional off-street car parking spaces are proposed. It is noted that the site is constrained in terms of space, with the footprint of the building covering a majority of the application site, with there being no further room on the application site to provide additional off-street parking beyond the current situation.
69. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Authority were consulted as technical advisor, and advised that in accordance with the NHDG, dentist surgeries require the provision of one parking space per member of staff plus two spaces per consulting room. Within the supporting information, it was confirmed that the dental practice currently employs 10 members of staff and would not expect the number of staff to increase due to the proposals. Therefore, the Highways Authority advised the proposals would require a parking provision of 22 off-street car parking spaces in accordance with the NHDG. The Highways Authority also noted that following the expansion of the dental practice, the number of staff employed would likely increase, which would further increase off-street parking demand. The Highways Authority acknowledged that the existing practice would likely generate some degree of

on-street parking, but stated that the increase in patients and staff expected as a result of the proposal would increase parking demand significantly.

70. The Highways Authority noted that the submitted Design and Access Statement states that most staff and patients are from the surrounding West Bridgford and Edwalton area and can access the practice by foot or via local bus connections. However, the Highways Authority considered much of West Bridgford and Edwalton to be beyond reasonable walking distance, so walking would be unlikely to be considered a convenient travel option. They also considered the bus routes serving the site as unlikely to be considered convenient for access to the practice for much of the surrounding area. In addition to this, they noted that the Design and Access Statement states that the dental practice is one of only two practices in the West Bridgford/Edwalton/Gamston area that provides NHS dental care to adults and children, catering to a population of close to 50,000 people. The Design and Access Statement also stated that it is the only practice in the area providing specialist NHS dental service for which referrals are received from the wider Nottinghamshire and Newark area. The Highways Authority stated that given the wide area the practice covers, they consider travel by private car to be the most prevalent option.
71. The Highways Authority stated that new or expanding commercial development must provide sufficient on-site parking to meet the demand generated and should not rely on on-street parking or existing public car parking facilities to overcome a shortfall. Whilst the Design and Access statement states that there is public car parking available near the Hilton Crescent shops and at the Alford Road car park some 500m away, the Highways Authority noted that both parking areas are remote from the site, and whilst within a reasonable walking distance, they are unlikely to be considered convenient by visiting patients when there is unrestricted on-street parking immediately adjacent the dental practice. Further, they advised that the car parking areas referred to serve existing facilities, and as such, reliance on these would remove existing parking provision.
72. Overall, the Highways Authority considered the proposals to present a considerable shortfall in off-street parking, and as such, would likely generate a significant increase in on-street parking in the vicinity. They advised this would likely have an adverse impact on access for vehicles, including service and emergency vehicles, restrict junction and access visibility splays, and could also obstruct footways and be a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians, all to the detriment to highway safety. Therefore the Highways Authority considered the development to be contrary to the objectives of paragraphs 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework as the proposal fails to: mitigate the likely significant impacts of the development on the transport network in terms of highway safety and congestion; to create places that are safe and that minimise conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles; or to allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles. For these reasons, the Highways Authority recommended the refusal of the application.
73. When asked if there were mitigation strategies that would enable the applicant to overcome the concerns regarding parking, the Highways Authority confirmed that they did not consider there to be any mitigation that could be secured to overcome their concerns. They stated that the existing surgery is

already substandard in terms of off-street parking provision, and the proposed expansion would create a significant increase in demand. The provision of Traffic Regulation Orders to restrict/control on-street parking was not considered appropriate as this would disadvantage existing residents/businesses, and would result in displaced parking elsewhere. They also reiterated that it was not acceptable to rely on on-street parking to cater for new/expanded commercial development.

74. The Highways Authority noted that the application site area is constrained, and as such there appears no opportunity to provide improved parking facilities, without additional land being available. They confirmed that remote parking facilities would not be accepted as a suitable solution, as people will park in the most convenient place available, which they stated in this instance would be on-street adjacent to the dental practice.
75. The agent of the application raised a number of points in response to the Highways Authority position, which can be summarised as follows:
  - An application in Bingham (ref: 24/00714/FUL) was approved in July 2024 for the change of use from a residential dwelling to a dental practice, and in this case the Highways Authority directed towards their standing advice. The agent considered the application to be similar in terms of scale and in terms of parking provision. They queried why the position of the Highways Authority varied between the two applications.
  - The number of consulting rooms would increase by three, with no new members of staff employed. In accordance with the NHDG, the number of off-street car parking spaces potentially required is six. The Highways Authority should only be considering the potential impacts of the additional requirement generated from the application. The potential increase of six parking spaces could be accommodated within the public car park on Hilton Crescent or on surrounding roads, without causing nuisance to local residents.
  - Referring to the public car park on Hilton Crescent as 'remote' is misleading, given it is approximately 60m away from the practice. The availability of free public off-street car parking within 100m of the practice is better than that available to most healthcare or commercial premises. It would not be unreasonable to expect a patient to make use of the public car park on Hilton Crescent before looking for an on-street space.
  - The Highways Authority's position that it is not acceptable to rely on on-street parking is unreasonable, as it would preclude new development or the expansion of existing premises on any site which did not fully meet the NHDG parking standards, regardless of mitigating factors such as location, proximity to public parking or public transport. The surrounding on-street parking caters to several other businesses in the area. Comments from local residents received in relation to this application note that the volume of cars from other facilities nearby far exceeds what would be generated by the additional consulting rooms.
  - The Highways Authority appears dismissive of the potential for patients to access the dental practice via any means apart from the private car. Nearby bus stops, approximately 150m-200m from the dental practice, on Albert Road are served frequently by several bus routes which serve the local area. Regarding walking, the agent provided a map illustrating areas that were within a 10 minute, 20 minute and 30 minute reasonable walking

distance. The agent stated that the majority of West Bridgford was within a reasonable walking distance of 30 minutes, with 20 minutes and 10 minutes walking times also covering a large area. They also noted the dental practice was within a 10-minute bike ride of most of West Bridgford, Gamston and Edwalton.

- The Highways Authority refers to Traffic Regulation Orders, which are not proposed as part of the application. The potential increase in the required number of car parking spaces, determined by the agent as six, is less than the total number of spaces required for staff. The agent commented that they were aware the Highways Authority elsewhere conditioning a Travel Plan for staff to encourage them to use non-car methods to access the workplace or car-sharing.
- Imposing the requirement of 22 parking spaces for a site of this size is unrealistic and will result in the practice having to relocate outside the local area, most likely to a remote location with space for parking but no public transport or pedestrian links to the detriment of the local community and in contradiction to national and local policies around strengthening local facilities and promoting sustainable transport.

76. The Highways Authority considered the additional information provided by the agent and confirmed that their previous recommendation remains. They addressed the agents' comments, as summarised below:

- In the case of the Bingham application (ref: 24/00714/FUL) the Highways Authority referred the Local Planning Authority to their standing advice, and it was the Local Planning Authority who determined that there would not be a severe impact. However, the proposal was located within Bingham Town Centre, where on-street parking controls are in place to prevent parking having an impact on access/safety. On-street parking is already prevalent within the town centre, where permitted, and the proposal would not materially change the situation. Additional on-street parking demand within the town centre location is unlikely to be of a highway safety concern, but more of an amenity issue, which is an issue to be considered by the Local Planning Authority. The approved surgery in Bingham is not comparable to the application site.
- The Highways Authority concerns relate to the additional demand to be generated from the application, which will exacerbate the current situation. It would not be unreasonable to assume two staff members per consulting room (e.g. dentist and dental nurse), plus two patients per room at any one time (e.g. one being seen and one waiting), which would generate a parking demand of 12 spaces from the proposed development. The expansion of the surgery may also generate a requirement for additional support staff, which would create additional demand. Therefore, the level of parking demand likely to be generated over the existing situation is significant.
- The Hilton Crescent public parking area is within proximity to the site, however, on-street parking on Hilton Crescent/Valley Road is more convenient. The Hilton Crescent public parking area serves several existing commercial premises, and would appear to be well used, with it being unclear whether any spare capacity exists. The proposed development would take up a considerable proportion of the available parking, taking this amenity away from the existing premises, and therefore would still likely lead to displaced on-street parking. The car park at Alford Road is too

remote from the site to be considered an appropriate option to serve the dental practice, and it also already serves an existing facility.

- Some patients/staff may travel to the site by modes other than the private car, but when considering the location of the site, travel by car will likely be the most dominant. It is not possible to control how people choose to travel, and even if walking/public transport are reasonable options, it does not mean that people will necessarily choose them over driving. People will often fit dental appointments around work and other commitments/activities, which will impact on their choice of travel, and driving is likely to be considered the most convenient option. Therefore, a worst-case scenario in terms of likely parking demand has been considered.
- Within the submitted Design and Access Statement, it is stated that the expansion of the dental practice is partly to accommodate the increase in demand as a result of rapid increase in housing development in the area. The significant new development in the area is beyond a reasonable walking distance from the surgery, reducing the likelihood that people will choose to walk. A larger surgery as proposed will likely attract patients from further afield, and as such, a larger proportion of new patients will likely travel by car.

77. The agent of the application provided further additional information in response to the Highways Authority, which is summarised below:

- Whilst ten members of staff are employed by the dental practice, not all work in the practice at the same time. The usage ranges between a minimum of three to a maximum of seven staff at one time. Two members of staff walk or cycle to the practice and work 3-4 days a week, two drive and work one day a week, two car share, and one drives and uses the off-street car parking space.
- The need to consider additional support staff is not valid as the necessary staff are already employed at the practice. The requirement of two parking spaces per surgery for patients is excessive as the appointments are scheduled to minimise overlap between patients.
- Staff parking can be controlled via contractual obligations to not use on street parking. The applicant has also agreed the use of six off-street parking spaces at the neighbouring Leewood Manor care home for staff use, which accounts for half the additional parking requirements as per the Highways Authority's assumptions.
- The assumptions made regarding patterns of patient behaviour is contradictory to what has been experienced. After Covid more people work from home which allows them to use alternate modes of transport other than cars. The practice has had to reduce its evening working hours due to lower demand at these times. The practice also sees a large percentage of older patients, who use free bus passes to access the clinic.
- Assuming that additional parking for the dental practice would take amenity away from the existing premises in the area implies that patients of the dental practice would not use any of the other nearby businesses, which is unlikely.
- The Highways Authority response regarding the Bingham application (ref: 24/00714/FUL) as not comparable was dismissive. How is the additional parking demand in the case of the Bingham application not a highway

safety concern. Patients would park on surrounding residential streets when unable to park near the dental practice at Bingham.

- The applicant is open to advice on how the situation can be better managed. A Travel Plan can be prepared for staff to encourage them to use non-car methods to access the dental practice or car sharing.

78. The Highways Authority reviewed the additional information provided by the agent of the application, and confirmed that their previous recommendation remained. They responded as summarised:

- With regards to the staffing levels at the dental practice, a worst case scenario in terms of likely parking demand would need to be considered, based on the maximum capacity of the facility. Current travel arrangements of existing staff have limited bearing as this is changeable over time.
- Two parking spaces per consulting room for patients is set out within the NHDG parking standards and is to account for the overlap between patients. There is potential for patients to arrive early for their appointment, and appointments often overrun, and as such overlaps will be expected. There is no way of controlling how appointments are actually scheduled.
- An agreement to use six off-street parking spaces at the neighbouring Leewood Manor Care Home for staff use is acknowledged. However, the parking is associated with the Care Home, and there is no evidence that spare capacity exists. The land also falls outside the applicant's control, and as such, there is no guarantee that the parking will always be available in the future. Furthermore, it is remote from the site.
- It is not possible to control how people choose to travel, be that staff or patients. Whilst a Travel Plan can put recommendations in place, there is no guarantee that staff will choose to travel more sustainably.
- Whilst more people work from home and therefore may have more flexibility to schedule appointments, there will still be time limitations which will impact on choice of travel. It is noted that the practice sees a large percentage of older patients who use free bus passes to access the clinic, yet no evidence has been provided to back this statement up. Additionally, as previously noted, the expansion of the surgery to accommodate a wider catchment area will most likely increase the proportion of patients travelling by car.
- The need for the facility and the level of local support is not a highway consideration. The proposal is for a commercial development, which should provide sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the demand to be generated, without relying on on-street parking to overcome a shortfall.

79. A site meeting between the Highways Authority Officer, Borough Council Officer's, and the applicant/agent was proposed to the Highways Authority. However, they confirmed that they had already attended the site, and did not see the benefits of a meeting, given their previous responses setting out the highway concerns.

80. It is noted that a neighbouring property has objected to the proposed development due to the current situation regarding on-street parking near the dental practice, and the impacts that would be caused by the proposed expansion of the practice. However, it is also noted that a number of supportive comments were received from members of the public, stating that there are no parking issues, the dental practice is one of the most accessible in terms of parking, and that various other facilities have worse parking situations.

81. A letter from James Naish MP was also received which requested that all on and off-road parking options be fully considered and explored, noting that few residents raised concerns about on-road parking. He also noted the approach taken in the Bingham application (ref: 24/00714/FUL).
82. Engagement with the agent of the application was undertaken with regards to the use of six off-street parking spaces at the neighbouring Leewood Manor care home for staff use. In order to be a material consideration, an assessment of the Care Home's parking was requested to demonstrate that spare capacity exists. Additionally, a unilateral undertaking between the applicant and the Care Home was requested to demonstrate that the proposed car parking spaces could be secured in perpetuity. Ultimately, the applicant decided to not provide the requested information, and the proposed parking at Leewood Manor care home cannot be materially considered as part of this application.
83. The Highways Authority have raised an objection to the proposed first floor extension on highway safety grounds as the proposals present a considerable shortfall in off-street parking, and as such, would likely generate a significant increase in on-street parking in the vicinity of the application site. Detailed communication with the agent to overcome the concerns raised by the Highways Authority have been had over the lifetime of the application, and additional information provided by the agent has been considered, but the Highways Authority position has not changed. Given the above, it is considered that all options have been fully considered and explored. Consequently, the proposed development would increase on-street parking, which would have an adverse impact on access for vehicles, including service and emergency vehicles, restrict junction and access visibility splays, and obstruct footways and be a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians, all to the detriment of highway safety. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 1 of the LPP2 and Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

#### Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

84. A majority of the application site is covered by the footprint of the building. The remainder of the application site is hard surfaced for the bin store and the car parking area. The application proposes a first-floor extension to the existing building. Based on the information submitted, I am satisfied that there are unlikely to be significant ecological impacts, and it is considered that the development would be acceptable from an Ecology perspective.
85. Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition" which means 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.
86. Under Regulation 4 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:

- does not impact an onsite priority habitat;
- and impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat.

87. The proposed development would not alter the footprint of the building. Therefore, based on the information submitted in the planning application documents, the Planning Authority considers that the proposed development is exempt from net gain.

88. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposed development would comply with the aims of Policy 17 of the LPP1, Policy 38 of the LPP2, Chapter 15 of the NPPF and the relevant legislation.

### Conclusion

89. The proposed development seeks planning permission for a first floor extension to an existing dental practice. The principle of the proposal is supported as it would result in the expansion of an NHS dental practice. However, the proposal conflicts with local and national policy on highway safety.

90. The proposal presents a considerable shortfall in off-street parking, and as such, would generate a significant increase in on-street parking in the vicinity of the application site. This would have an adverse impact on access for vehicles, including service and emergency vehicles, restrict junction and access visibility splays, and obstruct footways and be a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians, all to the detriment to highway safety.

91. For the above stated reasons, it is considered that the proposal would conflict with local and national policy. Whilst the expansion of an existing healthcare facility weighs in favour of the scheme, it does not outweigh the harm that has been identified above, and it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

92. The proposal was subject to pre application advice and discussions have been undertaken throughout the course of the application to try and resolve objections received. A fundamental highway concern has been raised which has been unable to be satisfactorily addressed resulting in a recommendation to refuse planning permission.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is RECOMMENDED that **planning permission be refused** for the following reason

1. **The proposed development, by virtue of its shortfall in off-street parking provision, would generate a significant increase in on-street parking that would have an adverse impact on access for vehicles, including service and emergency vehicles, restrict junction and access visibility splays, and obstruct footways and be a hazard to cyclists and pedestrians, all to the detriment to highway safety. The proposed development therefore fails to mitigate the likely significant impacts of the development on the transport network in terms of highway safety and congestion, to create places that are safe and that minimise conflicts between pedestrians,**

**cyclists and vehicles, and to allow for the efficient delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies and Chapter 9 (Promoting Sustainable Transport) of the National Planning Policy Framework.**