

# 18/00440/FUL

**Applicant** Mr Mick Duggan

**Location** 10 Meadow End Gotham Nottinghamshire NG11 0HP

**Proposal** Front extension, rear and side extensions, raising of roof to provide accommodation at first floor (revised proposals).

**Ward** Gotham

## THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The site accommodates a render, brick and tile bungalow, forming the first in a row of similar properties. The dwelling is set on the eastern side of Meadow End with terraced properties to the north. The building is set back from the road with a long rear garden.

## DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

2. The proposals comprise a front extension, rear and side extensions and raising the roof to provide accommodation at first floor with rooflights inserted into each side of the roof. The front extension would be roughly half the width of the bungalow with a depth of approximately 700mm and would infill the current setback to remove the staggered façade. The rear/side extension would be L-shaped projecting between 5 metres and 7.6 metres from the rear elevation of the bungalow with a width of 8.3 metres. The proposal also includes a new roof structure, over the existing property and extension, to facilitate the provision of accommodation at first floor level, raising the height of the property from 4.8m (measured to the highest ridgeline of the existing property) to 6m, measured to the ridge of the new roof structure. Revised plans were submitted showing the extension on the rear of the property set down at a lower level with a maximum height to the ridge of 6 metres, introducing a step down between the two sections of roof. The additional accommodation to be provided would comprise of a day room/kitchen on the ground floor and 3 bedrooms, a shower room and a bathroom on the first floor.

## SITE HISTORY

3. An application ref: 17/02351/FUL for a front extension, rear and side extensions, raising of the roof to provide accommodation at first floor and dormers to the side was refused in November 2017 on the following grounds:

*“The proposed dormer windows on the western elevation would be detrimental to the residential amenity of properties fronting onto East Street including numbers 4-10, through overlooking, the perception of being overlooked and loss of privacy. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy GP2 a) of the Rushcliffe Non Statutory Local Plan, criteria d) and policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Core Strategy (2b) which seek to ensure development protects the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.”*

4. An application ref: 17/02878/FUL for a front extension, rear and side extensions, raising of roof to provide accommodation at first floor and dormers to the side was also refused in January 2018 for the same reasons as above.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **Ward Councillors**

5. The Ward Councillor (Cllr Matthews) fully supports the neighbour and Gotham Parish Council in objecting to this overbearing development on the site. He has visited the site and strongly recommends this planning application is rejected as per the objection mentioned by the neighbour and Gotham Parish Council.

### **Town/Parish Council**

6. Gotham Parish Council object on grounds of *“Over-intensification, disproportionate for size of plot and out of sympathy with the character and design of other properties. Roof is overbearing for the neighbour on East Street. Loss of a village bungalow.”*
7. In response to a consultation on revised plans, Gotham Parish Council maintained their objection commenting *“Out of character with row of existing bungalows. Over development of the site, intrusive to neighbours. Gotham housing survey revealed a need for bungalows in the village for retirement. This will be a loss of a bungalow.”*

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

8. One representation received from neighbouring property objecting on the following grounds:
  - a. There would be a significant blockage of light to neighbouring properties on East Street, in particular from early morning until mid/late afternoon, would impact on the amount of light and warmth coming into the properties and would lead to extra heating and lighting costs.
  - b. 10 Meadow End would still look directly into the bedrooms and the rooflight from the neighbouring property would be directly over the proposed rooflights.
  - c. There is local demand for bungalows.
  - d. The garden room extension on the neighbouring property is not shown on the plans and projects a false impression of the actual impact of the proposed development.
  - e. No other bungalows on Meadow End have raised the height of the roofline, nor extended the roofline at the front. It is an over-intensive development, overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties and would lead to undue overshadowing and loss of privacy.

- f. The water table in this area is high, evidenced by the incessant battle with damp in the older properties, any more building requiring foundations can only serve to displace the water thereby creating more problems for other houses in the area.

## **PLANNING POLICY**

9. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and the 5 saved policies of the Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan 1996. Other material planning considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan 2006 and Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide.

### **Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance**

10. The National Planning Policy Framework carries a presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that for decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.
11. In relation to residential amenity paragraph 9 of the NPPF states pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built natural and historic environment as well as in people's quality of life, including but not limited to improving conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure. Paragraphs 56-68 of the NPPF relate to design and states planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle the innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however proper to seek, to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 64 states permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Paragraphs 79 to 92 relate to the Green Belt.

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

12. Saved Policy ENV15 Green Belt of the Local Plan 1996 defines the extent of the green belt and is of relevance in this case.
13. Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy reinforces the positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. Core Strategy Policy 4 refers to the Green Belt within the Borough. Policy 10 states, inter alia, that all new development should be designed to make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place and reinforce valued local characteristics. Of particular relevance to this application are 2(b) whereby the proposal shall be assessed in terms of its impacts on neighbouring amenity; 2(f) in terms of its massing, scale and proportion; and 2(g) in terms of assessing the proposed materials, architectural style and detailing.

14. Whilst not part of the development plan the Borough Council has adopted the Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan for the purposes of development control and this is considered to be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Policy GP2 is concerned with issues of design and amenity and the effect of proposals on neighbouring properties. The site is also within the Green Belt, albeit within the village, and Policy EN14 applies which allows for appropriate extensions to dwellings.
15. Consideration should also be given to the supplementary guidance provided in the Rushcliffe Residential Development Guide.
16. The Gotham Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been formally submitted to the Borough Council and carries little weight.

## **APPRAISAL**

17. The main issues to consider in the application are the visual amenity of the proposal and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The principle of the development is considered acceptable and although the enlarged property would no longer be a bungalow, it is not considered the loss of one bungalow provides sufficient grounds to refuse the proposal.
18. Gotham is washed over Green Belt and Policy EN14 considers proportionate extensions to dwellings as appropriate development. The NPPF at paragraph 89 states the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposals would create additional floorspace and would increase the scale and mass of the building, changing the appearance of the existing building, however, it is not considered the extensions and alterations sought are disproportionate in the context of the tests set out in the NPPF. Given the built up character of the area, it is not considered that the proposal would impact on the openness of the area and would not prevent the aims of including the land within the Green Belt from being achieved. The building would continue to form part of the built up settlement of Gotham. As such, subject to the detailed issues discussed below, the principle of development is acceptable and would achieve the aims of Green Belt policy.
19. The bungalow is one of a number of similar properties forming a uniform line of bungalows on the eastern side of Meadow End. This property is the first in the row and is adjacent to the rear elevations of terraced properties to the west, with two storey properties on the opposite side of Meadow End. The proposal would lead to a change in the character and appearance of the bungalow through a higher roof, upper storey accommodation and modern glazing. These works would arguably be at odds with the uniformity of the row of properties, however, given that the property is the first in the row of bungalows and that there are two storey properties to the north and on the opposite side of Meadow End, it is not considered that the proposal would be so harmful to the character of the area that refusal of permission would be justified.
20. From the highway the enlarged façade would be clearly visible but the dwelling is set well into the site and the dwelling would remain below two

storey. The massing would effectively be broken up by the design, incorporating a wing further to the rear and different eaves heights. Other than the front elevation the enlarged dwelling would not be readily visible from the public realm and given the size of the plot would not represent over-development.

21. The objections on visual grounds are noted and the view that the proposal is acceptable in terms of visual amenity is very much an on balance assessment. The extensions would be built using materials to match the existing dwelling and due to the siting, size and design would be visually acceptable, not affecting the openness of the Green Belt.
22. In terms of any potential impact on residential amenity of the properties to the west, the neighbouring dwellings are separated by the highway with no.29, opposite the site, being set back from the highway boundary. Although a first floor window serving a bedroom would be inserted into the gable end, this would be set a significant distance from neighbouring properties. As a result there would be no undue adverse impact.
23. To the north are gardens serving the neighbouring terraced properties. At present the existing property has a limited impact, being single storey and of a limited depth. The proposal would lead to an increase in the eaves and ridge heights of the dwelling which would be elongated through the extension. However, the host dwelling would remain two metres from the boundary and approximately 15 metres from the rear elevation of the neighbouring properties. As a result, the additional massing would not be unduly overbearing on these properties. In addition, the reduction in the ridge height over the extension would further reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.
24. To the rear a bedroom window with a Juliet balcony is proposed at first floor level. Whilst the introduction of accommodation at first floor level would potentially introduce overlooking of neighbouring properties, outlook from this room/Juliet balcony is likely to result in oblique views across gardens of the properties to the north and the distance to the rear boundary of the site would be approximately 22 metres. As such, it is not considered that any overlooking would be significant or would lead to unacceptable loss of privacy.
25. To the south the extension would be adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring bungalow. There would be a space in excess of 1 metre between the enlarged side elevation and the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling, set off this boundary with the driveway intervening. The additional height, length and massing would have some impact on this property. However, the impact would be on the driveway and there would be a sufficient distance from the dwelling and private area of the garden to not have an unacceptable impact.
26. The comments of the Parish Council and neighbour are noted. The proposal would result in an enlarged dwelling in terms of both height and depth and as a result would have a greater impact on the neighbouring terraced properties. However, compared to the refused schemes, the previously proposed dormer windows have been replaced with rooflights and part of the ridge height has been lowered. There would still be a greater impact compared to the existing

situation but on balance it is not considered the proposal could now reasonably be resisted on the grounds of overlooking or loss of privacy. The applicant's agent has confirmed the bottom sill of the rooflights would be 1.7 metres above the internal floor level and the separation distances would ensure there would be no undue overlooking, overbearing impact or a level of loss of sunlight or daylight that could warrant a refusal.

27. The access would be unaltered by the proposals and although there would be an increase in the number of bedrooms the traffic generation would not be such that harm would result on the local highway network. The scheme would not be detrimental to highway safety.
28. There is no evidence the proposal would lead to additional flood risk or increased damp to adjacent properties.
29. The proposal is acceptable in policy terms within the Green Belt, being appropriate development and the nature of the proposals would ensure the openness of the designation would not be adversely affected. The proposals are visually acceptable and would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity and it is recommended the application be approved.
30. The Borough Council will, in accordance with policies in the Core Strategy (Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice), seek a mix of housing types and tenure on new housing developments. This policy does not, however, afford any protection to existing housing stock and whilst the concerns raised regarding the loss of a bungalow are noted, it is not considered that this would justify the refusal of permission of an application for extensions and alterations to an existing property.
31. Negotiations have taken place during the consideration of the application and this has resulted in revised plans being submitted. The application is acceptable and can be recommended for approval.

## **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 permission hereby granted relates to the following plans:

Location Plan  
Block Plan  
A3 Drawing N0.1 Layout Plan April 2018  
A3 Drawing No.3 Elevations Plan April 2018

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

3. The development hereby approved shall be carried out using matching materials for the walls and roof unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Borough Council.

[To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]