

# 18/01327/FUL

**Applicant** Mrs Joyce C Sharp

**Location** The Dovecote Main Street Hickling Nottinghamshire LE14 3AJ

**Proposal** Single storey rear extension including demolition of existing sun lounge, single storey front extension to garage, replace flat roof dormer with pitched roof bridging gap between dormer and garage, render to front elevation, and Juliet balcony to rear (revised scheme)

**Ward** Nevile and Langar

## THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application property is a late 1960s/early 1970s 2 bedroom detached suburban chalet bungalow with a relatively steep gable fronting Main Street, with an attached garage to the side which originally had a flat roof. Extensions/alterations (approved under 18/00310/FUL) are under construction, including the provision of a pitched roof over the garage. The site is located on the west side of Main Street in a predominantly residential part of the village, within the Conservation Area. There is countryside adjacent to the west.
2. There are a variety of properties in the vicinity in terms of period, design/style and materials. 'Rowan House', adjacent to the south, is a relatively recent two storey house of a traditional design which replaced a bungalow from the same period as the application dwelling. To the south of this is 'Mulberry House', an 18th century Grade II listed building. A public footpath runs along the northern site boundary from Main Street to countryside to the west, and to the north of this is 'Olde Forge', a white rendered suburban bungalow. On the opposite side of Main Street is 'The Ruins' where a replacement dwelling of a predominantly traditional design with a more modern rear section is under construction.

## DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. A rear sun lounge would be demolished and replaced with a larger extension to accommodate a new sun lounge with patio doors to the side and rear elevation and a glazed gable. The remaining extensions would accommodate extensions to the hall, garage and first floor bathroom. A first floor rear bedroom window would be replaced with French doors with a screen across to form a 'Juliet' balcony.
4. The approved scheme proposed render to the front elevation gable of the original dwelling to just below the cill of the first floor window with the original brickwork retained below. It is now proposed to render all of the original front elevation.
5. The plans also show a 1m high wall along the Main Street boundary which would constitute permitted development. However, a condition was imposed on 18/00310/FUL requiring the submission of details of screen

fencing/walling and means of enclosure, and details have subsequently been approved (ref. 18/01052/DISCON), including the details of the boundary treatment to the front of the site.

6. In response to objections from the Ward Councillor and Parish Council, the applicant has commented that the application is to bring the property up to current day standards. The front of the property has very little cavity and the applicant understands that render would offer weather proofing to the building and add a thermal barrier. Some of the bricks have lost fascia and are very weatherworn, and have holes in from the previous owner's ornamental fixings. She points out that part of Main Street has 23 properties with render on the front elevations. Some are old, some extensions and some are mid 60s properties, even the historical chapel has render. The property stands next to a white rendered bungalow and the applicant considers the design is purely sympathetic. The proposal would enhance the oak windows to the front elevation and give some character to this very sad property and would be more pleasing to the eye. The Parish Council in their comments consider the use of 'thick concrete tiles' to be unsuitable, the applicant considers this statement to be incorrect and advises that the tiles are slim fibre cement similar to slate tiles.

## **SITE HISTORY**

7. Permission was refused for the construction of a replacement dwelling (following demolition of existing dwelling) in January 2018 (ref. 17/01982/FUL).
8. Permission was granted for the demolition of the dwelling (to allow replacement dwelling) in January 2018 (ref. 17/02761/FUL).
9. Permission was granted in March 2018 for a single storey rear extension including demolition of existing sun lounge, single storey front extension to garage, replace flat roof dormer with pitched roof bridging gap between dormer and garage, cladding to front elevation, and Juliet balcony to rear (ref. 18/00310/FUL).
10. An application to discharge conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission ref. 18/00310/FUL was approved in June 2018 (ref. 18/01052/DISCON).

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

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

11. The Ward Councillor (Cllr Combellack) agrees with the Parish Council and objects to the application commenting that render is not the traditional building form found in the village and that it seems such a shame to render the whole facia when clearly there has been a big and successful effort to match the buff brickwork to the original. Cllr Combellack questions the roof tiles to be used as there is a revision to the plans dated February 2018 where slate 'look a like' tiles are to be used, but it now appears the applicant has reverted to the original concrete tiles which she considers are entirely inappropriate in this setting.

## **Town/Parish Council**

12. The Parish Council objects commenting, *'The members of Hickling Parish Council were disappointed to see the submission of the amendments to the approval of the previous application as this has been supported in good faith as it had not included the full rendering to the front elevation or concrete tiles. The Parish Council objects to the proposals as rendering has only historically been used on properties within the conservation area to hide poor brickwork and the Conservation Officer stated recently, that an application for rendering on Harles Acres was acceptable as it was outside the central focal point of the Conservation Area. Rendering is not appropriate for a building in a prominent position within the Conservation Area especially as the bricks have been well matched. The use of thick concrete tiles is also unsuitable for this development as the materials are not in keeping with the surrounding properties. The Parish Council would like to see the applicant adhere to the agreed approved plans'*.

## **Statutory and Other Consultees**

13. The Design and Conservation Officer notes that the approved scheme proposed partial rendering of the upper section of the existing gable, whilst the lower part would remain as exposed brick and the new northern extension would be of matching brick, and that new proposal is for the frontage of the original element to be fully rendered and for the new northern extension to be in 'matching' brick.
14. He comments that an acceptable brick was previously approved via a discharge of condition for the extensions and, whilst this was a reasonably close match, it would not have been indistinguishable. Rendering of the existing section would avoid the difficulties of achieving a completely convincing match of materials. As no existing brickwork would be visible there would be nothing to compare the extension brickwork to, equally there would be no pressing need to match to the brickwork of the host property which was not ideally suited to the character of the local area anyway.
15. As none of the materials approved under the initial application have been included in this resubmission, he asks that a roofing materials specification will need to be applied.
16. Subject to these conditions, or complete details being obtained prior to determination, he concludes that the proposal would 'preserve' the special architectural and historic character and appearance of the conservation area and would achieve the 'desirable' objective described in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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

17. 2 written representations have been received supporting the application with comments which are summarised as follows:
  - a. The Dovecote is situated between a rendered bungalow and a red brick house, and the render will enhance the front elevation by covering the older yellow brickwork.

- b. This is a sympathetic improvement on the present design.

## **PLANNING POLICY**

18. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of the 5 saved policies of the Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan (1996), the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.
19. Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan (2006) and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide (RRDG).
20. Any decision should therefore be taken in accordance with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy, the NPPF and NPPG and policies contained within the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan where they are consistent with or amplify the aims and objectives of the Core Strategy and Framework, together with other material planning considerations

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

21. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local Planning Authorities should approach decision making in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development. In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
22. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles. The environmental role refers to 'contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment'.
23. Two of the core planning principles state that planning should:
- Always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of buildings and land.
  - Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
24. Chapter 12: 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' states that, in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets;
  - The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
25. Section 66 and 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation

Areas) Act 1990 require that special attention is paid to desirability of preserving Listed Buildings and their settings and preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

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

26. Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy sets out the need for a positive and proactive approach to planning decision making that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Other policies relevant to the current proposal are Policies 10 (Design and enhancing local identity) and 11 (Historic Environment).
27. Also of relevance are Policies GP2 (Design & Amenity criteria), EN2 (Conservation Areas and EN4 (Listed Buildings) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan.

### **APPRAISAL**

28. The original dwelling is a typical 1960s/1970s suburban chalet bungalow and, whilst not unattractive, it is considered that it has no significant architectural or historic interest and makes no positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the conservation area.
29. During consideration of the previous application (ref: 18/00310/FUL) it was considered that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. Due to the distance of the site from the Grade II listed Mulberry House and the intervening dwelling at 'The Rowans', it was also considered that the setting of the listed building would be preserved.
30. The only difference between the approved development and the current proposal is the rendering of the lower part of the original front elevation to match the approved rendered gable, i.e. the full rendering of the front elevation. As the applicant has noted, the Old Forge is fully rendered and there are other part and fully rendered buildings along Main Street to the north of the site, including a number of traditional dwellings. It is therefore considered that a relatively small area of additional rendering to match that which has already been approved would not be unsympathetic to the character of the area.
31. A matching brick and slate effect Marley Rivendale roof tiles were approved under the discharge of conditions application referred to in paragraph 10, and a condition could be imposed again to ensure use of these materials in the development.
32. In view of the above and the comments of the Design and Conservation Officer, it is considered that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. As the proposal would involve a relatively minor change to the approved scheme and to the external appearance of the dwelling, it also considered that the setting of the nearby listed building would be preserved. Consequently, the proposal satisfies the objectives described as desirable in Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

33. Due to the siting, scale and design of the proposals it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on the amenities of adjacent or nearby properties. Specifically it is considered that the shallower roof pitch and reduction in height of the garage section by 1.2m would address the Council's concern about an undue overbearing effect on 'Olde Forge' in relation to the plans proposed under application ref: 17/10982/FUL.
34. The application was not subject to formal pre-application discussions and it was not necessary to contact the applicant during processing of the application.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be granted subject to the following condition

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the 1:500 block plan received on 01/06/2018, and plan ref. S.H. 02 C, with the exception of the brickwork which shall be Swarland Autumn Brown Sandface, and the roof tiles which shall be Marley Rivendale.

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

2. All screen fencing/walling and means of enclosure to be erected on the site shall be in accordance with the details approved under application ref. 18/01052/DISCON.

[In the interest of amenity and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan].