

18/01035/FUL

Applicant Mr Chris O'Grady

Location 5 Roulstone Crescent East Leake Nottinghamshire LE12 6JL

Proposal Conversion of bungalow to four bedroom house including replacement of roof, increasing eaves and ridge height with dormer windows to front and rear; rear extension and replacement detached garage (resubmission)

Ward Leake

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site relates to a detached 1970's bungalow within the built up area of East Leake. The building is constructed in pale buff brick with grey interlocking concrete roof tiles. The existing bungalow is sited between a two storey detached hipped roof property to the north and a bungalow to the south, which has been partially converted into a 1.5 storey property. The properties immediately opposite consist of a row of two storey detached houses with hipped roofs. The rear garden backs on to the rear gardens of properties that front Gotham Road to the west. The surrounding area is defined by a mix of single storey bungalows and two storey detached houses all constructed in typical 1970s style with a mix of pale buff brick, sections of render and hanging tile with shallow pitched roofs.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

2. The application seeks planning permission for the conversion and extension of an existing bungalow to form a four bedroom property with dormer windows to the front elevation to provide first floor accommodation. The application also includes the removal and replacement of an existing detached garage with a more substantial structure. The application is a resubmission of a previously withdrawn scheme.
3. The height of the eaves is proposed to increase by 1.1m to 3.4m and the height of the ridge by 2.2m to 7.3m. The proposal would introduce three dormer windows to the front elevation roof slope, and one obscure glazed dormer window to the rear elevation roof slope, set between two roof lights. The proposed extensions include a 2m deep extension spanning the rear elevation. The proposed replacement garage is to have a pitched roof to a height of 2.1m to the eaves and 3.68m to the ridge.

SITE HISTORY

4. Application 18/00328/FUL - Convert bungalow into two storey dwelling with front and rear extensions, loft conversion, and garage to side. This application was withdrawn following concerns raised by neighbours, Ward Members and Officers.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

5. The Ward Councillor (Cllr Males) objects to the application stating that it is too large for the site, not in keeping with the other dwellings in the area and is an over intensive form of development.

Town/Parish Council

6. East Leake Parish Council objects to the application on grounds that it is over intensive and not in keeping with the rest of the houses on the road. There is also concern that it will result in the loss of a needed bungalow to the housing stock and that it will increase pressure for on street parking on a narrow road.

Statutory and Other Consultees

7. No statutory consultees are required to be consulted for this application. No comments have therefore been received.

Local Residents and the General Public

8. Three written representations objecting to the proposals have been received from three neighbouring residential properties raising the following concerns:
 - a. Loss of light.
 - b. Increased overlooking.
 - c. The design is considered to be out of keeping with the rest of the street.
 - d. Increased on street parking pressures.
 - e. Over intensive form of development.
 - f. Loss of needed bungalow to housing stock.

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. The East Leake Neighbourhood plan also forms part of the development plan for the purposes of considering applications in East Leake. Other material planning considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan (2006) and the Rushcliffe Borough Residential Design Guide (2009).

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

10. 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. The proposal should be considered under section 12 of the NPPF in terms of promoting good design, particularly the criteria outlined in paragraph 127 of the NPPF. Development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just in the short term but over the lifetime of the development. In line with NPPF paragraph 130, 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.

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

11. Policy 1 of the 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. The proposal should be considered under Core Strategy Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity). Development should make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place, and should have regard to the local context and reinforce local characteristics. Development should be assessed in terms of the criteria listed under section 2 of Policy 10, and of particular relevance to this application are; 2(b) whereby development should 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.
12. None of the five saved policies from the 1996 Local Plan apply to this application.
13. Whilst not a statutory document, the policies contained within the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan should be given weight as a material consideration in decision making. The proposal falls to be considered under the criteria of Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan. Of particular relevance is GP2(d) whereby development should not have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, nor lead to a loss of amenity. The scale, density, height, massing, design and layout of the proposal all need to be carefully considered, and should not lead to an over-intensive form of development.
14. The Residential Design Guide (2009) is a material consideration in determining applications. This implies that the style and design of any extension should respect that of the original dwelling and should not dominate over it. Extensions should be designed so that they are not readily perceived as merely 'add-ons' to the original building and therefore scale, proportion, and roof form are key considerations.
15. The East Leake Neighbourhood Plan (ELNP) was adopted on 19th November 2015 which focuses on new housing developments (mix and location) in respect of residential development. There are no specific policies within the ELNP that are relevant in the determination of this application.

APPRAISAL

16. The site is located within the built up area of the village and proposes extensions and alterations to an existing residential property. There is no

objection raised to the principle of development. The key considerations are, therefore, the design, scale and appearance and the impact on the character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

17. Objections have been received on grounds that the proposal would result in the loss of a bungalow to the housing stock. There are no specific local or national planning policies that restrict the principle of conversion of bungalows to form two storey properties in response to concerns over housing need. Should the proposal to convert a bungalow comply with other aspects of the development plan, in terms of design and amenity considerations, it is not considered that a reason to refuse the application on grounds of principle could be reasonably substantiated.
18. Concerns have been raised by a Ward Councillor, the Parish Council and residents that the design of the building would be out of keeping with the surrounding properties. The surrounding area is defined by a mix of bungalows and two storey properties which are of typical post-war suburban style constructed in buff pale brick, with the use of sections of render and tile hanging and shallow pitched roofs. It is not considered that the character of the area or the street scene is of any particular defining character or quality to which the proposal would cause harm or loss to this character or appear wholly out of character.
19. The height and scale of the building would be increased; however, the submitted plans indicate that the ridge height would be no greater than the two storey property to the north. The building line would also be maintained as the proposal would not extend beyond the existing front wall. Objections have been raised on grounds that the extension would amount to an over intensive form of development. Taking into account the additional 2m extension to the footprint at the rear of the property, the size of the extended dwelling is commensurate to the size of the plot with the rear garden retaining a central depth of 10.5m, increasing to 12m on the northern boundary. The total size of the garden space (rear and side) amounts to 132 square meters which is greater than the proportions recommended within the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide. It is therefore considered that an objection to the proposal on grounds of over development could not be reasonably justified.
20. Objections have been received from surrounding residential properties on grounds of harm to amenity through increased overlooking and overshadowing. The proposal would introduce rooms within the first floor roof space with dormer windows to the front elevation overlooking the street. The rear elevation would contain one dormer window to serve a bathroom which is to be obscure glazed, and two small roof lights to serve the secondary bedrooms. With regards to the first floor dormer windows to the front elevation, it is not considered that any additional unacceptable overlooking towards the public facing elevations of adjacent properties would occur. There is a 23m distance between the front elevation of the application property and the front elevation of the property directly opposite at no. 10 Roulestone Crescent. Furthermore, the first floor windows would serve bedrooms rather than living rooms and, therefore, the prospect of overlooking is likely to be limited, and would not amount to unacceptable harm to the amenity of other residential properties within the street. There are no windows proposed to either side elevation. In the interests of retaining control over any future development in order to protect the amenity of properties to

the rear, it is proposed to remove permitted development rights for alterations to the roof in order to prevent the insertion of dormer windows in the rear elevation following completion of the proposed development.

21. In considering the impact on the properties to the rear along Gotham Road, in terms of overlooking, the first floor openings have been designed to ensure that the prospect and perception of overlooking is minimised through the use of only one dormer window to serve the bathroom, which is to be obscure glazed, and the use of small roof lights to serve the rear bedrooms, which the angle and height would not allow for uninterrupted views or unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to the rear.
22. In terms of overshadowing, overbearing and loss of light, the building is positioned between nos. 3 and 5 Roulesone Crescent. Owing to the trajectory of the sun east to west, it is not considered that the additional height and mass of the building proposed would cause unacceptable overshadowing to the garden area of the property to the north, particularly as the rear elevation as proposed would not extend beyond the rear wall of no. 7 Roulestone Crescent and therefore the rear garden area of the neighbouring property remaining relatively open to the southern boundary. It is not considered that the height of the building proposed would appear overbearing to any of the neighbouring properties as sufficient space around the dwelling would be retained, and the massing of the first floor extension being limited to that of a 1.5 storey dwelling.
23. Negotiations through the course of the application have secured a revision to the roof form of the replacement garage so that the gable end is front facing so that the roof slope falls to the southern boundary, and as such the height is less overbearing. It is not considered due to its position north of the boundary shared with no. 2 Roulestone Crescent, that any overshadowing or loss of light would occur.
24. Objections have been received on grounds that the increased size of the dwelling would result in additional on street parking pressures on a road which is relatively narrow in width. The existing property provides off street parking for at least two cars to the side of the property (2.8m in width). The application includes the surfacing of an additional area of the front garden to provide an additional parking space. The proposal would therefore provide parking for at least three cars, with additional space provided within the detached garage. It is, therefore, considered that the amount of off street parking proposed is commensurate to the size of the property so as to minimise the potential for further on street parking.
25. In conclusion, it is considered that the proposal would not represent an incongruous or discordant feature within the street scene as the scale and form relates well to other properties within the locality and, therefore, would respect the otherwise non-distinctive character and appearance of the area.
26. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal represents a notable increase in the size of the existing property, it is considered that the proposed size of the building is proportionate to the size of the plot and the surrounding group of buildings.

27. It is not considered that the proposed increase in scale and mass of the building would unduly impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties to an extent that would be sufficient to substantiate a robust reason to refuse the application and accordingly does not conflict with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy, GP2 of the Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
28. Negotiations have taken place during the consideration of the application to address adverse impacts identified by officers and to respond to concerns raised in letters of representation submitted in connection with the proposal. Amendments have been made to the proposal, addressing the identified adverse impacts, thereby resulting in a more acceptable scheme and the recommendation to grant planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

It is **RECOMMENDED** that planning permission be granted subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

[To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004].

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans ref. 17003-05C and 17003-09A received on 3rd July 2018 and 17003-06B, 17003-07B, 17003-08 and 17003-01 all received on 3rd May 2018.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

3. The external materials and finishes shall be as specified within the submitted application and as shown on the approved drawings to match the existing external elevations.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

4. The first floor dormer window in the west elevation to serve the bathroom of the proposed development shall be permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent. Thereafter, the window shall be retained to this specification.

[To ensure a satisfactory development in the interests of amenity and to comply with policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no additional windows, doors or openings of any kind shall be formed in the east elevation(s) at upper floor levels of the approved development without the prior written approval of the Borough Council.

[To safeguard the reasonable residential amenities of adjoining properties and to comply with policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]