

20/00489/FUL

Applicant Mr M Harbottle

Location 36 Boundary Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire

Proposal First floor extensions including raising of roof height, balcony to rear, conservatory, internal alterations, replacement grey windows and render brickwork, and raised decking to rear.

Ward Musters

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application relates to a large detached bungalow located on the north side of Boundary Road in a residential area of West Bridgford. The dwelling is set back from the highway by some 25 metres and stands in the centre of a rectangular plot. The property is faced in white render to the front and red/brown bricks to the sides and rear with a tiled roof. It has previously been extended on several occasions, including front and rear extensions, a dormer extension in the front slope and a detached garage in the front garden.
2. To the south-west is a similarly proportioned bungalow at 38 Boundary Road. To the east is the bungalow at 34 Boundary Road; this neighboring property is at a lower land level to the application site as the land slopes down to the north-east. Similarly, the land also drops away quite significantly at the rear towards the properties on Ellesmere Road.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. The application is a resubmission of a previous scheme following the refusal of permission and dismissal at appeal. This proposal comprises the construction of first floor extensions including raising of the roof height, balcony to rear, conservatory, internal alterations, replacement grey windows and render brickwork and raised decking to rear.
4. The raising of the roof would be to the rear portion of the existing dwelling, to provide three bedrooms, two dressing rooms, two en-suites and a bathroom on the first floor. The ground floor would be enlarged through the provision of the conservatory.
5. A proposed outbuilding is shown on the plans but was not included in the description covering the proposed works. As such, it is not being considered under this application.
6. Revised plans have been received reducing the scale of the side facing dormer windows.

SITE HISTORY

7. 03/00108/FUL - Single storey rear extension – approved.
8. 04/00158/FUL - Insert dormer in front elevation roofslope; construct 2m high front boundary wall/gates – approved.
9. 11/00184/FUL - Double garage and store; front boundary wall (maximum 2.8m high) and gates – refused.
10. 11/01830/FUL - Front extension for garage with storage above; front boundary wall (maximum 2.5m high) and gates – approved.
11. 14/01923/FUL - Detached double garage – approved.
12. 18/01005/FUL - First floor extension, balcony to rear, conservatory, internal alterations, replacement grey windows, and render brickwork – withdrawn.
13. 19/00142/FUL - First floor extension, balcony to the rear, conservatory, internal alterations, replacement grey windows and render brickwork (resubmission – previous one withdrawn) – refused and dismissed at appeal (APP/P3040/D/19/3232006 Sept 19).

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor

14. In response to the original consultation one Ward Councillor (Cllr R Jones) objected on the grounds that the application must be assessed in the context of previous extensions, the resulting length and bulk of this property is greater than neighbouring properties, the ridge height would be increased by virtually 3 metres, including two substantial dormers to each side with two sets of windows, a first floor balcony is proposed to the north elevation and decking at ground level. The considerably increased ridge height with dormers would create a bulky and ungainly appearance from the front, back and side, the design does not improve the character of the area as the massing and scale are incompatible with the character of the area. Of equal importance is the impact on 34 Boundary Road, which is 1.5 metres lower and has a patio and main living area to the western side. The proposal, within 1.5 metres of the boundary, rises to the existing eave height then adds wide dormer windows rising over 6 metres above the ground level of 34 Boundary Road and some 5 metres wide. The increased ridge height across the length of the property would add to this. Sunlight currently reaching 34 Boundary Road would be reduced and the outlook and overbearing impact on the living conditions would be harmed being overly dominant. Regarding 38 Boundary Road, a much higher ridge height plus a dormer of the same scale on an already long building may have an impact on the amenity of that property. The application property might be higher than properties to the rear and am unsure the distance they would be from the proposed balcony.

15. Following submission of revised plans, Cllr Jones commented that the changes are a slight improvement but not enough to assuage impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties so the objection stands. Expertise required to judge the veracity of the sun paths, for 30 Sept at 6.30 to be total darkness seems very unlikely.

Local Residents and the General Public

Original Consultation

16. In response to the original consultation objections were received from five properties on the following grounds:
- a. Changes to the roof profile would make this proposal more harmful than the previous, the proposed dormer is at a location that obstructs the afternoon sun reaching the patio and patio doors to the principal living area of 34 Boundary Road, the land of 36 Boundary Road is already 1.5 metres above the patio and this dormer rises 6.34 metres above the patio just 1.5 metres from the boundary, the proposed ridge is a massive 9.35 metres above the patio compared to 6.44 metres for the present ridge which will have a serious overshadowing effect.
 - b. The patio currently receives variable amounts of direct sunlight between 28 February and 12 October, the amount of sunlight increases to a maximum in mid-summer. For instance, between 15 May and 15 August the shadow lengths are 0.91 and 1.13 respectively, which puts virtually the whole of the patio in direct sunlight. In a sample direction on the right-hand side of the dormer, the period of direct sunlight is currently nearly 4 months, lasting from 25 April to 16 August whereas with the proposed structure it would be just 26 days from 3 June to 27 June.
 - c. The dormer wall is 2.5m higher than the existing eaves of 36 Boundary Road. The centre of the dormer wall has been demonstrated to exclude all sunlight on the patio between 22 August and 20 April. The 2.5 metres extra obstruction height of the proposal will obviously cast an additional shadow that will vary in extent according to the inclination of the sun, there would be 3.35 metres. extra width of direct sunlight that would be excluded by 2.5 metres extra height, this is extra sunlight for the existing compared to that for the proposed dormer.
 - d. In a similar way the dormer will decrease sunlight throughout the 8 months when the patio now receives sun. This reduction in sunlight also applies to all directions where the sun is behind the large dormer. The sample dates illustrate a strip of 3.35 metres extra direct sunlight on the patio on 20 April and 22 August, on which dates the proposal projects shadow to the base of the door, and therefore excludes all patio sunlight. The proposal would therefore effectively change the patio from one that is now in sun during all the important summer months, to one that is mostly in shade.

- e. This lounge is the major living area of 34 Boundary Road and the period of total shade is increased by the proposed structure from 66 days to 139 days. The lounge does now receive some sunlight for most of the year, the amount of sunlight during that time would be greatly reduced by the proposed structure. The proposal would therefore cause a very large reduction in the sunlight that is currently enjoyed by the neighbouring lounge window for nearly 10 months of the year.
- f. There is only one window on the first-floor landing and the proposed ridge is 4.39 metres above the first-floor eaves of 34 Boundary Road and 2.91 metres above the existing ridge. The proposed roof structure therefore causes shade to the landing window in the season when the sun is lower in the sky. The period during which there is complete shading of the first-floor window increases from 96 days on average to 138 days. Direct sunlight is only part of the consequences as the replacement of open sky by brick and tile will reduce light levels at all times of the year.
- g. There are solar PV panels over most of the length of the roof of 34 Boundary Road starting 2 metres vertically higher than the eaves. This is higher than the existing roof of 36 Boundary Road's existing roof, and the panels are consequently never shaded at present. The proposed ridge is 2.75 metres above these panels, and consequently are shaded towards the end of the day. At the sample sun direction evaluated, this partial shading of the panels occurred from 30 September to 11 March.
- h. The proposed extensions would over-complicate the roof, the roof form would not be complementary to neighbouring properties.
- i. The extension would be incongruous in the streetscene.
- j. The increase in ridge height, the addition of bulky side dormers with windows and the rear first floor projection with balcony would have a significant imposing and dominant impact on neighbouring properties that fully justifies the refusal of planning permission.
- k. The overbearing impact would fundamentally impact on the neighbouring properties for the long term. The outlook would be categorially affected and be so dominant that it would be oppressive and unwelcomed.
- l. The roof line of the current proposal is 1.946 metres higher than that refused in 2019 and of a much more bulky and dominant appearance.
- m. The wide side dormer is much higher than the previous proposal and consequently more overbearing and overshadowing.
- n. There would be overlooking from the balcony to the property to the rear affecting the garden and rear windows of the dwelling and there would be potential noise from the balcony, against additional windows overlooking the side elevation.

17. Following receipt of revised plans, objections were received from two properties commenting:
- a. There have been many extensions approved in recent years to this property, but the most recent applications to build a rear second storey have been refused twice.
 - b. In 2019 permission was refused and also rejected on appeal. The amended scheme would still increase the dominance of the building, would be overbearing and have a greater and more severe impact on 34 Boundary Road than the refused application. There is no section drawing provided to accurately reflect the relationship and levels between the properties.
 - c. There would be a significant increase in ridge height, over-complicated roof form, dormers visible from Boundary Road, not subordinate extensions.
 - d. The roof form is not complementary to neighbours, the proposed roof is higher than the refused scheme, dormers still add bulk and lead to unacceptable overlooking, overbearing impact on principal rooms including living area and overshadowing.
 - e. Previous comments remain valid and an updated Light Impact Study has been submitted.
 - f. There would be intrusiveness from the full height windows and balcony, the extension would impact on the rear of the property at the back of the site.
 - g. The sunpath diagrams are supplied without any explanation with only four dates in the year of which January and March are largely irrelevant. The overall shading shown is not defined, but the implication that there is no sun at 6.30 on June 20th, and 4pm onwards on September 20th is incorrect. On June 20th, the sun is shown to be directly in front of the properties with no shading of the narrow gap between them at 10.00 but the sun does not reach this position until around midday. By 1pm the sun is still able to shine between the properties and the 5ft fence in the rear garden is shown as casting a shadow, but at the same time there is not much increase in the shadow cast by the proposed building. These sunpath diagrams are simplistic and erroneous.
 - h. In contrast, the shade calculations submitted in an earlier objection addressed the shadow effects at the time of day and year when they have a harmful impact on 34 Boundary Road with the conclusion being the overall effect is that a sunny patio becomes a largely shaded patio during important months, and sunlight to the windows is very radically reduced or eliminated during other months. Of even greater importance are the overbearing and bulky issues.
 - i. The previous planning application was refused and dismissed on appeal, the latest proposals are much more detrimental than the refused application as the proposal is higher than the previous application, the dormer in

particular makes the proposal much more overbearing on 34 Boundary Road than the rejected proposal and the bulky appearance from the road is also very significantly greater.

PLANNING POLICY

18. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1) and the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), the National Planning Practice Guidance and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide (2009).

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

19. The relevant national policy considerations for this proposal are those contained within the 2019 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 falls to be considered under section 12 of the NPPF (Achieving Well Designed Places) and it should be ensured that the development satisfies the criteria outlined under paragraph 127. 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 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

20. Policy 1 of LPP1 reinforces the need for a positive and proactive approach to planning decision making that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. The proposal falls to be considered under Policy 10 of LPP1. 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, specifically 2(b) whereby the 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.
21. The proposal falls to be considered under Policy 1 of LPP2 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.
22. The Residential Design Guide advises that “Extensions should be designed so that they are not readily perceived as merely “add-on” to the original building and therefore scale, proportion and roof form are very important. However, as a general rule the style and design of the original dwelling should remain the dominant element with the extension subordinate to it.”

APPRAISAL

23. The overarching Policy 1 in the LPP1 reinforces that a positive and proactive approach to decision making should be taken which reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. In this instance the proposed development comprises an extension to an existing dwelling within the main settlement of West Bridgford. As such, it is considered to be a sustainable development and therefore is acceptable in principle, subject to other material considerations being acceptable.

Design and visual amenity

24. Planning permission was refused and dismissed on appeal on this site under planning application ref: 19/00142/FUL. That application sought planning permission to re-model the existing bungalow and construct a large first floor extension at the rear along with a rear conservatory extension with balcony above, alterations to windows and external render to existing brickwork.
25. The first floor extension under that application proposed the substantial remodelling of the roof form at the rear of the property to include increasing the height of the walls and eaves down both sides of the property by almost a metre and creating a large, two storey high gable end wall in the rear facing elevation with a central flat roof between two asymmetric slopes either side when viewed from the rear. When viewed from the front this would have created two additional roof pitches that would rise above and flank the slope of the existing roof. The raised roof at the rear would not have exceeded the ridgeline of the existing dwelling. A series of roof lights were proposed in both side facing slopes of the raised roof.
26. Despite the substantial roof alterations proposed under that application the actual footprint of the existing dwelling would have only been increased by a relatively modest amount at the rear. The proposed conservatory would have been around 3.4 metres by 6.9 metres in floor area and would have infilled an L shaped area of decking at the rear of the house, effectively squaring off the rear wall. A balcony was proposed above the conservatory which, whilst being open to the north, would sit beneath the projecting roof above.
27. The application was refused on grounds of visual amenity as follows: *“The scale and proportion of the proposed development, in particular "shoulder" elements to the roof, would be an over-intensive form of development that would not be sympathetic to the style and design of the existing dwelling and would dominate over it causing harm to the character of the property. It is also considered that the "shoulder" elements on the roof would not be in keeping with the immediate area and would be a jarring feature within this local context. For these reasons it is considered that the proposed development would cause serious harm to the character of the property, would not be sympathetic to the local character and would not have a positive impact on the public realm or sense of place contrary to Policy 10 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP2 of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan, Policy 1 of the emerging Local Plan*

28. The appeal was subsequently dismissed with the Inspector stating the first-floor rear extension would raise the eaves of the dwelling to the side elevations. The ridge of the first-floor extension would be the same height as the existing main ridge. Consequently, the extended roof form would project past the existing side roof slopes introducing shoulder roof elements that would be visible when viewed from Boundary Road. Even accounting for the position of the first-floor extension, set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, these additional roof elements would over complicate the roof form and would not appear as a subordinate addition. He considered that the proposed roof form would not complement the hipped roof characteristics shared between the host dwelling and the immediate neighbouring dwellings on Boundary Road and would appear incongruous within the street scene.
29. The Inspector also stated the design approach would appear at odds with the character of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. For the foregoing reasons, he considered that the massing, scale and proportions of the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
30. This current application amends the proposed design of the extension following that appeal. The eaves height has now been designed to match the existing property, that is the eaves would not be raised as was the case with the previous proposal, and the ridge height of the first floor extension would be increased to a height of 7.9m to create a front gable, the sides would again extend past the existing side roof slopes but have been designed with an increased height and hipped roofs. The revised plans have then reduced the scale of the two side facing dormers.
31. The increase in the roof at the front and side hipped gable projections would be visible when viewing the dwelling from Boundary Road. The extension would represent a substantial re-modelling of the existing dwelling and would still result in a significant change to the existing roof form. However, the proposed front elevation would have a higher ridge above the existing somewhat squat gable and the wings would be visible albeit at a lower height than the proposed ridge. The overall result is a far more cohesive extension with small wall elements and limited additional roofs. The previously proposed gables have been omitted and the overall composition is far less fussy and cluttered compared to the refused scheme.
32. When viewed from the rear, the dwelling would change from essentially a single storey structure to a single storey plus attic accommodation. The proposed gable would fundamentally alter the elevation, but it would be to the rear and not open to view from the public realm. It would be subservient when read against the proposed higher ridge and wings. This compares well against the dismissed scheme which was essentially a two storey elevation to the rear and of a far greater massing.

33. From the side elevations, the refused scheme raised the eaves height and had a roof running from front to rear. Although the proposed extension would have a higher ridge height than the refused scheme, the eaves would remain as existing, the roof would be hipped and the proposed dormer windows have been reduced in scale. Although the side facing roofs would be relatively large, the hipped design would reduce the apparent massing and, on balance, from a design perspective are considered to be less heavy compared to the dismissed scheme.
34. On balance, it is considered that the proposal overcomes the reasons for refusal for refusal of the previous scheme and dismissal at appeal through removing the shoulders, simplifying the design and providing a more cohesive appearance. The objections raised are noted and have been considered in forming this view. However, the nature and appearance of dwellings in the locality vary, the dwelling is set well into the site and the proposed scheme is not considered to be visually harmful. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the aforementioned policies and guidance on visual grounds.

Impact upon neighbouring amenity

35. The previous application was also refused on the following residential amenity ground: *"The proposed development would be unduly overbearing and overshadowing on the neighbouring property at 34 Boundary Road which would be seriously harmful to the residential amenities of the occupiers of this property. In this regard the proposed development would also be contrary to Policy 10 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP2 Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan, Policy 1 of the emerging Local Plan Part 2, the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide 2009 and Chapter 12 of the NPPF."*
36. In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector stated; *"The neighbouring dwelling at No 34 is situated at a lower level to the appeal dwelling. The appeal dwelling projects past the nearest part of the rear elevation serving No 34. Clear glazed French doors serving lounge areas exist both to this rear elevation, as well as to the elevation of the rear projection at No 34 that faces the boundary with the appeal site. These windows and the patio area serving No 34 all sit in close proximity to the boundary with the appeal site."*
37. The Inspector further stated; *"The development would increase the eaves height to the side elevations of No 36. The ridge over the section of the dwelling that sits parallel to the boundary with No 34 would be increased to match the main ridge. There would also be an alteration from a hip to gabled roof to the rear elevation which would further extend the ridge line when looking towards the appeal dwelling from No 34. Given the change in levels between the sites and the depth and position of the side elevation of the host dwelling relative to No 34, the increased bulk, height and mass of the dwelling resulting from the development would have an imposing and dominating presence when experienced from the rooms served by the ground floor French doors and from the patio area serving No 34. As a result, the development would be overbearing and would have a detrimental impact on outlook for the occupiers of No 34."*

38. It was further stated; *“The Council’s decision also cites that the development would have an overshadowing impact on No 34. The orientation, proximity and relative levels between the appeal dwelling and this neighbouring property means there is already some impact on the levels of light experienced by the occupiers of No 34. However, I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that levels of light would be materially impacted on beyond the existing situation. In this particular respect, I have therefore not identified conflict with Policy 10 of the CS, Policy GP2 of the NSRLP or Policy 1 of the emerging LP. Nonetheless, for the reasons outlined earlier in this section, the proposal would not retain a suitable level of outlook for occupiers of No 34 and would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling.”*
39. The above reasons for refusal and the grounds for dismissing the appeal need to be addressed. To the east of the site is 34 Boundary Road, a detached dormer bungalow which is at a lower level than the application site. Along the boundary with No. 34, the proposed development would remain offset from the boundary by around 1.2 metres. One of the reasons the previous application was refused was undue overbearing and overshadowing impacts on this neighbouring property. The current proposal has been amended from the previous refusal and the eaves height of the eastern elevation would remain the same as the existing property. However, the proposal would raise the ridge height of the main section of the property to a height of 7.9 metres and introduce a dormer window.
40. The retained eaves height would ensure that no significant additional areas of wall would result on this elevation. The hipped roof would reduce the amount of roof facing no.34 at the rear most part of the side elevation compared to the refused scheme. Although the ridge height would be increased, the proposed roof diminishes in scale with height so that the massing of the roof reduces with the additional height.
41. The objections from the occupier of no.34 have been carefully considered and the proposal viewed from that property and garden. It is acknowledged that the proposal would have a greater impact on amenity compared to the current situation and the proposed scheme has also carefully been considered against the refused scheme. It is considered the current scheme, which does not propose an increase in eaves height, would have a lesser impact on the amenities of no.34 compared to the refused scheme in reducing the massing and visual impact. It is acknowledged that the current proposal then proposes a dormer window and a greater ridge height, and both would have an impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property. However, the reduced scale of the dormer window is noted as is the hipped design of the roof which would slope away from the neighbour and diminish in scale with height.
42. Information and modelling of the proposal on sunlight has also been submitted by both the occupier of the neighbouring property and the architect. Having assessed this, the conclusion is that whilst the proposal would affect sunlight

this would not be at a level that would be so harmful as to warrant a refusal on residential amenity grounds.

43. The conclusion that the proposal is acceptable on the grounds of residential amenity in relation to 34 Boundary Road is very much on balance and that the proposal has overcome the previous reasons for refusal and dismissal on appeal. The proposal would have an impact on the neighbouring property, but this is not now considered to be at the level where a refusal could reasonably be sustained.
44. No. 38 Boundary Road lies to the west of the application property and is at a slightly elevated level. The proposed rear extension would infill the area of existing decking adjacent to the rear of this property and would be set off the boundary by 0.85 metres. The extension would project approximately 2 metres beyond the rear wall of an existing small single storey sunroom extension at the back of No. 38.
45. The scheme has been amended from the previous application so that the eaves height would remain as existing and whilst the roofline has been changed to a pitched roof increasing to a height of 7.9m, this would be sloping away from the side boundary. A dormer window is also proposed in the west elevation facing No. 38. The location of the dormer would face the roof slope of No. 38 and it is not considered that this would create any overlooking or loss of privacy. It is not considered that the extension would have any detrimental impact on the residential amenities of No. 38. In forming this conclusion, the comments from the neighbour have been taken into account but it is not considered there are grounds to refuse in terms of this relationship.
46. Objections have been received regarding the proposed balcony to the rear of the extension. The balcony would be accessed from the rear bedroom and would be flanked to the east and west by the external side of the dormers; this would screen views to the east and west. It is also considered that the views from the balcony would not be significantly different to that from a first floor rear facing window. This relationship is typical from other dwellings in the area.
47. Properties to the north on Ellesmere Road would be separated from the extension and balcony by over 26 metres to the boundary with these properties with further separation to the rear elevations of the neighbouring dwellings. Notwithstanding that these properties sit at a lower land level and to an extent the proposed balcony would afford elevated views towards them, given the separation distances it is considered that there would not be any significant adverse impact on the amenities of these properties. In forming this view the objections have been considered; however, it is also noted that the appeal decision raised no objection to the amenity of neighbouring properties to the north.

Summary

48. Overall on balance, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties

and would comply with the objectives of Policy 10 of the LPP1 and Policy 1 of the LPP2. It is acknowledged the proposals would increase the impact on neighbouring properties and especially to 34 Boundary Road; however, it is not considered this harm would be such as to warrant a refusal.

49. The site is accessed from Boundary Road to the south and no alterations are proposed to the access. The property has a large front driveway and garage to the front which would be retained. As such, there is adequate parking to the front of the dwelling to serve the enlarged property. Accordingly, the development is not considered to impact on highway safety and complies with the above policies and guidance.
50. In principle the proposed development is considered acceptable. It is also considered that the resultant visual impact and impact on residential amenity would be acceptable. This is very much an on balance assessment, taking into account the comments received and the Planning Inspector's report in dismissing the previous appeal. It is considered the changes incorporated in this application address sufficiently the previous reasons for refusal and the reasons for the dismissed appeal.
51. The application was not the subject of formal pre-application discussions. The scheme as originally submitted was not considered acceptable and discussions with the agent took place to amend the proposal so that a favourable recommendation could be reached. The Council therefore acted positively and proactively in determining the planning application.

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

S01 Location Plan received 26.02.2020

S02 Rev C Block Plan received 21.10.2020

P210 Rev M Proposed Internal Layout received 15.07.2020

E02 Rev J Proposed Side Elevations received 15.07.2020

E01 Rev J Proposed Front and Rear Elevations received 15.07.2020

P211 Rev G Roof Plan received 15.07.2020

E05-A Site Section received 21.10.2020

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the materials as specified in the application.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

4. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans, the glazing in the side facing dormer windows shall be permanently fitted with glass which has been rendered permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent. The dormer windows shall also be non-opening below 1.7 metres measured from the height of the internal floor level. Thereafter, the windows shall be retained to this specification.

[To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy 10 of the Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

Notes to Applicant

Please be advised that all applications approved on or after the 7th October 2019 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Borough Council considers that the approved development is CIL chargeable as the floor area would exceed 100sqm. Full details of the amount payable, the process and timescales for payment, and any potential exemptions/relief that may be applicable will be set out in a Liability Notice to be issued following this decision. Further information about CIL can be found on the Borough Council's website at:

<https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningandgrowth/cil/>

This permission does not give any legal right for any work on, over or under land or buildings outside the application site ownership or affecting neighbouring property, including buildings, walls, fences and vegetation within that property. If any such work is anticipated, the consent of the adjoining land owner must first be obtained. The responsibility for meeting any claims for damage to such features lies with the applicant.

You are advised to ensure disturbance to neighbours is kept to a minimum during construction by restricting working hours to Monday to Friday 7.00am to 7.00pm, Saturday 8.00am to 5.00pm and by not working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. If you intend to work outside these hours you are requested to contact the Environmental Health Officer on 0115 9148322.

This planning permission does not authorise the erection of the outbuilding referred to in the submission. An informal view as to whether this building can be constructed under permitted development rights can be sought through the submission to the Borough Council of a request for advice, alternatively a formal determination can be

sought through an application for a Certificate of Lawful Development.