

# 18/00614/FUL

**Applicant** Mr & Mrs Senior

**Location** Nettle Barn Bassingfield Lane Bassingfield Nottinghamshire NG12 2LG

**Proposal** Single storey extensions to side and rear, first floor/two storey extensions to front and rear, new porch and pergola, and construction of car port (revised scheme)

**Ward** Gamston North

## THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application property is a red brick and pantile single and two storey dwelling converted from former farm buildings within a relatively large residential curtilage in a tandem/backland position on the south side of Bassingfield Lane. Bassingfield is a hamlet comprising late 18th/early 19th century and 20th century dwellings and farm buildings in Green Belt countryside. Manor Farm adjacent to the north is a white rendered traditional farm house, and Field House to the north west is a red brick late 20th century suburban house. A public footpath from Bassingfield Lane runs in a southerly direction around 60m to the east of the site, and the Grantham Canal is around 110m to the south.

## DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

2. The single storey extensions would accommodate a living room and glazed link to an existing annexe. The first floor/two storey extension would be constructed where the single storey part of the dwelling meets the two storey part to accommodate a master bedroom with a balcony to the front and a rear first floor section supported by pillars. This extension would be attached to a new flat roofed porch. A timber pergola would be attached to the north elevation, and a detached car port incorporating a garden store would be constructed adjacent to the western boundary.
3. The materials would be brickwork and glazing for the single storey side extension, predominantly glazing with some zinc cladding for the rear link extension, glazing and zinc cladding for the porch, timber & zinc cladding for the walls and roof for the first floor/two storey extension, and timber cladding and tiles for the car port.
4. The Design & Access Statement states the following:
  - The first floor bedroom extension has been designed to sit elegantly over the single storey part of the building at a perpendicular angle supported on thin columns to break up the mass.
  - The glass link would allow the existing house to be viewed through the extension.

- The materials and architectural detailing would be contemporary and sharp, and the materials have been chosen to visually contrast with the existing house.
  - The result is a series of small extensions that create subtle additions to the building which complement and do not overshadow its character and features.
  - The car port has been located in a secluded part of the site to not detract from the open nature of the Green Belt, and security represents very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the development in the Green Belt.
  - The extensions would represent a 2.9% increase in floor space of the original building.
5. The application is a re-submission with alterations to the design and scale of the single storey side and rear extensions together with the proposed pergola.
  6. The plans also show a number of alterations to existing openings.

## **SITE HISTORY**

7. Permission was granted in 1993 for alteration and extensions of farm buildings to form a dwelling (ref. 93/00775/FUL). Permission was granted in 1994 for a single storey extension, porch and store (ref. 94/00347/FUL).
8. Permission was granted by the Planning Committee on 11 January 2018 for single storey extensions to side and rear, first floor/two storey extensions to front and rear, new porch and construction of car port (ref. 17/2455/FUL).

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

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

9. One Ward Councillor (Cllr J Wheeler) objects on the following grounds.
  - a. He maintains his objection to the development and believes that the revisions are still out of character with the existing building and the surrounding area.
  - b. There is still no justification for a car port to be built in the development, and he believes that the Access and Design statement is very vague on the detail, and underplays the scale of work.
10. He hopes that officers take on board these comments and those of the Design and Conservation Officer in reaching the decision.

### **Town/Parish Council**

11. Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council do not object and comment that much of the application has already been approved and that this application applies to a proposed single storey extension (the courtyard

room) and a pergola. They consider that the scale, height and design of the proposed work seeks to enhance the character of the existing building and its immediate area.

### **Statutory and Other Consultees**

12. The Design and Conservation Officer comments that the existing dwelling is nominally a barn conversion but that it is difficult to identify any component of the existing building which has not been rebuilt, as much is built of modern engineering brick plinth courses and in stretcher bond masonry typical of cavity wall construction. He comments that some of the alterations previously permitted are typical of a late 80's early 90's approach to barn conversions and include features such as external porches which are best avoided as they significantly detract from the agricultural character of the building which it is desirable to retain as part of a successful barn conversion scheme.
13. He notes that the design and access statement does not draw the advantageous comparison between the proposed metal clad extensions and the historic photographs included with the application which show the pre-'conversion' situation where the barns included portal framed sheet metal clad structures.
14. He comments that, whilst it would be of a very much higher quality than an agricultural structure, the proposal has many factors in common with portal framed buildings, including external metal cladding to roofs and walls and the inclusion of large openings. Whilst he believes that this is the best way of justifying the proposed design and would represent a reasonably logical justification for this approach, he is not convinced that the scheme respects the retained character and appearance of the building, and the proposals have a significant impact on all of the main elevations of the building and would fundamentally change its character. Rather than a well-designed contrast, he is concerned that the proposal would represent an awkward clash which would detract from the overall design.
15. He considers that the single storey glazed link rear extension is easier to understand and accept than the extension approved under 17/02455/FUL, and that it would not have such a negative effect on the overall character of the building. He considers that the revised single storey side extension would have a far more contemporary and angular form than the previously approved extension, and a far less straightforward relationship with the host property. He notes, however, that it would be largely hidden and would have no impact on the main elevations or main routes to the buildings.

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

16. No written representations have been received.

### **PLANNING POLICY**

17. 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.

18. 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.
19. 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**

20. 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 and look for solutions rather than problems, seeking to approve applications where possible.
21. 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'.
22. One 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."*
23. Chapter 7: 'Requiring good design' states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute to making places better for people. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area and respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area. Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle 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.
24. Chapter 9 'Protecting Green Belt land' states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

## Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

25. Policy 10 (Design and enhancing local identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.
26. Policies GP2 (Design & Amenity criteria), and EN17 (Alteration or extension of buildings) and EN19 (Impact on the Green Belt and open countryside) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan. EN17 allows for extensions to buildings outside settlements where the proposal retains the form and character of the original building, and does not significantly increase its impact on the amenity or character of the surrounding area. EN19 states that it must be demonstrated that there will be no significant adverse impact on the open nature of the Green Belt or countryside.
27. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide (RRDG) states that, although it is important that developments respect local character, pastiche designs incorporating poor imitations of other styles should be avoided and that contemporary and imaginative solutions combining individuality can, when related to local character, make a positive contribution to a place.

## APPRAISAL

28. In determining whether an extension in the Green Belt is disproportionate the Borough Council's usual informal guidance is that extensions should not result in an increase significantly greater than 50% over and above the original building, in terms of volume/cubic content and footprint, although a judgement must be made with regard to the specific circumstances of the case. In this case it appears that the original conversion from farm buildings to a dwelling referred to in paragraph 4 involved the demolition of a substantial portal framed building and that extensions, including a pitched roof over the two storey section, were relatively limited. The extension approved in 1994 (the existing annexe) replaced an outbuilding on a similar footprint. The scale of the extensions now proposed is relatively small in relation to the original building, and it appears that they would not represent a disproportionate increase in the size of the original buildings. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
29. As the Design and Conservation Officer has pointed out, it appears that the original conversion of the buildings to a dwelling involved a substantial amount of re-building, and that the conversion was typical of that era when there was less emphasis on preserving the traditional agricultural form and character of this type of building, and conversions often included what are now usually regarded as inappropriate/unsympathetic features such as new openings with domestic style windows, and porches. The building still broadly retains the simple form of the original building; however, it appears that the conversion and subsequent extensions/alterations eroded much of the original character.
30. The proposed single storey side and rear extensions and attached pergola would be relatively small and would not be prominent in views from the public domain. The changes to the design and scale now sought to the side extension comprise an angled north elevation wall and a flat & mono-pitched roof resulting in a more contemporary appearance than the approved

extension. The rear extension would be increased in height by 0.4m. The Design and Conservation Officer's concerns regarding the first floor and two storey extension incorporating a balcony are acknowledged. It is also acknowledged that the design and materials would represent a contrast to the traditional character of the building. However, it is considered that the proposal would represent an interesting and imaginative addition to the building, and that the contrasting materials would help to retain the original form of the building. Whilst Bassingfield Lane around the site has a strong rural character, there are a number of 20th century suburban dwellings in the vicinity. In view of this, as the existing building is not the best example of a barn conversion and as the site is in a tandem/backland position and not highly prominent in the public domain, it is considered, on balance, that the proposal would not be unsympathetic to the character of the surroundings. Furthermore, as the Design and Conservation Officer has pointed out, the extension would reflect the portal framed sheet metal clad structures which were demolished as part of the original conversion.

31. The NPPF does not allow for curtilage buildings in the list of exceptions to the presumption against new buildings in the Green Belt and, therefore, it is considered that they should be regarded as inappropriate development. Consequently very special circumstances would have to be demonstrated to justify the car port. In this case the applicant suggests that security represents very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Whilst crime and security is a planning consideration, it is considered that these issues could only be given limited weight in this case. However, the scale of the car port would be relatively modest (the size of a typical double garage) and, in view of this and its siting adjacent to the boundary, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, although in this instance, permitted development rights were restricted by condition when permission was granted for the barn conversion, curtilage buildings can potentially be constructed pursuant to permitted development rights and this can potentially result in buildings which would be significantly larger and more prominent. Such rights are not constrained by Green Belt designation. In view of the above, and as the car port would be within the residential curtilage and would be associated with the residential use of the site, it is considered that it would be very difficult to justify refusal of the car port on grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
32. It also has to be borne in mind that the first floor/two storey extension and car port were approved under 17/02455/FUL and they could, therefore, be constructed. In addition, whilst a Design and Access Statement has been submitted, it is not a validation requirement for a householder application (unless it relates to a Listed Building).
33. In view of the siting and scale of the extensions and distance from neighbouring and nearby properties, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on residential amenity.
34. The proposal was subject to pre-application discussions and revised details have been submitted during processing of the application resulting in a 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 following approved plans:

- 17009-00-10 revision A
- 17009-00-11 revision B
- 17009-00-12 revision B
- 17009-00-13 revision A
- 17009-00-14 revision B
- 17009-90-02

[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 materials specified in the letter from Marsh Grochowski dated 14 February 2018 submitted with application ref. 18/00452/DISCON shall be used for the external walls and roof of the development hereby approved and no additional or alternative materials shall be used.

[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].

### Notes to Applicant

It is possible that the roofspace, and/or behind the soffit, fascia boards, etc. may be used by bats. You are reminded that bats, their roosts and access to roosts are protected and it is an offence under the Countryside and Wildlife Act 1981 to interfere with them. If evidence of bats is found, you should stop work and contact Natural England on 0300 060 3900 or by email at [enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk).

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.

This grant of planning permission does not alter the private legal situation with regard to the carrying out of any works involving land which you do not own or control. You will need the consent of the owner(s) involved before any such works are started.

The provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996 may apply in relation to the boundary with the neighbouring property. A Solicitor or Chartered Surveyor may be able to give advice as to whether the proposed work falls within the scope of this Act and the necessary measures to be taken.