

21/03091/FUL

Applicant Mr Martin Tsang

Location 38 Glenmore Road, West Bridgford, NG2 6GH

Proposal Demolition of garage, Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Loft/roof extension to rear, side dormer with glass light well, external alterations include application of timber cladding (part-retrospective)

Ward Abbey

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application relates to a two-storey detached dwelling located within an established residential area of West Bridgford. The property dates from the mid-20th century and has a double height bay window to the front with a small, hipped roof projection above and a projecting gable feature around the front door. The exterior of the dwelling is constructed from red brick with a clay tiled, hipped main roof. The property originally had a single storey garage to the side (south) that had a lean-to style roof. This has recently been demolished.
2. Either side (north and south) and across the road (east) are detached dwellings of similar size, style and age. To the rear is a modest rectangular shaped garden that abuts similar sized rear gardens of the detached dwellings on Rodney Road. Glenmore Road itself slopes gradually uphill from Leahurst Road to the south.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL AND BACKGROUND

3. Planning permission is sought to demolish the original side garage and construct a two storey side extension in its place with single storey extension wrapping around to the rear. The application also seeks permission to retain enlargements to the existing roof comprising a hip-to-gable extension at the rear and a box dormer extension in the side (north) roof slope.
4. Work on site was commenced last year following the grant of planning permission (ref: 20/00826/FUL), which was for a very similar form of development. This permission is extant. The previously approved hip-to-gable and dormer extensions in the roof are nearing completion and the foundations for the approved side/rear extensions has been laid. Due to access issues, however, the south-eastern side walls of the two storey and single storey extensions cannot be completed in render as originally approved. This application therefore seeks permission to change the exterior finish of those side walls and the north-west side wall on the single storey rear extension to brick instead of render.
5. Additionally, the application also proposes a number of other relatively minor changes to the previously approved scheme as follows:

- Introduce a small high level rooflight into the two storey side extension, above the en-suite bathroom for Bedroom 1;
 - Introduce two skylights into the roof of the box dormer over the en-suite bathroom for the master bedroom in the loft and the staircase leading into the loft.
 - Amend the design of the windows in the front (east) and side (north) faces of the box dormer to reduce the size of the panes and set them within a frame as opposed to being entirely glass panes.
 - Change the doors in the rear hip-to-gable enlargement to a window and omit the previously approved Juliet balcony.
 - Amend the design of the glazed rear curtain wall on the single storey rear extension.
6. Other than these relatively minor changes, the development proposed in this application would be broadly of the same design and style to the previously approved development. Indeed, the applicant initially sought approval for these changes with an application for a non-material amendment. However, officers noted that the drawings submitted with that application appeared to show an increase in the ridge height of the main roof of the dwelling.
7. The applicant's agent subsequently confirmed that this was not the case and the apparent difference in height was due to him inaccurately calculating the overall ridge height of the existing dwelling at the time of drawing the plans for the original application.
8. Notwithstanding this cartographic error, they have since carried out a further measured survey of the building and confirm that both the hip-to gable and dormer enlargements to the roof have been carried out within the existing roof structure and the original ridge height of the dwelling has not been increased.
9. Officers were satisfied that this was the case but considered that it would be appropriate in the circumstances for a new planning application to be submitted so that re-consideration can be given to drawings that more accurately reflect the enlargements/extensions that have/are intended to be built onsite.

SITE HISTORY

10. 20/00826/FUL – Demolition of garage, Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Loft extension, side dormer with glass light well, cladding and rendering finish. Internal alterations.
Granted with conditions 09/06/2020

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

11. One Ward Councillor (Cllr Gowland) has objected to the application. They consider the development would be over-bearing and would lead to a terracing effect, should the neighbour do the same. They also consider that the design of the two-storey side extension is out of keeping with the neighbourhood and the rest of the house and considers the view of the attic extension from the road is messy.

Parish Meeting and Adjacent Parish Councils/Meetings

12. Not relevant

Statutory and Other Consultees

13. None.

Local Residents and the General Public

14. No representations have been received.

PLANNING POLICY

15. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 ('LPP1') and The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies 2019 ('LPP2'). The overarching policies in the National Planning Policy Framework ('the NPPF') are also relevant, particularly where the Development Plan is silent. Additionally, The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide 2009 as a Supplementary Planning Document is also a material consideration.

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

16. Policy 1 of the LLP1 reinforces the positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.
17. Policy 10 of the LPP1 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. Policy 10 requires new development to be assessed in terms of its treatment of certain elements. Of particular relevance to this application are those elements outlined at sub-paragraphs; 2(b) impact on neighbouring amenity; 2(f) massing, scale and proportion; and 2(g) materials, architectural style and detailing.
18. In setting out the development requirements for the Borough, policy 1 of the LPP2 broadly echoes policy 10 of the LPP1. Specifically, it states that planning permission will be granted for new development provided that there would be no significant adverse effect upon the amenity of adjoining properties or the surrounding area; and the scale, density, height, massing, design, layout and materials of the proposal is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area. New development should not lead to an over intensive form of development, be overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties, nor lead to undue overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

19. The NPPF 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*".
20. Chapter 12 of the NPPF concerns achieving well-designed places. In terms of planning decisions, it requires that 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. Development should also be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping and should be sympathetic to local character and history and maintain a strong sense of place. Importantly, permission should be refused for development that fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design. Conversely, significant weight should be given to development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design.

21. The NPPF also requires local planning authorities to seek to ensure the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion as a result of being made to the permitted scheme (for example though changes to approved details such as the materials used).

APPRAISAL

22. The main issues to consider in this application are:
 - The principle of the proposed development.
 - The design of the proposed development and its impact on the character of the surrounding area.
 - The impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Principle of development

23. The principal of the proposed development has already been established by the grant of planning permission 20/00826/FUL for what was a very similar development proposal. As such, officers consider the revised development proposed in this application is acceptable in principle.

Design and impact on the surrounding area

24. In terms of its design, massing, scale and proportion the development proposed in this application is broadly the same, as the development that was previously approved in June 2020, with very similar architectural styles and detailing. Whilst the concerns of Councillor Gowland are noted, the two storey side extension would be stepped back from the front wall of the house by the same amount as it was previously approved (around 1.5 metres) and would have the same asymmetric style roof, with the eaves and ridge set well below the ridge of the existing house. As such, officers are satisfied that the two storey side extension would not give rise to an unacceptable terracing effect on the street. Whilst it is acknowledged that the asymmetric roof design is not found elsewhere along Glenmore Road, given the roofs set down/front wall step back outlined above and having regard to the relatively narrow gap between the existing dwelling and the neighbour at no.40, officers are satisfied that the side extension would not be particularly prominent and as such would not be unduly harmful to the host dwelling or character of the wider street-scene.
25. The hip-to gable enlargement that has been built at the rear is not particularly visible from the front of the house, being partially obscured by the side dormer and the existing tall chimneys on the opposite side. It is of note that the rear roof of the property at no.40 also has a similar, if slightly smaller, rear hip-to-gable enlargement. The side box dormer is visible within the street when

standing directly opposite the house and at an oblique angle from positions slightly further away to the north. However, beyond these immediate standpoints the dormer is largely obscured by the neighbouring house at no.36 and by the existing house from the opposite direction. As such officers are satisfied that the dormer does not significantly harm the character of the wider street. Indeed, it is of note that several other properties on Glenmore Road also have side facing dormers of a similar size and whilst it is acknowledged that the use of zinc cladding is not found on these other dormers, the use of this material was previously accepted for the side dormer at this property and as such officers consider that it would not be reasonable to refuse the current application on this basis alone.

26. With regard to the proposed change of external materials on the side and rear extensions from render to brick, officers consider that this would be acceptable and unlikely to harm the appearance of the house or wider area, subject to the bricks being of similar appearance to those use on the existing house. A condition is recommended in this regard to ensure that the new brickwork would blend appropriately with the existing house and the other materials used for the other elements of the proposal be in accordance with those stated on the submitted drawings.
27. In terms of the other relatively minor changes proposed in this application, the addition of the small roof light in the two storey side extension and the introduction of two new skylights in the roof of the side dormer are also considered to be relatively minor in nature and do not significantly alter the overall design of the previously approved development. Similarly, the alteration of the windows in the front and side walls of the dormer would result in slightly smaller openings than was previously approved. This is as a result of a more substantial frame being required to hold the panes of glass in place. This alteration has meant that the roof of the dormer has been constructed with a very gradual downward slope compared to the flatter roof that was previously approved. Notwithstanding this, officers consider that these relatively minor changes to the glazing and shape of the dormer design do not significantly or unacceptably alter the development from that which was previously approved.
28. Being contained entirely at the rear, officers consider that the replacement of the previously approved doors in the rear hip-to-gable extension with a window and the omission of the Juliet balcony are also be acceptable. As would the amendment to the glazed curtain wall in the single storey rear extension.
29. Overall, officers consider that in terms of its design and appearance the amended development proposed in this application would accord with the relevant policies in the Development Plan and as such is acceptable in this regard.

Impact on amenity

30. As outlined above, the amended development proposed in this application is broadly similar in scale and proportion to the development that was previously approved in June 2020. The two storey side and single storey rear extensions would have the same blank elevations running down the side boundaries with nos.36 and 40, albeit constructed in brick as opposed to render. At the front the two storey side extension would be offset from the boundary with no.40 by 0.4 metres that reduces to 0.2 metres at the rear corner. The eaves of the two

storey side extension would measure around 5.1 metres in height, lower than the eaves on the existing house although marginally taller (100-200 millimetres) than previously approved. The ridge of the extension would be 6.2 metres in height (100 millimetres taller than previously approved). However, given the asymmetric roof design the ridge would be offset around 2.1 metres from the boundary with no.40. There are three upper-floor windows in the side wall of no.40 that face the proposed two storey extension, however all serve non-habitable spaces (ie: bathroom, toilet and a landing).

31. Notwithstanding the neighbour's side windows and the slight increases in eaves/ridge heights, officers are satisfied that the proposed two storey side extension would not be significantly more overbearing or overshadowing upon the neighbour at no.40 than the previously approved development. The additional rooflight proposed in the extension would serve an en-suite bathroom. Given its position high up on the roof slope of the extension, officers are satisfied that it is unlikely to afford significant (if any) overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbour at no.40.
32. The height of the first part of the single storey extension would be around 3.2 metres and would continue at this height for about 2 metres before sloping down to around 2.8 metres in height at the rear corner (as previously approved). Similarly, on the opposite side the single storey rear extension would be 1.1 metres from the boundary with no.36 and would extend down the boundary by 4.1 metres (also as previously approved). As such, officers are satisfied that the single storey rear extension would not have a significantly greater impact on the neighbours at no.36 or no.40 than the previously approved scheme and no objections have been received from either of these neighbours in respect of this application.
33. In terms of the hip-to-gable enlargement that has already been carried out the only difference between this application and the previously approved development is to change the rear facing doors to a window and omit the Juliet balcony feature. Officers are satisfied that this minor amendment would not seriously harm the amenities of the occupiers of any of the neighbouring properties. With regards to the alterations to the roof of the side dormer, officers are satisfied that the introduction of a very shallow pitch to the roof and the insertion of the two rooflights would not adversely impact upon the amenities of the neighbour at no.36. Similarly, officers consider that the changes to the side and front facing windows in the dormer, would be unlikely to give rise to any greater impact upon no.36 than the previously approved scheme. In any case, the windows provide light into the staircase leading into the converted loft space. As such officers consider there would be limited opportunity for significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties from either window.
34. Overall, officers consider that in terms of its impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties the amended development proposed in this application would accord with the relevant policies in the Development Plan and as such is acceptable in this regard.

CONCLUSION

35. For the reasons outlined in this report, officers consider that in terms of its design, appearance and impact on the character of the area, the amended

proposed development is acceptable and would not be significantly more harmful to the character of the area than the development that was previously granted planning permission in June 2020. Similarly, officers consider that the amended proposed development would be unlikely to result in significantly more harmful impacts upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties than the previously approved scheme either, which was also considered to be acceptable in this regard.

36. On balance, officers consider that the proposed development would accord with the relevant development plan policies and therefore recommend that the application be granted, subject to conditions suggested at the end of this report.

RECOMMENDATION

To GRANT planning permission 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 must be carried out strictly in accordance with the following approved drawing(s):**

- **0021-1000 – Location Plan, Block Plan & Proposed Site Plan received on 6 December 2021;**
- **0021-01001 – Existing and Proposed Rear Landscape Layout received on 6 December 2021;**
- **0021-1125 – Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans received on 6 December 2021;**
- **0021-1126 – Proposed First Floor and Roof Plans received on 6 December 2021;**
- **0021-1275 – Proposed Elevations received on 6 December 2021.**

[For the avoidance of doubt having regard to Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies 2019]

3. **The bricks used in the construction of the exterior of the two-storey side and single-storey rear extensions hereby approved must be similar in appearance to the bricks used in the exterior of the existing dwelling. The construction of all other external elements of the development hereby approved must be carried out in accordance with the materials specified on the approved drawings referred to in condition 2 of this permission.**

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory having regard to policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2014 and policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies 2019]