Report of the Chief Executive

APPLICATION NUMBER:	22/00333/FUL
LOCATION:	5 Barlow's Cottages Lane, Awsworth,
	Nottinghamshire, NG16 2QW
PROPOSAL:	Construct two storey side extension

1. Purpose of the Report

The application is brought to the Committee at request of Councillor L A Ball BEM.

2. Recommendation

The Committee is asked to resolve that planning permission is refused subject to the reasons outlined in the appendix

3. <u>Detail</u>

- 3.1 The application seeks permission for a two storey side extension with gable roof.
- 3.2 The dwelling is an end terrace property within a semi-rural area, Awsworth, within the Nottinghamshire Green Belt.
- 3.3 The main issues relate to whether or not the principle of the development is acceptable in the Green Belt, whether the design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable and the impact on neighbour amenity.
- 3.4 The benefits of the scheme are that it would provide additional living accommodation to a residential family home. However, this does not overcome the principle of the application that it directly contravenes policies in relation to the extension resulting in inappropriate development in the Green Belt and its impact on openness.

3.5 Financial Implications

The comments from the Head of Finance Services were as follows:

There are no additional financial implications for the Council with the costs/income being within the normal course of business and contained within existing budgets. Any separate financial issues associated with S106s (or similar legal documents) are covered elsewhere in the report.

- 4. Data Protection Compliance Implications
- 4.1 Due consideration has been given to keeping the planning process as transparent as possible, whilst ensuring that data protection legislation is complied with.
- 5. Background Papers
- 5.1 None submitted.

APPENDIX

6 <u>Details of the Application</u>

6.1 The application seeks permission to construct a two storey side extension with gable roof. The extension will serve a downstairs living room and first floor bedroom.

7 <u>Site and Surroundings</u>

- 7.1 The application property is an end terrace dwelling in a line of four dwellings. The building is finished in a smooth cream render and has a front porch extension. There is off road parking to the front and the site is enclosed by gates, a brick wall, fencing and vegetation.
- 7.2 The property is located in Awsworth, in a semi-rural location within Nottinghamshire Green Belt. It has some residential properties to the east, west but mainly to the south and open fields to the north.

8 <u>Relevant Planning History</u>

- 8.1 An application (81/00274/FUL) was approved for a front porch and detached garage in April 1981.
- 9 <u>Relevant Policies and Guidance</u>

9.1 Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan 2014:

- 9.1.2 The Council adopted the Core Strategy (CS) on 17 September 2014.
 - Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy
 - Policy 3: The Green Belt
 - Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity

9.2 Part 2 Local Plan 2019:

- 9.2.1 The Council adopted the Part 2 Local Plan on 16 October 2019.
 - Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt
 - Policy 17: Place-making, Design and Amenity

9.3 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021:

- Section 2: Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4: Decision-making
- Section 12: Achieving well-designed places
- Section 13: Protecting Green Belt Land

Planning Committee

10 <u>Consultations</u>

- 10.1 One site notice was displayed. Two neighbour comments were received, both raising observations which can be summarised as follows:
 - The right of way to the east of the site is not annotated on the plans
 - Number 4 and 5 are shown as having the same garden
 - Loss of privacy
 - Concerns with traffic generation and access
 - Business vehicles parked at address
 - No dropped kerb access
 - Position/lack of windows are not in keeping with property.

11 <u>Assessment</u>

11.1 The main issues relate to whether or not the principle of the development is acceptable in the Green Belt, whether the design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable and the impact on neighbour amenity.

11.2 Principle and Green Belt

- 11.2.1 The application site is situated within Green Belt land, and therefore the principle of development is subject to whether or not it complies with local and national Green Belt policy. Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 (2019) Policy 8 states that development in the Green Belt will be determined in accordance with the Section 149 of the NPPF (2021) states that the Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt, exceptions to this is 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. Policy 8 of the P2LP states that additions which result in a total increase of more than 30% of the volume of the original building will be regarded as disproportionate.
- 11.2.2 As stated in the Planning History section of the report, the original dwelling has been extended with a porch and a detached garage which is taken into consideration when calculating the increase in volume (81/00274/FUL). The volume of the original dwelling has been calculated to be approximately 378.6m3, the two storey side extension is 252m3 and the existing porch is 10.6m3. Elevational plans have not been provided of the garage but the volume is approximately in excess of 28m3. Therefore, taking into consideration previous extensions (existing porch and garage), plus the proposed two storey side extension, this would mean the additional volume would be 290.6m3. Therefore, the proposed extension (and existing porch) would result in an approximate increase of 76.7% of the original volume of the dwelling.
- 11.2.3 Notwithstanding the above, an extension could be acceptable on this site if it did not exceed the 30% volume increase of the main property but in addition to this concern, the design itself is also considered to be a concern that it is comparable in width to the main house and is more reflective in size and massing of a new dwelling.

11.2.4 To conclude, the proposed extension would exceed the 30% volume increase which would not be considered a limited addition to the original dwelling, and therefore an exception to inappropriate development, in accordance with Policy 8. The proposal is therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In addition, the proposed design is also considered to be unacceptable due to its unacceptable size, scale, massing and width.

11.3 Design

- 11.3.1 Concerns were raised in relation to the design of the extension. The proposed extension will be constructed flush with the main house and will be 5.1m in width. The main property is 5.3m in width. It is considered that the combination of the flush front elevation and comparable width of the extension to the main property dominates the existing building and reflects the appearance of a new dwelling as opposed to an extension. It is considered the excessive width of the property and lack of setback from the front elevation means the extension will dominate the existing building and represent an overly-prominent appearance in the street scene.
- 11.3.2 Whilst it is acknowledged the host dwelling is the end property in a terrace of four dwellings, it is considered the proposed extension should still represent an element of subservience with a set back from the front elevation and a shorter width. However, it is the combination of these characteristics that means the extension has the appearance of an additional dwelling and therefore will appear out of character with the terrace properties. Furthermore, the resulting width of the property would be 10.4m in width and with a matching render and no setback would appear out of character with the main properties within the terrace due it the inappropriate massing, scale and proportion.
- 11.3.3 Policy 17 of the Part 2 Local Plan refers to householder development being of a size, siting and design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and does not dominate the existing building or appear over-prominent in the street scene. It further states that two storey side extension should avoid a terrace effect. Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy refers to development being assessed in terms of its massing, scale and proportion.
- 11.3.4 During the course of the application, concerns were raised in regards to the width of the extension, lack of setback from the front elevation and the fenestration. Only the fenestration was amended in the front elevation which included more windows with soldier courses and aligned more with the design of the windows in the host dwelling. It is considered the fenestration was improved to an acceptable level.
- 11.3.5 To conclude, it is considered the proposed extension reflects an unacceptable design due to its excessive width which is comparable to the main property and no setback. It is considered it directly contravenes Policy 17 of the Part 2 Local Plan and therefore should be considered as a reason for refusal.

11.4 <u>Amenity</u>

- 11.4.1 In regards to amenity, as the extension is situated on a corner plot and does not extend beyond the front or rear elevation of the property, it is considered it will not have a significant impact on the amenity of any surrounding neighbours.
- 11.4.2 It is considered that windows are sufficiently placed to not cause a significant amount of overlooking.
- 11.4.3 To conclude, it is considered the proposed extension will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of any neighbours.
- 11.5 <u>Highway Safety</u>
- 11.5.1 Concerns have been raised that the property does not have a dropped kerb which can be confirmed from the site visit. However, whilst this was confirmed at the time of the site visit, this does not relate to whether the application is acceptable and therefore is not a matter that can be considered in line with the application.
- 11.5.2 It is considered the proposal of a two storey extension with the existing sized drive would not generate a significant amount of traffic or cause access issues that would warrant a reason for refusal of the application.
- 11.5.3 Business vehicles parked at the address are not a planning consideration when determining this application.
- 11.6 Other Matters
- 11.6.1 Matters in relation to the right of way and shared access are not planning considerations.
- 11.6.2 The plans are sufficient and accurate to determine the merits of the application.

11.7 Planning Balance

- 11.7.1 The benefits of the proposal are that it would provide enhanced living accommodation for the occupiers and would not have a significant impact on neighbour amenity. However, this does not overcome the negative impacts of the unacceptable design and that the development would be considered as being inappropriate within the Green Belt with the applicant failing to demonstrate exceptional circumstances which would allow for development over and above the allowed 30%.
- 12 <u>Conclusion</u>
- 12.1 Recommend that planning permission for the development is refused.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that planning permission be refused subject to the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt as the proposed extension, in conjunction with the existing extension, represent a disproportionate addition to the size of the original building. Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated that clearly outweigh the harm resulting from the inappropriateness of the propose development and the significant harm upon openness. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy 8 of the Part 2 Local Plan (2019) and the NPPF (2021) and there are no other material considerations that justify treating this proposal as an exception.
- 2. The proposed extension is considered to reflect an unacceptable design that dominates the main building and appears overly prominent in the street scene due to the excessive width and no set back from the front elevation of the property. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy (2014), Policy 17 of the Part 2 Local Plan (2019) and the NPPF (2021).

	NOTES TO APPLICANT
1.	The Council has acted positively and proactively in the determination of this application by working to determine it in line with adopted policies.

<u> Map</u>



Photographs



South (front) elevation



South (front) elevation



North (rear) elevation



South (front) elevation

Plans (not to scale)













