

Report of the Chief Executive

**18/00662/FUL
RETAIN TWO STOREY REAR/SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR
EXTENSIONS, INCLUDING REAR DORMER (REVISED SCHEME)
84 BOUNDARY ROAD, BEESTON, NOTTINGHAM, NG9 2QZ**

Councillor S J Carr requested this application be determined by the Committee.

1 Details of the Application

- 1.1 The application seeks permission to retain side and rear extensions and a rear dormer.
- 1.2 The front 0.65m of the side extension is single storey with a lean-to roof and a front wall level with the original front wall. It is 3.6m wide and has a front window. The two storey part of the side extension has the same ridge height as the original roof and a first floor window on the front and rear elevations. A white UPVC board covers the side of the roof of the original house where the front elevation of the extension is set back. The roof of the extension has two rooflights, one at the front and one at the rear. To the side, is a small ground floor window. The ground floor is used as a lounge, with two bedrooms at first floor.
- 1.3 The two storey side extension has a length of 6.5m. To the rear, is a 3m long single storey extension with 3.9m high lean-to roof which extends for the width of the extended property and contains two rear windows and a door in the south east side elevation. It serves a kitchen/dining room. 2m from the boundary with no. 86 Boundary Road is a two storey rear extension which has a rear gabled roof 1.3m lower than the original ridge and with the same eaves height as the original house. This rear extension has a width of 3.3m and one rear first floor window. It extends to the rear in line with the single storey extension (3m).
- 1.4 The rear dormer is located above the two storey rear extension and extends to the side of this extension, towards no. 86 Boundary Road. The dormer has a height of 2.32m, is 4.6m wide and extends from the roof by a maximum of 3.5m. It has one rear window serving a bedroom.

2 Site and Surroundings



South west (front) elevation



South west (front) elevation



North east (rear) elevation



North east (rear) elevation



North east elevation and boundary with no. 82 Boundary Road.



Rear garden towards nos.33 and 35 Brook Road

- 2.1 The application property is an end of terrace red brick and flat red tiled house. The side and rear elevations of the rear dormer are tile hung. There is a white board on the side of the roof connecting the roof of the side extension to the existing roof. The bricks that have been used on the side and front elevations of the extension differ from those of the original house as they are a mixture of colours, including some dark bricks, compared to the red bricks of the original house.
- 2.2 There is a wide wooden gated access and no current driveway, but external landscaping is not yet finished and there is parking space for two cars.
- 2.3 There is a hedge and gate on the front boundary. Beside no. 33 Brook Road, there is a 1.4m concrete block wall leading to no. 33's garage which sits on the boundary. Along the side and around the rear boundary, there is a 1.8m high fence with gravel boards and concrete posts.
- 2.4 The site is generally flat. There is a highway tree on Boundary Road to the front of the property. The site is located in a residential area of two storey terraced and semi-detached houses with a uniform look and of red brick construction. No. 86 Boundary Road (adjoining terrace) has a rear conservatory.

3 Relevant Planning History

- 3.1 An application to construct a garage at the property was refused permission in 1979 as it was considered to be intrusive and detrimental to neighbour amenity (79/00088/FUL).
- 3.2 Permission for a single storey rear and two storey rear and side extensions was granted in June 2017 (17/00274/FUL). The main differences between the approved scheme and the as built scheme are that no rear dormer was previously proposed and the roof of the two storey extension was shown to be set down from the main ridge of the dwelling by 0.23m.

4 Policy Context

4.1 **National policy**

- 4.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2018, outlines a presumption in favour of sustainable development, that planning should be planned, decisions should be approached in a positive and creative way and high quality design should be sought.

4.2 **Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy**

- 4.2.1 The Council adopted the Core Strategy (CS) on 17 September 2014.
- 4.2.2 'Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. Applications which accord with the Local Plan will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2.3 Policy 10 'Design and Enhancing Local Identity' states that development should be assessed in relation to its massing, scale, materials, design and impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

4.3 **Saved Policy of the Broxtowe Local Plan**

- 4.3.1 The Part 2 Local Plan has recently been examined and is awaiting the Inspector's report. Until adoption, Appendix E of the Core Strategy confirms which Local Plan policies are saved. The relevant saved policy is as follows:
- 4.3.2 Policy H9: Domestic Extensions - extensions will be permitted provided that they are in keeping with the original building in terms of style, proportion and materials, are in keeping with the appearance of the street scene, do not create a terraced or cramped effect and do not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or amenity for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

4.4 **Part 2 Local Plan (Draft)**

- 4.4.1 The Part 2 Local Plan includes site allocations and specific development management policies. The draft plan has recently been examined. 11 representations have been made in relation to Policy 17. Given that there remain

outstanding objections that will need to be considered through the Local Plan examination process, this policy can be afforded only limited weight.

- 4.4.2 Policy 17 'Place-Making, Design and Amenity' states that householder developments should be 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. Any development should not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

5 Consultations

- 5.1 Six neighbours were consulted and one objection has been received, raising concerns regarding loss of privacy and daylight and in relation to the appearance of the extension.
- 5.2 Councillor Carr objects to the application as it is considered to be an attempt to create a House in Multiple Occupation and the builder should have known that extensions of the size proposed require permission.

6 Appraisal

- 6.1 The main issues to consider with this application are the design of the extensions and the impact on neighbour amenity.
- 6.2 Conditional permission was granted in June 2017 to construct a single storey rear extension and two storey rear and side extensions (17/00274/FUL). This application to retain the extension and dormer results from an enforcement case as the extension built differs from the development approved in 2017. The main differences are the inclusion of a rear dormer, the side extension now having the same ridge height as the original house (rather than a 0.23m lower ridge height) and changes to windows.
- 6.3 The dormer is to the rear and is set slightly below the ridgeline and is located above the eaves height. It has a flat roof. Concerns were raised with the applicant about the size and design of the dormer (it has an off-centre window) but no changes have been forthcoming. Given the dormer would likely have been permitted development if it had been built before the side and rear extensions and as it is not readily visible in the street scene being to the rear, it is considered the concerns about the dormer are not substantial enough to warrant refusal of the application.
- 6.4 The two storey side extension was initially approved with a lower ridge height than the original roof. The side extension as built has the same ridge height as the original house. There is a setback but a large triangle sheet of white uPVC has been used to cover the side of the original roof which has resulted in a disjointed and unsightly appearance. The applicant intends to remove this material and replace it with bricks or tiles. Subject to conditioning the replacement of this white uPVC triangle, it is considered that the design of the side extension is acceptable for this end of terrace property with no house in line to the south (so no terracing or cramped effect will result).

- 6.5 Two rooflights, one front and one rear, have been added to the side extension. It is considered these are acceptable and have no significant impact on the appearance of the property or neighbour amenity.
- 6.6 The as built side elevation is similar to that initially approved, except for the reduction in size of the ground floor side window. There are slight changes to the window design on the rear elevation, but these windows are in the same position and the same size. These changes are all considered to be acceptable.
- 6.7 Condition 3 of the previous permission states that “the extensions shall be constructed using bricks and tiles of a type, texture and colour so as to match those of the existing house”. The front and side elevations of the new extension have been built with a multi coloured brick that does not match the red brick of the original house. The applicant has agreed to tint the front elevation bricks of the extension. This will be conditioned to occur within three months of the decision to ensure tinting takes place.
- 6.8 No. 86 Boundary Road is the adjoining neighbour and has a rear conservatory. The single storey rear extension projects to the rear by 3m adjacent to this conservatory, which is less than the projection of the conservatory. The north west side elevations of the two/single storey rear extensions are blank. It is acknowledged that the application property is to the south of no. 86. However, due to the two storey rear extension being 2m from the boundary and being set down 1.3m from the ridge of the main house, it is considered there will be a minimal impact on the amenity of the occupants of no. 86.
- 6.9 It is considered that the proposed development will have no undue impact on the amenities of the neighbours at nos. 33 and 35 Brook Road, whose properties are at a distance of 13.9m from the closest point of the extension or on any properties to the rear, which are 17m to the hall and 40m to the nearest rear residential boundary.
- 6.10 The application is solely for the retention of extensions and the dormer. No change of use to create a House in Multiple Occupation is proposed or required so long as no more than six residents are living together as one household.
- 6.11 The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. A flood risk assessment has been submitted which confirms that floor levels have been set no lower than existing levels and flood proofing of the development has been incorporated where appropriate. It is considered that flood risk issues have been adequately considered and that the development has not increased flood risk.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 The design of the extensions and dormer are considered to be acceptable and to have no significant adverse impact on neighbour amenity.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be retained in accordance with the Ordnance Survey plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 26 September 2018 and the 'Proposed plan, block plan and elevations' received by the Local Planning Authority on 9 January 2019.
2. The side extension hereby approved shall be removed unless within 3 months of the date of this decision notice, the bricks on the front elevation of the extension have been tinted so as to match the colour of the bricks of the original front elevation.
3. The side extension hereby approved shall be removed unless within 3 months of the date of this decision notice, the white uPVC strip to the side of the roof has been replaced with materials which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons:

1. For the avoidance of doubt.
2. In the interests of the appearance of the development as the brick used does not match the colour of the original front elevation bricks and in accordance with the aims of Policy H9 of the Broxtowe Local Plan 2004.
3. In the interests of the appearance of the development as the white uPVC strip is unduly visually prominent and in accordance with the aims of Policy H9 of the Broxtowe Local Plan 2004.

Note to applicant

The Council has acted positively and proactively in the determination of this application by communicating with the agent throughout the course of the application.

Background papers

Application case file



Legend

-  Site
-  Flood Zone 3
-  Flood Zone 2