



Report to Planning Committee 20 April 2023

Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development

Lead Officer: Laura Gardner, Senior Planner, 5907

Report Summary			
Application Number	23/00436/FUL		
Proposal	Change of use from village hall to dwelling with rear two storey extension and demolition of existing flat roof extensions		
Location	Village Hall, Main Street, Morton		
Applicant	Mr Roger Blaney	Agent	Mr Mark Goodwill-Hodgson
Web Link	23/00436/FUL Change of use from village hall to dwelling with rear extension Village Hall Main Street Morton (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)		
Registered	13.03.2023	Target Date	08.05.2023
Recommendation	APPROVE, subject to the conditions in Section 10.0		

This application is being presented to the Planning Committee in line with the Council’s Scheme of Delegation as the applicant is an elected Member of the Council.

1.0 The Site

The site relates to a relatively modest plot of land approximately 0.09 hectares in extent to the south of Main Street. The existing church hall within the site is of brick construction with a slate roof. The building occupies a prominent position fronting Main Street at the eastern end of the built form to the south of Main Street. There are rear extensions which are less attractive but overall the building itself is still considered as a non-designated heritage asset.

The site is within the designated Conservation Area with the Grade II* listed St Dennis’s Church on the opposite side of the road. The site is within Flood Zone 2 according to the Environment Agency maps.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

There is no planning history of relevance to the proposal.

3.0 The Proposal

The application seeks permission to convert the existing Church Hall into a four bedroom dwelling. To facilitate the change of use, a rear extension is proposed following the demolition of existing 20th Century additions. The extension would be two stories with an approximate width of 12.3m and depth from the rear elevation of 6m. The first floor would be served by two roof dormers and a single roof light. The approximate ridge height of the extension would be 5.6m with eaves around 3.2m. The proposal also includes the demolition of two existing flat roof extensions at the rear of the building. Vehicular access would remain as existing with three parking spaces provided to the east of the proposed extension and a garden area to the side and rear.

The proposal has been considered on the basis of the following plans and documents:

- Design and Access Statement – dated 8th March 2023;
- Heritage Impact Assessment – dated 7th March 2023;
- Flood Risk Assessment – dated 6th March 2023;
- Site Location Plan – received 9th March 2023;
- Block Plan – received 9th March 2023;
- Plan, Elevation & Section as existing – L(08)01 A;
- Plan, Elevation & Section as proposed – L(20)01 A.

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 4 properties have been individually notified by letter. A site notice has also been displayed near to the site and an advert has been placed in the local press.

Site visit undertaken on 23rd March 2023.

5.0 Planning Policy Framework

Fiskerton cum Morton Neighbourhood Plan (made 12 December 2019)

FCM1: Residential Development
FCM5: Character and Design Policy
FCM6: Views and Vistas
FCM7: Community Facilities
FCM10: Heritage Assets
FCM13: Flood Risk

Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019)

Spatial Policy 1 - Settlement Hierarchy
Spatial Policy 3 – Rural Areas

Spatial Policy 7 - Sustainable Transport
Spatial Policy 8 – Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities
Core Policy 3 – Housing Mix, Type and Density
Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design
Core Policy 14 – Historic Environment

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM5 – Design
DM9 – Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2021
- Planning Practice Guidance (online resource)
- Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards SPD June 2021
- District Wide Housing Needs Assessment – Dec 2020

6.0 Consultations

Fiskerton Parish Council – Comments due 17th April 2023 (to be reported on the Schedule of Late Communication).

NSDC Conservation – In summary, the proposal would cause a minor degree of harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and wider setting of the listed church and moderate degree of harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). This would be contrary to s.66 and 72 of the Act. With reference to planning policies, this would be ‘less than substantial harm’ to the designated heritage assets (para.202 of NPPF and policy DM9 of the local development framework). There has been clear and convincing justification provided for the level of harm to the designated heritage assets (para.200 of NPPF) and there would be heritage-related public benefits resulting from the proposal as a longterm optimal use would be secured for the building (para.202 of NPPF). On balance the significance of the NDHA would not be completely lost via the proposed development and some elements of the proposal would better reveal and enhance its architectural and interest (para.203 of NPPF). This is a sensitively designed scheme which would result in positive long-term conservation of a heritage asset. There are no objections to the proposal from a conservation perspective.

Historic England – No comments specific to this application.

NCC Flood – No comments specific to this application.

No letters of representation have been received to date, consultation expiry is 17th April.

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and recognises the duty under the Planning Acts for planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The NPPF refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development being at the heart of development and sees sustainable development as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. This is confirmed at the development plan level under Policy DM12 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

As the applications concern designated heritage assets of the setting of a listed building and the conservation area, sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') are particularly relevant. Section 16(2) requires the decision maker in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, to *“have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess.”* Section 66 outlines the general duty in exercise of planning functions in respect to listed buildings stating that the decision maker *“shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”* Section 72(1) also requires the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of conservation areas.

The duties in s.66 and s.72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a local planning authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight.

Principle of Development

The NPPG acknowledges that Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area, thus providing a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.

Fiskerton cum Morton Neighbourhood Plan was made in December 2019 and now forms part of the Development Plan. The Plan defines the built up area of Morton and includes the building itself within the built up area but not the wider curtilage.

Policy FCM1 refers to residential development outside of the built up area being restricted to uses which require a rural setting which should then comply with the Scale, Impact and Character criteria of the same policy. These factors are discussed further below.

Loss of Community Facility

Policy FCM7 identifies the building as a community facility, the loss of which will not be supported unless one of two criteria are met. This is in line with Spatial Policy 8 of the Core Strategy. The two criteria are:

- a) *an alternative facility to meet local needs is available that is both equally accessible and of equal benefit to the community, or*
- b) *all options for continued use have been fully explored and none remain that would be financially viable. This would require demonstration that the facility has been marketed for its current use for an adequate period of time, at an appropriate price, and through adequate advertising strategies, and that no interest has been received.*

The use of the building as a community facility has diminished since the erection of a purpose built hall on the Arthur Radford sports ground. The Church Hall is modest in its size and would require renovation to have a long term viable use as a community facility. The Arthur Radford sports ground building on the other hand (also identified as a community facility by Policy FCM7) is a purpose built modern facility which has a hall; meeting room; kitchen and associated changing facilities. These facilities provide a much better offer than the Church Hall and therefore represent equal if not increased benefit to the community. Although at the other end of Morton, it would still be easily accessible to the occupiers within the village. The Arthur Radford building would therefore be sufficient to count as an alternative facility to meet local needs and satisfy criteria a) above. There is therefore no objection in principle of the loss of the community facility through a change of use to residential.

Location of Development

Spatial Policy 3 is clear that, *'Where Neighbourhood plans define village envelopes, development will only be supported beyond them if they meet the requirements of relevant policies within the Core Strategy or Allocations & Development Management DPD.'*

Core Policies 1, 2 and 3 set out the settlement hierarchy in the District. Spatial Policy 1 details the settlement hierarchy to help deliver sustainable growth and development in the District. The intentions of this hierarchy are to direct new residential development to the sub-regional centre, service centres and principal villages, which are well served in terms of infrastructure and services. At the bottom of the hierarchy are 'other villages' will be considered against the sustainability criteria set out in Spatial Policy 3 (Rural Areas).

The division on the map appears slightly unusual compared to what is 'on the ground.' Having visited the site, it is clear that the wider area within the site location plan is curtilage associated with the Church Hall being largely mown grass defined by a hedgerow on the eastern boundary. It seems in reality the whole site could have been included as part of the built up area.

It is notable that in assessment against Spatial Policy 3, the supporting text for locational criteria includes community facilities which I would infer to mean the facility and its associated curtilage. It is therefore considered that the whole site could reasonably be considered as part of the village which would therefore potentially meet the requirements of

the relevant policies within the Development Plan. However, if permission were to be granted, it is deemed necessary and reasonable to remove permitted development rights for outbuildings etc. for the wider curtilage so that the local planning authority retains control over where these buildings would be positioned and their potential resultant impact on the character of the area.

As above, it is necessary to assess the proposal against the Scale, Impact and Character criteria of Policy FCM1. Given that the building is within the built up area, for completeness the proposal would also require consideration against the need element of the policy.

Scale

This element of the policy requires new housing proposals to be small in scale and of a density consistent with the character of the neighbouring area. The proposal would be for a single dwelling facilitated through the conversion of an existing building. The proposal would therefore comply with this part of the policy.

Need

The proposal would create a four bedroom dwelling. Policy FCM1 refers to a need for 1-2 bed bungalows in particular being required to support the ageing population. It is noted that this would be for a larger dwelling but in the context that the property would have all primary means of accommodation at ground floor, I find that it would be facilitated by the need evidenced in the policy irrespective of the number of bedrooms. It is also notable that the Southwell sub-area, to which this site forms part of, has identified a meaningful need for 4 or more bedrooms dwellings (24%, second only to 3 bedroom properties at 33.3%). The identified need for larger units post dates the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan being based on surveys undertaken in 2020.

Impact

There are a number of elements of FCM1 in respect to Impact which would need to be addressed. These are material planning considerations in their own right which are discussed in further detail below.

Character (including heritage)

Development proposals will be supported where they do not have a detrimental impact on the Character of the Parish, as detailed in the Fiskerton cum Morton Neighbourhood Profile, and contribute to maintaining and enhancing the existing character of the villages, in line with Policy FCM5 (Character and Design). Noting the heritage significance of the building itself; the site's location within the Conservation Area and opposite to the Grade II* listed church, FCM10 (Heritage Assets) is also relevant.

It is noted that the existing building has been previously extended at the rear including through non-sympathetic flat roof additions. The intention to demolish these elements of the building is welcomed. The existing building has an attractive street frontage and a prominent position being at the northern edge of the built up area. An extension to the rear of the

building is supported in principle as it would inevitably have less impact from public vantage points.

However, being at the edge of the village, there will still be visibility of the proposed two storey rear extension on approach to the village from the east. The extension would be connected to the main existing building through an existing link which somewhat expands the depth of the proposed dwelling. The proposed extension would be no higher than the existing building and the gable width would be similar to the main building. The position of the site, and the additional chimney, would mean that the primary existing building would continue to be legible to a degree that the value as a non-designated heritage asset would be retained. Given the scale of the proposed extension compared to the existing building, it is considered reasonable to remove permitted development rights for further extensions so that the impact on the non designated asset can be fully considered if there were to be an intention to further extend or alter the building.

Colleagues in Conservation have commented on the submitted details as follows:

“The proposal would involve demolition of modern flat roof extension, erection of a rear two storey extension and external alterations to facilitate the conversion of the village hall to residential use.

Overall, the proposal would seek to bring a redundant heritage asset back into use and this would contribute to long-term conservation of the NDHA and Conservation Area. There would be some positive alterations to the rear of the building via the removal of the 20th century flat roof incongruous additions. The proposed rear extension would, however, erode and diminish the historic plan form and layout of the original building which would result in a moderate degree of harm to the NDHA (par.203 of NPPF). This harm would be minimised by the separation of the extension from the main part of the hall, and it would not completely subsume the historic footprint and could be legibly understood as a modern addition. In addition, the extension has been designed sympathetically in its scale, form, style and palette of materials. It would, therefore, not dominate or compete with views and appreciation of the NDHA.

The village hall is situated in a key view on the approach to the Conservation Area and listed church from the north. The proposed extension, whilst located to the rear, has the potential to cause some visual distraction upon the approach to these designated heritage assets. The extension would be modest in scale and, along with the proposed palette of materials, it would be reflective of the traditional character that is typical of much of the village. There would be some external alterations to the building, such as replacement of windows and doors and slight increase in height of the chimney stack. The latter is based upon historic photographs and would not harm the significance of the heritage asset. Subject to detailing, the proposed replacement of windows and doors would likely have a negligible impact on the significance of the heritage assets. There would likely be a minor degree of harm to the setting and significance of the designated heritage assets due to the siting of the extension in a key view. However, this level of harm has clearly been justified in terms of seeking the optimal viable use of the building (par.202 of NPPF) and the proposed alterations have been designed to be sympathetic and harmonious with the local distinctiveness of the village.”

As is inferred from the comments, the NPPF states at paragraph 202 that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, as is the case here, that harm will need to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, I would agree with the Conservation Officer that bringing the building into a long term and viable use, as well as the positive alterations to the building itself (removal of flat roof extensions and reinstatement of the chimney) would amount to public benefits which outweigh the less than substantial harm identified.

It is therefore considered that the character and heritage impacts of the scheme are acceptable and in compliance with Policy FCM5; FCM10; Core Policies 9 and 14 and Development Management Policies 5 and 9 as well as the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 of the DPD states that the layout of development within sites and separation distances from neighbouring development should be sufficient to ensure that neither suffers from an unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy. The NPPF seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The residential use of the site could arguably be less intensive than the existing community use potentially reducing overall noise and disturbance. Notwithstanding this, the site is positioned at the edge of the main built up area and therefore neighbouring properties are limited in any case.

One of the most likely affected neighbours would be Rose Cottage to the west. The proposed two storey extension would not feature any additional windows on the elevation facing the neighbour but it would extend southwards beyond the neighbouring building line and therefore consideration must be given to potential overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The extension would be set approximately 2m away from the shared boundary. The closest element of the neighbouring single is a 1.5 storey element with garage and bedroom above (the latter served by a dormer window on the principal elevation and roof light on the rear). According to planning records for the neighbouring property from 2019 and confirmed by the Officer site visit, the closest element at the rear is a 'garden store' (greenhouse) which is predominantly glazed. This is a small room accessed from the back of the garage (the 2019 plans show no internal linkage to the rest of the house) and therefore I do not consider this to be a principal habitable room. There would undoubtedly be visibility of the proposed extension from the garden store but I do not consider that this would amount to an overbearing impact noting both the use of the room but also the relatively modest height of the extension and the set back from the boundary.

There is also a dwelling to the south west of the site but this property is orientated at a perpendicular angle so that its rear elevation faces eastwards. There is a window on the gable end facing north-westwards but this is more orientated towards Rose Cottage than the application site. It is estimated that the proposed roof dormer to serve bedroom 3 would be approximately 14m away from the rear windows of the south western neighbour. However, any outlook between the windows would be at an oblique line of sight and given the vegetated boundary treatment, which would be retained, it is not considered that the impacts

of the two storey extension to this neighbour would amount to amenity harm worthy of refusal.

The occupiers of the dwelling would be afforded an adequate standard of outdoor amenity for a dwelling of the proposed size. The proposal is therefore compliant with the relevant elements of Policy DM5.

Flood Risk

Core Policy 10 of the Amended Core Strategy and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD states that new development shall be steered away from those areas at highest risk of flooding, by applying the sequential approach to its location. To pass the Sequential Test, the application must demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites in lower risk Flood Zones in which the development can be located.

Paragraph 168 of the NPPF states that applications for some minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the Sequential or Exception Tests. The sequential test would not be required for the change of use. However, the proposal would also include the operational development of extending the existing building which would require the application of the Sequential Test. Taking a pragmatic view, if the principle of the change of use to residential is acceptable then extensions would essentially form development akin to householder development. In this context sequentially there would be no other location to extend the existing building and therefore the Sequential Test is considered to be passed.

The application has been accompanied by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which confirms the proposal represents a more vulnerable use. The document goes on to state:

The design events to consider are the 1 in 100 year plus 50% climate change and the 1 in 100 year plus 30% climate change defence breach, whichever is the higher scenario. For this stretch of the River Trent, the 1 in 100 year 50% CC breach scenario is the worst and results in a peak flood level of 15.39m AOD on the site. The LiDAR from the EA (backed by site dimensions) suggests an external ground level of between 14.90m and 15.12m AOD.

This would result in between 300mm and 500mm of water on-site and which would be 240mm above the existing floor level and 220mm above the proposed floor level. Whilst it would be ideal for the dwelling to have a minimum floor level with a freeboard of 300-600mm above this peak, that would not be possible to achieve within the existing building. In this situation, it is understood that the EA will generally accept a floor level no lower than existing, providing significant mitigation is put in place.

It is acknowledged that part of the proposal relates to an existing building and it is accepted that to insist on the increase of existing floor levels would be unreasonable. The report goes on to detail flood mitigation measures to be incorporated into the design.

The proposal falls to be assessed against the Environment Agency Standing Advice. This clarifies that if floor levels cannot be raised to meet the minimum requirement then they should be raised as much as possible; consider moving vulnerable uses to upper floors and include extra flood resistance and resilience measures.

The agent has been asked to clarify why the proposed extension cannot have increased floor levels above the 300mm requirement. It has been confirmed that it would not be possible to achieve the two storeys if the finished floor levels in the extension were to be raised and that it would also compromise the inclusive access if there were a level change to the bedrooms in the rear extension.

The dwelling would have areas of refuge at first floor and it is noted that there are areas of the village (including the church opposite) which are within Flood Zone 1 at the lowest risk of flooding. The FRA measures, subject to being secured by condition are considered sufficient to protect the occupiers at a time of flood such that there are no objections to the development on flood risk grounds.

Impact on Highway Safety

Spatial Policy 7 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that vehicular traffic generated does not create parking or traffic problems. Policy DM5 of the DPD requires the provision of safe access to new development and appropriate parking provision.

The dwelling would rely on the existing vehicular access into the site. As with the amenity assessment, there is a case to be made that a single residential unit would be less intensive than the existing community use and therefore the impacts on the highways network are considered acceptable.

The Council has an adopted SPD for cycle and parking standards which details the need for three car parking spaces. These have been annotated on the proposed site plan of an appropriate size and there is also provision for cycle parking. On this basis the proposal is compliant with Spatial Policy 7.

Other Matters

There are existing trees and hedges around the boundaries of the site but these would be sufficient distance away to not be affected by the proposed operational development and therefore it was not considered necessary to request a Tree Survey. Equally, the existing building is still in active (albeit infrequent) use and therefore an ecological appraisal is not required.

The proposed elevations show that the dwelling would have solar panels on the south facing roof slope. The use of solar panels represents a benefit to the scheme in terms of the use of renewable energy sources.

8.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

9.0 Conclusion

The proposal seeks to change the use and extend an existing building considered of local interest in heritage terms. The principle of the change of use is acceptable noting the availability of alternative community uses in the village and the proposed design of the extension would be appropriate in character and amenity terms. It is noted that less than substantial harm has been identified to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and wider setting of the listed church and moderate degree of harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). However, this harm would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal in terms of bringing the building into a long term viable use.

Although the site is within an area at risk of flooding, the FRA submitted to support the application demonstrates adequate mitigation to protect the proposed occupiers of the dwelling in a potential flood event. The proposal would bring a marginal benefit to the delivery of the Councils 5 year housing land supply and in the absence of any other demonstratable harm, the recommendation is for approval subject to the conditions outlined below.

10.0 Conditions

01

The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

02

No development shall commence above slab level until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the heritage assets within the site.

03

No development shall take place above slab level until details of the design of external windows including rooflights and dormer windows; doors and their immediate surroundings, including details of glazing and glazing bars which should be timber; treatment of window and door heads and cills; verge and eaves; rainwater goods; copings; extractor vents; flues and chimneys; meter boxes; solar panels; soil and vent pipes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the heritage assets within the site.

04

All external joinery including windows and doors shall be of a timber construction only. Rooflights shall be conservation types and installed flush fitting with the roof plane. Details of the design, specification, method of opening, method of fixing and finish of all external joinery, in the form of drawings and sections of no less than 1:20 scale, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the windows and doors hereby approved are installed. The works shall be carried out only in accordance with the agreed window and door details.

Reason: To preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

05

No part of the development shall be brought into use until details of all the boundary treatments proposed for the site including types, height, design and materials, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved boundary treatment shall thereafter be implemented prior to the occupation of the dwelling.

Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity.

06

Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:

- full details of every tree, shrub, hedge to be planted (including its proposed location, species, size and approximate date of planting). The scheme shall be designed so as to enhance the nature conservation value of the site, including the use of locally native plant species;
- existing trees and hedgerows which are to be retained, together with measures for protection during construction;
- proposed finished ground levels or contours;
- car parking layouts and materials;
- hard surfacing materials;
- minor artefacts and structures for example, bin or cycle storage;
- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (for example, electric charging points).

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

07

The approved soft landscaping shall be completed during the first planting season following the first occupation/use of the development, or such longer period as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees/shrubs which, within a period of five years

of being planted die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. All tree, shrub and hedge planting shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3936 -1992 Part 1-Nursery Stock-Specifications for Trees and Shrubs and Part 4 1984-Specifications for Forestry Trees ; BS4043-1989 Transplanting Root-balled Trees; BS4428-1989 Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations. The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be completed prior to first occupation or use.

Reason: To ensure the work is carried out within a reasonable period and thereafter properly maintained, in the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

08

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

- Block Plan – received 9th March 2023;
- Plan, Elevation & Section as proposed – L(20)01 A.

Reason: So as to define this permission.

09

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), other than development expressly authorised by this permission, there shall be no development under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Order in respect of:

Class A: The enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse.

Class B: The enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof.

Class C: Any other alteration to the roof of a dwellinghouse.

Class E: Buildings etc incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse.

Reason : To ensure that any proposed further alterations or extensions are sympathetic to the original design and layout in this sensitive location.

10

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment dated 6th March 2023, including but not limited to:

- The proposed ground floor level throughout will be 15.14m AOD;
- All door openings and any floor vents will be fitted with removable flood barriers;
- The new walls are to be built using an insulated cavity wall construction;

- Flood resilient fittings will be used throughout the ground floor;
- All new exterior paving will be fully permeable.

Reason: To protect the occupiers in a flood event.

Notes to Applicant

01

The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1st December 2011 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website at www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL IS PAYABLE on the development hereby approved as is detailed below. Full details about the CIL Charge including, amount and process for payment will be set out in the Regulation 65 Liability Notice which will be sent to you as soon as possible after this decision notice has been issued. If the development hereby approved is for a self-build dwelling, residential extension or residential annex you may be able to apply for relief from CIL. Further details about CIL are available on the Council's website: www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/ or from the Planning Portal: www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

02

The application as submitted is acceptable. In granting permission without unnecessary delay the District Planning Authority is implicitly working positively and proactively with the applicant. This is fully in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Application case file.

Committee Plan - 23/00436/FUL

