



Report to Planning Committee 15 February 2024  
 Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development  
 Lead Officer: Jen Wallis, Planner

Report Summary			
<b>Application Number</b>	23/01650/HOUSE		
<b>Proposal</b>	Proposed front and rear extensions		
<b>Location</b>	31 Ridge Hill Lowdham NG14 7EL		
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr and Mrs Harrison	<b>Agent</b>	Mckenzie Tilson - Mr Alasdair Tilson
<b>Web Link</b>	<a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/23/01650/HOUSE">23/01650/HOUSE   Proposed front and rear extensions with internal reconfiguration   31 Ridge Hill Lowdham NG14 7EL (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a>		
<b>Registered</b>	27.10.2023	<b>Target Date</b>	22.12.2023
		<b>Extension of Time</b>	23.02.2024
<b>Recommendation</b>	That Planning Permission is <u>APPROVED</u> subject to the Conditions detailed at Section 10.0.		

In line with the Council’s Constitution, Councillor Wendels has requested the application be referred to the Planning Committee for consideration on the grounds that the proposed extensions would be overbearing and impact on neighbouring properties, overlooking, not in keeping and impact on surface water. In addition, the Officer’s recommendation differs from that of Lowdham Parish Council.

**1.0 The Site**

The application site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling located on the east side of Ridge Hill, within the village of Lowdham, within an established residential area.

The dwelling is constructed of brown brick with a grey tiled roof and is surrounded by detached two storey dwellings of a similar design and appearance as the host property. A

number of neighbouring dwellings have previously been extended and altered.

The host dwelling is slightly elevated above Ridge Hill with the site sloping gently downwards from east to west. The site frontage is open with a long driveway leading to a single integral garage. To the rear the garden is terraced and bounded by a variety of close boarded fencing approx. 1.8m in height above adjacent ground level.

The site is located within a part of Lowdham inset from the Green Belt.

## **2.0 Relevant Planning History**

98/50989/FUL – Pitched roof to existing extension. Application Permitted 16.03.1998.

23/00921/HOUSE - Single storey front and rear extensions, two storey rear extension, together with cladding and rendering. Application Withdrawn 19.07.2023.

## **3.0 The Proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey extension to the front elevation and a part single/part two storey extension to rear. In addition, sections of the front and rear elevations at first floor level would be finished in an off-white smooth render. The plans also indicate that the existing single garage would be converted to a fourth bedroom with the existing garage door replaced with a window and matching brickwork (such alterations could likely be carried out under Permitted Development and as such will not be considered any further as part of the application and an informative note added to advise that a Lawful Development Certificate be submitted).

During the consideration of the application, a first floor extension to the front of the dwelling has been removed from the proposals, and the area of brickwork to be finished in render has been reduced.

Single storey porch extension to front;

Depth: 1.1m

Width: 2.5m

Height to Eaves: 2.8m

Height to Ridge: 4.2m

Single storey extension to front;

Depth: 0.7m

Width: 3.5m (half width)

Height to Eaves: 2.8m

Height to Ridge: 3.3m

Single storey extension to rear;

Depth: 3.8m

Width: 8.5m (full width)

Height to Eaves: 2.5m

Height to Ridge: 3.8m

Two storey extension to rear;  
Depth: 2.8m  
Width: 5.2m  
Height to Eaves: 5.2m (match existing eaves)  
Height to Ridge: 6.8m (just below ridge of main roof)

Documents assessed in this application:

Existing Ground Floor Plan 2006.179.002  
Existing First Floor Plan 2006.179.003  
Existing Elevations 2006.179.004  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 15.09.2023

Location and Block Plan 2006.179.001 Revision C  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 30.11.2023

Proposed Floor Plans 2006.179.005 Revision G  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 08.12.2023

Proposed Elevations 2006.179.006 Revision H  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 01.02.2024

**4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure**

Occupiers of six properties have been individually notified by letter.

Site visit undertaken: 16.11.2023.

**5.0 Planning Policy Framework**

**The Development Plan**

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

Core Policy 9 – Sustainable Design  
Core Policy 10 – Climate Change  
Core Policy 12 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

**Allocations & Development Management DPD Adopted July 2013 (ADMDDP)**

Policy DM5 – Design  
Policy DM6 – Householder Development  
Policy DM7 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure  
Policy DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

## **Other Material Planning Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (on-line resource)

Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD June 2021

Householder Development SPD 2014

### **6.0 Consultations**

*NB: Comments below are provided in summary - for comments in full please see the online planning file.*

#### **(a) Statutory Consultations**

**None.**

#### **(b) Town/Parish Council**

**Lowdham Parish Council – Object** to the original plans on the following grounds:

- Overbearing
- Adverse affect on neighbours (overlooking/loss of privacy/light)
- Extension is too big for plot - proposed increase in rear ridge height not in-keeping with the neighbourhood
- Excessive amount of white render out of character with street scene
- two storey not acceptable
- No soakaway proposed - sewers will need to accept increased water flow
- Work started already without permission.

Following the submission of revised plans, Lowdham Parish Council maintain their objection on the following grounds:

- The second storey is overbearing and has a domineering effect
- Proposal would overshadow the neighbour's patio resulting in a loss of amenity, sunlight and privacy
- The neighbours back bedroom would be affected by loss of light
- The proposed render to the front of the property is out of character with the street scene.

#### **(c) Representations/Non-Statutory Consultation**

**NSDC Biodiversity and Ecology Lead Officer** - The proposals are unlikely to have any impact on bats or nesting birds, and the provision of a bird nesting box, or bat box, would provide some biodiversity enhancement, proportional to the type and scale of development, as required by the NPPF and NSDC Amended Core Strategy Core Policy 12. I would advise that a self-cleaning, integrated bat box located in a suitable position within the walls of the proposed extension would be preferable.

**Representations have been received from 3 neighbours**, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings and their garden areas
- Overshadowing and loss of light
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Large areas of render would be out of character
- Dwelling has previously been extended
- Proposed extensions are disproportionate to the host dwelling and would result in over-development
- Increased surface water run-off and flooding implications
- Existing boundary beech hedge should be retained
- Building work has already commenced.

## **7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development**

The key issues are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area
2. Impact upon Residential Amenity
3. Impact upon Highway Safety
4. Impact upon Flooding
5. Impact upon Ecology

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.

### Principle of Development

Householder developments are accepted in principle subject to an assessment of numerous criteria outlined in Policy DM6. These criteria include the provision that the proposal should respect the character of the surrounding area. The overall shape, size and position of an extension must not dominate the existing house or the character of the surrounding area. It also states that there should be no adverse impact in the amenities of neighbouring users including loss of privacy, light and over-bearing impact. Policy DM5 accepts development providing that it does not unacceptably reduce amenity in terms of overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy. It also states that the rich local distinctiveness of the character of built form should be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials and detailing of proposals for new development. Such considerations are assessed below.

## Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and new development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Policy DM6 of the DPD states that planning permission will be granted for householder development provided that the proposal reflects the character of the area and the existing dwelling in terms of design and materials. Policy DM5 is also relevant and has similar criteria to DM6. The Council's Householder Development SPD states the addition should respect and is balanced with the scale and proportions of the host dwelling and is well related to the characteristics of the application site in terms of its size and shape. Also, the addition should respect the wider street scene and integrate well into it. (para 7.4).

One of the main considerations in this application is the scale and massing of the proposed extensions and their impact upon the design of the original dwelling, and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The proposed porch would be located to the centre of the front elevation and enclose the existing front door. It has been designed with a simple dual pitched roof to respect that of the host property and would be constructed of brick to match those used in the construction of the original dwelling. The single storey extension to the southern half of the front elevation would comprise of a modest extension to the existing lounge. It has been designed with a monopitch roof to mirror the existing single storey element to the northern half of the front elevation. The new lounge window would reflect the proportions, design and positioning of the first-floor bedroom window above. Whilst these extensions to the front of the property would be readily visible from within Ridge Hill, they would appear as subservient additions, which would respect the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and would not therefore harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area.

The proposed extensions to the rear would comprise a single storey extension projecting 3.8m to the rear extending across the full width of the rear elevation. Above part of this single storey extension, a first-floor extension is proposed which would project 2.8m rearwards and extend across the northern two thirds of the rear elevation. Given the elevated position of the dwelling in relation to Ridge Hill, and the limited gaps between neighbouring dwellings, the proposed rear extensions would not be particularly visible or overly intrusive when viewed from public vantage points. The extensions would however be visible from the rear garden areas of neighbouring dwellings and some wider views across open countryside from the east.

The proposed single storey extension has been designed with a simple mono-pitch roof, the scale and proportions of which would remain subordinate to the two-storey detached host dwelling. Due to changes in land levels, this extension would sit relatively low in relation to the neighbouring gardens and would not appear overly intrusive.

The proposed first floor extension above would be more readily visible from neighbouring properties. However, this element of the proposals has been shortened in depth, thereby reducing its overall scale and massing. It has been designed with a pitched roof, the eaves height and pitch of which would be the same as the pitched roof of the host dwelling, but with a very slight reduction in the ridge height from the main roof. The fenestration detailing

has also been amended to ensure the new windows respect the size and proportions of the existing window openings. As a result, the proposed first floor extension would respect the design and appearance of the host property, remaining subordinate to it, and would not therefore appear overly intrusive or visually harmful when viewed from neighbouring properties.

Whilst concerns have been raised by local residents regarding the totality of development on the site, including the previous and proposed extensions, a number of neighbouring dwellings within Ridge Hill have been significantly extended and altered since the housing development was first constructed. As a result, the proposed extensions would not be out of character with the size or scale of surrounding properties, nor harm the established pattern of development within the surrounding area.

With regards to materials, all the extensions would be constructed in facing brick and roof tiles, to match those used in the construction of the original dwelling. There would also be small areas of off-white render to the front and rear of the first-floor elevations of the existing dwelling. Whilst the existing host dwelling and surrounding neighbouring properties are predominantly constructed of brown brick, there are several dwellings within the vicinity of the application site that have small sections of off-white render or white cladding to the front elevation. It is considered that the reduced level of render now proposed would not appear out of character with the established street scene, nor detract from the overall character or appearance of the host property.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development, would accord with the aims of Policies DM5 and DM6 of the NSDC DPD, the provisions of the Householder Development SPD and the NPPF in this respect.

#### Impact upon Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 of the DPD states that development proposals should ensure no unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts and loss of privacy upon neighbouring development. The NPPF seeks to secure high quality design and a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users.

Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupiers that the proposed rear extensions would result in harm to residential amenity through unacceptable levels of overlooking, overshadowing and by an overbearing impact.

32 Ridge Hill comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located to the north of the host property, the front and rear elevations of which are in line with those of no.31. The section of the proposed rear extension closest to the shared boundary with no.32 comprises part single storey, part two-storey element. The side elevation of the proposed extension would be located between 3m and 4.4m from the shared boundary. Given these separation distances, together with the reduced scale of the first-floor element which has been designed with a pitched roof design which would slope downwards towards the shared boundary, it is not considered that this element would result in an unacceptable degree of overbearing impact or result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing to occupiers of no.32. The proposed projection would not intercept the 45-degree line from the centre of the nearest windows

located within the rear elevation of no.32. In terms of overlooking, the rear elevation of the proposed first floor would contain 2 new bedroom windows. These windows are modest in size and whilst they would allow some views over the far end of the rear garden of no. 32, the angles would be so oblique that they would not allow unacceptable levels of overlooking to occur. In built up urban areas such as Ridge Hill, there will often be some level of mutual overlooking over neighbouring rear gardens. In this case, the expected private zone to the immediate rear of the neighbouring dwelling would be protected.

30 Ridge Hill comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located to the south of the host property, but it is set further forward towards Ridge Hill by approx. 2.5m. The element of the rear extension closest to the shared boundary with no.30 comprises a single storey element which would be constructed up to the shared boundary. The shared boundary currently comprises a 1.8m high close boarded fence, beyond which is a beech hedge which measures approx. 2.5m in height, located within the rear garden area of no. 30. The proposed extension would measure 2.5m to the eaves and 3.8m to the top of the monopitch. Given the limited height of the extension and its sloping roof, only the very top section of roof would be visible from the rear garden area of no.30 above the existing boundary fence and hedge. As a result, the proposal would not appear overbearing or overly intrusive. The submitted plans demonstrate that the proposed extension would not intercept the 45-degree line from the centre of the nearest windows located within the rear elevation of no.30. It is also noted that the proposed single storey extension would be orientated to the immediate north of the rear garden area of no.30, therefore no harm would occur through overshadowing or loss of light.

27 Ridge Hill comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located to the south east of the host property, the rear garden area of which measures in excess of 30m in length and extends beyond the rear eastern boundary of the application site. The existing rear elevation of the host property currently contains two-bathroom windows which are fitted with obscure glazing. The proposed first floor extension would contain two-bedroom windows with clear glazing. This would inevitably result an increase in overlooking over the far end of the rear garden area of no.27, at a distance of approx. 20m from the rear elevation of no.27. As stated above, in built-up residential areas some level of mutual overlooking, particularly from first floor bedroom windows over neighbouring rear gardens, usually occurs. In this case, the area of garden affected is so far from the host dwelling and already experiences some level of overlooking from other neighbouring dwellings, that it is not considered the proposal would lead to significant levels of overlooking or loss of privacy which would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of no.27. The proposed first floor extension would be located 8m from the boundary with no.27 and located on a lower level than the rear garden area of this neighbouring property, as such it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm through overshadowing or by an overbearing impact.

In reaching these conclusions, I have had regard to the 'fall back' position afforded by Permitted Development rights, from which the host property benefits. In this case the property could be extended by a 4m deep single storey extension across of the full width of the property, and a 3m deep two storey extension across part of the rear elevation.

Properties on the opposite side of Ridge Hill also comprise detached two storey dwellings. These neighbouring properties sit at a lower level than the host property due to the natural slope of the land running from east to west and are separated by a distance of over 25m.



Given the level of separation which would be retained between the host property and these neighbouring dwellings opposite, together with the intervening public highway, the proposals would not result in harm to the residential amenity of these properties through overlooking, over-bearing or overshadowing.

In terms of the residential amenities of future occupiers, whilst it is accepted that the proposal would result in a reduction in private amenity space for the property, there would be adequate private amenity space remaining to serve the enlarged dwelling.

It is therefore concluded that the proposal is acceptable from a neighbour amenity perspective and would not result in significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal therefore complies with Policy DM6 and DM5 of the DPD and the guidance contained within the NPPF having regard to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

#### Impact upon Highway Safety

Spatial Policy 7 states that new development should provide safe, convenient and attractive accesses for all, Policy DM5 states that provision should be made for safe and inclusive access to new development and Policy DM6 states that householder development should ensure that there is no adverse impact on the highway network as a result of the proposal.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF provides that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

With regards to off-road car parking levels, the revised proposal would increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling from 3 to 4. Guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide', specifies that a 4-bedroom dwelling in this location would normally require a minimum of three off-road car parking spaces.

As part of the proposals, the existing single integral garage would be lost, however the revised site plan demonstrates that three off-road car parking spaces could be accommodated on the frontage of the site. A condition could be attached to any approval to ensure that these three off-road car parking spaces were provided before the extensions were occupied.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to highway safety, and would accord with Spatial Policy 7, Policies DM5 and DM6 of the ADMDPD, Part 9 of the NPPF, and the Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD.

#### Impact upon Flooding

Core Policy 9 and Policy DM5 require that proposals pro-actively manage surface water and Core Policy 10 and Policy DM5 seek to mitigate the impacts of climate change through ensuring that new development proposals take into account the need to reduce the causes and impacts of climate change and flood risk.

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) of fluvial flooding and in an area at very low risk from surface water flooding. The proposed extensions would be erected on areas which are currently hard surfaced. The remaining rear garden area is part patio, part lawn, and the new driveway to the front would have low level planting to either side, a soakaway, and an acro drain installed between the driveway and Ridge Hill. As a result, any increase in surface water run-off from the driveway and extensions would be discharged within the site, and given the limited scale of the development, it is unlikely to lead to an unacceptable increase in flooding over and above the existing scenario. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Development Plan policies in this regard.

### Impact upon Ecology

Core Policy 12 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) of the ACS seeks to secure development that maximises the opportunities to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity. Policy DM5 states that natural features of importance, which are either within or adjacent to development sites should, wherever possible, be both protected and enhanced.

In support of the application a Protected Species Report was submitted, which concluded that there was no evidence of any bat roosts or birds nesting within the building. Following consultation with the Council's Biodiversity and Ecology Lead Officer, they have confirmed that the proposals are unlikely to have any impact upon bats or nesting birds, and the provision of a bird nesting box, or bat box, would provide some biodiversity enhancement, proportional to the type and scale of development, as required by the NPPF and NSDC Amended Core Strategy Core Policy 12. They advise that a self-cleaning, integrated bat box located in a suitable position within the walls of the proposed extension would be preferable.

Subject to a condition securing the provision of such a bat box, it is considered that the proposal would accord with the NPPF, Core Policy 12 of the ACS as well as Policy DM5 of the A&DM DPD.

## **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 Planning Balance and Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling would not have any adverse impact upon the design or appearance of the host dwelling or the character of the surrounding area. Although the concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers have been taken into account, the above assessment has found that the proposals would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding dwellings to justify a refusal of permission in this case. There would also be no adverse impacts upon highway safety, flooding or protected species as a result of the development, subject to conditions.

It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policies contained with the ACS and the ADMDPD, as well as the Council's Householder Development SPD 2014 and Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD 2021. It is therefore recommended that permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

## **10.0 Conditions**

### **01**

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

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

### **02**

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

Location and Block Plan 2006.179.001 Revision C  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 30.11.2023

Proposed Floor Plans 2006.179.005 Revision G  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 08.12.2023

Proposed Elevations 2006.179.006 Revision H  
Received by the Local Planning Authority on 01.02.2024

Reason: So as to define this permission.

### **03**

The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials details shown on the approved plan.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

### **04**

During the construction of the extensions hereby approved, a self-cleaning, integrated bat box shall be installed, a minimum of 4m above the ground (as close to the eaves as possible) within the southern facing side elevation wall of the proposed first floor rear extension.

Reason: To ensure bio-diversity net gain is achieved on the site.

**05**

Prior to the extensions hereby approved being first brought into use, the three off-road car parking spaces, as shown on the Location and Block Plan 2006.179.001 Revision C received by the Local Planning Authority on 30.11.2023, shall be provided and made available. The three off-road car parking spaces shall thereafter be retained for parking purposes for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable level of off-road car parking is provided, in the interests of highway safety.

### Informatives

01

This application has been the subject of discussions during the application process to ensure that the proposal is acceptable. The District Planning Authority has accordingly worked positively and pro-actively, seeking solutions to problems arising in coming to its decision. This is fully in accord Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

02

The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1<sup>st</sup> 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/cil/](http://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/)

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is not payable on the development hereby approved as less than 100m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace is proposed.

### 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 - 23/01650/HOUSE

