

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 5 NOVEMBER 2019

Application No:	19/00168/FUL	
Proposal:	Householder application for erection of second storey extension providing two bedrooms above an existing ground floor footprint	
Location:	Cobblers Cottage, Brickyard Lane, Farnsfield, Nottinghamshire, NG22 8JS	
Applicant:	Mrs Louise Smith	
Agent:	Franklin Ellis Architects – Mr Matthew Branton	
Registered:	31.01.2019	Target Date: 28.03.2019
	Extension of time agreed until 8 th November 2019	
Link to Application Documents:	https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage	

Introduction

Members may recall that this application was deferred by the Planning Committee in June this year. Members deferred the application in order for Planning Officers to negotiate a revised design to the scheme, possibly with a cat slide roof.

This updated report will firstly explain the progress made on this application since the June 2019 Planning Committee. The report will then summarise consultation and third party responses received since the June Planning Committee. An updated assessment of the proposal in the overall planning balance will then be made.

For the avoidance of doubt the original Committee report has been re-provided below. Any amendments to this report are in bold. There were no late items from the previous Committee relating to this application. Any amendments to recommended conditions are also in bold for clarity.

Progress / Current Situation

Following the June 2019 Planning Committee, the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer met with both the Applicants and the Planning Agent to discuss possible amendments to the scheme. Various options were discussed. One option was a traditional cat slide roof which would necessitate scaling back the depth of the extension. Another option involved keeping one proposed rear projecting gable but reducing its depth and introducing a side cat slide roof from this one rear gable to make up the other half of the proposed extension. A third option involved keeping the two proposed rear gables but scaling back their depth.

The Applicants have submitted revised plans but these are of a different design to the options

discussed in the meeting.

The amended plans differ from the previous plans in that the height of the proposed extension has been reduced. I have approximately measured the following revised heights:-

	Eaves height (approx.)	Ridge height (approx.)
Proposal presented to June Committee	4.85 metres	6.75 metres
Current proposal	4.45 metres	6.4 metres

The design of the roof has also been amended in that there is an infilling detail between the double rear gable projections (I assume this is to achieve the desired head height).

The design of the remaining part of the roof of the existing single storey rear extension has also been amended from a traditional lean-to roof to a flat green roof (sedum or similar).

A letter has been submitted by the Applicant in support of the amended plans. This letter explains that:-

- The applicants never thought there would be any issues with extending the property as it is situated outside the conservation area.
- The applicants have invested time and money in restoring the cottage.
- There are two teenagers in the house who desperately need more space to grow, study and socialise.
- Additional relatives are likely to have to come and live with them.
- Reducing the length of the extension to half that originally proposed would not give them enough room to create two further bedrooms and a bathroom.
- With the number of occupiers living in the same house 1 bathroom would be very difficult to manage with.
- The applicants consider that they have always tried to reduce any impact that the proposed first floor extension would have on the surrounding properties, by keeping the roof ridgeline as low as possible and using roof lights and windows facing only their own rear garden. They consider that the amended plans, which show a further reduction of the roof line, minimise any impact that the extension has from the street view.

Consultation Responses since June 2019 Planning Committee

Farnsfield Parish Council – comments received 23.10.19

“Object to the amended application on the grounds of loss of light to neighbouring properties.”

NSDC Conservation Officer (verbal comments):- *The amended design waters down the traditional features in that the traditional rear lean-to to the existing single storey extension is now replaced with a flat roof and the proportions of the proposed double rear projecting gables are no longer in keeping with the host dwelling. The infilling detail between the double rear gable projections adds additional bulk to the overall proposal. Given this is to the rear and not highly visible Conservation raised no objection.*

One additional letter of representation has been received from a third party raising the

following objections:-

- There is a minimal reduction in the roof ridgeline, which has no effect on the loss of daylight and sunlight to the west facing windows of the neighbouring property;
- There has been no attempt to address the concerns and suggestions raised by the Planning Committee;
- The applicant's letter dated 6 October contains no material planning matters;
- The accompanying plan 'A-21001 DP' shows a garage of 17 sq m on the north side of the property, which is incorrect as this former garage has now been converted into living accommodation and the vehicular entrance is blocked by a breeze block wall. There is already insufficient parking provided on the site, which results in vehicles being parked on the lane and the proposal would exacerbate this further with more vehicles needing to be parked on the lane, which has no pavement, thereby causing increased risk of injury to pedestrians.

Comments of the Business Manager

The following considerations from the previous report require re-assessing following the submission of amended plans:-

- 1) Design and Heritage Issues
- 2) Impact on Residential Amenity

1) Design and Heritage Issues

The eaves and ridge height of the proposed double rear projecting gables have been marginally lowered. The roof of the existing single storey extension has been amended from a lean-to roof to a green flat roof. Both of these amended elements marginally lessen the scale of the proposal when viewed from the public highway to the front of the site (there are views of the western side elevation from part of Brickyard Lane).

The Council Conservation Officer's comments as stated above are noted. I agree with their comments. I agree that some of the proposed traditional features are now watered down (the traditional rear lean-to to the existing single storey extension is now replaced with a flat roof and the proportions of the proposed double rear projecting gables are no longer in keeping with the host dwelling. The infilling detail between the double rear gable projections adds additional bulk to the overall proposal). This is particularly when viewing the proposal from the applicant's own rear garden.

However, I am also mindful of the marginal reduction in scale to the height of the proposal, particularly the western elevation which can be viewed from parts of the public highway. I note the Applicant's supporting letter stating that reducing the depth of the extension would not give them sufficient room to create the space they desire. I also consider that given the proposal is located to the rear of the building, the loss of the proposed traditional features will not be overly prominent from public areas.

Overall, the alterations to the proposal do not affect my previous considerations and conclusion on Design and Heritage issues in relation to the original proposal, as stated in the original Planning Committee report (copied below).

2) Impact on Residential Amenity

I consider that the marginal reduction in eaves and ridge height to the proposal marginally reduces the impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of massing / overshadowing or overbearing. In any case, these issues were assessed as part of the original scheme and it was concluded that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

I do not consider that the infilling detail between the double rear gable projections will impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties as it is screened by the double gable features themselves to either side.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The proposed amendments are marginal and as such I do not consider that they affect the acceptability of the scheme. My conclusion and recommendation remains unaltered from the previous Committee report (as set out below).

Change to Recommendation

Condition 2 has been altered to take account of the amended plans. Condition 3 has been altered to take account of the change in materials (sedum roof to existing single storey rear extension).

Report to June 2019 Committee

This application has been referred to the Planning Committee for determination by Councillor Laughton due to the concern that the size of development is not in keeping with surrounding dwellings.

The Site

The site lies within the defined built up area of Farnsfield. Farnsfield is identified as a Principal Village as defined by Spatial Policy 1 and 2 of the Amended Core Strategy DPD.

The site consists of a residential dwelling and associated curtilage. The building is a traditional cottage building, albeit it has been extended and altered. The building has some historic value, being identified as one of the first buildings along Brickyard Lane on the 1888 OS map. The building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The application site is located outside of the conservation area, however, the conservation area adjoins the southern boundary of the site.

Properties in the area are predominantly residential with the immediate neighbouring properties to the site being modern single storey detached bungalows.

Relevant Planning History

15/00837/HPRIOR Notice of householder prior approval for 9 x 8m single storey flat roof extension with patio doors at the end (staggered). It was confirmed that planning permission was not required for this proposal in June 2015.

15/02122/FUL Householder application for single storey extension to the rear of the property providing a new family room (previously started under Permission 15/00837/HPRIOR). Planning

permission granted January 2016. It was brought to the attention of Local Authority Enforcement Officers that the extension approved under prior notification 15/008374/HPRIOR was not being built in accordance with the approved plan. This application sought to regularise this with a slightly different extension measuring 7.98 metres in length, 7.56 metres in width and 2.7 metres in height. This is the ground floor extension which is currently in place at the site.

10/00378/FUL Householder application proposed two storey rear extension and porch. This application was withdrawn in May 2010.

68801350 Renewal of windows to dwelling and erection of garage. Planning permission granted January 1981.

The Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the addition of a first floor rear extension to the existing dwelling. This is on top of an existing ground floor rear extension.

Following negotiations between the Planning Officer and applicant, amended plans have been submitted showing the proposal reduced in depth by 2 metres. The amended plans can be described as follows.

The proposal measures 5.89 metres in depth by 7.45 metres in width. It is stepped in marginally (approx. 0.4 metres) from each side elevation of the host dwelling and is set back from the rear elevation of the existing ground floor extension by 2 metres. Accommodation in the proposed extension consists of 2 no. bedrooms, 1 no. en-suite bathroom, a landing extension and storage. The first floor extension takes the form of a double rear-gable design. The eaves of the extension are the same height as the eaves on the host dwelling at approx. 4.85 metres. The ridges are lower than the ridge on the host dwelling at approx. 6.75 metres in height. The 2 metre set back between the existing ground floor extension and proposed first floor extension would be covered by a lean-to roof measuring between approx. 2.4 metres in height and 2.9 metres in height. Windows are proposed in the rear elevation of the extension and rooflights within the side eaves.

The documents under consideration are;-

DP-A-10500 Rev B, SITE PLANS-EXISTING & PROPOSED, received 3rd April 2019

DP-A-21001 Rev B, FLOOR PLANS-PROPOSED, received 3rd April 2019

DP-A-30001 Rev B, PROPOSED ELEVATIONS, received 3rd April 2019

SITE LOCATION PLAN, received 30th Jan 2019

DP-A-22000 SUN PATH STUDY-SPRING EQUINOX-REV-B

DP-A-22001 SUN PATH STUDY-SUMMER EQUINOX-REV-B

DP-A-22002 SUN PATH STUDY-AUTUMNEQUINOX-REV-B

DP-A-30001 DP-A-50001 AXONOMETRIC-PROPOSED-REV-B

DP-A-50002 NW AXONOMETRIC CUT-GROUND-PROPOSED-REV-B

DP-A-50004 AXONOMETRIC VIEWS-EXISTING SHOWING PROPOSED-REV-B

DP-A-50005 STREET LEVEL PERSPECTIVE VIEWS

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

LETTER FROM APPLICANT DATED 2ND APRIL IN SUPPORT OF AMENDED PLANS

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of seven properties have been individually notified by letter. A site notice has been posted and a press notice published.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Farnsfield Neighbourhood Plan Adopted 28th September 2017

FNP7: The Quality of Development

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

SP7 – Sustainable Transport

CP9 – Sustainable Design

CP14 - Historic Environment

Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013)

DM5 - Design

Policy DM6 – Householder Development

DM9 - Protecting & Enhancing the Historic Environment

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2019
- Planning Practice Guidance
- Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Consultations

Farnsfield Parish Council 27.02.2019;- *“Farnsfield Parish Council objects to this planning application on the grounds that it will affect neighbouring properties adversely in regards to light.”*

Farnsfield Parish Council 16.04.2019;- *“Farnsfield Parish Council do not support the amended application on the grounds of loss of amenity to a neighboring property.”*

Conservation Officer 20.02.2019;-

“The application site is located outside of the conservation area, however, the conservation area adjoins the south of the site. The building has some historic value, being identified as one of the first buildings along Brickyard Lane on the 1888 OS map. The building is a good example of a vernacular building in Farnsfield. Due to the historic and architectural value of the building has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset.

Legal and policy considerations

Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance. The importance of considering the impact of new development on the significance of

designated heritage assets, furthermore, is expressed in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF, for example, states that: the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Additional advice on considering development within the historic environment is contained within the Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes (notably GPA2 and GPA3). In addition, 'Historic England Advice Note 2: making changes to heritage assets' advises that it would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset's significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of development that might be appropriate. The junction between new development and the historic environment needs particular attention, both for its impact on the significance of the existing asset and the impact on the contribution of its setting.

Assessment of proposal

The scheme is for a first floor extension of an existing single storey extension to the dwelling. This adds significant bulk to the rear of the property. The scale and massing of the addition is no longer subservient to the principle house. Due to the orientation of the road and property, there are clear views of where the proposed extension will be.

A first floor extension could be acceptable. However, it needs to be significantly reduced in size, with a step down to the existing single storey extension.

Conservation Officer 16.04.2019;-

"The amended plans submitted reduces the first floor extension by 2 meters and introduces a mono-pitched roof to the remaining single storey element.

Although the amendment is not substantially different the reduction is sufficient enough to remove the harm to the non-designated heritage asset."

Neighbours;

2 no. letters (one in response to original plans and one in response to amended plans) have been received by the occupiers of 1 no. neighbouring property. Concerns are;-

Original letter

Poor design

Will dominate the existing cottage and the two neighbouring bungalows

Impact on views to and from the adjacent conservation area

Impact on neighbouring amenity – loss of light

Further living accommodation will cause additional parking requirements impacting on safety

Letter in response to amended plans

Maintain previous objection
Loss of light
Poor design – not in keeping with traditional cottage
Dominates neighbouring bungalow
Visual impact is not shown properly in the applicant's submitted "Street level View Proposed" plan

Comments of the Business Manager

The PPG 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.

Following public consultation and independent examination, at its council meeting on 28th September 2017 Newark and Sherwood District Council adopted the Farnsfield Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan now forms part of the development plan for the district and its policies are a material consideration alongside other policies in the development plan and carry weight in the determination of planning applications in Farnsfield. In this instance the most relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan are listed above and are considered against the relevant aspects of the proposal in the assessment below.

Design and Heritage Issues

Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment. The importance of considering the impact of new development on the significance of designated heritage assets, furthermore, is expressed in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 197 of the NPPF, for example, states that: the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Additional advice on considering development within the historic environment is contained within the Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes (notably GPA2 and GPA3). In addition, 'Historic England Advice Note 2: making changes to heritage assets' advises that it would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset's significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of development that might be appropriate. The junction between new development and the historic environment needs particular attention, both for its impact on the significance of the existing asset and the impact on the contribution of its setting.

Criterion 5 and 6 of Policy DM6 relate to design for householder development in general and state that the proposal must respect the design, materials and detailing of the host dwelling as well as respecting the character of the surrounding area including its local distinctiveness, the significance and setting of any heritage assets, landscape character and the open character of the surrounding countryside. The Council's Householder Development SPD states that additions must respect and

be balanced with the scale and proportions of the host dwelling.

The building is a traditional cottage building, albeit it has been extended and altered. The building has some historic value, being identified as one of the first buildings along Brickyard Lane on the 1888 OS map. The building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The application site is located outside of the conservation area, however, the conservation area adjoins the southern boundary of the site.

The Planning Officer raised concerns with the scale of the original proposal. The original proposal measured approx. 7.9 metres in depth. This was only the same depth as the existing ground floor extension approved in 2015 under 15/02122/FUL. However, the existing ground floor extension is very similar to what could be built under the extended permitted development rights which permits, under the prior approval process, an extension up to 8m in depth. Furthermore, the second floor element would be visible within the street scene with views from the north-west when travelling along Brickyard Lane. The original proposal was larger than the main part of the host dwelling which measures just 7.163 metres in depth (albeit there is an attached garage to the front of the property which appears to have replaced an original structure in this location).

The applicant was contacted and advised that there were concerns with the scale of the proposed extension. Paragraph 7.4 of the Council's Householder Development SPD states that extensions must ensure:-

"that the addition respects 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."

This concern was exacerbated by the fact that the dwelling is considered to be a non-designated heritage in the form of a modest, traditional cottage.

The original proposal was considered to add significant bulk to the rear of the property to the extent that the scale and massing of the addition was no longer considered to be subservient to the principal house.

As such, the applicant was advised to reduce the proposed extension in size, with a step down to the existing single storey extension.

The applicant took on board the above planning advice and reduced the depth of the extension by 2 metres. A mono-pitch roof is now proposed to the remaining single storey element. A letter was submitted by the applicant in support of the amended plans stating that they did not wish to reduce the proposed extension any further as this would not give them the space they required.

On balance and in this specific instance, it is considered that the reduced scale of the proposal is acceptable and no longer dominates the host dwelling.

This is taking into account a number of considerations. This includes the scale of the existing rear extension (measuring 7.98 metres in length, 7.56 metres in width and 2.7 metres in height). This proposal adds a first floor to approx. three quarters of the depth of the existing extension and takes the existing 2.6 metre high flat roof to a double rear gable measuring 4.85 metres to the eaves and 6.75 metres to the ridge. This roof design somewhat lessens the impact of the second floor extension by making it as low as practically possible.

Furthermore, whilst the proposal would be visible from the street scene (when travelling from the north-west of Brickyard Lane), it would not be overly prominent due to its rear location.

For these reasons, I conclude that, on balance, the scale of the proposal is acceptable.

The proposed design details are considered to be acceptable. Materials are proposed to match the existing. However, given the fact that the proposal is a non-designated heritage asset, a condition should be attached to the grant of any planning permission requiring samples to be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

I consider that due to the scale and nature of the proposal (householder development) and distance from the conservation area, the proposal will not impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area.

Having taken the above information in to consideration, I consider that the proposal does not have an unacceptable visual impact on the host dwelling which is a non-designated heritage asset, the wider visual amenity of the area or views to and from the adjacent conservation area. As such the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant design and heritage policies set out earlier in this report.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The NPPF, as revised, seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users of land and buildings. Criterion 2 and 3 of Policy DM6 relate to neighbouring amenity for householder developments and state that new householder developments should not have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring users including loss of privacy, light and overbearing impact and that the layout of development within the site and separation distances from neighbouring development is sufficient to ensure that neither suffers from an unacceptable reduction in amenity by virtue of overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impacts.

Policy FNP1 of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which forms part of the Councils DPD, also states that;-

“Developments within the village envelope of Farnsfield will be supported where ... they respect the amenity of neighbouring properties.”

There is in excess of 30 metres from the proposed extension to the rear boundary of the application site. This is considered a sufficient distance so as to not cause an unacceptable impact on residential amenity to neighbouring occupiers to the south. The properties to the front (north) of the site will also not be impacted upon by the proposed extension due to its location to the rear of the host dwelling.

However, the impact of the proposal on both immediate neighbouring properties to the east and west of the site requires careful consideration. Both immediate side neighbouring properties are single storey bungalows. The dwelling to the east (Staddle Stones) is sighted on a similar alignment to the host dwelling and the dwelling to the west (Vine Cottage), located slightly further in to their plot with the principal elevation in line with the original rear elevation of application property.

There are no unacceptable overlooking issues onto either of these side neighbouring properties as the only new windows proposed on the side elevation are high level roof lights whereby they are

sighted so as not to have a direct view to neighbouring occupiers (the main windows providing outlook and light are located in the rear elevation).

However, issues of overbearing and loss of light do require careful consideration.

With regards to the neighbouring property to the east (Staddle Stones), the proposal does not project further forwards or rearwards than this neighbouring property. Therefore, there are no unacceptable loss of light issues to the front or rear windows of the neighbouring property. However, this property does have side ground floor windows facing the proposal. The side window closest to the proposal lights a garden room which is open plan into a living room. The garden room is an extension (granted planning permission in 2005) whilst the living room is part of the original dwelling. The proposed extension is between 2.9 and 3.3 metres away from the neighbour's property.

Whilst the neighbour does have side windows facing the proposal, there is also a rear window lighting the same room as well as a front window lighting the open plan living room. It should also be noted that the garden room itself is an extension with the side window closest to the extension being a new addition, albeit this is an existing arrangement. Due to concerns raised with the applicant they have submitted a sun path study to demonstrate potential levels of overshadowing throughout the year. Whilst the sun path plans do show a difference in impact to Staddle Stones this impact has to be balanced against the level of harm caused. It is accepted that there will be some light reduction to these windows for a short period of the evening, however as these rooms are lighted by other windows as well, it is not considered that the harm is so significant as to warrant a refusal of planning permission for this reason alone. It is therefore considered that the height and mass of the extension coupled with the M plan roof design helps to prevent unacceptable loss of light issues onto this neighbouring property.

The matter of overbearing is one which has received considerable attention and debate on its acceptability. Due to the scale of Staddle Stones when compared to the host property along with the juxtaposition of the two properties and the position of windows at Staddle Stones, there is a potential for an overbearing impact upon their amenity. However due to the proximity of the extension from Staddle Stones of between 2.9-3.3m, coupled with the position of other windows at this property, the scale and design of the roof, the proposal would not result in such a harmful overbearing outlook upon the amenities of the neighbouring occupier.

Turning now to the neighbouring property to the west (Vine Cottage), this neighbouring property is set further back within the plot than Cobblers Cottage such that the front elevation of Cobblers Cottage is approx. 1.8 metres further rearwards than the original rear elevation of Cobblers Cottage. However, given the separation distance between the two side elevations (approx. 4 metres), I do not consider that the proposal will cause unacceptable overbearing or loss of light issues onto the front windows of this neighbouring property. The rear windows of Vine Cottage are not affected by the proposal as they are set further back within the plot than the extension.

However, Vine Cottage does have side windows facing the site, one of which I understand to be a kitchen. However, I consider that the amended proposal will not cause unacceptable issues of overbearing or loss of light onto this neighbouring property due to separation distances (approx. 4 metres), juxtaposition of the two properties and the height and the roof design of the proposal helps to prevent such unacceptable issues.

For the reasons stated above, and taking in to consideration the concerns raised during the

processing of the application, I conclude that the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and therefore complies with the relevant planning policies set out at the start of this section of the report.

Highway Safety

Spatial Policy 7 of the Core Strategy states proposals should be safe, convenient and attractive for all and be appropriate for the highway network. Criterion 1 listed in Policy DM6 states that householder development should include provision for safe and inclusive access and parking and should have no adverse impact on the highway network.

Parking and access arrangements at the site are to remain unaltered. Relevant planning policies do not require additional parking spaces to be provided for householder developments.

Conclusion

The principle of householder development at this site is considered to be acceptable. On balance, I consider that the proposal does not have an unacceptable visual impact on the host dwelling which is a non-designated heritage asset, the wider visual amenity of the area or views to and from the adjacent conservation area. I consider that the proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity or on highway safety. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the relevant planning policies, as set out earlier in this report.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is approved subject to the conditions and reasons shown below.

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 not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plan references:

DP-A-10500 Rev D, SITE PLANS-EXISTING & PROPOSED, received 10th October 2019

DP-A-21001 Rev D, FLOOR PLANS-PROPOSED, received 10th October 2019

DP-A-30001 Rev D, PROPOSED ELEVATIONS, received 10th October 2019

SITE LOCATION PLAN, received 30th Jan 2019

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority through the approval of a non material amendment to the permission.

Reason: So as to define this permission.

03

No development above damp proof course shall take place until manufacturers details (and samples upon request) of the external facing materials (including colour/finish) identified below have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Bricks

Roofing tiles

Green roof

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in order to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the setting of the conservation area.

Informative

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 accordance with 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 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/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 the gross internal area of new build is less than 100 square metres.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Claire Turton on ext 5893.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

Lisa Hughes
Business Manager – Planning Development

Committee Plan - 19/00168/FUL



