



Application Number: 2016/0068

9 Rosegrove Avenue, Arnold, Nottinghamshire, NG5
8DU.

Location:



NOTE:

This map is provided only for purposes of site location and should not be read as an up to date representation of the area around the site.
Reproduced with the permission of the Controller of H.M.S.O. Crown Copyright No. LA 100021248
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution of civil proceedings

Report to Planning Committee

Application Number: 2016/0068

Location: 9 Rosegrove Avenue, Arnold, Nottinghamshire, NG5 8DU.

Proposal: Construction of a detached bungalow and associated alterations to existing boundary and parking arrangement.

Applicant: Mr D Storer

Agent: Green 2K Design

Case Officer: Elizabeth Campbell

This application is referred to the Planning Committee because the owner of the property is a Freeman of Gedling Borough.

Site Description

No 9 Rosegrove Avenue is a detached modern bungalow on the north side of the junction of Grenville Rise with Rosegrove Avenue. The dwelling is accessed from Rosegrove Avenue via a private drive leading to a detached garage. The front gable to the bungalow stands back from Grenville Rise by 6 metres. The rear amenity serving the dwelling measures a depth of some 15 metres with the east side boundary adjacent to 11 Rosegrove Avenue. The rear boundaries of the application site are defined by mature hedges. The land slopes down to the detached garage which serves the dwelling and the adjacent property to the west, No 9 Grenville Rise, stands at a lower level.

The site is within the built up area of Arnold.

Proposed Development

Full Planning Permission is sought for the construction of a detached bungalow and associated alterations to the existing parking arrangement.

- ☐ The proposed one bedroom bungalow would be sited in the rear amenity serving no.9 Rosegrove Avenue.
- ☐ The bungalow would have footprint dimensions of some 10 metres and 6.7 metres, with ridge and eaves heights of 4.85 metres and 2.2 metres respectively.
- ☐ There would be a gap of 4.64m between the existing and proposed bungalow,
- ☐ There would be a path of 1m – 1.2m in width between the proposed bungalow and the side boundary of 11 Rosegrove Avenue;

- ❑ 2.415m deep back garden, along the side boundary of the back garden to 9 Grenville Rise.
- ❑ Windows on the rear elevation – to a bathroom and the kitchen/dining would be obscure glazed with top opening lights only. The kitchen has a second smaller window and front/back door on the side elevation.
- ❑ The proposed bungalow would be built in brick, with a rendered panel on the front elevation and have a concrete interlocking tiled roof to match the existing bungalow. Windows would be white UPVC.
- ❑ A 1.8 m high fence would be erected on the side and rear boundaries.
- ❑ The development would provide two car parking spaces to serve the proposed bungalow.
- ❑ The Proposal incorporates two parking spaces to serve the existing property accessed from Grenville Rise.

Following a site visit, a section through the site and street scene were requested and submitted by the agent. The submitted plans show the bungalow with a slightly lower ridgeline than the existing bungalow and the site regraded at the front with a steeper drive and the front of the bungalow set within the ground.

Consultations

Nottinghamshire County Council (Highway Authority –

The proposed bungalow will be accessed from an existing crossing on Rosegrove Avenue where there is sufficient space to station two vehicles clear of the public highway.

Two parking spaces will be created for the host dwelling that will be accessed from Grenville Rise, which is acceptable. It is not envisaged that this proposal will compromise highway safety.

There are, therefore, no highway objections subject to conditions in respect of the surfacing of the drive to the proposed dwelling and the provision of a dropped kerb, both prior to occupation

A Site notice has been posted and neighbouring properties have been notified. Three letters of representation have been received in response. One letter represents seven other signatories and another letter also represents two other neighbours. Neighbours were also consulted on the additional information (street scene and cross section through the site). The representations received can be outlined as follows:

- ❑ The left corner Grenville Rise into Rosegrove Avenue is treacherous in snow and ice for cars and people, so object to the new parking to serve the existing bungalow off Grenville Rise so close to the junction. The proposed access is almost across the corner of the junction. This would be dangerous. Children use the area to get to school.
- ❑ Since the installation of traffic lights by Arnold Library there is queuing up Calverton Road and Surgey's lane, and Rosegrove Avenue and Grenville Rise are used "to speed around"
- ❑ Invasion of privacy in conservatory and garden of neighbouring property

- because of the height of the bungalow (on land at a 1metre higher level)
- ☐ Overbearing impact on neighbouring property by reason of loss of light and outlook
- ☐ The existing property is poorly maintained
- ☐ The existing area is characterised by fairly modern 2, 3 and 4 bedroomed family houses and bungalows, all of which have reasonably large rear gardens. The proposal will virtually eliminate the amenity space of the existing bungalow and the new bungalow will have an overbearing effect on the rear windows of the existing bungalow
- ☐ Because of the difference in levels between the site and 9 Grenville Rise the new 1.8m privacy fence would be overbearing on this property. The new bungalow would have an estimated ridge height of 5.5m above the amenity space of 9 Grenville Rise resulting in a loss of sunshine for much of the day
- ☐ Many authorities ask for a back garden of 13 m in depth.
- ☐ The proposal is totally out of keeping with the existing residential development in the area and creates an incongruous street scene
- ☐ The extra information submitted does not change the substances of the initial objections, which remain in place
- ☐ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Section 7 - para 64) states that “permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions” We (eight signatories) consider that the character of the area is family houses and bungalows with good amenity spaces and consistent street scenes with...safe access. The proposal leaves only the front garden to No. 9 as amenity space. The new bungalow is in effect a two bedroomed dwelling with a 2 metre deep back garden and having an unacceptable and detrimental effect on the existing bungalow and the neighbour on Grenville Rise (to the west)
- ☐ NPPF (para 58) states “the quality of development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development” The community (eight signatories) feel the new dwelling is a poor design – with no clearly identified front door and far below “Lifetime Homes” standards and therefore unsustainable. The study window is 4m from the existing bungalow bedroom window.
- ☐ Policy H7 of the Local Plan (Residential development on unidentified sites within the urban area). We (eight signatories) believe that the development does not comply with this policy because it is not of a high standard of design and does not complement the appearance of the area.

Planning Considerations

In my opinion the main planning considerations in the determination of this application are whether the proposal has an undue impact on the character and appearance of the site and the wider area, any impact upon the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and any highway safety implications that may arise.

At the national level the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) is relevant. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following sections are relevant:

- ☐ 6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paragraphs 47-55); and
- ☐ 7. Requiring good design (paragraphs 56-68);

The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Section 7 of NPPF states inter alia that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that it should contribute positively to making places better for people. Developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Gedling Borough Council adopted the Gedling Borough Aligned Core Strategy (GBACS) on 10th September 2014 and this now forms part of the Development Plan along with certain saved policies contained within the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan referred to in Appendix E of the GBACS. The following local policies are relevant: -

- ☐ Policy 8 Housing size, Mix and Choice; and
- ☐ Policy 10 –Design and Enhancing Local Identity

Policy 10 reflects the guidance contained in the NPPF and Replacement Local Plan policies (see below)

Appendix E of the GBACS refers to the following saved relevant policies contained within the Gedling Borough Council Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved) 2014:-

- ☐ ENV1 (Development Criteria);
- ☐ H7 (Residential Development on Unidentified Sites Within the Urban area and Defined Village Envelopes);
- ☐ T10 (Highway Design and Parking Guides).

Criterion a, c and d of Policy ENV1 state that planning permission will be granted for development provided that it is of a high standard of design which has regard to the appearance of the area and does not adversely affect the area by reason of its scale, bulk, form, layout or materials.

Design and layout are considered in criterion a, and b. of Policy H7. This policy states that permission will be granted for residential development, within the urban area provided it is of a high standard of design and does not adversely affect the area by reason of its scale, bulk, form, layout or materials.

In respect to car parking, regards should be had to the Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Provision for Residential Developments' (May 2012).

Design and Layout

The site is located within the urban residential area of Arnold where in, principle; a new dwelling would be acceptable. I note that the area is characterised by similar bungalows and semi-detached two-storey dwellings. I would accept that there are

examples of modern bungalows of similar style to the application dwelling in the immediate area; however, these tend to be on larger plots of greater depth. Given the character and appearance of the surrounding properties and the size of the plots I am of the opinion that the erection of a detached bungalow over the majority of the rear amenity serving the application dwelling would be overintensive development and would result in a design, layout and massing that would not reflect the pattern of development in the area. It is my opinion that the resultant development would appear cramped and would result in an incongruous appearance within the existing streetscene.

The proposed dwelling would therefore not accord with either Policy H7 or ENV1 as these policies require development to be of a high standard of design which does not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the area. Neither would the proposal accord with Policy 10 which requires development to have regard to its local context and make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF advises that development of poor design should be refused, in this instance I consider that the proposed development is of poor design.

Residential Amenity

Policy 10 of the ACS requires consideration to be given to the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and occupiers of development.

It is my opinion, that by reason of the proposal being in a higher position to no.9 Grenville Rise, the distance to the rear boundary, and that the bungalow would occupy the majority of the shared boundary, that the development would result in an unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property.

Highway Safety

I note that the Highway Authority has no concerns subject to conditions and that the proposed parking arrangements for both the existing and proposed dwellings are acceptable.

The highway issues raised by the neighbours were referred to the Highway Authority, however; the Authority considers the new access on Grenville Rise and the widened access onto Rosegrove Avenue would not compromise highway safety.

Other Considerations

With respect to the neighbour objections it is considered that the proposal does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 8 of the Aligned Core Strategy because of the introduction of a residential development with inadequate amenity space serving it and the application dwelling. Furthermore it is considered that the proposed dwelling would have an undue impact on the amenities of 9 Grenville Rise by reason of overbearing and overshadowing.

Conclusion

Having regards to the above considerations it is my opinion that the proposed bungalow would result in an overintensive development of the site resulting in an incongruous feature in the streetscene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy and Saved Policies H7 and ENV1 of the Gedling Borough Replacement Local Plan. The proposed development would also fail to accord with paragraph 63 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that new development is of good design.

Recommendation:

To REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION:

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale and design would result in an overintensive development of the site that would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the area and incongruous on the streetscene. The proposal would therefore not accord with the following local policies:- Policy 10 'Design and Enhancing Local Identity' of the Aligned Core Strategy 2014 and Saved Policies H7 'Residential Development on unidentified sites within the Urban Area and the Defined Village Boundaries' and ENV1 'Development Criteria' of the Gedling Borough Council Replacement Local Plan. The proposed development would also fail to accord with paragraph 63 of the National PPF which seeks to ensure that new development is of good design.
2. In the opinion of the Borough Council, by reason of the scale and bulk of the proposed bungalow on elevated land and the proximity to neighbouring residential amenity, the proposed development would result in an undue overbearing and overshadowing impact on no.9 Grenville Rise. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the aims of Policy ENV1 of the Gedling Borough Council Replacement Local Plan (Certain Policies Saved 2014).