

**When telephoning, please ask for :** Member Services  
**Telephone no :** 0115 9148481  
**Email:** memberservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk  
Our Reference :  
Your Reference :  
Date : 13 September 2017



To all Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

### **Planning Committee – 14 September 2017**

The following is a schedule of representations received after the agenda for the Planning Committee was finalised.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. B.', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Deputy Monitoring Officer

Rushcliffe Community  
Contact Centre

Rectory Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 6BU

**In person**  
Monday to Friday  
8.30am - 5pm  
First Saturday of  
each month  
9am - 1pm

**By telephone**  
Monday to Friday  
8.30am - 5pm

**Telephone:**  
0115 981 9911

**Email:**  
customerservices  
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

[www.rushcliffe.gov.uk](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk)

**Postal address**  
Rushcliffe Borough  
Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 7YG



# 17/00941/OUT

**Applicant** John A Wells Ltd And Bovis Homes

**Location** OS Field 7525 Land At Sharp Hill Wood, Melton Road, Edwalton

**Proposal** The development of the Site for up to 600 new dwellings, construction of a primary school and the creation of a community park, together with associated access, drainage, landscaping and other infrastructure works

**Ward** Edwalton

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Supporting information

**RECEIVED FROM:** Agent for the application

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

In response to the comments made by the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) regarding Air Quality the agent explains that, as part of the work for the Edwalton Framework SPD a Transport Assessment was undertaken for the SUE as a whole and this informed the planning permission for Zone 1. Whilst the Air Quality Assessment was undertaken for the previous outline application, it was found sufficiently robust and valid at the time of that application because it was based on a level of traffic generation which exceeded that now being predicted in the latest Transport Assessment. They consider, therefore, that it assumes the worst case scenario for air quality impacts. As the Air Quality Assessment considers the impacts of the SUE as a whole there is no need for it to be updated as no new impacts are being introduced over those already assessed as acceptable.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The points made by the agent would seem to be valid and it is not considered necessary to require additional Air Quality Assessment work.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Supporting information

**RECEIVED FROM:** Applicant's Noise Consultant

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

In response to the Council's EHO comments they say the layout of the primary school has not been confirmed, therefore, it has been assumed that the school would be designed in a way to minimise any potential noise impact on the surrounding houses. It is not anticipated that the community park would have a noise impact on the development. A community park would not routinely be

assessed in terms of noise impact.

The ambient noise levels from the A52 were measured in 2014 and it was ascertained that the proposed glazing and ventilation measures for the dwellings would result in acceptable noise levels. Even with an assumed significant increase in traffic of around 25% the ambient levels would only increase by 1dB and internal noise levels would be well below the maximum standard.

In respect to the EHO suggestion that the acoustic fence should be of an overlapping specification they consider this to be a reasonable request.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The points made by the consultant would seem to be valid and it is not considered necessary to request additional noise assessment work.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Consultee comment

**RECEIVED FROM:** Nottinghamshire County Council as  
Education Authority

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

In respect of Primary School provision they state that if the number of dwellings exceeds 1500 a larger school (420 place instead of 315 place) would be required. This would need a site of 1.9ha together with a greater financial contribution.

In respect of secondary education they state that the places would be commissioned through a project at Rushcliffe School in the first instance. However, if at the time the places were needed they could not be commissioned at this school the LA would seek to commission places within a reasonable distance from the site of the development.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

It is by no means certain how many dwellings would ultimately be constructed on the wider site and the Policy and SPD approach allows for 'around 1500 dwellings'. This application would not depart from that approach.

The Primary School site to be provided as a result of this application would be 2ha in area, which would be sufficient to accommodate a larger primary school if needed. The 'roof tax' approach being adopted through the SPD would mean that contributions towards provision of education facilities would go up and down dependent on the number of dwellings constructed.

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Consultee Comment

**RECEIVED FROM:** Borough Council's Community  
Development Manager

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

He has considered the plans for the NEAP submitted by the applicant and considers the location good. However, he does recommend consideration of equipment themed more towards a natural theme and perhaps the omission of fencing. He welcomes the addition of the basketball/football goal end but notes that generally the other equipment appears geared towards younger ages.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The application is in outline with all matters reserved for subsequent approval. The final details can therefore be subject to further discussion as part of a Reserved Matters submission. However, the location and general form of the NEAP is considered to be broadly acceptable. Condition 2 should be amended to include a requirement for details of the NEAP to be submitted with the reserved matters application.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**      Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:**                      Neighbour (Mr R Crombie)

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Since the installation of cycle lanes on Melton Road, with consequent loss of filter lane in to Ludlow Hill Road, this is a pinch point for traffic with congestion and road safety concerns. At times of heavy rain water flows down Melton Road towards Carnarvon Road and Tavistock Road. What measures will be introduced to stop excess water from Sharphill from exacerbating this issue?

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The development is part of a site allocated for development in the Core Strategy and as such the site wide impacts have been considered and infrastructure requirements have been incorporated into the Development Framework document and S106 Agreements for the individual parcels. The site specific Transport Statement and the Highway Authority have not identified any capacity issues arising from the current application.

Surface water flows from the site will be managed by a site wide surface water strategy which aims to achieve a betterment over current greenfield run off. Site specific drainage measures will be secured by a condition (19) on this outline planning permission.

**17/01692/FUL**

**Applicant** Mr S Mellors

**Location** 53 Park Lane, Sutton Bonington, Nottinghamshire

**Proposal** Development of one detached dwelling house on land between 53 and 55 Park Lane, Sutton Bonington which is presently the garden of 53 Park Lane.

**Ward** Sutton Bonington

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:** Ward Councillor (Cllr Brown)

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

The Ward Councillor (Cllr Brown) has submitted a further representation objecting to the proposal on grounds that the proposal is “...*inappropriately large for the plot.*”

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

Matters relating to the scale and size of the dwelling are addressed in the report.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Support

**RECEIVED FROM:** Architect

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

The applicant is unwell and the architect is unable to attend committee due to annual leave commitments. The architect commends the officer recommendation and wishes the significant revisions made to the previously withdrawn scheme to be noted. The current proposal also seeks to address the comments and concerns raised by consultees in respect of the previous scheme. The client considered the previous scheme to be acceptable however agreed to the current revisions to be considered by the planning committee which the architect feels comprehensively and satisfactorily deals with all the objections previously raised.

The architect considers that the current design is an entirely acceptable solution for a viable and relatively spacious infill plot and commends the Councillors to uphold the recommendation to conditionally approve.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

No further comments required

**17/01577/FUL**

**Applicant** Mr & Mrs T. Thomas

**Location** Manor House, Main Street, Hickling

**Proposal** Garage and storage building

**Ward** Neville And Langar

## **LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE**

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:** Neighbours at “Blessing”, The Green, Hickling

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Objections still remain, despite the revised plans;

- “Blessings” will end up facing a long, blank wall, and Manor Cottage will end up with part of its front garden missing.
- Concerns about additional noise, and loss of light.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

- The garage will be largely screened by the existing hedge to Main Street and the distance across the street from “Blessings” is such that loss of light would be limited.
- The garden area to Manor Cottage is addressed in the report.
- Noise during construction on a build of this scale would be a matter for Environmental Health, an informative could be included on the decision notice advising to keep works to reasonable hours.