

When telephoning, please ask for: Martin Elliott
Direct dial 0115 914 8511
Email constitutionalservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 15 August 2018

To all Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

Planning Committee – Thursday, 16 August 2018

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

Yours sincerely



Julian Crowle
Monitoring Officer

Membership

Chairman: Councillor R Butler
Vice-Chairman: Councillor J Stockwood
Councillors: B Buschman, N Clarke, M Edwards, J Greenwood, R Hetherington, R Jones, Mrs M Males, S Mallender, F Purdue-Horan, Mrs J Smith and J Thurman



**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

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



Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble at the far side of the plaza outside the main entrance to the building.

Toilets: are located to the rear of the building near the lift and stairs to the first floor.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

Recording at Meetings

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 allows filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control.

Rushcliffe Borough Council is committed to being open and transparent in its decision making. As such, the Council will undertake audio recording of meetings which are open to the public, except where it is resolved that the public be excluded, as the information being discussed is confidential or otherwise exempt.

18/00856/FUL

Applicant Stagfield Group (Mr Kevin Hard)

Location 134A Trent Boulevard, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire

Proposal Demolish existing house and ancillary buildings, erect 2x apartment blocks comprising 9x2 bed apartments, 1x1 bed apartment, plus 10 allocated parking spaces.

Ward Lady Bay

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Update – revised plans

RECEIVED FROM: Officers

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Revised plans have been submitted omitting the proposed decking and reverting back to grassed amenity areas, as shown on the plans originally approved under the previous application. In addition, the plans show a revised parking layout, reducing the number of spaces accessed directly from Trent Boulevard from two to one and changing the layout of the parking around the internal courtyard. A total of ten spaces would still be provided.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

No further comments.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Loss of existing house; danger to pedestrians including during construction; impact on local infrastructure; lack of car parking.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

No further comment.

This page is intentionally left blank

18/01010/FUL

Applicant Stanton On The Wolds Golf Club Ltd

Location Stanton On The Wolds Golf Club, Golf Course Road, Stanton On The Wolds

Proposal Construction of two single storey dwellings and demolition of two storey cottages post occupation (resubmission)

Ward Keyworth And Wolds

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Support

RECEIVED FROM: Ward Councillor (Cllr Edyvean)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

*"To members of the Committee,
Having read the report and also had meetings with representatives of the Golf Course, along with a site meeting with planning officers to discuss concerns following the withdrawal of the original planning application, I am somewhat disappointed by the recommendation to refuse.
This recommendation seems to me a clear case of lack of common sense being applied to an acceptable proposed development that is in the Green Belt.*

Firstly these lodge homes are of a type of modern, energy efficient prefabricated home, easy to build in situ and pleasant to live in, The golf course management feel that the cost of refurbishing the existing damp and unpleasant cottages or demolishing and rebuilding them is beyond the value of the existing barely habitable dwellings.

The report suggests that there is no reason to accommodate the existing occupiers on the Golf Club premises, my understanding is that the reasons are for security purposes (a relevant point given the recent invasion of another local course by travellers only a couples of months ago), and the detrimental impact of having no persons employed by the club on site that would be seen on the insurance cover afforded to the Golf Club, bearing in mind that these personnel already do live on site.

The report dismisses the perfectly logical proposal that a new location to replace existing accommodation would be an improvement for the safety of the inhabitants. The existing location of the cottages is in easy reach from balls struck from the first tee, no doubt when the course was first laid down this was

not the case but improvements to Golf technology now mean that even average club players hit the ball much further. The proposal to relocate the dwellings removes the danger of balls being struck from the first tee which is by far and away the primary danger to the existing cottage inhabitants.

If the Borough feels that insufficient guarantees of the intent to demolish the cottages have been given and that the application could result in new dwellings, not replacements, I fail to understand why this cannot be covered in conditions along with suitable enforcement.

The suggestion that these houses are out of keeping and therefore constitute bad design is very puzzling, especially given the condition of the cottages they are intended to replace. These are modern easy to maintain, efficient buildings that do not look out of place in this environment especially surrounded, as they are by trees.

The report also makes reference to the impact on wildlife. I fail to see how siting these dwellings in the much safer location proposed, which is currently laid to Concrete, can have an impact on wildlife. The report itself suggests that mitigating measures may be put in place, and again these could be dealt with in conditions, yet no proposals are forthcoming.

Members of the committee, by all means insist on conditions that safeguard the openness of the green belt and conserve nature for this application, but please allow some common sense and approve this application which is supported by all three Ward Members.”

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The Ward Councillor asks the committee to show some ‘common sense’ and approve the application. Members of the Planning Committee are reminded that section 96 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that, *“If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”* Furthermore, paragraph 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states, *“The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.”*

‘Common sense’ is not a material planning consideration. Local and National Planning Policy attach significant weight to the protection of the Green Belt. Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states, *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the*

potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.” Officers remain of the opinion that the proposed development would be harmful to the Green Belt and very special circumstances do not exist to outweigh this harm.

This page is intentionally left blank

18/00163/FUL

Applicant Mr Kerry

Location Land North West Of Lammas Farm, Kneeton Road, East Bridgford

Proposal Erection of a temporary rural workers dwelling and agricultural building.

Ward East Bridgford

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objections

RECEIVED FROM: Ward Councillor (Cllr Lawrence)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Cllr Lawrence confirmed that he objects to the application citing the following grounds:

1. There is no end date on the "Temporary" agricultural workers dwelling.
2. There is no demonstrated need for such a dwelling. The site is not large enough to justify having one and the Rabbit Barn is not too far from the housing within the village.
3. The proposed barn is large for the site and is inappropriate for the green belt.
4. The barn will have a negative impact on the surrounds of a listed building, namely the old windmill on Kneeton Road.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The recommended conditions (condition 1) limit the permission to a period of three years from the date of the permission, on or before which date the occupation of the temporary dwelling should cease and the building is to be removed from the land.

The need for the dwelling is dealt with in the committee report. Similarly, the consideration of Green Belt issues is dealt with in the report.

The old windmill is situated on the western side of Kneeton Road at a minimum distance of around 450 metres from the application site, around 625 metres from the proposed site of the temporary dwelling and around 680 metres from the site of the proposed barn. Furthermore, there is an intervening dwelling situated

directly to the south of the Old Windmill. In view of the distance involved, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the setting of the Listed Building and, therefore, would preserve this setting, an objective described as desirable in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: East Bridgford Parish Council

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The parish Council comment that they have not received notification of this application. The Parish Council objects to the application on the following grounds:

- a. Lack of an end-date for the so-called “temporary dwelling”.
- b. The proposed barn is so large that it represents “agri-business”, not agriculture, and that it impacts the negatively the area round a listed building – namely the windmill.
- c. This is Factory Farming in the Green Belt and is quite unsuitable.
- d. It is too near the listed Windmill.
- e. There is no justification for a 'works dwelling'.
- f. 24 hour supervision necessitating the building of a dwelling was NOT necessary.

The Parish Council comments that they may have further comments and request details of the application.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The Parish Council was initially consulted on this application on 27 February 2018 and provided comments in a letter dated 7 March 2018, which are summarised in paragraph 6 of the committee report. It is therefore apparent that the Parish Council was previously consulted on this application and provided with details of the proposal. The remainder of the comments from the Parish Council are addressed in the committee report or above in response to the additional comments from the Ward Councillor.

Applicant Mrs Joyce C Sharp

Location The Dovecote, Main Street, Hickling

Proposal Single storey rear extension including demolition of existing sun lounge, single storey front extension to garage, replace flat roof dormer with pitched roof bridging gap between dormer and garage, render to front elevation, and Juliet balcony to rear (revised scheme)

Ward Neville And Langar

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Supporting comments
RECEIVED FROM: Applicant

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The front of the Dovecote had shutters from the day it was built which certainly defected the brickwork. This will not improve with acid and spoils the finish to the front elevation. She has tried to enhance a very sad looking rundown property with additional expense by installing the oak windows. The bricks have a number of holes from ornamental fixings and, being built in the late 60/70s, the property has very little wall cavity hence the render would help weather proofing. There are other rendered properties on Main Street including The Old Forge, a white rendered bungalow, and the old chapel with a large area covered in render.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

None.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comments withdrawing objection
RECEIVED FROM: Parish Council

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

As it appears that the previously approved tile is being used instead of the thick concrete tile, the Parish Council has reviewed its position and, provided the application is amended to make the change effectively only the additional render, would like to remove their objection and give a neutral comment.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Condition 1 requires the previously approved tiles to be used.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comments withdrawing objection

RECEIVED FROM: Ward Councillor (Cllr Combellack)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

According to the committee report the roof tiles are to be secured by way of condition and, as can physically be seen, they are the Rivendale tiles originally approved and not thick concrete. The Ward Councillor is not in favour of the full render as it attempts to introduce a contemporary design in the historic heart of the village which will impact on the street scene in a Conservation Area. Additionally she disputes the premise that it will bring the property up to modern day standards of insulation as the original brick work will remain on the south and west elevations. However, as the Parish Council have indicated they will be removing their objections and the Conservation Officer comments that the additional render will avoid any mismatch in brickwork, the Ward Councillor removes her objection.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

None.