

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

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 10 October 2018

To all Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

Planning Committee – Thursday, 11 October 2018

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

Yours sincerely



Sanjit Sull
Monitoring Officer

Membership

Chairman: Councillor R Butler
Vice-Chairman: Councillor J Stockwood
Councillors: B Buschman, N Clarke, M Edwards, J Greenwood, R Jones,
Mrs M Males, S Mallender, 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.

13/02329/OUT

Applicant William Davis Limited

Location Land Off Shelford Road,(Shelford Road Farm), Shelford Road

Proposal Outline application for development of up to 400 dwellings, a primary school, health centre and associated infrastructure including highway and pedestrian access, open space and structural landscaping

Ward Radcliffe On Trent

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comments
RECEIVED FROM: Radcliffe on Trent Health Centre

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. They welcome the invite to comment on this development.
- b. They consider the land provides sufficient space to accommodate a Health Centre with adequate parking for patients and staff and would also accommodate future expansion should this be required
- c. Their understanding is that provision will be made to allow for the construction of a Health on the site to commence within five years of the start of the commencement and if a Health Centre is not developed within this time period then the Health Centre reserved site will be returned to the developer.
- d. They consider that this time limitation is too short and does not allow sufficient time for interested parties to develop a detailed financial and construction strategy and commence a scheme.
- e. They recommend the proposed five year period be extended. If this does not happen then there is a risk that if a suitable central site cannot be located within the village an alternative site would then be unavailable.
- f. The plans show a number of residential dwellings close to the Health Centre and consideration will be required to ensure that the privacy of patients and the care they receive is ensured.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Discussions have been undertaken which has resulted in the applicant confirming that the offer for the site for a health centre will remain available for six years (previously 5 years) and that the financial contribution in relation to health provision will be provided prior to the occupation of 25% of the dwelling(previously 80%) The applicant has also confirmed that it is not necessary for work to commence on site within six years but that some certainty in that the site is needed (eg a contract of building works) will need to be provided. Details are proposed to be finalised by solicitors in the wording of the S106. This is considered to be an acceptable position and will allow sufficient time for the CCG to formulate a future plan for additional healthcare provision to serve the development and any future growth within Radcliffe on Trent.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comment

RECEIVED FROM: Head Teacher South Nottinghamshire Academy

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

As Headteacher of SNA in principle he neither objects or supports this application. Without the proposed investment as set out in the S106 Heads of Terms summary for the proposed investment for secondary education to enable extra capacity they would not be able to provide additional secondary places and therefore this is critical.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The applicant has confirmed that he is in agreement with the approach to a financial contribution towards secondary school provision and this is set out in the draft S106 Heads of Terms.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

a. Concern that insufficient time has been given to notify residents of the committee date – he is unable to use his right to public speaking and questions process

- b. Concerns revolve around changing the essential nature of the village with 1000 plus people
- c. Concern around the increase in traffic in an already overloaded system
- d. Do not consider that the traffic surveys bear any resemblance to reality
- e. Welcome that there are plans for increased infrastructure for education, health and public spaces but that doesn't address basic problem of traffic or the impact in increased numbers of residents
- f. He understands the why and the need for increased housing but not on the scale proposed
- g. He accepts change happens but this doesn't feel like evolution or progress but like a dawn raid on the semi rural village.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The resident has been made aware of the following:- In accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100B, paragraph 3, as amended by the Local Authorities (Access to Meetings and Documents) (Period of Notice) (England) Order 2002, we are required to publish agendas for public meetings five working days before the date of the meeting.
- b. In terms of the notification to residents of the date of the meeting, the timescales are not specified in legislation but we obviously cannot do this until such time that the agenda is finalised and published. We work to very tight timescales for finalising and publication of the agenda and the notification is normally sent to coincide with the publication of the committee papers. Similarly, the specific procedures for the operation of public speaking are not set out in legislation and these are determined locally. We have published on our website a protocol for public speaking.
- c. In relation to the remaining comments the consideration of scale and traffic impacts are set out in the report

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional comments

RECEIVED FROM: Campaign for Better Transport

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. The NBT planning expert is a bit surprised at the limited number of speakers allowed by Rushcliffe.

- b. Although the 'eastern bypass' Cllr Upton and others suggest may have merit, as it has to cross the railway plus new A52 junction, it will be VERY expensive. We could have a gold plated train service for that spend and it will of course encourage more to use their car. It would also impact on tranquility on the countryside beyond the development.
- c. We note not all S106 is agreed and remains under discussion. Improved bus services need to be sooner and the applicant needs to fund the buses at the start of the development. Otherwise, at the rate houses are built, it could be a couple of years into the development before the S106 buses kick in. There isn't clarity on what 'improved' offers and given the precarious status of the Villager bus route, it might only fund what we have now, rather than anything better.
- d. Improvements to rail infrastructure are mentioned, but this remains pointless without a meaningful level of service, which gets no mention. Rail ought to be a solution to the A52 corridor.
- e. Following on from 4), even if Rushcliffe is minded to grant permission, Rushcliffe needs to add a narrative pointing out that it considers the County Council's transport policy for the A52 unsound and enhanced rail services must be part of policy along the corridor.
- f. No matter what, there will be increased traffic through RoT to the RSPCA Junction. In the Chestnut pub area, the 90 degree bends, with bus stops, elderly citizens and cars travelling at unsafe speeds, all point to a disaster soon to happen. There needs to be safe crossing provision in the area of the Chestnut.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The specific procedures for the operation of public speaking are not set out in legislation and these are determined locally. We have published on our website a protocol for public speaking.
- b. The site is not proposed to deliver a eastern bypass
- c. The S106 table whilst in draft clearly sets on the proposed contributions for bus services and the triggers for payment. This has been agreed with the NCC Transport and Travel Services. They have confirmed that the S106 contribution will support a bus service for the Shelford Road development. Where possible the existing service will be enhanced to provide an improved level of service. If this is not possible a new service will be commissioned using the funding.
- d. Rail Services improvements in relation to frequency of services is unable to be directly secured by an application of this nature. Work is being undertaken by other areas of the Borough Council to encourage the provision of improved services and

the Council supports the Strategic Outline Business Case for improving the Poacher Line to serve its communities and enable the wider economic growth of the area as part of the East Midlands refranchise.

- e. The S106 secures the provision of funding (£ 260,000) for traffic management calming measures on Shelford Road. The County Council as the highways authority wish to have the flexibility to design the scheme which will reduce speeds and facilitate non vehicular movements. This is set out in the Heads of Terms table.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional Comments

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr Clarke

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. He re-iterates that he has no objection to the principle of the development, as it is recognised that considerable additional housing provision needs to be found in the Radcliffe on Trent area. However, he does have some concerns, many of which are contained within his ward members comments in the report but, in addition:
- b. He would have thought that it would be much more practical to consider this application in tandem with the application for land at the northwest tip of this application site. This smaller development will require a separate access on to Shelford Road. It should be considered at the same time, so that a proper integration of traffic issues are developed with an overall plan - not piecemeal.
- c. The current application should have two access points anyway, not one. Therefore, a second access should be proposed that incorporates access to both this current application and the smaller application. What if an emergency occurs that blocks the one access? Some collective foresight planning needs to be brought into play. Future residents will think it very odd, and will not be interested in an explanation that the two developments were a few months apart. This needs more thinking through.
- d. On the current application, the roundabout must be positioned further north, away from the hazard that will be created, affecting some of the existing dwellings on the northwest side of Shelford Road (See comments in report's ward member comments).
- e. Parking standards guidelines are wholly inadequate for today's needs. An allocation of 2 spaces per household should be included, not 1.5. Otherwise, this will be just the same as other estates that become overcrowded with cars parked on footways and verges.
- f. He underlines his previous comments regarding a Health Centre. A contribution should be included for a new Health Centre in the centre of the

village.

- g. There are comments locally that insufficient education provision is being made to meet demand.
- h. Finally, he would like to place a reminder for the need for a management company to be established to cater for all maintenance of amenity and open spaces.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. It is not necessary for both this site and Grooms cottage to be considered at the same time. They are separate sites in separate ownerships and one site will not prejudice the delivery of the other site. The site subject to this application is at a position to move forward and help improve the Borough Councils housing land supply situation. Grooms Cottage can be accessed independently and can be delivered separately. There is no justification to delay the determination of this application. Consideration in terms of layout and linkages between the developments can be achieved at Reserved Matters stage.
- b. Nottinghamshire County Council have confirmed that the provision of a roundabout as the site access to serve the proposed scale of development has already been deemed to be acceptable in the original highway observations which were made on the proposal. Nothing has changed in the intervening period to alter the opinion of the Highway Authority as to the adequacy of the proposed means of access. A second access is therefore not required on highway safety grounds.
- c. The location of the roundabout and its interrelationship with existing properties has been considered by the County Council as the Highways Authority and is considered acceptable in highway safety terms.
- d. Parking provision will be considered at the REM stage and detailed design considerations in relation to level and location of parking provision will be given at that stage.
- e. A financial contribution is sought for health care provision which could go towards a new health centre in the village. The application allows flexibility in how health care provision is provided in the future to serve the new residents
- f. The S106 heads of Terms table allows for provision of a new school if necessary or improvements to existing provision. Contributions are also sought for secondary school improvements. These are in line with what is requested from the education authority.
- g. The S106 heads of Terms table reflects the need for a management company to be established

6. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION**

Updated Framework Plan
reference number and
change to conditions

RECEIVED FROM:

Planning agent for the application

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. An updated Framework Plan reference DE_085-003 Rev F has been submitted which includes the general outline of the proposed roundabout details including the provision of a replacement hedge for what is required to be removed for visibility requirements.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

This plans avoids removes any confusion with the detailed roundabout design subject to this application which will require the removal of hedgerow to provide the necessary visibility splay and the previously submitted framework plan. Condition 3 and 35 needs amending to refer to this plan

7. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**

update to S106 Heads of Terms Table

RECEIVED FROM:

Planning Agent

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The agent has confirmed that the offer for the site for a health centre will remain available for six years (previously 5 years) and that the financial contribution in relation to health provision will be provided prior to the occupation of 25% of the dwelling(previously 80%) The applicant has also confirmed that it is not necessary to work to commence on site within six years but that some certainty in that the site is needed (eg a contract of building works) will need to be provided. Details are proposed to be finalised by solicitors in the wording of the S106.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

These changes are welcomed and will assist with the forward planning of health care provision within Radcliffe. The draft Heads of Terms table is proposed therefore to be amended to reflect this change. The Radcliffe on Trent Health Centre and the CCG have been consulted on these changes

but have not yet responded.

8. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Update from Planning Officer

RECEIVED FROM:

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Condition 9 is proposed to be amended to tie the details to the technical approval from the County Council as highways authority under S38 not S278 (S38 deals with internal road layout not changes to existing roads)

The committee report refers at para 207 to a planning application being expected to be received shortly at Grooms Cottage. An outline planning application for 55 dwellings has been received and is now valid. Consultation will be commencing shortly on the application. The application reference is 18/02269/OUT.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. Condition 9 needs amending to include the words technical approval and S38 not S278 and to ensure the implementation of such works. The condition will therefore read:-

No development shall take place within each phase of the development (other than for the access to Shelford Road approved under condition 6) until the technical approval under S38 has been agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council for the construction of the roads and associated works within that phase of the site. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details and no dwelling in that phase shall be occupied until the roads necessary to serve that property have been constructed to base level.

- b. This application and the recently submitted application at Groom Cottage can be considered independently with consideration of the interrelationship of the two sites being considered at Para 207 of the Report.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** objection
RECEIVED FROM: local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. Consider that the consideration of this application should be deferred as any decision will be premature and will undermine the process of approving Part 2

- b. Many residents object to the proposals in Local Plan Part 2 on the grounds that they do not take into account the Neighbourhood Plan. They have the opportunity to present their objections to the Independent Inspector later this year and any decision will undermine the Local Plan process and effectively deny residents the opportunity to have their objections heard.
- c. They question whether the regulations actually allow RBC to make a decision on this application before the Local Plan Part 2 has been approved.
- d. Consider the local plan process has highlighted some significant issues that will directly impact on this application – specifically impact on the A52

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The report sets out why the application is being considered at this time.
- b. The report considers the implications of the Neighbourhood Plan
- c. Should members be minded to support the application the matter will be referred to the Planning Casework Unit to see whether the SoS for Environment wishes to call in the application for a decision or whether the Borough Council can make the decision on the application.
- d. There are no highway objections to the application from Highways England on the Strategic Road Network or the County Council as Local Highways Authority on either the proposal subject to this application or the proposals put forward in Part 2 of the Local Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

18/00300/OUT

Applicant Space Foods Limited

Location Land At OS Reference 456332,Asher Lane, Ruddington

Proposal Outline planning application for proposed development of 175 dwellings including vehicular access (via 75 Musters Road), pedestrian links, public open space, car parking, landscaping and drainage

Ward Ruddington

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr Lungley

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. Cllr Lungley continues to object to the proposal as before.
- b. The extra road traffic would be too much for a village such as ours, resulting in traffic jams and urbanisation.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The issues raised by Cllr Lungley are addressed in the Committee Report.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. There is an exit/entrance to the Western Fields children's playing area on Barton Close, leading to Musters Road. There have been at least two accidents to children at this junction, both were serious. The exit from the proposed development would be about 100m from the junction with Barton Close. With 175 houses proposed, there could potentially be 300 extra

vehicles passing this junction every day. There will also be many more children using the playing field. This could be an accident spot.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Following the receipt of Mr Groves' email, further consultations were carried out with NCC Highways, who advised as follows;

'I have checked with our accident investigation unit and can find no record of the accidents referred to in the e-mail, given that both involved a car and result in injury to a pedestrian they should have been reported to the police who in turn would have provided NCC with a record for our database, hence it is difficult to explain why we do not hold the records.

The only logical explanation is that the accidents occurred so long ago that they pre-date the current 'live' data base which runs from 1989 through 2018. If this is the case then unfortunately we are unable to consider them as being representative of any current accident pattern, as standard practice only suggests we should be considering the last five years accident data. It would appear that the accidents in questions may fall out of this period by a significant timeframe.

Incidentally, rechecking the data shows only two accidents on the whole length of Musters Road since 1989. The first is classified as a slight or minor injury accident involving two cars hitting each other. The second is another slight involving a car and pedestrian. The dates on these are 1990 and 1996 respectively. Given their age they would not have been included in the TA, as they are not recent enough to be considered relevant.'

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. Decisions on housing sites in the village should be made strategically and not ad-hoc.
- b. The proposal would result in a loss of amenity and result in traffic issues. It seems the traffic issue is acceptable based upon an outsiders report produced probably with little appreciation of the ensuing increase in traffic.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The issues relating to the principal of housing on this site, and the impacts on amenity and highway safety are addressed in the Committee Report.

With regards to the Planning Inspector's decision to allow the previous application for residential development on this site; this followed a 4 day Public

Inquiry. The majority of the Inquiry time focused on the impacts of the proposed housing development on the local highway network, both in terms of safety and congestion, with highway engineers from both sides giving evidence and being cross examined by a Barrister. Officers are satisfied that the Inspector, in reaching his decision, had a full and detailed understanding of the local highway issues.

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. At the Public Inquiry, the applicants stated that they would no longer be pursuing their secondary plan to demolish 75 Musters Road to allow vehicular access to the site.
- b. If approved, their house would be turned into a corner plot, standing on the corner of Musters Road and the new road into the housing development, resulting in a stream of traffic in the morning and evening just feet away from out lounge and bedroom windows. The change to their living conditions would be intolerable and they ask that this application be rejected.
- c. They have contacted the applicants' agent to ask what measures would be taken to minimise the impact of noise, pollution and traffic emergence, but the reply received was unhelpful and vague.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The issue of an access to the site via 75 Musters Road was discussed at the Public Inquiry. The applicants' agent agreed that the Public Inquiry (which related to the previous planning application where access was proposed via Asher Lane) was not the correct forum to consider the suitability of an alternative access, and that it was a matter to be considered under a separate planning application.

With regards to the impacts of the new access road on the living conditions of existing residents, this issue is addressed in the Committee Report.

This page is intentionally left blank

18/01097/FUL

Applicant Mr Rob Bailey

Location Land South East Of 75a,Wilford Lane, West Bridgford

Proposal Erection of four new dwelling houses with associated access

Ward Compton Acres

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- Continues to object to the proposal on grounds of loss of privacy and overlooking due to the first floor living accommodation
- Questions why the living accommodation is required to be on the first floor given the presence of flood defences which protect the area

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Issues of overlooking are considered at paragraph 32 of the committee report.

Issues of flood risk are considered at paragraphs 26-28 of the committee report. The requirement for habitable living accommodation above the flood level is recommended by the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and supported by the Environment Agency. Taking into consideration the possibility of a breach event, the increasing risks posed by climate change and the lack of any guarantee that the flood defences will be maintained in perpetuity, the defences cannot be treated as a guarantee against flooding in this area, and we should therefore plan for such event in terms of new development. In the event of a breach of the flood defences, this area of Wilford Lane would have depths in excess of two metres, which therefore requires living accommodation at first floor.

2. Additional Officer Observations

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The site planning history at paragraph 4 omits the following relevant planning applications –

Application ref: 06/01076/FUL - Construct two-storey building containing 5 apartments; terrace of three two-storey dwellings (with bedroom in roofspace) and two detached houses. This application was withdrawn.

Application ref: 06/01623/FUL - Construct two-storey building containing 5 apartments; terrace of three two-storey dwellings (with bedrooms in roofspace) and two detached houses. The application was refused on grounds of Flood Risk and on impact on the amenity of 75a Wilford Lane.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The previously withdrawn and refused planning applications were determined under a different planning policy context. The current scheme for consideration is of a different amount, form and scale than the previously refused application and therefore the schemes are not directly comparable and should be considered on individual merit in the context of the most up to date planning policy.

18/01705/OUT

Applicant Mr & Mrs Horner

Location Land Adjacent To 63 Moor Lane, Gotham, Nottinghamshire

Proposal Outline application for proposed erection of one detached dwelling with new access.

Ward Gotham

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Consultee
RECEIVED FROM: Environmental Health

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- No objections raised.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Consultee
RECEIVED FROM: Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The site is outside of the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and there are no board watercourses in close proximity to the site.
- The erection or alteration of any mill dam, weir or other obstruction to the flow or erection of any culvert temporary or permanent within the channel of a riparian watercourse will require the Boards prior written consent.
- Surface water run off rates to receiving watercourses must not be increased as a result of the development.
- The design, operation and future maintenance of site drainage systems must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Local Planning Authority.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

There are no further comments to add.

3. NATURE OF REPRESENTATION: Statement in support of the application

RECEIVED FROM: The Applicant (full statement available online)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- There is no specific definition of limited infilling but nonetheless the width and distance from the road are deemed too large in the report
- There seem to be many definitions and in some cases many variants of 'limited infilling'
- It is not the case that if a proposal meets one of the exception criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 it also has to be shown that very special circumstances exist
- The Gotham Neighbourhood Plan was submitted in June and will be open for the final 6 week consultation on the 19th before it is inspected. So obviously carries some weight
- A recent application for infill in the green belt was given permission where the frontage was 150m
- Similarly at 16 Loughborough Road, Bunny, in this case there was no mention of gap size but the proposal was found to be limited infill in the Green Belt where the frontage was 46 metres and 35 metres from the road
- The report states that the open countryside begins beyond the last house on Moor Lane, the main consideration is actually whether the proposal is for limited infill in villages in which case there is no need to consider the effect on the openness of the Green Belt
- The proposal meets the NPPF Green Belt exception criteria for limited infill in villages
- Side spacing will be maintained in accordance with the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

It is accepted that there are many different variants in defining the term 'limited infilling' and that neither local nor national planning policy gives a specific measurement for gap sizes in terms of what is deemed to be limited infilling and what is not. The Planning Portal Glossary defines it as 'the development of a relatively small gap between existing buildings', however this is treated as a guide and again is not specific in terms of actual distance. As this is the case it is therefore treating each case on its own merit and each case will be assessed separately to determine whether it constitutes limited infilling.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF outlines that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved unless in very special circumstances. Officers do not consider that this case represents very special circumstances. The NPPF also outlines limited infilling in villages as an exception to inappropriate development in the NPPF. As mentioned above each case is treated differently for limited infilling and as

mentioned in the main report the proposal does not constitute limited infilling due to the size of the plot and the location of the plot therefore in conflict with the exception criteria outlined in the NPPF. As such it would impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal has been designed to reflect the design of the host property at 63 Moor Lane. However this property was only allowed on the condition it was used as an agricultural farmers dwelling which is deemed an exception for residential development in the Green Belt. The proposal would bridge a substantial gap between the host property at number 63 and the neighbouring property on the other side at 'Redroofs'. This would impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the views of the countryside to the rear of the site which can currently be viewed from Moor Lane.

This isn't the last property on the road before entering the open countryside however the plot is very much on the edge of the village. As mentioned in the main report Local Plan Part 2 intends to inset Gotham from the Green Belt, however it is only the main built up area of Gotham with this plot falling outside of this area therefore due to remain in the Green Belt. It is accepted that this has not been formally adopted as yet so carried little weight but it gives an indication of the value of the site in retaining it within the Green Belt and that it would not constitute the main built up core of the village. Likewise the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan cannot be given much weight at this stage even though as mentioned in the applicant's statement this plot has been earmarked in that plan as a potential development site for future housing.

The statement references a recent approval for residential development in Bunny, also in the Green Belt. The site is 15 Church Street, Bunny (ref no 18/01489/FUL). This site is in the centre of the village of Bunny and not bordering any open countryside. The width of the plot facing the road is wide but it is not a very deep plot. The main village of Bunny, just like with Gotham is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt as outlined in the Green Belt Review forming part of the new draft Local Plan. This site falls within the area to be inset and the review considers this area does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt.

Another recent approval mentioned was at 16 Loughborough Road, Bunny (ref no 17/03038/FUL). Again this site was in the built up core of the village of Bunny where it is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt as outlined in the Green Belt Review.

This page is intentionally left blank

18/01543/FUL

Applicant Mr Liam Duggan

Location 14 The Rushes, Gotham, Nottinghamshire

Proposal Demolition of garage, two storey side extension, and single storey front and rear extensions.

Ward Gotham

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Further objection

RECEIVED FROM: Neighbour

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- The committee report doesn't establish the nature of the rooms served by the two windows in my house.
- There have been noise issues from the builders contrary to what the committee report states.
- Applicant has accused neighbour of trespass

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The nature of the rooms in the side serve a bathroom and a staircase. These rooms are not principal rooms so they are not afforded protection as outlined in the main report. The comment with regards to there being no noise or issues from the builders was submitted by another neighbour and summarised in the representations, which was separate to the summary of the objection letter. The issue of trespassing or allowing permission onto a neighbours land is a civil matter not covered within the planning process.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION** Planning Officer Update
SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS

The site is located within the Green Belt.

Saved Policy ENV15 (Green Belt) of the Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan 1996 defines the full and detailed extent of the Green Belt within

Rushcliffe.

Policy 4 (Nottingham-Derby Green Belt) of the Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy 2014 confirms the principle of the Nottingham Derby Green Belt within Rushcliffe will be retained and it will only be altered where it is demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist.

Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Protecting Green Belt Land) sets out that development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate which is, by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Local planning authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to inappropriate development are set out in paragraphs 145 and 146 of the NPPF and include extensions, provided that they are not 'disproportionate'.

Policies EN14 (Protecting the Green Belt) and EN19 (Impact on the Green Belt and Open Countryside) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan should be given weight as a material consideration in decision making. Policy EN14 states that within the green belt permission will only be granted for (amongst other things) alteration and limited extension or replacement of existing dwellings. Policy EN19 requires proposals to have no significant adverse impact upon the open nature of the Green Belt.

Neither the NPPF nor the Council's Local Planning Policy prescribes what would amount to a disproportionate addition to a dwelling; however, it is common practice at Rushcliffe to accept an increase of around 50% in terms of floor space and/or volume to the original dwelling, subject to the individual property, specifics of the site and planning history. The property sits in an average sized plot within the village of Gotham. The proposed extensions would, in part, replace an existing single storey garage to the side and a single storey extension to the rear. The proposed two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions, by reason for their relatively modest size and scale, would not result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling. The proposal is not therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The essential characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness and its permanence. The property is not an isolated house in the Green Belt, but is within the settlement of Gotham, which is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt under Part 2 of the Local Plan. The proposed development would be wholly contained within the residential curtilage of the property and remove more unsympathetic additions. The proposal would therefore safeguard the countryside from encroachment and protect the openness of the Green Belt.

No change to the recommendation is necessary.

This page is intentionally left blank