

When telephoning, please ask for: Tracey Coop
Direct dial 0115 914 8277
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 5 June 2019



**Rushcliffe Community
Contact Centre**
Rectory Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 6BU

To all Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

Planning Committee – Thursday, 13 June 2019

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 read 'Sanjit Sull'.

Sanjit Sull
Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

4. Planning Applications (Pages 1 - 14)

The report of the Executive Manager - Communities.

Membership

Chairman: Councillor R Butler
Vice-Chairman: Councillor Mrs M Stockwood
Councillors: K Beardsall, A Brennan, P Gowland, L Healy, A Major, J Murray,
F Purdue-Horan, C Thomas and D Viridi

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.

18/02688/REM

Applicant William Davis Limited

Location Shelford Road Farm, Shelford Road, Radcliffe On Trent

Proposal Development of 103 dwelling (Use Class C3), reserved sites for a health centre (Use Class D1) and associated infrastructure, including highway and pedestrian access, open space, structural landscaping and SUDS features (application for approval of matters reserved under outline application ref 13/02329/OUT)

Ward Radcliffe On Trent

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional Information

RECEIVED FROM: Applicant

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Response to additional questions asked by the Planning Officer:

Tree loss and net gain

Information has been submitted to show that 6 trees would be removed in Phase 1, all young to early semi mature in age and determined to be of low landscape value C2. All are of non-native ornamental species and not considered to be of any ecological or arboricultural value. The consented arboricultural report assess a net gain in respect of tree cover post development with 115 trees to be planted as part of the proposed landscape scheme.

Permeable Paving

The 'sustainability credentials' of permeable paving are no greater than filter strips. They both serve the same function in providing a further element of the 'treatment train' in the improvement in water quality by conveyance of the surface water runoff by filtration through stone construction elements. From a sustainability point of view, either construction method can be used to achieve the same effect. The principal difference therefore relates to cosmetic appearance; and indeed by using one preferred system, such as filter strips, they suggest that will be able to achieve consistency in design throughout the development.

Broader Sustainability

They acknowledge the importance of sustainability issues very seriously. This is addressed in Section 7 of the design statement. Since this was prepared, they confirm they have been working with colleagues in the Economic Development Team on their Employment and Skills Plan. This will bring the following additional sustainability benefits:

Procurement - They advise that they always attempt to procure locally to minimise their carbon footprint and to maximise reinvestment in the local economy. They are hosting a 'Meet the Buyer' day at Grange Hall in Radcliffe to attract local suppliers. They have already identified local suppliers associated with ready mixed concrete, heavy side building materials (concrete floor beams and lintels and walling / flooring blocks) and cleaning services, which are either within Rushcliffe Borough or within a 15 mile radius of the site which will reduce the overall carbon footprint of our development. Their experience of similar events, particularly at Chesterfield, is that they will attract other new supply chain relationships after the event has been held.

Local Employment - The plan will target (as a minimum) the employment of 4 site operatives who live in the local area, together with the creation of 4 apprenticeships recruited locally. Working with South Nott's Academy, Toothill School and South Wolds Academy they also intend to create 8 work experience placements and 3 community / school projects per year (including career talks, sustainability and health and safety awareness projects).

Affordable housing - they will provide an affordable housing scheme in accordance with the S106. They will be led by the Registered Provider on the location of the particular types of tenure. Once this is determined they will seek to discharge condition 12 (xii) and Pat 16 of the S106.

Plan numbers on condition 1 require prefix rev. before letter.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The additional comments are noted.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional comments on revised plans

RECEIVED FROM: Resident at Hunting Stables

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Confirm that they do make a sound improvement to the position and do respond positively to the concerns they have and have had.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Noted

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional comments on revised plans

RECEIVED FROM: Occupier of Redmile House

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

As previously set out, the changes that provide a planting buffer to the rear curtilage of plots 130-132 and the substitution of plots 130 and 131 (2 x 2-bed Rother) for a single 2-bed Bungalow (Blake) are welcomed.

Also welcome the recommendation to the planning committee to protect the proposed planting buffer.

However, there appear to be no constraints proposed on the future owners of plots 130-132 with respect to applications to extend their properties or convert the bungalow to two-storey dwelling. This must be addressed to ensure that the measures taken to minimise the impact on our amenity are permanent.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The comments are noted in relation to the planting buffer.

With regard to potentially withdrawing permitted development rights for extensions to the specified plots, this is not considered to be justified in this instance as the garden lengths and sizes for these properties satisfy the guidelines set out in residential design guide.

19/00678/OUT

Applicant Rushcliffe Borough Council

Location Rushcliffe Borough Council, Central Works Depot, Abbey Road

Proposal Demolition of existing buildings, residential development with associated landscaping, infrastructure and access points from Abbey Road and Buckfast Way (outline with all matters reserved except access).

Ward Abbey

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Jason Mordan, Senior Practitioner
Historic Buildings NCC

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Former pump house should be considered a non-designated heritage asset as per the Archaeological DBA submitted as part of the application.

Suggestion that the building should be considered as being of “considerable heritage significance” for both local historic value and as a preserved example of Victorian utility architecture.

Comparisons are drawn with examples with statutory protection at Bestwood and Papplewick (both grade II* listed sitting within registered park and garden landscapes). Also with a Model Farm connected with sewerage disposal at Corporation Farm, Bulcote (grade II). It is also suggested that these assets, all associated with Nottingham City Corporation, form a group and that further the pumping station at Abbey Road should be considered part of that group.

Concern that demolition would represent substantial harm to a heritage asset and that this has not been addressed/justified through the planning statement.

There would appear to be clear opportunities through the redevelopment of the site to reuse the building which have not been explored including opportunities to engage with education including links to the primary curriculum with nearby schools such as Abbey Road.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The pump station appears to have been built in 1901 and as such stands at the threshold of the Edwardian Era.

The designated pumping stations discussed at Papplewick and Bestwood are both from earlier in the Victorian Period in the 1880's and 1870's respectively and both retain elements considered as key in listing designation guides such as intact interior schemes and surviving original equipment (that at Papplewick being near complete), and landscaped grounds often including water features (both Papplewick and Bestwood have ponds, a formal mirror pond at Papplewick and an informal naturalist example at Bestwood). In these cases the landscaping was publically accessible and indeed public attendance was encouraged almost as a public park.

The pumping station at Abbey Road is a late example, dating to after the peak of civic pride which lead to even industrial buildings being lavishly decorated. Unlike those at Bestwood and Papplewick there is no known architect and the decorative scheme externally is simple by comparison. Bestwood and Papplewick were designed by engineers Thomas Hawksley, M.O. Tarbottom and Arthur Brown – Only Brown could conceivably have had any involvement as the other two were both deceased by 1883. Brown, however, was employed by the city and this site is outside of its boundaries and not related to water supply to the city.

No internal decoration survives and no original fittings or equipment. Historic mapping suggests that the site never had any landscaping, there is no suggestion that public access was encouraged.

In almost every respect Papplewick and Bestwood excel, the specific criteria against which Historic England considered statutory protection by listing, the example at Abbey Road falls short.

Having gained access to view the interior, any conversion has been undertaken in a way as to completely expunge any remnants of significance. All floor finishes are laid over new concrete, a first floor has been inserted and all internal walls are studwork, any original internal walls have been removed as part of the remodeling. No equipment survives and the conversion and strip-out has also removed any evidence of mounting points or structural features which might indicate the location, scale and nature of any equipment that was present.

The large arched openings are all fitted with modern uPVC windows. It is not possible to determine what, if any, windows were originally present. Also the ground floor sections of the arched openings appear to have all been infilled in modern brickwork, whether these areas were previously open or whether they were opened up briefly (possibly to allow plant and equipment to be removed more easily from the building) and then in-filled is unclear.

The listing criteria are not designed to identify non-designated heritage assets, but it is clear that a structure which falls marginally short of meeting the criteria for statutory designation would represent a non-designated asset of significant value.

The building has some landmark value, although it is not prominent from any of the surrounding contemporary street frontages and can be seen only briefly from the junction of Abbey Road and Eltham Road, while the chimney is a tell feature it is not prominent in the skyline outside of the site. It is a reasonably attractive building incorporating a polychrome decorative scheme, but is hardly an extravagant example of this type of building.

It is considered that the pump house at Abbey Road falls far short of the criteria for listing and fails to convincingly meet the criteria for local listing set out in the emerging part 2 of the Local Plan. It is dubious as to whether the building would justify recognition as a non-designated heritage asset, however if it does, then it would do so at the bottom end of the scale and certainly would not represent a non-designated asset of “considerable heritage significance” as suggested by the representation made here.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Do Not Object

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr Bushman

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Confirmation of no objection to proposed application.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

None required.

6. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** No objection subject to conditions

RECEIVED FROM: Nottinghamshire County Council as
Lead Local flood Authority

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Based on the submitted information we have no objections to the approval of reserved matters subject to a condition requiring the submission and approval of a detailed surface water drainage scheme based on the principles set forward by he approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy 18-0250/FRA/Rev B, May 2019, BSP Consulting Ltd.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Paragraph 99 of the Officer's report sets out the consideration of the drainage issue and concludes that the most appropriate approach would be to secure a Sustainable Urban Drainage scheme through planning condition to accompany the reserved matters application for the layout of the development. The LLFA's comments are therefore welcomed as they echo this approach. No further consideration is required on this matter and as suggested condition 11 of the recommendation requires the submission of a surface water drainage scheme, it is considered the recommendation of the LLFA is already catered for through the current recommendation to grant planning permission.

19/00323/FUL

Applicant Mrs Louise Ward

Location Land East Of Kirk Ley Road (Phase 3), East Leake, Nottinghamshire

Proposal Full application for the erection of 83 dwellings (partial re-plan to increase number of dwellings on Phase 3 by 47).

Ward Leake

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

7. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional objection.

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident.

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- An increase in the number of dwellings to 347 would result in additional strain on existing infrastructure. The health services and primary schools are at capacity. The S106 pooling limit has been reached on health service provision.
- Proposal would result in the removal of more hedgerow and woodland.
- Significant increase in traffic flows.
- Lack of open space for children's play areas.
- The Neighbourhood Plan requires housing to be within the village envelope without impacting on the ridgeline.
- There should be pedestrian connections between new developments and existing neighbouring developments.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- The impact upon infrastructure is addressed in the Officers report and mitigated by the contributions secured through the S106 agreement, including health and education. The agent has agreed to pay the S106 contributions (as set out below).
- The extent of the proposed developed area would not increase as a result of this application. There would be no additional hedgerow or woodland removed.
- No objections have been raised by NCC Highways.
- A children's play area has been secured on the earlier phases.
- The impacts upon the ridgeline are addressed in the Officer report.
- Pedestrian links are proposed through the site to Kirk Ley Road. A pedestrian connection to the approved residential development to the east, off Rempstone Road, was secured as part of that outline

planning permission.

8. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Officer update.

RECEIVED FROM: Case Officer.

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- S106 contributions.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The agent has agreed to sign up to a S106 agreement to secure contributions towards village infrastructure. The S106 would contain a mechanism to ensure that contributions are secured for the previously approved 36 dwellings on this phase, together with the additional 47 dwellings proposed.

- 20% affordable housing (across the whole of phase 3) comprising on this part of the site of; 3 social rent, 4 affordable rent and 3 intermediate (shared ownership).
- (Based on 83 dwellings) primary school contributions for 17 places at £19,048 equating to £323,816.
- (Based on 83 dwellings) secondary school contributions for 13 places at £17,753 equating to £230,789.
- (Based on 83 dwellings) $83 \times £920 = £376,360$ towards the provision of a new medical centre in East Leake or the re-development or upgrading of the existing medical centre in East Leake.
- (Based on 83 dwellings) $83 \times £428 = £35,524$ towards the provision and / or improvement of sports pitches and / or changing room facilities and / or a pavilion and / or car parking at Costock Road Playing Fields.
- A scheme to secure the provision, permanent availability, management and maintenance by an appropriate organisation of the open space, including securing the necessary funding.

19/00666/FUL

Applicant Mr And Mrs R Combellack

Location 17 Bollards Lane, Sutton Bonington, Nottinghamshire

Proposal Two storey front extension, two storey side extension over existing garage and utility, and rendering of existing dwelling.

Ward Sutton Bonington

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

9. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Withdrawal of planning application

RECEIVED FROM: Applicant

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The applicant confirmed via email on 5 June 2019 that they wish to withdraw the application.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

No further comment.

19/01268/CTY

Applicant Nottinghamshire County Council

Location Sharphill Primary School, Rose Way, Edwalton

Proposal Erection of a two-storey 420 place primary (2 phases) and 39 place nursery school with associated playing fields, car parking, hard surfaced outdoor play area, footpaths and access roads. Entrance canopy and a covered nursery play area, enclosed bin store (2m), sprinkler tank and pump house (3.5m), 2.4m high perimeter security fence and gates, associated landscape works and off-site highway works.

Ward Edwalton

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

10. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Points of clarification

RECEIVED FROM: Nottinghamshire County Council
(applicant)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

It is not possible for the school to accommodate community use during the teaching day as rooms are used all the time for teaching purposes. As such, it will not be necessary to increase the car park for daytime community use benefit. Doors to the school hall and the adjacent studio have been proposed directly from the car park area for community use purpose out of hours. A lobby to either of these rooms is not deemed necessary as this is not a main circulation route and as such doesn't warrant a lobby. In addition, there isn't any allowance for such lobby in the EFSA guidelines meaning funding isn't available for this. Doors from the rooms designated community use and the remainder of the school as shown on the relevant drawings submitted for planning approval have been restricted to ensure the public cannot access other part of the school.

Nottinghamshire County Council also wish to highlight section 9 of the Planning Statement (Outdoor Sport) which clarifies that the sports pitches will be available for community use outside of school hours in conjunction with the internal facilities.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The points of clarification from the County Council are noted however, these matters were considered in the committee report, if not directly referenced. The

County Council appears to be raising these notes of clarification to address comments received from Ward Members.

11. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** No objection subject to conditions

RECEIVED FROM: Nottinghamshire County Council's Lead Local Flood Authority.

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The LLFA comment that based on the submitted information no objections are raised subject to a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a Sustainable Drainage System which includes the following:

- Demonstrate that the development will use SuDS throughout the site as a primary means of surface water management and that design is in accordance with CIRIA C753. Preference should be given to above ground SuDS features.
- Limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to the 100 year plus 40% (for climate change) critical rain storm 5 l/s rates for the developable area.
- Provision of surface water run-off attenuation storage in accordance with 'Science Report SCO30219 Rainfall Management for Developments' and the approved FRA
- Provide detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details on any attenuation system, and the outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
- For all exceedance to be contained within the site boundary without flooding new properties in a 100year+40% storm.
- Details of STW approval for connections to existing network and any adoption of site drainage infrastructure.
- Evidence of how the on-site surface water drainage systems shall be maintained and managed after completion and for the lifetime of the development to ensure long term operation to design parameters.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Paragraph 56 of the Officer's reports states that a Sustainable Urban Drainage scheme for the site should be provided and therefore the comments from the LLFA are welcomed and Rushcliffe Borough Council.

12. NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:

Consultation Response

RECEIVED FROM:

Rushcliffe Borough Council –
Environmental Sustainability Officer

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Comments that the Ecological Survey is suitable for identifying habitats for and potential for protected and priority species. The site consists of arable and semi-improved grassland, and scattered trees. Sharphill Wood LWS / LNR is to the west of the site. No protected or priority species were identified on the site although some protected species movements signs were identified. There is potential for wild birds, badgers and hedgehogs, to forage on the site. The development provides opportunities for ecological enhancement. The conservation status of European Protected Species is unlikely to be impacted by this development.

The Environmental Sustainability Officer raises no objection to the development subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the submission of an Ecological and landscape management plan, the creation of wild bird nests and bat boxes within the development and new wildlife habitat together with the protection of trees and hedgerows.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The comments from the Environmental Sustainability Officer are welcomed and largely echo the comments made on the application by the County Council's Officers. As per paragraph 58 of the Committee report the County Council is advised that these relevant protections and measures should be secured via condition to any permission granted.

This page is intentionally left blank