

Public Document Pack

When telephoning, please ask for: Democratic Services
Direct dial 0115 914 8511
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: 19 July 2022

To all Members of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group

Dear Councillor

A Meeting of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group will be held on Wednesday, 27 July 2022 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

This meeting will be accessible and open to the public via the live stream on YouTube and viewed via the link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/RushcliffeBC>
Please be aware that until the meeting starts the live stream video will not be showing on the home page. For this reason, please keep refreshing the home page until you see the video appear.

Yours sincerely



Gemma Dennis
Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 April 2022 (Pages 1 - 8)
4. Conservation Areas - Part 2 (Pages 9 - 18)
5. Work Programme (Pages 19 - 20)

Membership

Chairman: Councillor N Clarke
Vice-Chairman: Councillor J Cottee
Councillors: M Barney, R Butler, M Gaunt, A Phillips, V Price, J Stockwood and L Way



Rushcliffe Borough
Council Customer
Service Centre

Fountain Court
Gordon Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 5LN

Email:
customerservices
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Opening hours:
Monday, Tuesday and Thursday
8.30am - 5pm
Wednesday
9.30am - 5pm
Friday
8.30am - 4.30pm

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





Rushcliffe
Borough Council

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.

Rushcliffe Borough
Council Customer
Service Centre

Fountain Court
Gordon Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 5LN

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

Email:
customerservices
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Opening hours:
**Monday, Tuesday and
Thursday**
8.30am - 5pm
Wednesday
9.30am - 5pm
Friday
8.30am - 4.30pm

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





**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY GROUP
WEDNESDAY, 20 APRIL 2022**

Held at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West
Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillors N Clarke (Chairman), R Butler (Vice-Chairman), M Barney,
J Murray, A Phillips, J Stockwood, L Way and Mrs M Stockwood

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor T. Combellack and Councillor R. Upton

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

C Evans	Service Manager – Economic Growth and Property
A Pegram	Service Manager – Planning
A Ashcroft	Planning Services Consultant
A Poole	Democratic Services Officer

18 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor J. Cottee and Councillor L. Howitt.

19 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest recorded.

20 Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2022

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2022 were approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

21 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman informed the Group that he had invited Councillor Upton as Chairman of the Planning Committee and Councillor Combellack as author of the Scrutiny Matrix to attend the meeting as he felt that it would benefit the discussion on Planning Communications. He had also invited Councillor Edyvean, as Portfolio Holder, although he had been unable to attend.

22 Planning Communications

The Service Manager - Planning delivered a presentation to support the report of the Director - Development and Economic Growth concerning the planning service standards, particularly in response to the increased workload that had been experienced recently, and the various concerns raised regarding some procedural issues, principally in terms of communication and consultation on

planning applications.

The presentation to the Group covered:

- Service Standards
- Planning Communication
- Interpretation of Planning Policy
- Consultation process
- Procedures for determination of planning applications
- Conservation areas.

Following the presentation, the Service Manager - Planning explained that the Service Standards had been developed to bring about improvements in service delivery in response to a significant increase in workload and to provide a more structured approach for communications with applicants, agents and councillors. He added that the number of planning applications received in the last year had risen by 40% compared to the previous year and some improvements in service delivery had already been delivered.

Members were informed that the Service Standards aimed to bring greater transparency to the process, to ensure that applications were processed efficiently and within the timescales expected by the Government and to improve communications with applicants, agents and Councillors. Changes in process had been made to the notification of decisions as a result of the introduction of the Service Standards.

The Service Manager explained that, following the recent changes to the Standards, officers would now notify Ward Councillors and Parish and Town Councils/meetings of appeal decisions and non-material amendments, provide an update on progress at 4-5 weeks following receipt of the application and would also notify when an enforcement notice had been served. He added that, the taking of enforcement action was discretionary; officers aimed to resolve a breach issue by negotiation, with the formal enforcement action being taken as a last resort. Again, those who had made the complaint would be kept informed of progress.

Regarding consultation, the Service Manager informed the Group that the Regulations required that letters be sent to addresses which adjoined the application site allowing 21 days for comment, which would be extended if the timeframe included a Bank Holiday. Additionally, a site notice would be displayed, and a notice entered in the newspaper if required. As per the Regulations, consultation would be undertaken with relevant statutory bodies, Councillors, Town and Parish Councils. Although the Regulations did not require consultation with Parish meetings, the Council did consult with them; it was often the case that the Council exceeded the minimum requirements of the legislation.

Councillor Combellack asked that adjoining Parish Councils also be notified and cited the planning application for the poultry farm at Owthorpe and her request to notify Cropwell Bishop Parish Council. The Service Manager assured the Group that this had been done and the Chairman added that the application had been discussed at a Parish Council meeting.

The Service Manager explained that non-material amendments were when an applicant had changed their mind about what they wished to do. There was no statutory requirement for the Council to consult on these. He added that the scale of what was accepted as a 'non-material amendment' was determined by the size of the development.

The Service Manager informed the Group that conservation areas were treated seriously and that there was a statutory duty imposed on the Council to have special regard for conservation areas. This would be the subject of a report to the Group at its meeting in July.

The Chairman asked whether a large number of enforcement notices was seen as a failure to the Council. The Service Manager explained that the Council had strengthened its approach to the issue of enforcement notices and planning officers worked alongside other neighbourhood services, for example Environmental Health, to address issues with developments that caused a nuisance especially with noise. Members were assured that officers would not hesitate to take action where it was considered appropriate to do so.

Members asked whether sufficient resource was available to handle the volume of planning applications and whether those officers who had left the Council had been attracted by higher salaries elsewhere. The Service Manager assured Members that the issue of securing adequate resources was experienced by other local authorities. The Planning Services Consultant added that the previous 12 months had been challenging with a large number of planning applications received and a number of experienced staff obtaining employment elsewhere; all of which had resulted in a significant backlog of planning applications and some dissatisfaction by applicants in the service provided. With circa 3,000 planning applications received per year, there were usually 400 that were being processed through the system, and in the last 12 months this level had been exceeded. The new Service Standards came into place in November 2021. He added that agency staff had been employed which had increased the number of planning officers above the establishment and this had enabled the backlog to be cleared. He explained that the Council was in a fortunate position, as agency staff could be employed at short notice in periods of high demand and their contract terminated with two-weeks' notice should the level of planning applications falls, for example due to some of the issues being faced in the construction industry such as cost of and poor availability of building materials. The Planning Team had previously reported three vacancies, one of which had been filled in the last week. Officers were recruiting to the remaining two vacancies. Positive feedback had been received on the working conditions offered and the range and variety of planning applications handled. He added that the Council had undertaken a salary benchmarking exercise with other councils which highlighted that the Council was competitive in terms of salary. He acknowledged that salary was a key factor when seeking employment, which was higher in the private sector, but highlighted that other factors, such as working conditions and pension scheme, were also important.

The Chairman expressed concern about the loss of corporate memory following the departure of experienced staff. The Service Manager agreed that the retention of corporate memory was a challenge with a changing staff

resource but explained that officers were encouraged to retain accurate records. He assured Members that there was a good level of experience within the team.

Members asked whether the level of non-determinations in planning applications created additional work for the Planning Team and whether working practices could be reviewed. The Planning Services Consultant agreed that this had been the case, which was why the new arrangements had been introduced, with the Agent updated at the 5-week stage. He added that the Council had retained exceptionally high standards especially at the start and end of the process and highlighted that the processes were efficient compared to some other local authorities. However, he acknowledged that the process for communicating progress with an application needed improvement and the employment of new agency staff helped with this as they brought fresh ideas to the team. The process would be reviewed and streamlined once the team was fully staffed and had stabilised the workload.

Councillor Butler asked whether the resource and recruitment issues had affected the issue of enforcement notices. The Planning Services Consultant responded by saying that he did not believe that this was the case, rather that the team was efficient and more proactive than was the case in other local authorities, carrying out rapid engagement with the developer concerned in order to avoid the need to issue an enforcement notice, which could lead to a lengthy court process. All enforcement cases were inspected within one day of notification and were then prioritised, with cases in conservation areas receiving a higher priority.

Members said they were very pleased to see different Planning Officers coming to Planning Committee to present their reports. They did, however, express concern about the length of some of the presentations delivered and the level of detail, included in delegated decisions, but acknowledged that presenting to a committee could be a daunting experience. The Service Manager assured members that this had been addressed with officers and were informed that, as the Council was quasi-judicial, a certain level of detail needed to be included should the case be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Councillor Combellack commended planning officers for the five-week update she had received on a planning application, which was thorough, excellently written and helpful.

The Chairman expressed concern about the consistent application of planning policy by planning officers. The Service Manager explained that the role of the planning officer was to apply and interpret policies, and to apply weight to various issues within the planning application. The Planning Policy Team would also be consulted on complex applications. He assured Members that no one person in the authority had the autonomy to make decisions; there were checks and balances in the system to ensure consistency.

Councillor Barney expressed concern about the role that Neighbourhood Plans play within the planning system, especially in the consideration of appeals. Members were informed that Neighbourhood Plans were useful and communities who wish to should develop them.

Councillor Butler questioned whether applicants were clear of their responsibilities in removing the site notice once determined and whether members should have a role in removing them in their areas. The Service Manager informed the Group that site notices clearly set out the responsibilities of the applicant to remove the notice and officers did remove them if they saw them when out on visits. However, he welcomed the support of Members in doing so in their areas providing the 'date for comment' set out on the notice had passed more than five weeks ago.

Members expressed concern about the definition of 'near neighbour' in the consultation process and how this could be strengthened. They were informed that it was usually those neighbours which shared a boundary with the development and that it was the responsibility of the planning officer to determine whether additional consultation was required, following a site visit. He advised Members, that should they feel that additional consultations were necessary, this should be raised with the relevant planning officer. Councillor Combella suggested that applications be accompanied by a google earth view so that near neighbours could be identified. The Service Manager explained that the planning team would conduct the initial application and asked members to keep in contact with the relevant case officer should they feel that other consultations were required. He clarified that anyone could comment on a planning application, not just those who had received a formal letter notifying them of the application.

Members expressed concern about the delays experienced in uploading comments on planning applications to the website and were informed that this process had improved now that it was carried out by the Council's Business Support Unit allowing Planning Officers to focus on planning applications. All comments received were read thoroughly to ensure that nothing was offensive or contravened GDPR regulations. This took time, as such comments needed to be redacted before upload to the website. Councillor Combella suggested that the planning process be clearly set out on the reverse of letters sent out to consultees. The Service Manager agreed to include a link to the Council's website where the planning process was fully explained.

Members expressed concern that, within the Planning Portal, the links to some documents did not appear to work. The Service Manager agreed to investigate further and asked that Members report any issues immediately so that they could be addressed.

In response to questions about the operation of the hybrid mail system, the Service Manager informed the Group that hybrid mail operator printed and posted letters only; choosing the addresses for consultation was managed by officers at the Council. There were checks and balances within the system to clarify whether someone had been sent a letter, should this be questioned.

Members discussed the ongoing role of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group in overseeing the arrangements for planning communications following this report to the Committee. The Chairman asked that Members of the Group feed their comments and thoughts through him and the Vice Chairman so that they could be raised with senior officers. The Service Manager added that

timeliness was important so that issues could be addressed quickly and asked Members to contact senior officers/case officers to discuss day to day issues.

In considering the issue of ongoing monitoring, the Group agreed that an additional recommendation should be included.

It was moved by Councillor Butler and seconded by Councillor Clarke that:

“The Service Standards be reviewed in line with feedback received and in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair as well as other Members.”

The Motion was put and carried unanimously.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group:

- a) supports the updated service standards;
- b) supports the continuation of the current practices for the publicity of and consultations on planning applications; and
- c) agrees that the Service Standards be reviewed in line with feedback received and in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair as well as other Members.

23 **Work Programme**

The Chairman presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services, which detailed the proposed Growth and Development Scrutiny Group Work Programme for 2022/23. Members suggested that they would like to receive a report on ‘Alternative energy’ at a future meeting, possibly in September 2022. This would be discussed by COG at its meeting in May.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group consider its Work Programme and the following items for scrutiny at future meetings were agreed :

27 July 2022 (provisional date)

- Conservation Areas – Part Two
- Work Programme

21 September 2022 (provisional date)

- Covid-19 Business Recovery – Update
- Work Programme

4 January 2023 (provisional date)

- Work Programme

8 March 2023 (provisional)

- Work Programme

ACTION SHEET

Minute Item	Action	Officer responsible
4	Letters to Consultees to be revised to include a link to the website where the planning process was fully explained.	Service Manager – Planning
4	Officers to investigate and address issues with the document web links contained in the Planning Portal	Service Manager – Planning

The meeting closed at 6.21 pm.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank



Growth and Development Scrutiny Group

Wednesday, 27 July 2022

Conservation Areas - Part 2

Report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth

1. Summary

1.1. A previous report on Conservation in Rushcliffe was presented to Scrutiny in April 2021. At the conclusion of that session, a number of refined items for further scrutiny were presented and these include:

- how to undertake the review of Conservation Area Appraisals and encourage enhancements to Conservation Areas
- consider developing a list of non-designated heritage assets
- training for Planning Committee members regarding the potential for cumulative impact of development in a Conservation Area.

1.2. In addition, two further topic areas have been raised concerning the withholding of permitted development rights within conservation areas and the possible creation of Conservation Area Advisory Committees or a Conservation/Heritage Planning Sub-Committee.

1.3. This report is focused on addressing the above items/questions where further scrutiny has been requested.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group:

- a) promote to Councillors that they support this review process by helping to identify local groups within their communities with conservation areas who might be interested in assisting with a community lead in the review process, or confirm that no such group exists and that review will likely need to be 'top-down' in their respective area
- b) provide comment on a 'crowd sourced' approach to contribute to the development of a local list of non-designated heritage assets including putting forward suggestions of local groups/organisations to engage with
- c) support the proposed mechanism for addition of assets to a local list as detailed within the report
- d) Support officer recommendation not to create either conservation area advisory committees or a heritage planning sub-committee at this time for the reasons detailed within the report.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. To facilitate the review of conservation areas in a way which maximises community involvement and ownership in the process and its outcomes.
- 3.2. To lead to the delivery of an initial set of entries onto a 'local list' of non-designated heritage assets and to progress the adoption of a mechanism by which that list can be added-to and maintained via a practical mechanism, given that the need to add to the list (at least initially) may be fairly frequent.
- 3.3. To provide Councillors' training on matters relating to assessing impact, as well as cumulative impact, upon heritage assets including conservation areas.

4. Supporting Evidence

How will Rushcliffe undertake the review of Conservation Area Appraisals and encourage enhancements to Conservation Areas

- 4.1. The last time conservation areas were reviewed in Rushcliffe (c. 2008-2011) this work took place over a period of approximately three years and at a time when the conservation team at the Council had two full time conservation officers as well as overlapping with a third officer on reduced hours leading towards retirement. It is considered, and has been experienced to be the case over the past nine years, that the capacity does not exist with a single conservation officer to undertake a comprehensive review over any reasonable timescale. Since October 2021, and the last scrutiny of 'conservation areas', the Director for Development and Economic Growth has secured funding for the creation of a time limited post, for three years, to undertake a project to review conservation areas in Rushcliffe. Recruitment has already been completed and a successful candidate already taken up post on 4 July.
- 4.2. Latest best practise guidance advocates maximising community engagement up to and including facilitating community led reviews. Greater support than with the development of neighbourhood plans is important and possible. It is important to ensure that community groups understand the purpose of appraisals, what they can and cannot do and that appraisals define character and management plans set objectives but neither type of document can create or amend policy.
- 4.3. It is anticipated that most larger communities will have community groups interested in taking a community led approach, with sufficient members to create the time necessary for this approach to work. It is also recognised that some of the smaller conservation areas, including many that do not have representative groups like parish councils, may lack established groups with enough interested persons to take this approach.
- 4.4. Extensive community involvement, to the extent of the community undertaking much of the groundwork is identified as a potential approach in section 28 of the latest best practise guidance (Historic England Advice Note 1 [Second Edition]), with the guidance identifying benefits of this approach in terms of the community feeling 'ownership' of the results.

- 4.5. The Council will, however, offer a more top-down approach in smaller communities where residents are not able to take on parts of the task of review themselves.
- 4.6. It will not be possible to undertake a review of all conservation areas simultaneously, even if most were community led as the capacity to provide the needed support and guidance will not exist. As such Councillors may be in a position to pre-empt review of their areas by laying the groundwork and identifying local groups or volunteers, or otherwise being able to confirm that no such group exists, and that a top-down approach will be needed in their areas.

Consider developing a list of non-designated heritage assets

- 4.7. The adopted Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 includes a policy which was included to enable the production of a 'local list' of non-designated heritage assets ([Policy 28 and supporting text paragraphs 9.13 – 9.15](#)).
- 4.8. Whilst the policy basis for such a list was secured through the Local Plan a mechanism by which such a list could be produced within existing resources has not been developed to date.
- 4.9. Research by the Institute of Historic Building Conservation suggests that only "around half" of local authorities have 'Local Lists', however that research did not consider the extent or quality of such lists.
- 4.10. The most effective way of producing a rapid baseline list would be to crowd source the work and to set up a mechanism to allow residents to nominate buildings or structures for inclusion, again this is in line with national best practise and would also promote community ownership and engagement in the process.
- 4.11. Whilst this would be an effective way of quickly growing a list, at least initially, it would risk patchy coverage as residents of some parts of the Borough might be more active in this regard than others.
- 4.12. Whilst some potential list candidates could be identified by the Project Officer as part of conservation area review it should be noted that identification of non-designated heritage assets is a more meaningful activity where directed at buildings and structures which are located outside of conservation areas.
- 4.13. Positive buildings within conservation areas form part of the designated heritage asset of the conservation area and there are specific policies within the NPPF designed to give weight to their retention (paragraph 207). As such positive buildings within conservation areas make use of NPPF policies for designated heritage assets and already benefit from consideration at a higher level than inclusion on a list of non-designated assets can achieve.
- 4.14. This does not imply that it is pointless to identify non-designated heritage assets within conservation areas, simply that the greatest benefit of creating a list will come from identifying unlisted buildings and structures outside of the

boundaries of conservation areas which would otherwise have no protection under heritage policies unless identified reactively as part of an application process.

- 4.15. Whilst some such buildings might be at the fringes of conservation areas many more will be in remote locations. This is part of what makes survey highly time consuming, but it also means that some not immediately obvious groups, such as walking or ramblers groups, might be in a position to make important contributions to a crowd sourced survey.
- 4.16. Members and parishes may be well placed to identify local groups which might be well placed to contribute to such a project with some training from council officers.
- 4.17. Review of proposed buildings/structures will still require officer involvement and it should be noted that the Local Plan Policy sets out criteria which buildings / structures must meet for consideration, meeting the necessary criteria does not automatically qualify a building for inclusion and a degree of sorting and assessment will be required.
- 4.18. Final shortlists could be adopted in a relatively straightforward way via meetings with the relevant ward Councillors and the planning portfolio holder on a ward-by ward basis.
- 4.19. Such a project is, by its nature, never complete and once embarked upon there will be a requirement for ongoing updates as new candidate buildings are identified as well as potentially targeting field work on under-represented parishes and wards.
- 4.20. The ongoing work can be partly handled in the same way, seeking suggestions from the community, perhaps occasionally re-advertising the mechanisms via Rushcliffe Reports. If there are areas of the Borough which feel under-represented, then there may be a need for some additional survey work by the Council. This may be a task that a potential sandwich year planning student placement could assist with and would be more manageable if it is targeted on specific areas rather than district wide.
- 4.21. A point has been made in connection to consideration of local listing that the Historic Environment Record (HER) maintained by NCC is 'out of date' on the basis that it does not include all buildings identified as 'positive buildings' within conservation area appraisals. It should be noted that the HER and the identification of positive buildings within conservation areas do not serve the same function or follow the same criteria, the lack of overlap between these two sets of data would not imply that the HER is incorrect or out-of-date.

Training for Planning Committee members regarding the potential for cumulative impact of development in a Conservation Area

- 4.22. Initial training is provided to members on planning committee as part of their initial adoption onto committee. However, the range and nuance of the planning system is such that this training does not cover all of the planning system in terms of either depth or breadth. Whilst subsequent training

sessions have been arranged, including a recent one on design, the assessment of impact on the settings of heritage assets is not a topic that has been covered previously.

- 4.23. Whilst conservation areas are assets in their own rights the established best practise guidance for assessing the setting of heritage assets is highly useful in considering the impacts of proposed development within conservation areas as each component of a conservation area could be considered to have a setting of its own, the context of a street and the setting of positive unlisted building could be examples.
- 4.24. Training on addressing impact of proposals on heritage assets does not form a substantial part of the training package provided to planning committee members and any consideration of cumulative impacts must be built upon an understanding of how individual impacts are considered in the first instance.
- 4.25. To address this shortcoming an evening training session has been arranged for after the summer holiday season from 6 to 8pm on the evening of Wednesday 28 September 2022. Whilst the session is primarily intended for members of planning committee, the Planning Committee Chairman is happy for any Councillor with an interest to attend.

Withholding of Permitted Development Rights When Approving New Development in Conservation Areas

- 4.26. It is reasonably common practice to withhold permitted development rights on new developments, or at the point of change of use when a site would gain a different class of permitted development rights, where the use of those rights may result in detrimental change to the approved scheme.
- 4.27. This is particularly the case in areas which could be described as 'design sensitive' including conservation areas and barn conversions.
- 4.28. A point has recently been made that sometimes after having chosen to withhold permitted development rights the Council has subsequently granted planning permission for something which would otherwise have been permitted development. The point being raised was that it seemed counter-intuitive to withhold a right only to allow change which would have fallen under that right anyway.
- 4.29. Permitted development rights are drafted in a technical fashion and set limits in terms of scale, volume, height, closeness to boundary, position in relation to highways. Importantly they set no less tangible criteria and there is no requirement that permitted development be well designed or tasteful.
- 4.30. When a new dwelling is created, either built or through change of use, it gains residential permitted development rights unless they are specifically withheld. Each class of permitted development can be withheld individually, however it is not practical to use a condition to grant but amend a permitted development right. The right is either granted, or not, in full.

- 4.31. When considering whether to withhold a permitted development right some thought must be given to what the consequences could be if it were not withheld.
- 4.32. Perhaps the easiest example is the Part 1 Class B PD right which allows additions to a roof up to 50 cubic metres in volume on non-front elevations provided 'materials of similar appearance' are used, provided the addition is set in 200mm from eaves and no part is higher than the highest part of the existing roof.
- 4.33. At its worst this could allow large flat roofed box-dormers on three out of four elevations of a house, fundamentally changing its architectural appearance. Clearly, in a design sensitive area the ability, to do such work without the need to obtain permission is undesirable and as such this right might reasonably be withheld.
- 4.34. The same permitted development right would also allow a number of small, traditional style dormer windows along just a rear-facing elevation. There may well be no issue with such work, indeed it may be entirely compatible with the character of the building; however, the permitted development right is either granted or withheld in full. You cannot allow one type of roof extension as PD without also allowing the other. Therefore, if withheld even the 'acceptable' traditional dormers would need to apply for planning permission.
- 4.35. Given this explanation, it can be seen why there are circumstances where PD rights are withheld only for work which would otherwise have been permitted under that class to be granted planning permission.

Conservation Area Advisory Committees or Heritage Planning Sub-Committee

- 4.36. The idea of conservation area advisory committees has been raised, as has the idea of a standing planning sub-committee to consider heritage implications on applications.
- 4.37. Planning Committee has recently been restructured and its membership reduced to 10 members inclusive of the chairman and vice-chairman. As such any sub-committee would, necessarily, either consist of a minimum of three members, or be attended by half of the members of the committee.
- 4.38. Sub-committees of this type or not typically utilised as standing functions to routinely pre-vet proposals destined for planning committee. Sub-committees are commonly formed to consider time-limited projects or investigate new or innovative ways of working. For example, a sub-committee might be formed to consider the potential impacts of a new type of development beginning to appear within the Borough, or the implications of new legislation so as to report back to the parent committee.
- 4.39. The creation of a sub-committee of this type would also necessitate more time between publication of agendas and planning committee meetings to allow time for the sub-committee to also meet and report back.

- 4.40. It is not considered that the sub-committee approach would be practical.
- 4.41. Conservation Area Advisory Committees are intended to serve individual conservation areas and to be made up of local residents “who are able to bring expertise or understanding of the area's history and amenity”. Such committees are, however, council committees and what legislation exists to allow their creation allows them to be created by local planning authorities.
- 4.42. As such any meeting would need to be attended by at least one Council officer, and likely one Councillor, most likely one of the local ward Councillors. If the intention is for these committees to scrutinise and advise upon individual applications then they would necessarily have to meet at least every 6 weeks, or 9 times per year. Given we currently have 30 adopted conservation areas this could potentially result in 270 meetings a year, or more than one for every working day of the year.
- 4.43. The potential pressure on time and resource created as a result of establishing such committees would be impossible to accommodate within existing resource. It would be problematic to create such groups from some conservation areas and deny others the same opportunity.
- 4.44. As such it is not recommended that either the creation of conservation area advisory committees or a heritage planning sub-committee would be realistically achievable at this time.

5. Risks and Uncertainties

- 5.1. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty on Local Planning Authorities when exercising any of its functions in a conservation area to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Failure to apply the duty when considering planning applications can result in an unsound decision and the risk of a successful legal challenge.

6. Implications

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. Provision has been made in the budget of £39k per annum for an additional temporary three-year post of Project Officer: Conservation Area Review.

6.1.2. Mechanisms for crowd sourcing nominations to a local list should be possible using existing IT facilities or via free to use software such as editable and sharable google maps.

6.2. Legal Implications

6.2.1. There are no legal implications associated with the consideration of this report and the recommendation.

6.3. Equalities Implications

6.3.1. The Council is committed to delivering all planning activities in accordance with its Equality and Diversity Policy and will embed the principles of that policy in its approach to regulatory functions. The planning process, including consideration of impacts on heritage assets, relates to land and property and personal circumstances will rarely be a material planning consideration. Therefore, the Council will treat all people equally and fairly, irrespective of their nationality, political views, race, gender, disability, age, religion, or sexual orientation.

6.3.2. Adoption of non-designated heritage assets onto a local list would be on the basis of the merits of that asset rather than any personal characteristics of the individual(s) or organisations who currently own or are responsible for that asset, as such there should be no equalities implications arising from the formulation of a local list.

6.4. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Implications

6.4.1. There are no crime and disorder implications associated with the consideration of this report and the recommendation.

7. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
Efficient Services	The delivery of an efficient and effective planning service is consistent with the Council's corporate priority to transform the Council to enable the delivery of efficient high-quality services.
Sustainable Growth	The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable growth. One of the three overarching objectives to sustainable development is the environmental objective. Development should contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. There is a need to consider carefully the impacts of development on the special architectural and historic significance of conservation areas to ensure that development preserves or enhances the significance of these areas and that any harm is justified by wider public benefits.
The Environment	The preservation or enhancement of the conservation areas within the Borough is an important aspect of the planning process and protecting our historic environment.

8. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that members of the Scrutiny Group note the content of the report and presentation to the Group, specifically:

- a) promote to Councillors that they support this review process by helping to identify local groups within their communities with conservation areas who might be interested in assisting with a community lead in the review process, or confirm that no such group exists and that review will likely need to be 'top-down' in their respective area
- b) provide comment on a 'crowd sourced' approach to contribute to the development of a local list of non-designated heritage assets including putting forward suggestions of local groups/organisations to engage with
- c) support the proposed mechanism for addition of assets to a local list as detailed within the report
- d) Support officer recommendation not to create either conservation area advisory committees or a heritage planning sub-committee at this time for the reasons detailed within the report.

For more information contact:	James Bate Principal Planning Officer – Monitoring and Implementation jbate@rushcliffe.gov.uk 0115 9148483
Background papers Available for Inspection:	None
List of appendices (if any):	None

This page is intentionally left blank



Growth and Development Scrutiny Group

Wednesday, 27 July 2022

Work Programme

Report of the Director of Finance and Corporate Services

1. Summary

- 1.1. The work programme is a standing item for discussion at each meeting of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group. In determining the proposed work programme due regard has been given to matters usually reported to the Group and the timing of issues to ensure best fit within the Council's decision making process.
- 1.2. The table does not take into account any items that need to be considered by the Group as special items. These may occur, for example, through changes required to the Constitution or financial regulations, which have an impact on the internal controls of the Council.
- 1.3. The future work programme will be updated and agreed at the next meeting of the Corporate Overview Group on 6 September 2022, including any items raised via the scrutiny matrix.

Members are asked to propose future topics to be considered by the Group, in line with the Council's priorities which are:

- Quality of Life;
- Efficient Services;
- Sustainable Growth; and
- The Environment

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Group agrees the work programme as set out in the table below.

21 September 2022

- Covid-19 Business Recovery Update
- Sewerage infrastructure and discharge within Rushcliffe
- Work Programme

4 January 2023

- UK Shared Prosperity Fund

- Work Programme

8 March 2023

- Work Programme

3. Reason for Recommendation

To enable the Council's scrutiny arrangements to operate efficiently and effectively.

For more information contact:	Pete Linfield Director of Finance and Corporate Services 0115 914 8349 plinfield@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	None.
List of appendices (if any):	None.