



**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 APRIL 2018**

Held at 6.30 pm in the the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West  
Bridgford

**PRESENT:**

Councillors R Butler (Chairman), J Stockwood (Vice-Chairman), B Buschman, N Clarke, J Donoghue (substitute for J Greenwood), S Hull (substitute for R Jones), Mrs M Males, R Mallender (substitute for S Mallender), M Edwards, Mrs J Smith and J Thurman

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor A Brown  
Five members of the public

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

M Elliott	Constitutional Services Team Leader
L Marshall	Area Planning Officer
A Pegram	Service Manager - Communities
I Norman	Legal Services Manager

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillors R Jones, J Greenwood and S Mallender

**41 Declarations of Interest**

17/03015/FUL - 99 Wilford Lane, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire, NG2 7RN – Councillor Donoghue declared a non-pecuniary interest as she personally knew the applicant.

**42 Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 March 2018**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 March, 2018 were approved as correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**43 Planning Applications**

The Committee considered the written report of the Executive Manager - Communities relating to the following applications, which had been circulated previously.

**Item 1 - 17/03015/FUL - Demolition of garage and remodelling of dormer bungalow to form two storey dwelling with side and rear extension - 54 Park Lane Sutton Bonington Nottinghamshire LE12 5NH**

## **Updates**

There were no updates reported.

In accordance with the Council's Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee Mr Ian Storm of Storm Design (agent for the applicant), Mr Philip Watson (objector) and Councillor Andrew Brown (Ward Councillor), addressed the meeting.

## **COMMENTS**

Members of the committee were concerned about the scale and mass of the proposed development in relation to the size and scale of the original dwelling, and were of the opinion that it would cause an unacceptable and overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. Members of the committee were also of the opinion that the proposed development was out of character with the immediate streetscene.

## **DECISION**

### **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS**

1. The proposed development by virtue of its height, scale, bulk and mass would result in unacceptable overbearing impacts on the immediate neighbouring properties at 52 and 56 Park Lane. The proposed development would also be out of scale and character with the neighbouring properties due to the proposed two storey scale, form, mass and bulk being substantially more dominant within the street scene than the original building and the adjacent dwellings.

The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing the Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy which specifies that development will be assessed in terms of, inter alia, the following criteria:

- a) structure, texture and grain, including street patterns, plot sizes, orientation and positioning of buildings and the layout of spaces;
  - b) impact on the amenity of occupiers or nearby residents;
  - e) density and mix; and
  - f) massing, scale and proportion;
2. The proposal is also contrary to Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan which states that planning permission for new development, changes of use, conversions or extensions will be granted provided that, inter-alia:
    - (d) The scale, density, height, massing, design, layout and materials of the proposals are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area. They should not lead to an over-intensive form of development, be overbearing in relation to

neighbouring properties, nor lead to undue overshadowing or loss of privacy and should ensure that occupants of new and existing dwellings have a satisfactory degree of privacy.

The adverse impacts of granting planning permission for the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal would also be contrary to guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Donoghue who declared an interest in the following item left the room at this and did not take part in the subsequent discussion and vote.

**Item 2 - 18/00327/FUL - Demolish existing kitchen extension and construct single storey rear extension and garden steps - 99 Wilford Lane, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire, NG2 7RN**

**Updates**

There were no updates reported.

**DECISION**

**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE REASONS SET OUT IN THE REPORT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.**

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

[To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004].

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1802-05 Rev. A, 1802-04 Rev. C received on 12th March 2018, and Site Location Plan and Block Plan received on 6th February 2018.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan].

3. The extension(s) hereby permitted shall be constructed in suitable facing and roofing materials as specified in the submitted application to match the elevations of the existing property.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan].

4. Prior to the extension and raised terrace hereby approved being brought into use, a close boarded fence with a height of 1.8 metres above the level of the terrace shall be erected on the north east boundary as shown on drawing numbers 1802-05 Rev. A and 1802-04 Rev. C.

Thereafter the fence shall be retained and maintained for the life of the development.

[To ensure a satisfactory development in the interests of amenity and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

Councillor Donoghue re-joined the meeting at this point.

### **Item 3 - 18/00491/FUL - Single storey rear and two storey side extension - 44 Nottingham Road, Keyworth, Nottinghamshire, NG12 5GT**

#### **Updates**

There were no updates reported.

#### **DECISION**

#### **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE REASONS SET OUT IN THE REPORT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.**

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

[To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004].

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 Site Location Plan, 1:500 Block Plan, Roof plan and 1:50 Floor Plans and 1:100 Elevations all received on 28th February 2018 and "13ccd Technical detail" received on 28th March 2018.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan].

3. The extension(s) hereby permitted shall be constructed in suitable facing and roofing materials as specified in the submitted application to match the elevations of the existing property.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan].

#### **Notes to Applicant**

This grant of planning permission does not alter the private legal situation with regard to the carrying out of any works involving land which you do not own or control. You will need the consent of the owner(s) involved before any such works are started.

The provisions of the Party Wall Act 1996 may apply in relation to the boundary with the neighbouring property. A Solicitor or Chartered Surveyor may be able to give advice as to whether the proposed work falls within the scope of this Act and the necessary measures to be taken.

#### 44 **Planning Appeals**

The report of the Executive Manager - Communities was submitted and noted.

The meeting closed at 7.40 pm.

CHAIRMAN