

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, 14 MARCH 2019**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors R Butler (Chairman), J Stockwood (Vice-Chairman), B Buschman,
N Clarke, M Edwards, S Hull, Mrs M Males, S Mallender, F Purdue-Horan,
Mrs J Smith and J Thurman

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors Khan, Jeffreys

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

M Dunne
D Mitchell
I Norman
A Pegram

Principal Area Planning Officer
Executive Manager - Communities
Legal Services Manager
Service Manager - Communities

APOLOGIES:

There were no apologies.

36 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

37 Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 February 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 14 February 2019 were declared
a true record and were signed by the Chairman.

38 Planning Applications

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

**18/02821/FUL – Development of a crematorium and memorial gardens
with associated access, parking and landscaping – Land East of Main
Road and South of Stragglethorpe Road, Cotgrave, Nottinghamshire.**

As ward Councillor for Cotgrave, Councillor Richard Butler left the committee at
this point and Councillor John Stockwood took the role as Chairman.

Updates

A representation from the applicant providing additional information regarding site sections between application site and Thorntons Holt was received after the agenda had been published and was circulated before the meeting.

In accordance with the Council's Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee Andy Marshall (applicant), Simon Jones (objector) and Councillor Christine Jeffreys (ward councillor) addressed the committee.

Comments

Members of the Committee thought that the quantitative and qualitative data provided did not meet the criteria of basic need required to amount to 'very special circumstances' that would outweigh the harm caused by the proposal which is deemed inappropriate development in the green belt.

DECISION

THE ABOVE PLANNING APPLICATION WAS REFUSED PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON.

1. The site falls within the Green Belt as defined by Saved Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan 1996 Policy ENV15 . The proposal would involve a new building in the Green Belt and a form of development which does not feature as one of the exceptions to inappropriate development within the closed lists in paragraphs 145 and 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore, the proposal amounts to inappropriate development, which is harmful by definition. The Borough Council, as Local Planning Authority, does not consider that it has been adequately demonstrated that very special circumstances exist, including quantitative and qualitative need for a crematorium at this location, to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. A decision to refuse planning permission would accord with paragraph 143 of the NPPF which states that 'inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances' and would be contrary to the objectives of Chapter 13 'Protecting Green Belt Land' of the National Planning Policy Framework and the objectives of Policy 4 'Nottingham - Derby Green Belt' of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.

Councillor Butler re-joined the committee at this point and regained his position as Chairman.

18/02894/OUT – Outline planning permission for construction of a 3/4 bedroom bungalow and access (with all other matters reserved)

Updates

There were no updates reported.

DECISION

PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS SET OUT IN THE REPORT.

1. The proposal would extend the built up area of a sporadic ribbon of properties and an encroachment into the open countryside, resulting in significant harm to the character and openness of the open countryside and the character and appearance of the area. The site falls outside of the key settlements for growth identified under Policy 3 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and the site would not constitute a small scale infill or exception site for local needs as set out in 3.3.17 of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 3.9 of the emerging Local Plan Part 2 lists a number of smaller settlements which are capable of accommodating a limited number of dwellings. Paragraph 3.10 states that beyond these allocations, development will be limited to small scale infill development, defined as development of small gaps within the existing built fabric of the village or previously developed sites whose development would not have a harmful impact on the pattern or character of the area. The proposed dwelling sits outside any village and would not constitute infill development as envisaged in 3.3.17 and would, therefore, be contrary to policy 3 of the Core Strategy.

The proposal is also contrary to Policy HOU2 (Development on Unallocated Sites) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan (2006) which states: *"Planning permission for new unallocated development within settlements will be granted providing that:*

- a) the development of the site would not extend the built-up area of the settlement;*
- b) the development would not have an adverse visual impact or be prominent from locations outside the settlement*
- c) the proposal does not fall within an area of sporadic or ribbon development outside a settlement, nor is situated in the countryside"*

The proposal is contrary to Policy EN19a (Impact On The Green Belt And Open Countryside) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan (2006) which states, inter alia, that development must demonstrate that: *"there will be no significant adverse impact upon the open nature of the green belt or open countryside, or upon important buildings, landscape features or views"*

The proposal would not fall within any of permitted uses set out under Policy 22, para. 2 of the emerging Local Plan Part 2 and it would be contrary to para. 3 of this policy which states that development will be permitted where:

- "c) it does not create or extend ribbon development"*

The proposal would be contrary to paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework where development should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. A decision to refuse planning permission would accord with paragraph 130 of the NPPF which states

that "Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents".

19/00172/FUL – Increase roof height of bungalow to create first floor living accommodation and external alterations - 6 Haileybury Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire

Updates

A representation from the applicant which stated their intent to withdraw their current appeal for the previously refused application (18/02185/FUL) should this current application be approved was received after the agenda had been published and was circulated before the meeting.

In accordance with the Council's Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee Nick Grace (applicant's representative), Ian Jones (objector) and Councillor Karrar Khan (ward councillor) addressed the committee.

DECISION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE FOLLOWING 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;

Proposed floor plans, site block plan and OS plan 623 002 revision I updated 21.01.2019

Proposed elevations, street scene, site block plan and OS plan 623 003 revision B updated 21.01.2019

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan and Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy.]

3. The materials specified in the application shall be used for the external walls and roof of the development hereby approved and no additional or alternative materials shall be used.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe

Notes to Applicant

This permission does not give any legal right for any work on, over or under land or buildings outside the application site ownership or affecting neighbouring property, including buildings, walls, fences and vegetation within that property. If any such work is anticipated, the consent of the adjoining land owner must first be obtained. The responsibility for meeting any claims for damage to such features lies with the applicant.

You are advised to ensure disturbance to neighbours is kept to a minimum during construction by restricting working hours to Monday to Friday 7.00am to 7.00pm, Saturday 8.00am to 5.00pm and by not working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. If you intend to work outside these hours you are requested to contact the Environmental Health Officer on 0115 9148322.

19/0013/FUL – Resubmission of applications 18/02305/FUL for the erection of a two storey side extension – 2 Bishops Road, Bingham, Nottinghamshire

As ward Councillor for Bingham West, Councillor John Stockwood left the committee at this point.

Updates

There were no updates reported.

In accordance with the Council's Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee Christina Pankiw (objector) and Councillor John Stockwood (ward councillor) addressed the committee.

Comments

Members of the committee expressed concerns that the proposed extension would have an overbearing impact on the house and garden at 19 Hill Drive, to the detriment of the amenities of occupants of this property.

DECISION

THE ABOVE APPLICATION WAS REFUSED PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.

1. The proposed extension would have an overbearing effect on the house and garden of 19 Hill Drive resulting in a significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of this property. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of The Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework specifically paragraphs 127 and 130.

The meeting closed at 9.22 pm.

CHAIRMAN