

21/03205/REM

Applicant Mr & Mrs J Kent

Location Chestnut Farm Chestnut Lane Barton In Fabis Nottinghamshire

Proposal Application for matters reserved under application ref 19/00412/OUT for approval of access, appearance, landscaping and layout and scale for demolition of existing buildings and construction of a residential scheme for 3 dwellings

Ward Gotham

Full details of the application can be found [here](#).

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site comprises an area of gravel hardstanding currently in use for the storage of vehicles and equipment/ materials in relation to an arboricultural and grounds maintenance company. There was previously a large open sided barn structure in the centre of the site which has been removed since the determination of the outline application. There is a linear single and two storey traditional brick barn running along the northern boundary of the yard, along with a recently constructed outbuilding which are currently in use by the arboricultural and grounds maintenance company. These fall outside of the current application site.
2. To the north there is a residential property at 18 Chestnut Lane, with a converted barn to the north east at The Old Slaughterhouse. The southern boundary of the site abuts the residential curtilage of 8 Chestnut Lane and the rear boundary of The Forge. There is a traditional brick barn to the south east corner of the site associated with The Old Forge. There is a neighbouring farmyard to the south east at Oliver's Yard.
3. The site falls within the Green Belt and within Flood Zone 3.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

4. Outline planning permission was granted in 2019 for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a residential scheme of up to 5 dwellings, with all matters reserved. The reserved matters application seeks planning application for the erection of three detached two storey dwellings and associated access. Plot 1 would be positioned to the front (west) of the site with Plots 2 and 3 to the rear (east), all served off a single spur road using the existing access from Chestnut Lane. Plots 1 and 3 would comprise 4- bed dwellings both with an attached garage with an additional guest bedroom above, Plot 2 would comprise a 4-bed dwelling with a detached garage. The dwellings would be traditional in form, constructed in brick and featuring parapet roof edges, detailing to the eaves and elements of brick

detailing. The rear elevation of each dwelling would feature floor-to-ceiling glazing and a Juliet balcony. Each dwelling would feature a raised rear terrace.

SITE HISTORY

5. 16/02246/OUT- Demolition of existing buildings. Construction of a residential scheme of up to 10 dwellings. Refused in 2016. It was considered a scheme of 10 dwellings would be overintensive and excessive in scale for the size of the site and that the resultant development would not constitute limited infill in the Green Belt. The scheme was considered to be at odds with the density, layout and pattern of the existing settlement.
6. 19/00412/OUT- Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a residential scheme of up to 5 dwellings (Outline planning permission with all matters reserved). Approved in 2019.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

7. The Ward Councillor (Cllr R Walker) submitted comments on 4 February 2022 in objection to the application with comments summarised as follows: Notwithstanding the incomplete information the application represents a significant change from the outline permission. The material alterations from the outline concern include a smaller overall plot leading to increased density, 2 storey rather than 1.5 storey design, extension of development significantly further east into the plot, and no longer a courtyard style design. The changes result in significant adverse cumulative impacts on neighbouring residential amenity arising from ground/ first floor windows and raised deck, overbearing due to the proximity to the boundary, and noise from the dwellings and raised deck. The development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt. The openness and permanence of the landscape is further damaged by the development extending further westward including the rear of the houses, garages and raised deck.
8. The Ward Councillor submitted further comments on 11 May following revisions to the application plans. In summary, the Ward Councillor considers that the alterations are only very minor and have not addressed the previous objections. Outline planning permission was granted on the basis of an indicative masterplan which showed a fair degree of set back from the eastern boundary and some consideration of the historical context. The current proposals bear no resemblance to this with little regard to the fabric of the village, which is acute given the deep agricultural tradition and heritage of the immediate vicinity. The plans omit the deep gardens and courtyard style reflective of the agricultural setting and the buildings are no longer 1.5 storey height. Impacts on neighbours arising from scale and massing, particularly the raised height of ground floor windows, have not been addressed. The reduction in the size of the plot compared to the outline permission pushes the buildings unreasonably closer to neighbours. It does not constitute limited infill in the Green Belt.
9. The Ward Councillor submitted further comments on 4 July following further revisions to the application plans, maintaining his objection. He considers the

previous reasons for objection have not been addressed. Increased building heights are an important consideration in assessing neighbour impacts. Plots 1 and 3 are too close to the neighbouring properties. The rear boundaries are too close to the east of the plot. Not limited infill.

Parish Council

10. Comments were received on 11 January 2022. The key points are summarised as follows:
 - a. Transport assessment based on the false premise that the agricultural business at Chestnut Farm will no longer operate.
 - b. Noise impacts on neighbours.
 - c. Holme Pit not included in table of SSSI's.
 - d. Potential chemical spills into ditch and winder impact.
 - e. Lack of reference to foul water treatment.
 - f. No sequential test.
 - g. Flood Risk Assessment fails to assess combined risks of a weather event.
 - h. No details of flood resilience/ mitigation measures.
 - i. Unclear if business will use hazardous chemicals.
 - j. Issues regarding Environmental Report.
 - k. Concerns regarding use of Oliver's Yard.

11. Further comments were received on 26 January 2022. The key points are summarised as follows:
 - a. Information provided in support of the application is incomplete.
 - b. No planning statement/ design and access.
 - c. Rbc policy 1 (development requirements) is of relevance).
 - d. Material change from outline.
 - e. Plot size significantly reduced.
 - f. Removal of land from site to ne corner.
 - g. Significantly larger houses than outline.
 - h. Massing of houses closer to that of the refused outline application.
 - i. Plot 1 closer to house to the south, loss of privacy.
 - j. Increased noise impacts.
 - k. Possible loss of southern boundary hedge due to proximity.
 - l. Modern rear windows/ balconies out of keeping.
 - m. Layout no longer compliments courtyard developments in the village.
 - n. Add odds with linear pattern of village.
 - o. Impact of backland development on amenity.
 - p. Proximity of plots 2-3 to eastern boundary compared to outline.
 - q. Conditions should be applied should planning be granted as detailed in the consultee response.

12. Further comments were received on 17 February 2022. The key points are summarised as follows: The comments are in addition to the previous comments and refer to the history of the village and the historic value and the setting of The Forge as a non-designated heritage asset.

13. Further comments were received on 10 May 2022. The points are summarised as follows:
 - a. Green belt.
 - b. Scale and massing.
 - c. Proximity to eastern boundary.

- d. Concerns regarding impact of septic tank, no details provided.
 - e. Not limited infill.
 - f. Design concerns.
 - g. Potential use of space above garages as habitable rooms.
 - h. Overlooking from windows.
14. Further comments were received on 30 June 2022. The points are summarised as follows:
- a. Proposal remains overbearing in rural setting.
 - b. Does not consider need for independent sewerage.
 - c. Septic tanks liked to be raised at height above floodplain, green belt intrusion.
 - d. Use of foliage to protect neighbouring privacy is impractical.
 - e. The parish council maintain their objection for these and the previously stated reasons.

Statutory and Other Consultees

15. Nottinghamshire County Council's Archaeology officer comments that provided condition 7 of 19/00412/OUT is applied, there are no further comments to make.
16. The Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) comment that a minimum access width of 4.8m plus 0.5m clearance on either side is required for a minimum distance of 8m to the rear of the highway boundary. A bin collection point will be required within the site adjacent to the public highway, positioned so as not to obstruct the required access width. It is recommended that the application is deferred to enable these points to be addressed.
17. The Borough Council's Environmental Health Officer comments that the sustainability statement refers to Air Source Heat Pumps however these are not reference on the plans. Further details of these are sought due to the potential to impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Conditions 8 and 9 of the outline permission are prior commencement conditions.
18. The Borough Council's Environmental Sustainability Officer comments that he is satisfied that the new hedgerow is appropriate, however the species of new tree planting to the boundary of the site does not appear to be shown. It is unclear what the ground treatment would be under the new planting, if this is to be vegetated that it is recommend that an appropriate wildflower and grass mix is used and an appropriate management regime implemented.
19. The Borough Council's Design and Landscape Officer has provided comments summarised as follows: The Chestnut in the south west corner of the site shown for removal is reasonably prominent and makes a pleasant contribution to the street scene. The tree report notes concerns regarding its structure and health. It is noted that the tree is close to the brick outbuildings of the adjacent property and it is therefore unlikely to meet the criteria for warranting protection as it is likely to outgrow the location and pose a risk of structural damage. The best approach is to seek replacement planting. The application drawing seems to show 3 new trees in this location and a detailed landscaping scheme should be conditioned for these and the other planting which is shown. Tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837 will need to be conditioned for the retained trees and boundary hedges.

20. The Borough Council's Monitoring and Implementation Officer has provided heritage comments summarised as follows: The Forge merits consideration as a non-designated heritage asset. It retains historic features including within its outbuildings. Weight should not be given to the 'sites sounds and smells of blacksmiths work' in contributing to the historic environment given that these activities are not still ongoing. The proposed residential use is unlikely to adversely impact on its setting. The coat of arms on the roadside frontage no longer exists and if it were to be restored then the development would not affect its context. The proposed development would not harm the historic understanding of The Forge. The immediate context is largely modern with 20th century houses to the west and portal-framed agricultural barns to the north and a modern barn conversion to the east. Further housing to the north would not harm the way in which the building can be experienced and understood as a non-designated heritage asset. Development outside of the site would not interfere with either the presence of The Old Forge within the streetscene or its relationship with outbuildings within its own site. The older buildings to the northern edge of Chestnut Farm are considered as a non-designated heritage asset which traditionally would have had a close relationship, inward-facing onto the former yard between them (now the garden of Chestnut Farm. The yard to the south makes little contribution to the significance of this group of buildings and its loss and redevelopment would not be significantly different to other modern housing development along Chestnut Lane which has filled space between earlier buildings.
21. It is not considered that the wider views north from within application site make a significant contribution to the special architectural or historic significance of The Forge. The interrelationship of the main house with its outbuildings and its presence on the main approach to the village are the most notable aspects of its setting insofar as setting contributes towards significance and these would be unaffected by proposals. It is not considered that the converted former stables to the north-east should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The proposed 3 dwellings would be larger than the 5 proposed at outline stage but their overall footprint and built form is in line with the illustrative masterplan in terms of the degree to which the site would be developed. The containment of development away from the eastern end of the site was a positive feature of the illustrative masterplan and it would be positive if the outbuilding could be pulled back to the west to avoid creep into less developed land. The illustrative masterplan had a more rural character due to its enclosed form around a yard. The development would be partly dwellings arranged gable end on to the street and partly backland development, there are examples of both forms of development nearby.
22. The reduced number of larger buildings has resulted in scales and massing which is less well related to existing dwellings nearby than the loose courtyard arrangement of the outline application. Whilst dormers are not a common feature in the village, their use is reasonable given the need to raise the ground floor level yet keep the overall heights as low as possible. It is considered that the application site in its current form makes little positive contribution to the significance of The Forge. The development would not result in harm to the special significance of nearby non-designated heritage assets via their settings, partly because the impact on context and views would not itself adversely affect significance and partly because the proposed development would not be greatly dissimilar to other nearby more recent

housing development. There would be no direct physical impacts on non-designated heritage assets arising from the proposed development and the proposal does not include any demolition of non-designated heritage assets.

Local Residents and the General Public

Comments can be found in full [here](#).

23. Objections have been received from 22 neighbours and member of public with comments summarised as follows:

- a. Scale, density, height, massing, layout and materials. unsympathetic to the character and appearance of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.
- b. Bungalows would be more appropriate due to raised floor levels.
- c. Two dwellings would work better, providing more open space.
- d. Dwellings unnecessarily large in height and width. Should be reduced in size.
- e. Dominant development harming rural character of village and landscape due to the height and requirement to raise floor levels due to flood risk.
- f. Cramped/ Over intensive form of development, density has increased due to reduction in site area and increased footprint of dwellings.
- g. A farmyard style/ courtyard development would be more in keeping with surrounding properties and would reflect the agricultural history of the site.
- h. Reduced length rear- gardens/ limited setback from eastern boundary a significant departure from the outline application, greater impact on openness of Green Belt. Loss of open strip of land to the east of the site, therefore the justification for the houses set out in the outline application no longer apply.
- i. Inadequate screening along rear boundary, visible from footpath to the east.
- j. Loss of agricultural character of original farmyard.
- k. Modern rear windows and balconies out of keeping with the character of this part of the village and the neighbouring properties.
- l. Would dominate the neighbouring houses and the 'low rise' original farm buildings.
- m. Adverse visual impact on bridleway users.
- n. Plot 1 extends beyond the rear of Nos. 2-8 Chestnut Lane with garages to the front-out of character with the existing frontage/ building line and does not reflect outline plans.
- o. Does not enhance open character of the Green Belt Rear.
- p. Plot 2 would be visible from New Road.
- q. Would block breaks in the built area and would block views east. Impact of view on Brandshill Wood which is an important part of the village setting.
- r. Screening and road between farm buildings and farmyard would result in a loss the agricultural heritage of the yard and farm buildings.
- s. The design should reflect the farming heritage rather than a suburban design. Would not complement existing farm buildings.

- t. Little difference in ridgelines to help blend the into the surrounding area.
- u. Raised patios out of keeping with rural/ agricultural context.
- v. Greater impact on openness of the Green Belt than the previous Dutch barn.
- w. Eastern hedge unlikely to be an effective screen and native trees should be incorporated into it.
- x. No clear details of materials.
- y. Dormer windows and prominent barge boards out of keeping.
- z. Impact on openness of Green Belt from the garage with home office above. This could become a habitable room extending plot 2 further east.
- aa. Proximity of buildings to neighbouring properties.
- bb. Dwellings concentrated to one side of the site, close to the boundary, impacting neighbouring privacy and living space.
- cc. Proximity of plots 1 and 3 to southern boundary.
- dd. Potential loss of southern boundary hedge screening, dwellings should be set back to leave space for the hedge without blocking sunlight. Narrow space would preclude boundary tree planting.
- ee. Loss of neighbouring privacy. Windows would be above hedge height. Loss of privacy from raised patios. Insufficient distance from the neighbouring rear gardens.
- ff. The planting is on the north side which is next to business not residential.
- gg. Undue overbearing and overshadowing of neighbours, dominant due to raised floor levels.
- hh. Noise impact from raised patios. Noise from windows.
- ii. Impact on windows/ outlook from The Forge, would dominate over this neighbour.
- jj. Overshadowing, loss of light and loss of tranquillity to the garden of The Forge impacting on character, setting and attractiveness for open events. Overbearing due to width of dwellings compared to the narrow garden serving this neighbour.
- kk. Light from windows rather than a dark sky outlook.
- ll. Outbuilding to the rear of The Forge would not lessen impact of development.
- mm. Tree/ hedge screening should not be relied on.
- nn. obscure glazing of facing bedroom windows would deny future occupants light and outlook, and not attractive.
- oo. Skylights could overlook garden of The Forge.
- pp. Proximity of cooker extraction to neighbouring windows and outline pipes/ drains to adjacent hedge/ trees.
- qq. A wall of sufficient height should be built to protect neighbouring privacy.
- rr. Positioning of plots 1 and 3 out of keeping with village layout whereby gardens back onto other gardens rather than dwellings.
- ss. Impact of business operations in the adjacent buildings on future occupiers.
- tt. Privacy screens to terraces would provide insufficient neighbouring privacy. Reduced- size terraces would still result in a loss of privacy due to floor level.

- uu. No height given for the raised patios.
- vv. A 1.8 metre high privacy screen would be 3.25 metres high due to the change in levels, resulting in an intrusive feature for the neighbour which would diminish the historic setting of The Old Forge.
- ww. Cumulative impact of proposed development, retained business and Oliver's Yard on residential amenity.
- xx. Would result in business traffic being moved further down Chestnut Lane- amenity impact.
- yy. Plans show the only access to the business and farmland beyond is via the private road between North House and Chestnut Farmhouse, existing business access across the yard would be blocked which is different to envisaged at outline stage. Use of this access would harm amenity and tranquillity at the northern end of Chestnut Lane. Track is narrow and difficult to see passing traffic. Damage already arising from emerging vehicles, additional commercial vehicles would worsen this.
- zz. Access to the business should be restored from the existing site or access.
- aaa. Plots 1 and 3 would only have 2 spaces, could lead to on- street parking, access and visibility issues, negative visual impact of parked cars.
- bbb. Proximity to The Forge, harm to the setting of a non- designated heritage asset. The Old Forge and associated buildings should be considered a combined group of non- designated heritage assets.
- ccc. Original buildings in Chestnut Yard should be considered as non- designated heritage assets.
- ddd. The interrelationship of the historic buildings need to be considered including the relationship between the farmyard, The Old Forge and The Old Stables.
- eee. Open undeveloped farmyard integral to the historic character of The Old Forge.
- fff. No other permanent non -agricultural buildings have been erected and the openness and agricultural setting of The Old Forge has remained intact.
- ggg. Design of the dwellings not in keeping with the style of the heritage assets.
- hhh. Revised plans remain overbearing on the historically important The Forge and its rural context.
- iii. Question why the flood banks cannot be raised rather than raised floor levels.
- jjj. No reference to drainage in reserved matters application. No details of the treatment of surface and foul water.
- kkk. Impact of impermeable hardstanding. The site is surfaced in gravel not concrete so it is currently permeable.
- lll. Excess water directed towards the paddock from the application site could increase risk of flooding to neighbouring land and barn.
- mmm. The outline application considered the decrease in hardstanding as a community sustainability benefit to outweigh flood risk but the proposal does not offer this.
- nnn. Plans have changed significantly from the indicative plans in the outline permission.

- ooo. There should be a greater emphasis on sustainability to make the houses fit for the future.
- ppp. Concern that piling could be used.
- qqq. A road along the south side of the site would protect the hedge and address amenity issues.
- rrr. Concerns regarding construction noise.
- sss. Lack of description of building materials, hard to assess appropriateness.
- ttt. Lack of ecological mitigation measures.
- uuu. Impact of construction traffic on Chestnut Lane.
- vvv. Affordable smaller homes are needed.
- www. Tandem development contrary to Residential Design Guide.
- xxx. Measurement between hedge and Plot 3 taken at widest point.
- yyy. The boundaries to neighbouring gardens, location of neighbouring house and outbuildings not shown correctly on the submitted plans.
- zzz. Outline plans incorrectly showed the entire width of the rear boundary hedge to The Forge within the application site.
- aaaa. Boundary hedge varies in height rather than 2.5 metres as shown.
- bbbb. Noise and light impact on wildlife.
- cccc. Lack of tree survey.
- dddd. Neighbouring trees should be protected. Damage to roots of boundary hedge and adjacent trees.
- eeee. The site differs from existing residential barn conversions referred to in the outline report as it is a new build with no existing dwellings.
- ffff. 3D visuals show floor-to-ceiling windows on plots 2-3 whereas the elevation plans do not.
- gggg. Infilling gaps in built form could diminish Green Belt washed over status.
- hhhh. Potential noise and disturbance impact on neighbouring owl roost.
- iiii. No compensatory provision for wildlife, bird and bat provision should be made.
- jjjj. No reference to species used to gap up boundary hedge.
- kkkk. The proposal should not put demands on the neighbours to reduce the height and overhang of the current trees to provide more light to plots 1 and 3.
- llll. Object to the removal of mature Horse Chestnut Tree T6 which has a high biodiversity value, provides greater carbon storage than new trees, and helps provide screening to the south west corner of the site.
- mmmm. Horse Chestnut Tree important to the local history of the village and the name Chestnut Farm.
- nnnn. Consideration of whether Horse Chestnut Tree could impact on the structural integrity of the neighbouring property.
- oooo. New fence built to the east of the original hedge line, concern it may not be possible to clearly judge the eastern boundary position.
- pppp. Reliance on private car use would result in increased vehicle movements, climate and amenity impacts.
- qqqq. Question the sustainability of large homes building built, smaller houses more likely to attract children of existing residents to

stay in the village, older residents unable to stay in the village due to a shortage of smaller properties. Would not cater for local need.

rrrr. Reference is made to the development of the site avoiding a derelict eyesore should the business cease, however the business continues to operate and therefore this cannot be used as justification.

ssss. Original ecological survey out of date.

tttt. Potential for hibernating toads to the southern edge of the site.

uuuu. Gable ends of plots 2-3 closer to eastern boundary than the measurement shown on the plans.

PLANNING POLICY

24 The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LLP1) and the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2). Other material considerations include the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance), and the 2009 Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

25. The relevant sections of the NPPF are:

- Paragraph 11c).
- Chapter 12 (Achieving well- designed places).
- Chapter 13 (Protecting Green Belt Land).
- Chapter 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change).
- Chapter 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment).
- Chapter 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment).

A copy of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 can be found [here](#).

A copy of the Planning Practice Guidance can be found [here](#).

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

26. The relevant policies from the LPP1 are:

- Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.
- Policy 2 Climate Change.
- Policy 3 Spatial Strategy.
- Policy 8 Housing Size, Mix and Choice.
- Policy 10 Design and Enhancing Local Identity.
- Policy 16 Green Infrastructure, Landscape, Parks and Open Spaces
- Policy 17 Biodiversity.
- Policy 18 Infrastructure.

A copy of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1) can be found [here](#).

27. The relevant policies from the LPP2 are:

- Policy 1 (Development Requirements).
- Policy 11 (Housing Development on Unallocated Sites within Settlements).

- Policy 12 (Housing Standards).
- Policy 17 (Managing Flood Risk).
- Policy 18 (Surface Water Management).
- Policy 21 (Green Belt).
- Policy 38 (Non- Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network).
- Policy 32 (Recreational Open Space).
- Policy 37 Trees and Woodland.
- Policy 38 Non-Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network.
- Policy 39 Health Impacts of Development.
- Policy 40 Pollution and Land Contamination.

A copy of The Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LLP2) can be found [here](#).

APPRAISAL

28. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF advises that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and for decision-making this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.
29. Outline planning permission was granted under 19/00412/OUT with all matters reserved. Accordingly the matters of access, appearance, layout, scale and landscaping fall to be considered under the current application.
30. Matters of flood risk (Sequential test, Exception Test Drainage), contamination, demolition and construction impacts, and ecological assessment were considered at the outline stage and are, where appropriate, subject to condition discharge and so are not part of the consideration of this application.
31. The outline application considered that a scheme based on the submitted indicative layout plan could be considered as a 'limited infill' development within the settlement subject to appropriate design, layout and scale. The indicative outline plans proposed a 'courtyard style' development of 5 dwellings, set back from the eastern boundary. It was considered that the development based on this layout would not project beyond the eastern boundary of the residential properties on New Road nor would the dwellings extend beyond the rear boundary of the tennis court associated with 18 Chestnut Lane or The Old Slaughterhouse to the north and accordingly it was not considered to represent an eastern extension of the built area of Barton in Fabis.
32. The reserved matters application proposes a lower quantum of development comprising 3 dwellings. The dwellings would be detached rather than positioned in a linked courtyard arrangement as was indicated at outline stage. The dwellings would be set back a minimum of 16.3 metres from the eastern boundary providing a green buffer from the eastern boundary.

33. The originally submitted layout plans showed a garage between plots 2 and 3 that would have projected beyond the rear of these dwellings, extending to within 7 metres of the eastern boundary. Officer concerns were raised regarding the eastern encroachment of development within the site, following which the application plans were amended to pull the garage back from the eastern boundary and to position it between plots 2 and 3. The garage has also been reduced in scale from a double garage to a single garage with the ridge height reduced from 6.2 to 5.3 metres.
34. The revised plans also proposed the set back of plot 2 from the eastern boundary by an additional 1.5 metres. The rear- projecting raised terraces to the rear of each property have been reduced in depth. As a result of these changes, the proposal would sit within the fabric of the village and that it would provide a reasonable green buffer with the adjacent open fields to the east. It is considered that the layout of the reserved matters scheme would comprise limited infill and therefore an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
35. The application site fronts Chestnut Lane to the west and is set behind the properties fronting New Land to the south. Plot 1 would be the most visible property in street scene of Chestnut Lane. The dwellings would have limited visibility from New Lane due to the frontage properties and the distance from this highway.
36. The consultee comments regarding the departure of the reserved matters scheme from the 'courtyard style' development shown on the indicative outline plans are noted. There are however other examples of backland or infill development in the vicinity comprising detached dwellings for example at The Limes off Brown Lane and the dwellings set back from the end of Chestnut Lane. It is not considered that the built form comprising three detached dwellings in large plots would appear at-odds with the surrounding fabric of the village. Details of facing and roofing materials are required under condition 4 of the outline permission.
37. The street scene of Chestnut Lane comprises a mix of property types and ages. The proposed dwellings would be of a traditional brick design and it is not considered that the proposal would harm the character of the street scene. The proposed dwellings would occupy a service yard that was formerly used for the storage of vehicles and materials and occupied by a large centrally positioned barn structure which did not contribute positively to the character of the street scene.
38. The proposed three dwellings would each be larger in footprint than the five dwellings shown on the indicative outline plans, however they would sit within reasonably sized plots which would each provide a rear garden space in excess of the minimum garden size standards set out in the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide.
39. The proposed dwellings would require a substantially elevated Finished Floor Level (FFL) due to the modelled flood level. Concerns were raised at outline stage that the elevated FFL could result in the dwellings being of a substantial height. Accordingly, a condition was applied (condition 5) stipulating that the ridge height shall not exceed 35.65m AOD (Above Ordinance Datum), this equating to and approximately 8.2 metres ridge height relative to the existing

ground levels, this broadly reflecting the roof height of the neighbouring two storey properties at Nos. 6-8 Chestnut Lane which have a ridge height of 8 metres.

40. The Reserved Matters application proposes two storey dwellings although the first floor would be partly within the roof space, thereby lowering the eaves to effectively one-and-a-half storey height to counteract the elevated FFL. It is not considered that the height and overall scale of the dwellings would appear at odds with the surrounding built area.
41. The application site abuts the residential curtilages of 8 Chestnut Lane and The Forge to the south. The proposed dwelling on Plot 1 would project approximately 8.4 metres beyond the rear of No. 8 with a minimum set back of 1.6 metres from the boundary with this neighbour. The separation distance between the plot 1 and the neighbouring dwelling would be approximately 9.5 metres. The proposed dwelling would not impact upon the 45 degree line of sight from the rear windows of this neighbour.
42. The submitted application plans show that a 3 metre boundary hedge is to be retained on the southern boundary of the site, however it is appreciated that this screening cannot be relied upon should the hedge die or become damaged in the future. Notwithstanding the hedge screening, it is not considered that plot 1 would have an undue overbearing impact on No. 8 due to the separation distance between the two dwellings. As No. 8 is due south of the application site, there would not be a significant direct overshadowing impact.
43. The proposed dwellings would each feature a rear- projecting raised terrace. Through revisions to the application plans these have been reduced in depth compared to the originally submitted plans. The sections of the rear terraces serving plots 1 and 3 closest to the southern boundary have been reduced to a metre in depth. A 1.8 metre high side privacy screen is proposed, details of which shall be secured by way of a condition should planning permission be granted.
44. The dwelling on plot 3 would be set off the southern boundary by between 1.2 And 1.76 metres. It would abut the rear garden of The Forge and the rear corner of the garden serving No. 8. There is a high hedge and tree screening to the rear of The Forge but again it is appreciated that this cannot be relied upon to provide screening in perpetuity. The dwelling at The Forge fronts New Road to the south with a sizeable c. 44 metre deep rear garden backing onto the application site. To the rear of The Forge but offset to the east of the main garden there is a large 'L' shaped converted barn outbuilding which has a blank elevation facing the application site.
45. The originally submitted application plans for Plot 3 featured an attached front garage with living space above that would have measured 3.7 metres to the eaves and 6.8 metres to the ridge. Officer concerns were raised regarding the combined scale and massing of the dwelling and attached garage as viewed from the southern side profile. Discussions took place with the agent and the plans were amended to reduce the height of the garage to an eaves height of 2.2 metres and a ridge height of 5.5 metres, thereby reducing the massing of the south side elevation. The raised rear terrace has been reduced in depth with the rear corner stepped back from the southern boundary. Given the

separation distance between Plot 3 and the dwelling at The Forge, it is not considered that there would be an undue overbearing impact on this neighbour.

46. The neighbour concerns regarding privacy are noted. The southern elevation of plots 1 and 3 would feature ground and first floor windows. The originally submitted set of plans proposed obscure- glazing to the upper floor side windows only. However it is noted that the ground floor windows would be elevated due to the substantially elevated FFL. As a result, the ground floor windows would have a cill height of 2.2 metres above external ground level. Officer concerns were raised that the elevated ground floor windows could give rise to the overlooking of the neighbours to the south should the current boundary hedge fail or be removed. Accordingly discussions took place with the agent and the plans were amended to obscure- glaze the ground floor side windows in addition.
47. To the north of the site there is a run of single storey and one-and-a-half storey converted brick barns which house a grounds maintenance business, these buildings run along approximately 2/3 of the northern edge of the site with a neighbouring tennis court to the north east that falls within the curtilage of Chestnut Farm House. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in an undue overbearing impact on Chestnut Farm House. There is also a good degree of separation between the proposed frontage dwelling on plot 1 and the opposite- facing properties on Chestnut Lane which are set back from the highway.
48. The proposed dwellings would be served via the existing access which is to be upgraded. An adjacent access would be formed to serve the commercial use. It is not considered that the traffic generated by three dwellings would result in a significant noise and disturbance impact on neighbouring residents and they would occupy a service yard currently used by grounds maintenance vehicles and for the storage of materials.
49. The relationship between the proposed dwellings and the retained commercial use has been considered. The dwellings would occupy the former service yard/ storage yard which would have been the main noise- generating element of the commercial use. The commercial buildings along the northern edge of the site house offices for the grounds maintenance along with some fairly small- scale storage provision and parking. It is not considered that the retained commercial use would be likely to result in undue noise and disturbance impacts on future occupiers of the dwellings and Environmental Health have not raised any concerns in this regard.
50. The neighbouring property at The Forge is merits consideration as a non-designated heritage asset. Accordingly the proposal falls to be considered under paragraph 203 of the NPPF which states, inter alia, that in weighing applications that affect non- designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
51. Due to the distance between the dwelling at The Forge and the application site, the proposed dwellings on Plots 1 and 3 would not appear prominent against the backdrop of The Forge as viewed from New Road. The development would not interfere with either the presence of The Old Forge

within the streetscene or its relationship with outbuildings within its own site. The immediate context of is largely modern with 20th century houses to the west, and the application site itself previously occupied by a large portal-framed barn along with vehicles, stacked materials and various structures/containers. It is also not considered that the wider views north from within application site make a significant contribution to the special architectural or historic significance of The Forge.

52. The older brick barn buildings along the northern edge of the application site are also considered as non-designated heritage asset, however traditionally they would have had an inward-facing relationship between them centred around what is now the garden of Chestnut Farm House, rather than a close relationship with the application site/ former service yard which makes little contribution to the significance of this group of buildings.
53. It is not considered that the development would adversely affect the context and views of the non-designated heritage assets and it noted that the proposed development would not be greatly dissimilar to other nearby more recent housing development. The proposal would not therefore harm the special significance of nearby non-designated heritage assets via their settings.
54. The submission includes an Archaeological Report which notes that there is moderate potential for medieval remains. The site has not been previously evaluated and the impact is unknown. Further archaeological work is therefore required to clarify the archaeological potential of the site and trial trenching may provide an appropriate method of survey work. Further archaeological investigation shall be secured by way of a condition should planning permission be granted.
55. The application proposes the removal of a mature Chestnut tree to the south west corner of the site which makes a positive contribution to the street scene. The submitted Tree report however identifies concerns regarding its structure and health. The Design and Landscape Officer notes the proximity of the tree to neighbouring brick outbuildings and that it is unlikely to warrant protection as the tree is likely to outgrow the location and pose a risk of structural damage. Accordingly, replacement planting is sought along with tree protection measures for the retained boundary trees/ hedges. The submitted layout plan proposes additional planting to the south west corner of the site along with planting along the northern boundary with the adjacent commercial buildings. A detailed landscaping scheme along with details of tree protection measures shall be secured by way of a condition in the event that planning permission is granted.
56. The residential development would be served via the existing access which is to be upgraded. It was noted on the originally submitted layout plan that this would have effectively cut off direct access off Chestnut Lane to the retained commercial use. There is a track that loops around the back of the commercial buildings adjoining Chestnut Lane further north, however officer concerns were raised that any intensification of the use of this access track could give rise to noise and disturbance issues for the properties adjacent to this track (Nos. 18 and 20 Chestnut Lane) arising from commercial vehicles using it as the sole means of access. Discussions took place with the applicant and the plans were amended to provide a separate direct access off Chestnut Lane to serve the

commercial use. The existing rear access track would be retained but it is to be gated and restricted to occasional emergency use.

57. Following the receipt of comments from the Highway Authority, the proposed access to serve the residential use has been amended on the site layout plan to provide an access width of 4.8m plus 0.5m clearance on either side in accordance with Highway Authority specifications.
58. It is considered that the proposal as revised during the course of the application would not unduly harm the character of the street scene or the setting of adjacent non-designated heritage assets and that it would not unduly harm neighbouring amenity. For the reasons set out above it is considered that the proposal accords with the general national and local planning policies considered above and accordingly it is recommended that Planning Permission is granted.
59. The outline application included a Sustainable Drainage Statement which noted that the existing site is hard- surfaced with surface water runoff onto surrounding verges, roads and fields with a lack of any mapped adopted sewer network. Infiltration is proposed as a means of controlling surface water. Details of drainage shall be secured by way of a condition should planning permission be granted.
60. The application site comprises predominantly of hardstanding with vegetation to the boundaries. It was established in the outline application that the site lacked suitable habitats for priority or protected species provided that boundary hedges, trees and ditches are not impacted upon.
61. An Arboricultural Assessment was provided under the outline application which identified the proposed removal of a prominent Chestnut tree to the south west corner of the site due to concerns regarding its structure and health. The Design and Landscape Officer considers that the tree is unlikely to warrant protection as it is likely to outgrow its location and due to the risk of structural damage to adjacent outbuildings. The plans show 3 new trees in this location. A detailed landscaping scheme is required under condition 3 of the outline planning permission.
62. The southern boundary hedge provides screening from the neighbouring gardens and its retention is sought along with supplementary planting on part of the boundary between the application site and No. 8 Chestnut Lane. Tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837 shall be secured by way of a condition should planning permission be granted.
63. Discussions have taken place during the application process to address officer concerns regarding the layout and scale of the dwellings. The application plans have been amended to pull development away from the eastern boundary, and to reduce the scale and massing of the dwellings by reducing the height of the front-projecting garages on plots 1 and 3 and to reduce the depth of the raised rear terraces. As a result of the changes, it is considered that the development has overcome the initial officer concerns, thereby resulting in a more acceptable scheme and the recommendation to grant planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Planning Permission subject to Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan, received on 23 December 2021.

 - 21.3940.13A Sheet 5 of 11 (Plot 1 Proposed First Floor).
 - 21.3940.14 Sheet 6 of 11 (Plot 2 Proposed Elevations).
 - 21.3940.15 Sheet 7 of 11 (Plot 2 Proposed Floor Plans).
 - 21.3940.16A Sheet 8 of 11 (Plot 2 Proposed Garage).
- received on 21 April 2022.
- 21.3940.10B Sheet 2 of 11 (Plot 1 Proposed Elevations).
 - 21.3940.10B Sheet 3 of 11 (Plot 1 Proposed Elevations).
 - 21.3940.18B Sheet 10 of 11 (Plot 3 Proposed Elevations).
 - 21.3940.09H Sheet 1 of 10 (Proposed Site and Roof Plan).
- received on 14 June 2022.

and

- 21.3940.12C Sheet 4 of 11 (Plot 1 Proposed Ground Floor Plan).
 - 21.3940.19B Sheet 11 of 11 (Plot 3 Proposed Floor Plan).
 - 21.3940.17C Sheet 9 of 11 (Plot 3 Proposed Elevations).
- received on 16 August 2022.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

2. No operations shall commence on site until the existing trees and/or hedges which are to be retained have been protected in accordance with BS5837, details of which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The approved means of protection shall be retained for the duration of the construction period. No materials, machinery or vehicles are to be stored or temporary buildings erected within the perimeter of the fence, nor is any excavation work to be undertaken within the confines of the fence without the written approval of the Borough Council. No changes of ground level shall be made within the protected area without the written approval of the Borough Council.

[To ensure the development does not cause harm to the health of the trees which are to remain within this development which would be detrimental to the amenity of the public in accordance with Policies 1 (Development Requirements) and 37 (Trees and Woodlands) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. This condition requires discharging prior to development to mitigate harm during construction and site clearance works].

3. Prior to the commencement of development, an archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. Any investigation and/ or mitigation measures shall be

implemented in accordance with the details and timings as approved.

[In order to ensure the assessment of the nature, extent and significance of any archaeological potential and to comply with Policy 29 (Development Affecting Archaeological Sites) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. This is required to be discharged prior to commencement due to the archaeological potential of the site].

4. Prior to the formation of the drive, turning/ parking areas or any other hard surfaced areas, details of the surfacing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council and the development shall be carried out in accordance with details as approved.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

5. Prior to the occupation any dwelling, the respective driveways, parking and manoeuvring spaces shall be provided in accordance with the layout shown on drawing 21.3940.09H Sheet 1 of 10 (Proposed Site and Roof Plan) received on 14 June 2022 including the formation of a separated dedicated to serve the adjacent commercial use.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

6. Prior to the vehicular access points for either the residential development or adjacent commercial use being brought into use, they shall be fronted with an appropriate dropped kerb crossing constructed to Highway Authority specifications.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

7. Prior to the development progressing beyond ground floor slab level, a statement of Biodiversity Net Gain from the development shall be submitted to the Borough Council for approval. (enhancements) Any approved mitigation and enhancement scheme, which must include installation within buildings (including Swallow/swift and sparrow cups/boxes) and hedgehog corridors, shall thereafter be implemented prior to the first occupation of any unit and retained for the lifetime of the development.

[To ensure that the proposed development contributes to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity within the site and for the wider area in accordance with paragraphs 174-175 of the NPPF and Policy 17 of the Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy].

8. The development shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until a surface water drainage scheme (in accordance with the sustainable drainage hierarchy) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. This shall include provisions to prevent the unregulated discharge of surface water onto the public highway. The development shall only be carried

out in accordance with the approved surface water drainage scheme, which shall thereafter be maintained throughout the life of the development.

[To ensure the proper drainage of the site and to accord with the aims of Policy 2 (Climate Change) of the Local Plan Part 1 Rushcliffe Core Strategy, and Policy 18 (Surface Water Management) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

9. Prior to the installation of air heat source pumps, details of these shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council and thereafter shall be installed and retained to the agreed specification.

[In the interest of neighbouring amenity and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

10. Prior to the removal of the tree to the south west corner of the site referred to as tree T6 in the Arboricultural Assessment (FPCR- 2016) submitted under 19/00412/OUT, details of replacement tree planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The replacement planting shall be carried out within the first tree planting season following the substantial completion of the development. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Borough Council gives written consent to any variation.

[To ensure the development is of a satisfactory appearance in accordance with Policies 1 (Development Requirements) and 37 (Trees and Woodlands) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

11. Prior to the erection of the boundary treatment on the external boundaries, details of the materials shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Borough Council and the boundaries shall be constructed in accordance with the details as approved.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

12. Prior to installation of any external lighting, a bat-sensitive lighting scheme should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting scheme should be in accordance with Conservation Trust (2018) "Bats and artificial lighting in the UK. The lighting scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained to this specification thereafter.

[To protect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A; B; and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without

modification) there shall be no enlargement or alteration of the proposed dwelling, or erection of any outbuildings without the prior written approval of the Borough Council.

[In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and character and appearance of the conservation area, and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) and Policy 28 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

14. The dwellings hereby permitted shall be designed to meet the higher 'Optional Technical Housing Standard' for water consumption of no more than 110 litres per person per day.

[To promote a reduction in water consumption and to comply with criteria 3 of Policy 12 (Housing Standards) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

15. Prior to the construction of any dwelling proceeding above foundation level, a scheme for the provision of electric vehicle charging points shall be submitted to and approved by the Borough Council. The scheme shall provide details of the provision of electric vehicle charging points to serve each dwelling. Thereafter, no dwelling shall be occupied until such time as it has been serviced with the appropriate electric vehicle charging infrastructure, where practicable, in accordance with the agreed scheme and the apparatus shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

[To comply with and to comply with policy 41 (Air Quality) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

16. Prior to the development being brought into use, the rear terraces serving plots 1 and 3 shall be fitted with a 1.8 metre high privacy screen to the southern side of the respective terraces, details of which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. Thereafter the privacy screens shall be retained to the agreed specification for the lifetime of the development.

[To protect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

17. The ground and first floor windows in the southern elevation of plots 1 and 3 shall be permanently fixed shut and fitted with glass which has been rendered permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent. Thereafter, the window shall be retained to this specification unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Borough Council. No additional windows shall be inserted in this elevation without the prior written approval of the Borough Council.

[In the interest of neighbouring amenity and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

18. Prior to the development being brought into use, a gate shall be installed

across the eastern end of the drive serving the adjacent commercial use in the location as shown on drawing 21.3940.09H. Vehicular access through this gate shall be restricted to occasional emergency use for the lifetime of the development.

[To protect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and to comply with policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies.

Note-

Negotiations have taken place during the consideration of the application to address adverse impacts identified by officers/to address concerns/objections raised in letters of representation submitted in connection with the proposal.

Amendments have been made to the proposal, addressing the identified adverse impacts, thereby resulting in a more acceptable scheme and the grant of planning permission.

Having regard to the above and having taken into account matters raised there are no other material considerations which are of significant weight in reaching a decision on this application.

NOTES TO APPLICANT

Please be advised that all applications approved on or after the 7th October 2019 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Borough Council considers that the approved development is CIL chargeable. Full details of the amount payable, the process and timescales for payment, and any potential exemptions/relief that may be applicable will be set out in a Liability Notice to be issued following this decision. Further information about CIL can be found on the Borough Council's website at <https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningandgrowth/cil/>.

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.

The Borough Council is charging developers for the first time provision of wheeled refuse containers for household and recycling wastes. Only containers supplied by Rushcliffe Borough Council will be emptied, refuse containers will need to be provided prior to the occupation of any dwellings. Please contact the Borough Council (Tel: 0115 981 9911) and ask for the Recycling Officer to arrange for payment and delivery of the bins.

A biodiversity net gain (BNG) assessment, with a demonstrated gain should be

provided as recommended by CIRIA (2019) Biodiversity Net Gain - Principles and Guidance for UK construction and developments, with the gains implemented and maintained in the long term and agreed by the local planning authority, this may require support from a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). A simplified BNG assessment is available from Natural England for use in householder and small developments. BNG is likely to become mandatory under law in the near future.

A construction ecological method statement (CEMP) incorporating reasonable avoidance measures (RAMs), should be agreed and implemented, including the good practice methods below:

- Advising all workers of the potential for protected species. If protected species are found during works, work should cease until a suitable qualified ecologist has been consulted.
- No works, fires or storage of materials or vehicle movements should be carried out in or immediately adjacent to ecological mitigation areas or ecologically sensitive areas.
- All work impacting on vegetation or buildings used by nesting birds should avoid the active bird nesting season, if this is not possible a search of the impacted areas should be carried out by a suitably competent person for nests immediately prior to the commencement of works. If any nests are found work should not commence until a suitably qualified ecologist has been consulted.
- Best practice should be followed during building work to ensure trenches dug during works activities that are left open overnight should be left with a sloping end or ramp to allow animal that may fall in to escape. Also, any pipes over 200mm in diameter should be capped off at night to prevent animals entering. Materials such as netting and cutting tools should not be left in the works area where they might entangle or injure animals. No stockpiles of vegetation should be left overnight and if they are left then they should be dismantled by hand prior to removal. Night working should be avoided.
- Root protection zones should be established around retained trees / hedgerows so that storage of materials and vehicles and the movement of vehicles and works are not carried out within these zones.
- Pollution prevention measures should be adopted.

Other recommendations include:

- The use of external lighting (during construction and post construction) should be appropriate to avoid adverse impacts on bat populations, see <https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2018/09/new-guidance-on-bats-and-lighting> for advice and if lighting is required a wildlife sensitive lighting scheme should be developed and implemented.
- Measures to ensure that the roof liners of any building do not pose a risk to roosting bats in the future should be taken.

- Permanent bat boxes and bird boxes (including swifts) should be incorporated into buildings and / or where appropriate on retained trees. Hedgehog corridors, access and enhancements should be provided within and through site boundaries. Invertebrate enhancements (e.g. bee bricks and Insect hotels) should be provided as appropriate. Where amphibians are found locally, hibernacula or other enhancements should be provided.
- New wildlife habitats should be created where appropriate, including wildflower rich neutral grassland, hedgerows, trees and woodland, wetlands and ponds. For amenity grassland, flowering lawn seed mixes are recommended.
- Any existing hedgerow / trees should be retained and enhanced; any hedge / trees removed should be replaced. Any boundary habitats should be retained and enhanced.
- Where possible new trees / hedges should be planted with native species (preferably of local provenance and including fruiting species). See <https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/conservation/treeshedgesandlandscaping/landscapingandtreeplanting/plantingonnewdevelopments/> for advice including the planting guides.
- It is recommended that consideration should be given to energy efficiency, alternative energy generation, climate change impacts (including increased temperatures and increased rainfall), water efficiency, travel sustainability (including, travel planning, electric vehicle and cycle charging points and cycle storage), management of waste during and post construction and the use of recycled materials and sustainable building methods.