

**21/03205/REM**

**Applicant** Mr & Mrs J Kent

**Location** Chestnut Farm, Chestnut Lane, Barton In Fabis

**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

## **LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE**

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation

**RECEIVED FROM:** The Old Forge

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- Arboricultural assessment does not assess/consider trees on neighbour's land, these are within 12-15m of proposed buildings. This should have been considered at Outline stage.
- Requests condition to ensure hedge boundary with The Old Forge remains at same height and width as present to provide screening.
- Paragraph 43 of the Committee Report is misleading as it refers to 'converted barns'. The owner of these barns states the barns have never been converted.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

- An arboricultural assessment for this site was submitted and considered at outline stage. This did not include trees on neighbour's land. No concerns were raised by the Borough Council's Design and Landscape Officer at this stage regarding trees outside the site but he noted that tree protection measures would need to be considered at a later stage.
- As part of this Reserved Matters application tree protection measures are recommended to be submitted prior to commencement of development under Condition 2.
- The committee report at paras 42 and 44 makes it clear that the officer has considered the impact if the hedge were to be removed at a later date and still finds the proposal acceptable. This condition is not therefore justified.
- The committee report erroneously states that the barn to the rear of the Old

Forge has been converted, however the neighbour has clarified that the barn has not been converted and remains in its original form.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neighbour representation

**RECEIVED FROM:** The Old Forge

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- The committee report refers to public views of the Non- Designated Heritage Asset but in Historic England's guidance states that the contribution that setting makes to the significance of a heritage asset is not dependent on public views.
- Concern that buildings would detract from the rural garden setting resulting in a suburban influence.
- The committee report does not provide a fully informed synopsis of the impacts on The Old Forge. The current application is not visible from garden setting of The Old Forge.
- Where a heritage asset has been compromised in the past, consideration should still be given to whether additional change would further detract from or enhance the significance of the heritage asset.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

- The committee report refers to not only to public views of the heritage asset but also its context and the relationship between the dwelling at The Old Forge and other buildings within its own site.
- The impact of 'Plot 3' on the garden of The Old Forge is considered in paras 44 and 45 of the committee report.
- It is considered that the committee report provides a sufficient synopsis of the setting of The Old Forge to provide members with an understanding of the relationship between this heritage asset and the application site.
- The presence of more modern properties in the vicinity is one of a number of factors considered when assessing the setting of The Old Forge and not the sole justification for developing the site.

**22/00854/FUL**

**Applicant** Mr Daniel Asher

**Location** Land To The Corner Of Ashley Road And Church Drive, Keyworth, Nottingham

**Proposal** Erection of single storey dwelling including associated landscaping, parking and access works

**Ward** Keyworth And Wolds

### **LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE**

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Officer point of clarification

**RECEIVED FROM:**

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Para 2 of the committee report refers to the site as comprising part of the curtilage of No. 46 Ashley Road, however the site has now been subdivided from this property and is under separate ownership.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The above point does not change the assessment of the application and para 27 of the committee report clarifies that the site has been subdivided already.

**22/00774/FUL**

**Applicant** Dr Kashif Chauhan

**Location** 18 Mountsorrel Drive, West Bridgford, Nottingham

**Proposal** Construction of two-storey front extension, first floor side extension, first floor rear extensions, single storey rear extension and application of render to all elevations.

**Ward** Abbey

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:** Member of the Public

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- Notes the changes to the red line plan, question why the block plan has also not been updated.
- The reduced site boundary increases concerns that the poorly designed first floor extension are over development and out of keeping with the area.
- General concerns regarding consistency of decision making.
- Distances in paragraph 44 of the report are incorrect.
- Could set a precedent for poor design in the area.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

- The site location plan identifies the extent of the site ownership and a revised red line ownership boundary has been provided. The Site block plan showcases the footprint of the extensions and key distances to boundaries. The distances to boundaries are not a matter changed by the production of an updated red line boundary.
- The assessment in relation to design and character has been made in light of the revised information. Please refer to the committee report.
- Every application must be determined on its own merits.
- The distances quoted in paragraph 44 remain accurate as distances to identified site boundaries. Whilst the ownership boundary differs as per the updated red line site location plan, the current property garden boundaries provide a definitive point from which to measure distances, as shown on the submitted block plans.
- As per point 3, every application must be assessed on its merits.