

18/00019/FUL

Applicant Mr Hasmukh Mistry

Location 85 Chaworth Road West Bridgford Nottinghamshire NG2 7AE

Proposal Demolition of bungalow, erection of 5 apartments and creation of parking area.

Ward Lutterell

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The site accommodates a bungalow of brick and tile construction on the southern side of Chaworth Road, close to the junction with Loughborough Road. The property is served by an access along the western part of the site leading to an outbuilding in the south-western corner. There is a small garden to the front and a large garden to the rear.
2. To the east is a pair of semi-detached properties with a significantly extended building to the north, on the opposite side of Chaworth Road, last used as a nursing home. To the west is a single storey bungalow which is used as a dentist surgery. To the rear are properties that front onto South Street; these are separated by rear gardens.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. The application has been amended and comprises the demolition of the bungalow and the erection of five apartments, three 1 bedroom and two 2 bedroom. The building would provide accommodation over three floors, with the second floor accommodation within the roof space. The building would have a gable feature to front and rear on the eastern side and cropped gable roof over the western side of the building, with a lower ridge height providing a transition between the two storey buildings to the east and the bungalow to the west. Five parking spaces would be provided to the rear of the property, an amenity area and the existing outbuilding. The revised plans have re-sited the building from the original location adjacent to the eastern boundary with 83 Chaworth Road to the western side of the site, further from no. 83, with the proposed access now to the east of the proposed building. It is also proposed to erect a 2 metre high acoustic fence along the eastern boundary to mitigate the potential noise from vehicle movements along the access drive.

SITE HISTORY

4. History on the site includes application ref: 16/01694/FUL for the demolition of the bungalow and garage and the erection of 6 no. 1 bedroom apartments, garages and parking area; this was withdrawn on Officer advice. Application ref: 17/01494/FUL for the demolition of the bungalow and the erection of 6 no. 1 bedroom apartments and the creation of a parking area was refused on the following grounds:

- The proposed development, by reason of siting, scale, massing, size and design, would create a discordant element on the site and street scene. The building would be an overly dominant structure, out of keeping with the transitional nature of the site between two storey and single storey buildings and would result in an imposing building, harmful to the character and appearance of the site and street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy GP2 (d) of the Rushcliffe Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan which seek to ensure development is in keeping and Policy 10 (1a and 1c), (2f and 2g) of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure visually acceptable development. The decision to refuse planning permission would be in accordance with Paragraph 64 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."

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

Original Submission

5. One Ward Councillor (Cllr Donoghue) objected on the grounds that a similar application on this site has been refused twice by the Council; this new application is not dramatically different to the previous applications. The massing, size and scale is inappropriate for the size and nature of the site. This apartment block is over dominant and not appropriate in replacing an existing bungalow. The structure impacts negatively on 83 Chaworth Road, affecting privacy and light. The apartment block is out of keeping with the nature of the road and impacts negatively on existing residents. The structure is the same height and bulk of previously refused applications. The increased depth of the building impacts negatively on 83 Chaworth Road. The over dominant structure impacts negatively on the open nature of the existing residents gardens and rear bedroom windows. The three storey apartment block structure is of a poor design in terms of being out of context. The apartment block would have a negative impact on the privacy and increased noise for existing residents. She also raised concerns regarding the narrow access road to the parking area, there would have to be increased maneuvering on Chaworth Road near the Loughborough Road junction. There is limited parking on Chaworth Road itself. The proposal would affect the right to light in neighbouring homes. There is no screening between the proposed apartment block and existing residents.
6. One Councillor (Cllr Edwards) objects on the grounds that there are no structural or amenity reasons for the demolition of the existing bungalow. It forms part of a group of 4 single-storey properties that wrap round this corner of Chaworth Road and Loughborough Road that were all built in the mid to late 20th century. The neighbouring property at No. 83 Chaworth Road is a traditional, semi-detached house built in 1902. It was intended as the last house on Chaworth Road as the land was undeveloped up to the junction with Loughborough Road. Consequently, there is a ground floor bay window at the western side of the house facing No. 85 and there is also a conservatory with extensive glazing also facing No. 85. At first floor and roof

levels there are other clear-glazed windows facing west, all benefiting from the amenity this affords. The existing bungalow at No. 85 was built much later and being single-storey and having no windows on its eastern side facing No. 83 there have been no issues of overlooking or loss of privacy. This new proposal retains the height, bulk and massing that were a cause of the last application for development on this site being rejected. The increase in depth of this application impacts further on No. 83 and is detrimental to both the house and garden areas resulting in loss of amenity and loss of privacy. For its unacceptable size, massing and scale with its consequent overlooking, overbearing and loss of amenity on No. 83 this application should be refused planning permission.

Revised Proposals

7. One Ward Councillor (Cllr Edwards) reiterated his previous comments adding that there will be overlooking from the 2nd and 3rd floor rear windows into the garden of No. 83 resulting in a loss of amenity and loss of privacy. Currently, there is a 1-metre high wall that forms the boundary between the 2 properties. The new proposal for a 2-metre high fence along the boundary with No. 83 will be seriously detrimental to the amenity of the occupants of No. 83. Their main habitable room is the glazed conservatory and they would face the fence along its whole side. For its unacceptable size, massing and scale and for the detrimental impact of the new fencing on the main living room of No. 83, he objects to this application which should be refused planning permission.

Local Residents and the General Public

Original Submission

8. 34 written representations have been received from neighbours/nearby residents objecting on grounds which can be summarised as follows:
 - a. The proposal maintains essentially the same height, bulk and massing of the previous application with three storeys of accommodation, any reduction in the massing is offset by the increased depth.
 - b. The roof does not reflect the neighbouring properties, the greater depth and bulk would be readily apparent from the access and fails to make the transition of building heights with the neighbouring properties.
 - c. Out of keeping and would affect the streetscape.
 - d. Over-development, would increase density of development
 - e. The rear area is dominated by car parking leaving little space for amenity of landscaping.
 - f. Access into car parking spaces difficult.
 - g. The impact on 83 Chaworth Road increased by the greater depth of the building leading to overbearing impact on light and outlook from the

neighbouring garden, side habitable room, bay window and side/rear conservatory. Noise from the adjacent parking to this garden, would overlook no.83 leading to loss of privacy.

- h. Noise, disturbance and car lights from car park would affect amenity of surrounding properties.
- i. Would remove natural daylight from 173a and would lead to overlooking of no.81 through a larger building on the site, would lead to overlooking of 66 South Road and loss of outlook, looking towards a three storey dwelling.
- j. The proposal would be more intensive than the previous scheme with potentially 14 occupants rather than 12 plus 14 vehicles, traffic and parking already at breaking point, traffic has increased over the years and offers access to a busy main road and supermarket, the road is narrow and North Road has a barrier at one end, is also a route for emergency vehicles, already difficult to park.
- k. Photographs taken during the day do not reflect the level of parking after work, the building opposite is in multiple occupation and generates high levels of parking, at least double the number of parking spaces proposed are needed.
- l. The road narrows at this point, there would be harm to pedestrians and cyclists, this is a walking and cycling route for school children.
- m. The driveway is too narrow and would lead to more on road parking.
- n. The proposal would lead to the loss of a bungalow, there are no structural or amenity issues requiring the demolition of the bungalow, loss of garden.

Revised Proposals

- 9. 26 written representations have been received from neighbours/nearby residents objecting on grounds which can be summarised as follows:
 - a. Increase in parking is a concern on an already busy road, parking is almost impossible at any time of day or night due to the nature of businesses on surrounding roads having visitors, there are no, or very few places, for vehicles to pass, this can create aggressive and dangerous driving and has caused damage to cars in the past, the parked cars make it dangerous to cross the road, especially for the local children.
 - b. The driveway is closer to a major junction, so the parking around this drive would make the junction even more dangerous, the proposed driveway is still too narrow and will lead to multiple manoeuvring on this already congested road, there has been no provision for visitor parking.

- c. Will block the light of various surrounding neighbours on this and neighbouring road, there would be overlooking on some neighbours from floors 2/3.
- d. 2 metre high fence will cause distress to neighbours.
- e. There is no change that has materially improved the planning application, the revised proposal would have an even greater impact than the previous schemes.
- f. Over-development of the site.
- g. Demolition of a perfectly good family home, loss of much needed bungalow.
- h. Apart from an improved front elevation and a design more in line with the style of the majority of properties in the road there is little in the application to recommend it, lack of emphatic design.
- i. The proposal does not meet a local need as the road is primarily family orientated so the development is not in keeping.
- j. This is a major school route in both directions for walking and cycling and access onto and off the proposed development would be hazardous. The road is a cut through. Doesn't make sense Chaworth Road has been designated a cycle route when this development would reduce road safety.
- k. Obscure glazing will not reduce the feeling of being overlooked.
- l. The re-siting does not overcome the previous objections which remain valid, there would be an increase in noise to no.83 from cars using the new access, turning is difficult within the site which would result in significant maneuvering, still an overbearing impact and impact on light and outlook to no.83.

Statutory and Other Consultees

Original Submission

- 10. Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority commented that the bin store will prevent two-way traffic from taking place at the access and increase the likelihood of collisions. It should, therefore, be repositioned elsewhere within the curtilage so that such maneuvers can take place, as per the previous arrangement. Should these details come forward they recommend a condition. Following the submission of revised plans showing relocation of bin storage they confirmed that they did not object, subject to a condition.

Revised Proposals

- 11. Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority – commented that it is not envisaged this proposal will compromise highway safety.

12. The Environment Agency – raised no objection.

PLANNING POLICY

13. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of the 5 saved policies of the Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan (1996) and the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy (December 2014). None of the saved policies are of relevance in this case.
14. Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan (2006).
15. Any decision should, therefore, be taken in accordance with the Rushcliffe Core Strategy, NPPF and NPPG and policies contained within the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan where they are consistent with or amplify the aims and objectives of the Framework together with other material planning considerations.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

16. The National Planning Policy Framework carries a presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. It states that Local Planning Authorities should seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.
17. Chapter 10 of the NPPF: 'Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change' states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change, by applying the Sequential Test and, if necessary, the Exception Test.
18. In relation to design and residential amenity section 12 of the NPPF seeks to ensure the creation of high quality buildings and places, and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that "*planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of an area, are visually attractive, sympathetic to the local character and history and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users*". Paragraph 130 states, "*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.*"

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

19. The Core Strategy sets out the overarching spatial vision for the development of the Borough to 2028. Policy 1 deals with The Presumption in Favour of

Sustainable Development and Policy 10 with Design and Enhancing Local Identity.

20. Under Core Strategy Policy 1, a positive and proactive approach to planning decision making should be taken that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) states development should make a positive contribution to the public realm and sense of place, and should have regard to the local context and reinforce local characteristics. Development should be assessed in terms of the criteria listed under section 2 of Policy 10, and of particular relevance to this application are 2(b) whereby the proposal should be assessed in terms of its impacts on neighbouring amenity; 2(f) in terms of its massing, scale and proportion; and 2(g) in terms of assessing the proposed materials, architectural style and detailing.
21. The Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan has been used in decision making since 2006 and despite the Core Strategy having been adopted its policies are still a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.
22. Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan is relevant to the consideration of this application. Policy GP2 states that planning permission for new development, changes of use, conversions or extensions will be granted provided that, where relevant, certain criteria are met. Criterion a) refers to the impact of development on amenity, particularly residential amenity. Criterion b) requires a suitable means of access without detriment to the amenity of adjacent properties or highway safety and the provision of parking. Criterion c) requires the provision of sufficient space within the site to accommodate the proposal and ancillary amenity and circulation space. Criterion (d) is concerned with the scale, density, height, massing, design, layout and materials of proposals and states, inter-alia, that these should be sympathetic to the character and appearance of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding areas. 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.
23. Policy HOU2 states planning permission for unallocated development within settlements will be granted provided that, inter alia, the size and location of the site is such that its development would not detrimentally affect the character or pattern of the surrounding area, the development would not have an adverse visual impact and the site is accessible to a range of services other than by use of the private car. Policy MOV9 relates to car parking provision. Policy WET2 relates to flooding.
24. It is considered the above policies are in compliance with the general thrust of the NPPF.

APPRAISAL

25. The principle of development is acceptable. The site is within an established residential area and West Bridgford is a sustainable location for new housing with a good range of facilities. Although objections have been raised over the

demolition of the bungalow, this building is not of such merit that its retention could be insisted upon. Furthermore, although bungalow accommodation is welcomed, the loss of a single such unit is not considered to be sufficiently harmful to the housing mix of the locality as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

26. The site is something of a transition between the larger scale Victorian/Edwardian dwellings to the north-east of the site and the bungalows on Loughborough Road. The previous scheme was not considered to respond to the characteristics of the site resulting in an over-dominant structure in relation to the adjacent bungalow. The design comprised a larger block which did not break up the massing and would have appeared as a dominant façade at odds with the prevailing character on the street which has more of a vertical emphasis. In addition, the fenestration was not of traditional Victorian proportions with the first floor windows lacking verticality and the dormers being overly large.
27. The current application deviates significantly from the refused scheme in incorporating a three storey gable on the façade with a subservient ridge running parallel to the highway at two storey level. This element is set back further into the site than the gable which reduces the massing of the building. Fenestration is of a vertical emphasis and provides symmetry to the building, mirroring the neighbouring traditional development. The design includes the step down towards the neighbouring bungalow (the dental surgery) which responds to the transitional nature of the site.
28. When viewed looking east the side elevation would be subservient to the three storey element with the setback visible and incorporating a lower ridge and a bonnet hipped roof to further reduce the massing.
29. It is acknowledged objections have been raised to the visual appearance of the proposal. However, it is not considered to represent over-development of the site as it would have the appearance of a large, detached dwelling occupying a substantial plot. There would also be significant undeveloped grounds to the rear which include private shared amenity space. Although the depth of the building would be significant the visual impact of this would not be dominant due to the lower eaves and ridge height and the design of the roof.
30. On balance, it is considered the proposed scheme would be visually satisfactory and would effectively infill the transitional site. Conditions relating to materials and architectural detailing would secure a high quality scheme, in compliance with the above policies and guidance.
31. With regard to residential amenity, to the north the highway intervenes and the building would look towards the side elevation of 171 Loughborough Road. To the east the two storey building has a ground floor bay window in the main side elevation and a conservatory running down the side of the dwelling. The wall of the proposed building would be adjacent to the side elevation of this neighbouring property as is the current bungalow. The proposal would have a greater impact in terms of outlook and would be more overbearing than the current bungalow. However, the revised plans have re-sited the building further from this boundary to now leave a space of 5.4 metres from the side of the proposed building to the boundary and a further 2.3 metres from the boundary to the side elevation of no. 83.

32. The conservatory on no. 83 would remain open beyond the rear projection of the proposed building and the end elevation would continue to look over the garden. This boundary is currently very open and two metre boundary treatment could be erected without planning permission which would impact on outlook and light received through these windows. The re-siting of the building would relocate the access adjacent to the boundary with no.83; this would potentially increase the level of noise and disturbance through vehicular movements. However, given the likely limited number of traffic movements it is not considered this would have an undue adverse impact in terms of noise and disturbance. A condition is recommended to ensure the provision of noise attenuation fencing in order to reduce any impact.
33. It is acknowledged objections have been received on amenity grounds regarding this property and the proposal would have a greater impact than the bungalow which currently occupies the site. However, on balance, it is not considered the impact would be such that a refusal could be upheld. The neighbouring property has windows on all floors looking onto the application site which itself is not particularly neighbourly. Furthermore, although there would be additional rear facing windows looking over the rear garden, these would be at an oblique angle and would result in a similar relationship to many others in the area. The only openings proposed on the north-eastern elevation would be a door and window serving the kitchen of apartment 1 on the ground floor and two small windows at first floor level, obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres, serving a bathroom and living area for apartment 3. In addition, there would be two roof lights in the eastern slope of the roof serving a bathroom and kitchen area to the second floor apartment. However, given the angle of these windows and height above floor level, it is not considered that these would cause any overlooking.
34. To the rear there would be rear gardens and the parking area on the application site and long rear gardens on the neighbouring dwellings fronting South Road, as such, it is not considered that the impact would be unduly harmful. To the west elevation windows would be limited and in any case the adjacent property is used as a dentist surgery and it is not considered the impact would be unduly harmful.
35. It is acknowledged there have been a high number of objections on the grounds of residential amenity. However, the proposal would have a satisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties and would not lead to undue overlooking, loss of daylight or sunlight or be overbearing. As such, on balance, the proposal is acceptable and complies with the above policies and guidance.
36. The proposed development would be served by an access leading to 5 off street parking spaces and a turning area. There has been a high level of objection, many on the grounds of the existing high demand for on street parking. This is acknowledged; however, it must also be noted the Highway Authority raise no objection and one space per flat is proposed in a sustainable location, in close proximity to the town centre. It is, therefore, considered the increase in demand for on street parking would be reduced by this provision to the point that it would be difficult to resist on either highway safety or harm to amenity of neighbours through it being harder to secure on street parking. It is also acknowledged the road in places narrows and has a

high level of on street parking; it is also used as a cut through and the site access is in close proximity to the junction with Loughborough Road. However, it is not expected the development would generate a significant level of traffic that would lead to highway capacity issues or dangers to highway users.

37. A flood risk assessment has been submitted and the Environment Agency raise no objection and the application confirms the design of the building will be based on flood resilience design recommendations.
38. In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle, occupying a sustainable location close to the town centre. The proposal is visually acceptable, satisfactorily overcoming the previous grounds for refusal and would have a satisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties. The proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety and flood risk and is recommended for approval.
39. The proposal was subject to pre-application discussions with the applicant and advice was offered on the measures that could be adopted to improve the scheme and address the potential adverse effects of the proposal. As a result of this process, modifications were made to the proposal, in accordance with the pre-application advice. Further negotiations have taken place during the consideration of the application to address concerns raised in written 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 recommendation to grant planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

It is **RECOMMENDED** that planning permission be granted subject to the following condition(s)

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: CR-17-01 Rev C Location and Block Plan and CR-17-02 Rev B Elevations and Layout.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan].
3. The development hereby permitted shall not proceed above foundation level until details of the facing and roofing materials to be used on all external elevations have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council and the development shall only take place in accordance with the materials so approved.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

4. Prior to development progressing above damp proof course level a detailed landscaping scheme for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The approved scheme shall be carried out in 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.

[In the interests of amenity and to comply with policy EN13 (Landscaping Schemes) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan.]

5. Prior to development progressing above damp proof course level details of all screen fencing/walling and means of enclosure to be erected on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The scheme shall include noise attenuation fencing along the boundary with no.83 Chaworth Road, as indicated on the approved plans. The development shall not be brought into use until the approved screen fencing/walling and means of enclosure have been completed, and they shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

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

6. Before development commences details of finished ground and floor levels in relation to an existing datum point, existing site levels and adjoining land shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council before the development commences and the development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the details so approved.

[In the interest of amenity and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan. This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure the levels are appropriate to the character of the area as no details have been submitted]

7. Development shall not proceed beyond foundation level until such time that the following details have be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any apartment hereby approved:

- a) Details of cills and lintels;
- b) Details of all fenestration including design and confirmation the windows will be set in reveal;
- c) Details of all rooflights;
- d) Details including materials and location of rainwater goods.

[To ensure the appearance of the development is satisfactory and to comply with Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local

Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

8. The proposed apartments shall not be occupied until the approved off-street parking area has been provided and the parking area shall thereafter be retained for residents parking.

[To ensure that adequate off-street parking is made to reduce the possibilities of the proposed development leading to on-street parking in the area, in the general interest of highway safety].

9. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Rev A, 03/11/2016 compiled by Consulting Engineering, and the following mitigation measures detailed within the Flood Risk Assessment:
 1. Finished floor levels are set no lower than 25.0 m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) as stated in section 2b of the FRA.
 2. Flood resilient and flood repairable design be utilised in the design of the unit, as discussed in section 6a of the FRA.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

[To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and to comply with Policy WET2 (Flooding) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

10. The windows shown on Plan CR-17-02 Rev A as being obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres from the internal floor level shall be obscure glazed prior to the first occupation of any apartment to group 5 level of obscurity. The development shall not proceed beyond foundation level until such time that these details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. No changes shall be made to the windows without the prior written approval of the Borough Council.

[To ensure the impact of the proposal is acceptable and to comply with Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

11. Notwithstanding the approved plans, and prior to the development being brought into use a scheme detailing the location and construction of a bin store and cycle store shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The approved bin and cycle store shall be implemented prior to first occupation.

[To protect the amenities of nearby residents and to comply with policy GP2 (Design & Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

12. Occupation of the apartments shall not take place until the access driveway has been surfaced in a bound material (not loose gravel) for a minimum distance of 5.0 metres behind the highway boundary, and which shall be drained to prevent the discharge of surface water from the driveway to the public highway. The bound material and the provision to prevent the discharge of surface water to the public highway shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

13. Occupation of the apartments shall not take place until the access driveway is fronted by a dropped kerb vehicle crossing.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

14. Occupation of the proposed apartments shall not take place until a refuse collection point has been provided in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be provided as approved prior to the first use of any apartment hereby approved and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development.

[In the interest of highway safety and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

15. The cill level of the rooflights in the eastern roof slope of the building hereby approved, serving the bathroom and kitchen area to apartment 5, shall be no lower than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level within apartment.

[In the interests of the amenities of the neighbouring property and to comply with Policy GP2 (Design and Amenity Criteria) of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan]

Notes to Applicant

With respect to the materials condition of this planning permission, please contact the Case Officer to arrange for samples to be viewed on site, giving at least 5 days' notice. The application for discharging this condition relating to materials, should be submitted prior to this.

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