

**18/02515/FUL**

**Applicant** Bloor Homes Limited

**Location** Land North Of Bunny Lane, Keyworth

**Proposal** Erection of 222 dwellings with landscaping, public open space and associated infrastructure.

**Ward** Keyworth And Wolds

## **LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE**

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:** Local resident

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

- a) Development on the ridgeline would be visible.
- b) The ridgeline and the two northern fields should be left to farming and free from infrastructure.
- c) A proposed mini-roundabout would urbanise Bradmore Conservation Area.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The impacts of the development are assessed in the report.

The junction of Pendock Lane with the A60 is immediately adjacent but outside the Bradmore Conservation Area. Whilst the final design of the roundabout has yet to be agreed with the Highway Authority, the information currently available indicates that this will be a mini roundabout. It is considered that this would not have a significant visual impact, appearing as part of the wider highway network, and would not harm the setting of the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Townscape Appraisal identifies key views out of the village at this point, but again it is considered that the provision of a roundabout at this location would not harm these. The proposed mini roundabout is not considered to result in harm to the setting of Listed or key unlisted buildings or their setting. It should be noted that the County Council as Highway Authority are able to undertake works within the highway without requiring planning permission.

# 19/00535/OUT

**Applicant** Mr John Coleman

**Location** Land East Of,Loughborough Road, Ruddington

**Proposal** Outline application (with all matters reserved apart from access) for residential development of around 180 homes with associated landscaping, public open space and infrastructure.

**Ward** Ruddington

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Neither supporting nor objecting

**RECEIVED FROM:** Member of the Public

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

1. The contributor notes disappointment that with over 500 homes to be built in Ruddington there are no new schools and no more doctors surgeries.
2. They also express concern regarding the amount of traffic coming through the village.
3. The contributor expressed that this would represent 2 out of 3 sites for Ruddington, does this mean the 3<sup>rd</sup> site would be taken off the agenda.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

1. Members are referred to the S106 table which indicates the site would make financial contribution to allow provision of additional school places and capacity at the doctors' surgery, amongst a range of other things including a financial contribution to the parish council for the provision of a new community facility and parish rooms.
2. The matter of transport impact has been dealt with in the full in the report, with the scheme supported by appropriate transport assessments.
3. The Emerging Local Plan Part 2 has, following main modifications, proposed to allocate 4 housing sites around Ruddington. This site forms one of these proposed allocations and its delivery would not

prejudice the delivery of, or the need to deliver, any other proposed allocations.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Update to Recommended Conditions

**RECEIVED FROM:** Planning Officer

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Amendments highlighted in **Bold:**

9. No development shall take place in the relevant phase (other than for the access to Loughborough Road approved by under this permission) until details of the following in respect of that phase have been submitted:-
  - I. A detailed layout plan of the proposed development
  - II. The siting, design and external appearance of the proposed buildings;
  - III. details of finished ground and floor levels in relation to an existing datum point, existing site levels and adjoining land
  - IV. Cycle and bin storage facilities;
  - V. Sections and cross sections of the site showing the relationship of the proposed development to adjoining land and premises;
  - VI. The means of enclosure to be erected on the site;
  - VII. The finishes for the hard-surfaced areas of the site;
  - VIII. The layout and marking of car parking, servicing and maneuvering areas;
  - IX. The details of a scheme for the provision of electric vehicle charging points to serve each dwelling on the site. If any plots are to be without provision then it must be demonstrated why the positioning of such apparatus to the external fabric of the dwelling or garage, or the provision of a standalone vehicle charging point would be technically unfeasible or would have an adverse visual appearance on the street-scene.**
  - X. Plans, sections and cross sections of any roads or access/service roads or pedestrian routes within the application site, and this shall include details of drainage, surfacing and lighting;
  - XI. The means of access within the site;
  - XII. Details of the means of foul and surface water drainage;
  - XIII. The number and location of the affordable dwellings to be provided together with the mix of dwellings in terms of number of bedrooms and proportion of houses and flats and tenure;
  - XIV. Details of how renewable/ energy efficiency, climate change proofing has been incorporated into the phase to include for the provision of electric charging points and measures to conserve and recycle water;
  - XV. A statement providing an explanation as to how the design of the development has had regard to the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application and include an assessment the

development against the Building for Life Standards and will allow for a development which does not prejudice the delivery of the neighbouring site Flawforth Lane.

XVI. Details of connectivity to the neighbouring site on Flawforth Lane.

XVII. Details of on-site recreation space/facilities to serve the proposed development. Details to be submitted shall include landscaping, planting and any equipment to be provided on the proposed amenity spaces with equipment for the proposed LEAP to generally accord with the aim to cater for children in the age bracket of 8 - 11 years unless evidenced otherwise.

The development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with those approved details.

[These details will help inform the Reserved matters details and will ensure a satisfactory development in accordance with the aims of Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy and Policy 6.3 of emerging Local Plan Part 2 Land and Planning Policies. This condition is pre commencement to ensure details are acceptable prior to work commencing on site].

**Condition 23** – remove reference to car charging points.

23. Prior to the occupation of each dwelling submitted as part of the planning application each dwelling shall be provided with ducting to enable the connection to high speed fibre optic Broadband.

[To assist in reducing travel demand by enabling working from home initiatives and in the interests of encouraging sustainable forms of travel in accordance with the aims of Policy 24 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy].

**NEW CONDITION inserted at 24.**

**24. No dwelling shall be occupied until such time as it has been serviced with the appropriate electric vehicle charging infrastructure, where practicable, as agreed and detailed through reserved matters approval (condition 9).**

**[In order to address the causes and impacts of climate change and in accordance with Policy 2 (Climate Change) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy].**

All conditions following this to be retained and re-numbered in response to the additional condition above.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

Additional requirement to condition 9 to ensure details of car charging points are provided with appropriate allowance for any possible delivery issues that cannot

be envisaged or overcome. Associated changes to condition 23, and new condition 24 to ensure charging points are implemented and available to use for dwellings prior to occupation.

This does not alter the assessment of the scheme.

# 19/00735/FUL

**Applicant** Mr & Mrs Lee

**Location** 12 Cliff Drive, Radcliffe On Trent, Nottinghamshire

**Proposal** Demolish existing dwelling and outbuildings, construct one two-storey house and one bungalow, associated means of access, enclosure and soft and hard landscaping

**Ward** Radcliffe On Trent

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comments in support of the application

**RECEIVED FROM:** Applicant's agent

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

- a) The application is supported by Councillor Neil Clarke and Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council which suggests that the issues on which officers have reached their recommendation to refuse the application are by no means 'clear cut', and that at least some people with intimate local knowledge of the area do not see a problem with this proposal.
- b) The report acknowledges the proposal is satisfactory in respect of highway access, separation distances, overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing, but identifies two connected issues on which the recommendation to refuse is based.
- c) It is considered the proposal is out of character with the established building line set well back from the road. However in reality, such a building line is not evident on the ground. The more general pattern of development immediately surrounding the site is a mixture, of bungalows and two storey dwellings, with varied setbacks from the road. The new house, and bungalow behind, would group with the two houses 12a and b behind.
- d) It is stated that the development is 'cramped' and over intense. This is nonsense. This is a very large plot. It can easily accommodate the two proposed dwellings, with ample amenity space and separation between the proposed. Other developments have been permitted in Radcliffe where more accommodation of a similar type has been placed on smaller plots. The issue of 'tandem' development is mentioned as a negative; however,

the tandem development already exists along much Cliff Drive.

- e) The development would not harm the character of the area. At worst, its effect would be neutral, and it may set the standard for future redevelopment of adjacent plots. Refusal would set a precedent for neighbouring properties, when, in all probability, future applications are made to redevelop these very large sites.

#### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

- a) Whilst it is acknowledged that the local Ward Councillor and the Parish Council have no issue with the proposal, these views amount to material considerations to be weighed in the planning balance, this does not in itself mean that the proposal is acceptable. The proposal still needs to be assessed against its local context and against the relevant local and national planning policies.
- b) The proposal is considered acceptable on certain grounds, including highways and residential amenity. However, as mentioned in the main report the application is recommended for refusal on other grounds. It is not the case that these issues are connected.
- c) Whilst there is no formal fixed, rigid building line on this part of Cliff Drive the properties are characterized by being set well back from the road and on a similar building line to each other including the existing dwelling. The proposal would be significantly further forward of this line. Whilst the general area has a mix of bungalows and two storey dwellings the properties facing Cliff Drive are smaller properties comprising bungalows or dormer bungalows. The proposal, which includes a large two storey dwelling would be in contrast to the character of the existing properties, which are smaller in size facing this part of Cliff Drive.
- d) Other similar development in Radcliffe may have been permitted on smaller plots, however the character and pattern of development in the area is likely to have been different. The character of the area is defined as smaller properties on large plots set back from the road and representing a low density of development. The proposal would be at odds with all of these characteristics.
- e) Refusal would not set a precedent for future development in the area. There is no guarantee that any of the other plots would be developed in the future just because they sit on large plots. Each application must be determined on its own merits.

**19/01236/FUL**

**Applicant** K Jones

**Location** Flat 1 And 2,59 Crosby Road, West Bridgford

**Proposal** Proposed rooflight to side elevation; basement window to side (revised description)

**Ward** Lady Bay

#### **LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE**

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** objection

**RECEIVED FROM:** neighbouring property

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

- a) Concern over the proposed closing off of the rear entrance to the flats at 59 Crosby Road causing noise, disturbance and loss of privacy.
- b) This proposed change of access is not mentioned in the proposal for the flats.
- c) Also adequate space for bin storage, washing lines etc. for the flats will be removed with the change of access.
- d) It will have a huge impact on the area due to the overdevelopment, especially when considered in conjunction with the planned extension/redevelopment of The Lodge at 7 Trevelyan Road (19/01330/FUL).

#### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The space at the rear of the flats, currently used as a forecourt area, is outside of the red line boundary for this particular application. Currently there is an informal arrangement where occupiers of the flats park and walk across the forecourt of The Lodge to access the flats. This would be closed off to provide amenity space for the future occupiers of the Lodge building under application 19/01330/FUL. Residents would then access their properties over the side pedestrian passage adjacent to the neighbour at number 61 Crosby Road. However, this is an existing access for occupiers, which they can currently use so no additional pedestrian access is being created.



2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** comment

**RECEIVED FROM:** applicant's agent

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

The agent of the application confirmed the loft conversion and fencing at the rear of the flats should be removed from the application, this work is already authorised by a previous planning permission. The description has been amended to reflect that change. They also confirmed the basement would be used for storage and a TV room.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

No further comments to add.