

**20/02623/FUL**

**Applicant** Miss Jen Harvey

**Location** Land West Of, Pasture Lane, Sutton Bonington

**Proposal** Erection of an equestrian stable block, with outdoor manège, associated car parking and access. Stable block with eight stable pens, hay store and tack room, used as a full livery yard. (Resubmission)

**Ward** Sutton Bonington

### LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** comments/ points of clarification
- RECEIVED FROM:** Highway Access Solutions in support of the applicant

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

- Clarification of initial comments on vehicle movements, it is accepted that the proposal would result in a slight intensification of vehicular movements compared to the current consented use of the land.
- Vehicular movements would be negligible in the context of existing traffic flows along Pasture Lane, which serves a 20 space car park at Diamond Wood and is used by heavy agricultural machinery.
- Inaccuracy in paragraph 31 of the committee report - the entire length of Pasture Lane is paved, rather than the 'metalled surface' terminating at Pasture Close as stated in the report.
- It should be the duty of the Highway Authority to maintain the road.
- The matter of mud on the road does not relate to the state of the paved surface.
- The works requested to upgrade the highway would cost more than the value of the development, not considered that the works would meet the tests set out under paragraph 56 of the NPPF.
- Access to an equestrian use by a single-track dual-use bridleway is not an uncommon situation
- Not considered the proposal would result in an unacceptable highway safety impact

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

The officer agrees that the section of Pasture Lane serving the application site is a tarmacked surface, rather than the tarmacked/metalled part of the highway terminating at Pasture Close as stated in paragraph 31 of the committee report.

There is however a clear distinction between the section of Pasture Lane running to Pasture Close, and the proceeding part of Pasture Lane serving the application site which is single width and in a poor state of repair and would require improving.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**      Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:**                      Neighbour/member of public

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Alleged that there are several timber buildings currently erected on the site, not shown on the application plans. Unclear if these structures are to remain if planning permission is granted.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

No structures were observed at the time of undertaking the site visit. Any additional permanent structures erected on the site would be considered unauthorised, therefor requiring consent regardless of the outcome of the application.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**      Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:**                      Neighbour/member of public

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Alleged operation of equine business from the field with several horses owned by third parties.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The land is not currently consented for an equestrian use, however formal action has not been pursued whilst the planning application is pending consideration. In the event that planning permission is refused, the matter may be subject to further enforcement investigation.

## 20/02632/REM

**Applicant** Mrs H Dawkins

**Location** OS Field 8500 Partial,Lantern Lane, East Leake

**Proposal** Application for approval of matters reserved under application ref 17/02292/OUT relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 195 dwellings with associated access, landscaping, open space and drainage infrastructure.

**Ward** Leake

### LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional information and revised plans. Further clarification on the delivery of the landscaping scheme and the proposed affordable housing mix.

**RECEIVED FROM:** Applicant/Agent

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

Additional and revised plans have been received, including a revised planning layout, landscape proposals and plot landscape proposals. An additional plan detailing the 3 bar post and rail fence proposed along the boundary of the attenuation pond and watercourse. They have also provided further clarification in response to concerns raised by local Councillors, including:

- a. The open space will be retained in the ownership of the RP, Platform Housing Limited, and will be directly managed and maintained by their property care department, with assistance from landscaping sub-contractors if necessary. A modest estate management charge will be required from each household, but this will be considerably more cost effective than estate management by a separate entity.
- b. The new tree planting within the landscape buffer can be provided within the first planting season following commencement of development, so in this case, should planning be granted, and development commence (both in March 2021), then the planting can be done between October 2021 and April 2022, which is the earliest planting season.
- c. The height of the trees provided in the landscaping scheme would be their size at the time of planting.
- d. Platform have derived the housing mix from assessing the local demographics and housing needs information that is available to them. It is a balanced mix that they believe enables them to provide a cohesive and

- inclusive community.
- e. In response to the lack of one bedroom house types proposed, Platform has a preference for 2 bed house types in lieu of 1 beds in this location, to provide some scope for household growth, and 2 bed shared ownership properties will be accessible to people on lower incomes who would normally only be able to afford 1 bed properties on the open market. Shared owners purchase additional equity in their homes as their incomes increase over time, eventually staircasing to full ownership. This will ensure over 50% home ownership, and a balanced mixed tenure community will be developed over the life of this Lantern Lane estate.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

Amended plans have been submitted altering the parking layout so that vehicle spaces are located to the front of the dwelling they serve, rather than to the front of the neighbouring dwelling. The alterations affect plots 53-54, 119-120, 131-132, 133-134 and 151-152. The landscaping scheme has also been amended to accommodate these changes, including the repositioning of a number of trees both within and surrounding the plots.

Although the Agent has indicated the Applicants willingness to begin the tree planting within the landscape buffer within the first planting season following the commencement of development, condition 8 attached to the outline permission does not require planting to begin until: *“the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development.”* Rather than vary this condition it is suggested details of the scheme for planting is secured as part of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, attached to condition 2 suggested for inclusion under this condition.

Condition 1 need to be updated to refer to:  
Detailed Planning Layout EL-DPL-01, Rev. D  
On plot landscape proposals 9707-I-04-09c  
POS landscape proposals 9707-I-01-03e  
Post and rail fence detail SDF/80

An additional note to applicant needs to be included to highlight the protection afforded to the landscape buffer against future development with reference to the outline application and the Local Plan Part 2 policy 3.2.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**      Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:**                      Ward Councillor Cllr.Thomas

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

Cllr. Thomas raised a number of further concerns to the proposed scheme as outlined in the attached table. In addition Cllr. Thomas raised concerns relating to

access to public transport of an “all affordable” site in this location and questions the proposed housing mix.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

Many of the Concerns raised in the submitted table have been addressed in the main report with additional clarification provided in the additional information submitted by the Agent/Applicant above.

With regard to public transport, Cllr Thomas provides calculations relating to the distances between properties within the site and the existing bus stops on Gotham Road, measuring between 800m and 1km, and quotes Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide requires (para 2.8) that “Affordable housing, and higher-density residential development should all be located within 400m of a bus stop, and preferably closer.” A financial contribution of £32,000 has been secured through the Unilateral Undertaking attached to the outline permission ref. 17/02292/OUT towards the provision of two bus stops within or within the vicinity of the site. These bus stops should bring all of the dwellings in the site within 400m walking distance of a bus stop. This detail has been requested as part of the Section 38 technical highways submission to the Local Highway (LHA).

The financial contributions towards the new bus stops as well as the improvements to the existing bus service of £100,000 would be paid directly to the County Council and it would be for them to assign to an additional/improved bus service provision as they see fit, whether it be a new service or re-routing an existing service.

Cllr Thomas is concerned that this development would not be a sustainable development because of its distance from public transport and would be in the wrong place for a concentrated site to meet Rushcliffe’s affordable target. The sustainability of the site with regards to access to public transport and services, in particular via walking and cycling, was considered at the outline application stage. As outlined in the main report, the fact that the site would now provide a 100% affordable scheme is not considered to undermine this original assessment.

Cllr Thomas is concerned that the justification given for the housing mix proposed refers to an assessment by the Registered Provider (RP), which has not been made available. She references significant data analysis and surveying of opinion re housing mix undertaken during the neighbourhood plan process which is also supported by more recent comments from residents including: “*the need for affordable options for local young single people to get onto the housing ladder whilst staying in the village and the need for homes suitable for older people.*” She suggests possible changes to the tenure to address this including option 1: a slight reduction in 1 bed houses and 2 bed bungalows in social rent, and 2 bed bungalows in shared ownership and an increase in 1 bed houses in shared ownership. Option 1 includes the addition of an increase in the number of 2 bed social rent and a reduction of the same house two in shared ownership.

As outlined above in the response from the agent the applicant has derived the housing mix from assessing the local demographics and housing needs information that is available to them. It is noted that Strategic Housing are supportive of the housing mix proposed. In addition, the work carried out by the Parish Council as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process is over 5 years old and may no longer be up to date.

With regard to the lack of 1 bed house types proposed in shared ownership, the explanation provided by the Applicant/Agent is accepted that *“2 bed house types provide some scope for household growth, and 2 bed shared ownership properties will be accessible to people on lower incomes who would normally only be able to afford 1 bed properties on the open market.”* In addition, it should be recognised that the properties in shared ownership, which would make up 51% of the properties within the site, could over time come within the full ownership of their occupiers creating *“a balanced mixed estate”*.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**      Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:**                      Local resident/Tree Warden for East Leake

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Disappointed to see the hedgerow removed and requests that a pot grown hedge be considered along the frontage as an alternative to the suggested whips as this will be a more instant hedge, mature quicker and provide a home to wildlife in a much shorter time. Note there is a large amount of open space with few trees planned, can only see 56 planned in the open areas. Could more tree planting be provided?

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The removal of the hedgerow was approved at the outline stage and is not a matter for consideration under this application. The landscaping scheme has been assessed by the Borough Council’s Design and Landscaping Officer who is supportive of the scheme proposed. Although larger hedge planting could have a more instant visual impact, pot grown hedging is not always faster to establish in the long run, and can be more prone to failing than whips. Additional tree planting has already been provided within the area of open space to the north and east of the proposed dwellings, on the request of the Design and Landscaping Officer. The level of tree planting proposed is considered sufficient and the new tree planting would significantly exceed the one tree which has been lost from within the site.

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

**RECEIVED FROM:** Cllr. Brown (County Councillor)

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- a. The village infrastructure will not support further developments
- b. Lantern Lane and surrounding roads are not suitable for a bus service
- c. Eastern side of Village has been destroyed over the past 20 years, wildlife and their habitats have been lost forever.
- d. Think it's a disgrace he cannot speak at Committee.
- e. If development goes ahead it is another nail in the coffin for East Leake.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The principle of the development has been established by outline application ref. 17/02292/OUT. The provision of a bus service to the site was requested by Nottinghamshire County Council, and their Highways Department as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has raised no objections to this provision. The impact of the proposal on wildlife and their habitats was considered at the outline stage and has been given further consideration in the main Committee Report. Although there is no specific provision for a County Councillor to speak at Planning Committee it would have been possible to register to speak as an objector/member of the public.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objections (x2)

**RECEIVED FROM:** Local Residents

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- a. Object to the removal of the hedgerow before this application has been determined, request the developer be instructed to plant mature replacement stock immediately.
- b. Groundworks have caused problems walking the existing footpath, especially where a boggy area has been left in the middle of the footpath. The developer should be required to put down some hardcore.
- c. Object to the new proposed layout at the junction of Lantern Lane/Falcon Way for a number of reasons including:
  - i) Raised platform will not slow down traffic and will not keep vehicles on the road.
  - ii) No HB2 kerbs to stop vehicles mounting the pavement, would make the junction unsafe for pedestrians.
  - iii) A car was prevented from mounting the footway by the existing HB2 kerbs in a recent collision in light icy/snowy weather.
  - iv) Increase in air and noise pollution from vehicles changing speed in the vicinity of the speed bump (raised platform).

- v) Resident's property at 2 Falcon Way has not been put on any plans.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The removal of the hedgerow was established at the outline stage, it is not dependent on the outcome of this application. Condition 15 attached to the outline permission ref. 17/02292/OUT required the hedgerow be removed outside of bird nesting season: March to August inclusive. Having walked the footpath on Tuesday morning (09 March), it was noted that there is a muddy area immediately adjacent to the stile located towards the center of the site. However, it is unclear if this is as a result of the groundworks carried out or by pedestrians walking around rather than over the stile. Nonetheless, users of the footway following the recorded path would avoid this area.

The site access, including the proposed traffic calming and highway improvement measures were extensively considered under the outline application ref: 17/02292/OUT, in consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Department as the LHA. It is noted that they did not raise any objections in relation to highway safety. In addition, objections were not raised by the Borough's Environmental Health Department in relation to this matter with regard to noise and air pollution. Technical details relating to the construction of the highway, including the type of kerbstone proposed, are submitted to the LHA in the form of an application for technical approval under Section 38 of the Highways Act. Therefore, as these details have already been considered and approved under the outline application, they are not considered to be a matter for debate under the current application.



## 20/02632/REM – Further Comments re Ward Members’ Objections - 9 March 2021

Ref	Issue	Agent(A) and Case Officer (CO) response	Further Comments	Possible resolution/mitigation
1	Distance of the site from public transport	A+CO - Contributions of £100K to improve bus service and £32 for bus stops to be provided as requested. This was decided at the outline stage.	This issue relates to the acceptability of an “all affordable” site at this location. The affordable housing is provided to meet Rushcliffe need rather than local need so access to public transport is vital. Outline permission was not for all affordable. Residents in affordable homes less likely to own cars and more likely to have mobility issues. Contributions unlikely to result in changes that would position the site within required distance from public transport. No confidence that contributions will be spent. Plans do not show bus stops on or near the site.	This is a fundamental objection, contrary to policy: LPP1 Policy 14 LPP1 Policy 10 1(e) ELNP T3 NCC Highways Design Guide Para 2.8 NPPF Chapter 9 See narrative in notes below the table.
2	Electric vehicle charging points	CO – Suggest a condition. Not a condition at the outline stage because preceded LPP2	Outline was all matters reserved except access – this is not access. Added at committee stage for other developments. LPP2 policy 41, NPPF 105(e) NCC Highways Design Guide 4.1.13	Add condition
3	SUDS and POS ownership and management charges	A - “The open space will be retained in the ownership of the Housing Association/Registered Provider (RP), and will be managed by their own internal maintenance sector. Whilst this will still mean a small management fee, it will be considerably less than what it would be if it were to be	Thank you for clarification. This is preferable to a profit-making management company.	Is variation of S106 needed?

OFFICIAL

		transferred and maintained by a separate entity, so far more cost effective for the prospective residents.”		
4	Connectivity to neighbouring estate	A – Can only provide to the boundary	Connectivity required by ELNP policy T1/T2 and various other local and national policies and standards incl NPPF 91(a), Building for Life question 1, LPP1 10 2(d), LPP1 16 3(b) We ask for two links – one for a cycle and pedestrian connection into the body of the adjacent development and one to allow the two parcels of open space at the top of the sites to be linked for recreational use by pedestrians and to give access to the rights of way network. Whilst connected links would be preferred it is important to at least provide the paths to the boundary on one side as adopted highway to allow connection at some time in the future. We draw your attention to the fact that some current residents do not want links, but others, and future residents on both sides, may.	Amend plans to create foot and cycle paths up to the boundary, as adopted highway.
5	Environmental harm Landscape buffer Planting plans Planting timescales	CO – Landscape buffer set out in 3.2 of LPP2. More trees already added after comments by relevant Officer who now supports scheme. Planting timescale is in condition 8 of outline permission	Public outcry at premature removal of hedges and tree. Scheme can easily be improved to reduce environmental impact Request from tree warden	Use mature hedging plants along boundary to Lantern Lane. Include more trees, add a woodland area. Consider areas where planting could take place sooner than at the end of build.
6	Protect Public Open Space (POS) against further building	CO – There are already conditions relating to this in the grant of	Huge public concern because of increased housing numbers and loss of green space on other sites, and fear of further	Add an advisory note to detail how the POS is protected.

OFFICIAL

		<p>outline permission and policy 3.2 of LPP2.  A – “Clearly the outline planning permission (OPP) restricts numbers of 195 dwellings, so any increase in numbers, whether this be within the development parcels themselves or on open space (which it is not our intention to do) will be subject to new planning consents, which will be treated on their own merits.”</p>	<p>applications being submitted for this one in the future. This would damage the amenity of existing residents on the adjacent site as well as residents on this site.</p>	<p>(This issue is linked to future ownership of the land – see 3)</p>
7	<p>Change the parking spaces outside the wrong houses</p>	<p>CO – Highways supports.  Only a few spaces slightly separated from their dwelling</p>	<p>The distance from the dwelling is not the main issue – it is disturbance to the homes where spaces outside belong to other houses.  Also makes electric charging difficult – see 2  Examples – 179/180  parking spaces for 120 are in front of 119, giving rise to potential disturbance to the residents of 119, and yet there would appear to be the ability to put these in front of, or even beside, 120.</p>	<p>Replan where possible.</p>
8	<p>Put in extra/visitor parking spaces</p>			<p>Replan if possible</p>
9	<p>Replace tandem parking places by side-by-side</p>			<p>Replan where possible</p>
10	<p>Layout of parking – long distances to reverse</p>		<p>Examples  54/55 (wheelchair) – see below also  No turning space by 119/120 resulting in need to reverse in or out along the private</p>	<p>Replan where possible</p>

## OFFICIAL

			road. The same situation is in other corners of the estate.	
11	Housing mix	CO – not sure what request for RP’s analysis of housing need refers to. Mix will contribute towards Rushcliffe affordable target Strategic Housing Manager supports Proposed is 51%/33%/15% This “broadly meets” LLP1 which stipulates 42%/39%,/19%	Refers to earlier comment from agent “ <i>The mix is based on what the RP consider is required based on their assessment of housing needs within the area</i> ” Does not “broadly meet” LPP1 stipulated %s E.g. total rental is 49% as opposed to 58% stipulated – this is significant.	Publish RP’s assessment.  Could easily address compliance with LLP1 and some of the issues 11(a) to (e) below by changing tenure types without having to change the building plan See narrative below table
11a	Make more of the bungalows wheelchair adapted. Revisit design of wheelchair adapted, including parking	CO - (response to ELPC) All bungalows are adapted for people with disabilities. In line with RBC’s requirements, 1 % of the dwellings (2), are wheelchair compliant CO – Parking spaces considered acceptable	Not clear how the 12 bungalows that are not adapted for wheelchairs are adapted for older people or those with reduced mobility, other than being bungalows. Even in the adapted bungalows, there is no indication of any adaptations other than layout. e.g. positioning of electric sockets, workstation heights, step-free entrance ...	Condition that wheelchair adapted bungalows fully meet relevant standards. Clarification needed on design of both kinds of bungalow. Revise parking layout for plots 54/55 to include turning space rather than a long reverse (see 10) and avoid tandem parking for plot 55 – which is particularly difficult for a wheelchair user (see 9).
11b	Some 1 person needed, e.g. studio flats (ELNP studies)	CO – (response to ELPC) there are 8no. 1 person homes	1B2P are one bedroom 2 people houses These are not 1 person accommodation	Accept difficult to change at this stage
11c	Some shared ownership 1-bed needed	CO - There are no one bedroom shared ownership properties but a two person household could potentially meet the criteria for a two bedroom property of which there are 30 proposed including bungalows, flats and houses.	Community Plan survey revealed demand from single people to get onto housing ladder and stay in E/L. The smallest houses will be the most affordable for shared ownership.	Make some of the 1B2P shared ownership

OFFICIAL

11d	Bungalows required for older people, but part ownership not required for older people	CO- Bungalows not just for older people looking to downsize, may be suited to a wide range of people.	The more part ownership bungalows there are the greater the likelihood that these will be allocated to couples and families who don't need a bungalow, as opposed to older people who do.	Make all/more of the bungalows social or affordable rent, and fewer part ownership
11e	Why so few 2B houses for social rent?	CO – 2B bungalows for social rent are available	2B homes are needed for families not requiring bungalows – if bungalows are the only 2B options available then availability for older people will be reduced.	Change some of the shared ownership 2B houses to social rent
12	Amend the S106 to give priority to E/L residents and allow right to buy etc	CO – already laid out in S106 and cannot be changed. Housing is to cater for Rushcliffe needs – it is not a rural exception site	Disappointed there is no will to help with this, which was an aspiration in the ELNP and would help with neighbour acceptance of all affordable site. Young people are unhappy they can't obtain affordable housing to stay in the village. Residents on other new estates here are unhappy they cannot buy their homes. Are shared ownership properties eligible for staircasing so that buyers can move towards full ownership in the future?	
13	Crossing patrol	CO – Contribution of £30K obtained.	No belief it will happen. Existing crossing patrol in village has long standing vacancy	RBC needs to monitor
14	Highways/pavement improvements	CO- Developer to improve Lantern Lane and Gotham Road footpath as far as Stonebridge. £20K contribution payable towards cost of improving Gotham Road pavement south of Stonebridge Drive.	Fear some of this may get forgotten or be subject to wrangles about whether Highways or the developer does the work as has happened with other sites. £20K is likely to be insufficient for additional Gotham Road work south of Stonebridge drive which is pressing.	Absolute clarity needed about who does what and when. Additional conditions may be needed for the items to be undertaken by developer. Monitoring by RBC is needed for items where there is a contribution and the work is to be done by Highways
15	Safety around drainage ponds and water courses	n/a – newly raised issue	The pond is right next to play area and the plans show open post and rail fencing	Revisit fencing around ponds so that it is child safe. And/or a

## OFFICIAL

				condition to ensure children play area is fenced.
16	Construction traffic at school peaks	n/a – newly raised issue	Lantern Lane already congested – real fears of road safety at times when schools open and close. Heavy construction traffic needs to avoid the area at these times. Construction plan does not consider this in specification of hours for deliveries etc.	Contact schools to determine peak times and amend construction method statement to prevent deliveries at these times.
17	Lantern Lane road improvement works and school peaks	n/a – newly raised issue	Fears for road safety if road works to improve Lantern Lane are under way while children are travelling to school. Ref Highways plans 1499/20 and 1499/18B	Ideally schedule road works for school holidays, or weekends, otherwise restrict hours of work to avoid school peak hours

**20/03153/FUL****Applicant** Dr Sharon Ding**Location** 12 Abbey Road, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire**Proposal** Proposed Two Storey Rear Elevation extension and Single Storey Side Elevation Extensions**Ward** Trent Bridge**LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE**

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Further/additional objections
- RECEIVED FROM:** Mr & Mrs Coffey, 10 Abbey Road, West Bridgford

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

Additional comments responding to the updating supporting letter submitted 24th January, and the sun path video submitted 17th February 2021.

- Many points of the committee report are not accurate.
- Comment that their property and small rear garden is at an angle to the application property, the impacts are therefore greater in the case of their property due to this layout arrangement of the road.
- The agent has stated the 45 degree guideline in relation to their property is not breached and therefore the proposal is acceptable. No details have been submitted, however, to confirm this via a block plan with the 45 degree angle drawn from their living room window.
- Digital sun path video does not reflect the position in relation to their property and garden on the ground.
- The sun path only considers the shadow cast in relation to the extension, does not include the garage and neighbouring property at 39 Florence Road.
- The applicant has not been clear about what is happening to the brick wall garage, which forms part of the main boundary wall with their property and has not included this on the plans.

- Any narrowing of the gap between the rear of no. 12 and its garage will have a significant effect on sunlight and natural light into the back of the neighbouring property.
- As the sun moves round to the west (as stated in the report), it does not then totally clear the garden as stated in the committee report.
- No assessment has been made either by the applicant's agent nor the case officer, in relation to their back of our house.
- The proposal will have a very real and immediate effect on their residential amenity and negatively impact on their health and wellbeing.
- Consideration should also be given to the size and position of their property, in relation to the proposed two storey extension which will have a disproportionate impact on their property and garden.
- They would like to make particular reference to the design of the rear windows which do not accord with each other and appears an after-thought.
- They request the Planning Committee Members visit their property to see for themselves the existing position, before determining the application, if this is not considered appropriate, they would urge that full consideration is given to their concerns and the application is refused for the reasons above.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

The majority of the additional comments are reiterations of those objections previously made after the objector has spoken to a planning professional. These have been addressed in the committee report, however some require responses as follows.

A plan demonstrating the 45 degree rule is not a validation requirement. In this instance a calculation has been made by the case officer and a block plan showing the 45 degree line has been included in the committee presentation clearly showing that the proposed extension at no. 12 does not encroach on the 45 degree line of the nearest window on the rear of no.10, it shows that no windows along the rear of no. 10 would be impacted by the 45 degree rule.

It is not suggested that there would be no impact on the rear garden of no.10, by definition, development at adjacent properties would have some impact on neighbouring dwellings. It is also accepted that existing structures in the vicinity cause some elements of shadowing, a common occurrence in a built-up residential area. It is therefore the purpose of the planning assessment to determine the acceptability of any additional harm and the severity that any additional impact would result in and unacceptable harm would likely result in a refusal of an application.



## OFFICIAL

The objections regarding the narrowing of the gap between the rear of no. 12 and the facing wall of the garage are noted and indeed in the morning as the sun is rising the slight reduction in width would likely reduce the sunlight through the gap, however any harm in terms of over-shadowing or loss of light would be minimal for the majority of the day, into the afternoon and evening as the sunlight would come into the rear garden of no. 10 from the west as it moves from east to west with little additional overshadowing from the proposed development.

The assessment made has taken into account the rear of the neighbouring dwelling and its garden as, at the request of the objector at no. 10, the case officer visited their property and assessed the application from their point of view. It should also be noted that an impromptu and unarranged visit was also made to the garden of 39 Florence Road to see the proposal from this angle.

Fenestration on the rear of a dwelling is rarely as elaborate or attractive as on a street facing elevation and as such the majority of the first floor windows on the rear elevation would serve non-habitable rooms/bathrooms and have specifications which are appropriate for such rooms.

It is considered that a full and fair assessment has been made of the proposal and the comments and concerns of all objectors have been carefully considered. Additional site visits have been made at the request of neighbours, enabling a thorough and comprehensive assessment and recommendation for the Planning Committee to review.