

**21/00414/FUL**

**Applicant** MR HABIB ALI

**Location** 1 Green Leys, West Bridgford, Nottinghamshire

**Proposal** Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension and new front porch

**Ward** Compton Acres

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Statement and photos from Neighbour
- RECEIVED FROM:** John and Sue Redgate of 3 Green Leys, West Bridgford

### **STATEMENT IN FULL:**

*'Our objection to the above application applies to the two storey & single storey rear extensions. i.e. The single storey starting from the underside of the upstairs window.*

*We are commenting on the appraisal by the planning department.*

**Section 23** states that the highest point of the mono-pitch roof would not be visible from the rear of our property. On the plans submitted, the extension roof at its start point is 3977cm and its end is 2550cm. The fence separating the two properties is 1800cm, so it would be very visible and it would overshadow the dining room french doors, meaning less light into that room. The differences of 2177cm and 750 cm, between the height at the start and the end of the proposed extension and the height of the fence, is a very large difference, so we are surprised that the planning department would say that it would not be visible. We do know that on the day that the planner came to view our property, she did have a very heavy case load, of between 12 and 14 properties throughout Rushcliffe, to view that day, so are the measurements used to consider acceptance of this proposal correct? We have enclosed a photograph (A) of the fence that separates our house and no. 1 Green Leys. The silver marker attached to the fence shows where the extension will extend to and the height of the roofline of the proposed single storey extension. We have also enclosed a photograph (B) which we sent in our objection showing the area both extensions would cover.

**Section 24** states that the presence of the two story rear element may result in a loss of direct sunlight to a small section of the rear garden in the later part of the day during winter months. This we dispute, as we do get some shadow from the roofline of 1 Green Leys now, during the afternoon and evening throughout the year, especially during the summer months. The proposed extension would exacerbate this and would cause significant loss of light to the rooms at the rear of our property. It would significantly reduce the use of our patio due to reduction in sunlight caused by this proposed extension. The only thing we would see, from the left side kitchen window, would be of the roof and wall of the single storey and the roofline and wall from the two storey extension.


**Section 29/30** re: sewer/drains. The drains for our downstairs toilet will now run under the full width of the new proposed extended driveway. We have, at our own expense, had an additional manhole installed in order to be able to clear blockages from our property, these built up from a problem with the sewer pipe running under 1 Green Leys' driveway. This will mean that all drains from our toilets will run under the new extensions/driveway of No. 1 Green Leys. How do we ensure that this is addressed under the Building Regulations or has the appropriate agreement from Severn Trent?'

## **PHOTOGRAPHS SUBMITTED BY NEIGHBOUR:**

### **PHOTO A**



**PHOTO B**



## **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

1. With regards to paragraph 23 of the Committee report, it would appear the neighbour's have mis-interpreted the Officers report which states '*The highest part of the monopitch roof would not therefore be visible when viewed from the immediate rear of no.3.'* This is due to the staggered position of the two properties. The report does not state that the single storey rear extension would not be visible from the rear garden of no.3, as it clearly would be visible. The fact that an extension would be visible, is not a reasonable ground for refusal.
2. Officers consider that there would be some loss of light to the rear garden area of no.3, however this would not be at a level which would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of this property.
3. As detailed in the Committee report at paragraph 29, issues relating to the location of sewers would be a matter to be addressed under Building Regulations or through an appropriate agreement with Severn Trent as necessary. It is not a material planning consideration. It would be the responsibility of the applicant to address these issues with the appropriate body.
4. The outline of the proposed extensions as shown on the photographs provided by the neighbour do not appear to be to scale and do not necessarily provide a true representation of what is proposed.

**21/00680/FUL**

**Applicant** Rushcliffe Borough Council

**Location** Playing Fields Corner of Boundary Road and Loughborough Road,  
West Bridgford

**Proposal** Upgrade/remodel existing bike track

**Ward** Musters

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

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** No objection to the upgrade but concerns over privacy/ amenity as a result of increased usage

**RECEIVED FROM:** Resident of 60 Boundary Road

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

- a. Privacy and amenity: from the congregation of children at the entrance to the park and increased traffic to the park. The open structure of the metal loop fencing provides no privacy or noise protection.
- b. Driveway access: impact on visibility coming off the drives of number 60 and 58 Boundary Road and coming out of Repton Road due to increased traffic to the park, and potential congregation of children at the entrance to the park.
- c. Litter: Not enough bins in the park that are emptied regularly enough and the metal hooped top fencing does not prevent the litter from blowing into garden to the neighbouring property.
- d. Access to the park: the plans do not show the detail of the new entrance to the park/where the temporary roadway will start. I assume this will be where the metal swing gates are? If that is the case, can the entrance to the park that is nearest the boundary of 60 Boundary Road be removed as it will be redundant (the entrance that double backs on itself)?
- e. Fence condition: there are several areas of the existing fence that are broken which creates the risk of injury to park users and residents. The gaps in the fencing are large enough for a child or dog to enter the garden of 60 Boundary Road should they wish. Can the council consider upgrading the fencing to address all the issues raised above.

- f. Whilst the points raised above are not directly linked to the application of the new bike track (and we do not object to the new bike track), we feel that these factors need to be addressed as part of the applications as they will cause a loss of privacy and amenity to 60 Boundary Road without the proper provisions put in place.

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

- a. Privacy: The application does not look to alter the existing boundary treatment to the site. The concerns have been passed to the Estates Department in order that they can review the condition of boundary treatment. Under the Councils functions, certain works can be undertaken without the need for planning permission should it be deemed necessary. With regard to the congregation of children this is again something that can be monitored by the Council and should it prove to be a cause for concern methods to prevent/discourage this can be considered.
- b. Driveway Access: The Highways Authority were consulted on the application and they raised no objections or concerns with the proposal on highway safety grounds. This is covered in the Committee Report.
- c. Litter: this has been addressed in the Committee report.
- d. Access to the Park: changes to the footpaths has been addressed in the Committee Report. It is not intended to relocate the existing access as part of this application.
- e. Fence Condition: Concerns regarding the boundary treatment to the park have been passed to the relevant department for consideration. This does not fall within the remit of consideration of the planning application.
- f. It is noted that the representation confirmed that they do not raise objections to the bike track improvements.