

21/01352/FUL**Applicant** Mr D Lovatt**Location** Brookland House 4 Park Lane Sutton Bonington Nottinghamshire
LE12 5NH**Proposal** Construction of two storey 4 bedroom dwelling with swimming pool and attached 3 car garage. Construction of stables and tack room.**Ward** Sutton Bonington**THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

1. The application site comprises of land currently used as equine paddocks and equine exercise area (sand school) located to the rear (south-west) of the property at 4 Park Lane and the adjoining stable building to this property.
2. 4 Park Lane is a large, contemporary, two-storey, detached dwelling set behind properties fronting Park Lane and is accessed via a private drive. The dwelling is faced in red brick and cedar cladding. The stable building is arranged in a "U" shape fronting the property and is built from the same brick. Between the house and the stable yard is the vehicular access to the sand school and paddocks that comprise the application site. Sited within the settlement of Sutton Bonington the property is surrounded by other residential properties to its north-east and north-west, by the residential garden of 8 Park Lane to the south east (located beyond the aforementioned stable buildings), and by existing equine paddocks to the south-west.
3. The dwellings on the western side of Park Lane (which continues into Main Street) whilst of varying ages, sizes and designs are predominantly linear in their form, save for a few areas where the built form deviates from this prevailing pattern. Notable examples are Park Lane, along with Barrington Court and Gables Lea to the north. Park Lane and Barrington Court are both relatively recent private driveways with residential development accessed off them, constructed when a pub was demolished and where former farm buildings (barns) once stood respectively. Gables Lea is a development of two storey dwellings and bungalows that appear to have been built in 1960s/70s.
4. The majority of the land to the south-east, south-west and north west immediately adjoining the application site appears to be in either agricultural or equine uses and, along with the current use of the application site for equine related activities, forms the edge of the village with the surrounding countryside.
5. Part of the site is located within Floodzone 2 and the site is also identified as being within 50m of the Conservation Area and within 50m of a Listed Building (6 Park Lane).

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

6. The application proposes a two storey, detached dwelling with an enclosed swimming pool building along the south-eastern elevation and an attached 3 bay garage projecting forward of the north-eastern corner of the dwelling. The proposal also includes a new access track along the south-eastern boundary of the application site, leading to a new single storey 3 box stable and tack room to be located in the south-west corner of the site. The application plans also detail the formation of two paddocks between the proposed residential garden of the new dwelling and the stable building.
7. At ground floor the dwelling would comprise of the following accommodation; a hallway with w/c and cloaks, study (with foot access to the garage), snug/cinema, larder and utility, open plan sitting, dining, living and kitchen area, a covered seating area, garden room along with the 3 bay garage and an indoor swimming pool with changing area and plant room. At first floor level four en-suite bedrooms (three of which also have dressing areas) and a laundry room are proposed. A storage area above the garage is also proposed (not accessible from first floor level within the main dwelling). The garden would be located to the rear (south-west facing), beyond which the two paddocks, one containing the new stable building are proposed.
8. Access to the site would be via the existing vehicular access down Park Lane and across the frontage of the properties known as 2 and 4 Park Lane, which currently serves both of those properties, but also provides access to the stable area belonging to number 4 and the other equine facilities to the rear of 4 Park Lane which comprise the application site. The dwelling is proposed on the part of the site within Floodzone 1.
9. The proposed access to the stables (proposed in the south-east corner of the site) is via the existing site access, with a new track proposed across the back of the existing stable building that would then run tight to the south-eastern boundary of the site, servicing as access to both the proposed paddocks and the stables/tack room. The stables are proposed on part of the site located within Floodzone 2.

SITE HISTORY

10. The dwellings accessed off Park Lane have an extensive planning history which (primarily focussing on the history of number 4 as the site currently belongs to this property) is summarised as follows:
11. Nos. 7, 9 and 11 Main Street and the vehicular access were built after permission was granted in 2005 and 2006 (refs. 05/01062/FUL and 06/00796/FUL) following the demolition of The Poachers Arms Public House (ref. 04/01809/DEMOL).
12. The 2005 permission also gave approval for a pair of semi-detached houses on the site to the rear of 7, 9 and 11 Main Street. Subsequent planning permission was granted for a single house on the site and the first of the two dwellings (2 Park Lane) was erected following that permission (ref. 08/00822/FUL). The design of 2 Park Lane was subsequently revised through a further application (ref. 09/00587/FUL) and is a contemporary style two storey house, part built in a conventional dual pitched form and part with mono-

pitch roofs. It is a mix of brick and timber cladding and has concrete tiled roofs and large areas of glazing.

13. In 2010 the applicant applied to extend the residential curtilage of the property into the existing paddock area to the west of the site and to erect a summer house (ref. 10/01882/FUL). Although this application was refused, a subsequent appeal was allowed and this area currently is turfed lawn used as garden for 2 Park Lane. In allowing the appeal the Inspector concluded that the site had *"...a clearly developed character and that the appeal site represents a small projection of land designated as agricultural land into the visual confines of the village. I consider that the proposed garden extension would round off the rural edge of the village, between the equestrian site and other developed land, in view of the particular configuration of the site, even though it may not, in a strict sense, round off the "plot"."*
14. Permission was originally granted for the adjacent stables and manege in 2006 (ref. 06/00691/FUL), and in a revised form in 2009 (ref. 09/00261/FUL). An application for the second stable building to the west of the existing stables was granted permission (ref. 13/00622/FUL). In July 2013 planning permission was granted (ref. 13/00627/FUL) for a two storey, 3-bed dwelling on the site of what is now 4 Park Lane.
15. Application 14/00338/FUL sought (and secured) planning permission for a detached, two storey dwelling to be sited to the south-west of 2 Park Lane. The principle of a dwelling on this site had been established through the granting of planning permission reference 13/00627/FUL. Application 14/00338/FUL was for an alternative dwelling of differing size and design to that approved. That proposal's design was clearly influenced by the modern elements of 2 Park Lane.
16. The approved dwelling (ref. 13/00627/FUL) was two storeys high, with a small flat roofed section centrally located, with two flanking mono-pitched roofs either side that rise up to the east and west respectively. The lower points of the flanking mono-pitched roofs are raised above the central flat roofed area, appearing as "butterfly-wings". To the west would be a first floor balcony area as an extension to the master bedroom, with a covered, open sided area beneath the balcony which would be supported by four posts.
17. Application ref. 15/00890/FUL for the erection of two-storey dwelling (revised design following approval Ref: 14/0338/FUL) was subsequently permitted and it is this dwelling that is now known as 4 Park Lane.

PLANNING HISTORY FOR NEIGHBOURING PLOTS ON BARRINGTON COURT

18. The neighbouring properties at Barrington Court also have an extensive planning history which is summarised as follows:
19. 02/00674/FUL - (Demolition of farm buildings); erect 4 detached 2 storey houses – Approved Oct 2002.
20. 15/00330/FUL - Residential development (Plots 2, 3 and 4 Barrington Court) – Approved May 2015

21. 16/02624/FUL - Proposed new detached house and detached garage (variation to planning approval ref. 15/00330/FUL) – refused December 2016.
22. 17/00210/FUL - Proposed new detached house and detached garage – Approved May 2017.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

23. One Ward Councillor (Cllr Barney) objects echoing the Parish Council's objections.

Town/Parish Council

24. Sutton Bonington Parish Council object to the proposal, citing issues of the massive projection into the country side; that the proposal would be beyond the curtilage of the previous development to the south and beyond the stable block and even introduces a new stable block; that the design and scale dwarfs even the large properties that the applicant previously pushed the boundaries of scale on with the previous permissions; and the size and scale will hugely impact all elements around it including wildlife such as bats that are common in this green space.

Statutory and Other Consultees

25. The Environment Agency note that part of the site falls within Floodzone 2 and therefore advise that their standing advice should be followed. They also requested confirmation as to how the swimming pool effluent (filter backwash and down drain) would be dealt with. The agent provided this but at the time of drafting this report the Environment Agency had not responded. Members will therefore be updated via the late representations procedure of any comments received from the Environment Agency.
26. Nottinghamshire County Council as Highways Authority does not object to the proposal subject to a condition requiring parking and turning to be provided, prior to the first occupation of the dwelling, being attached to any grant of permission.
27. RBC Conservation Advisor does not object to the proposal.
28. RBC Environmental Health do not object, but recommend conditions requiring a construction method statement, details of any security lighting/floodlighting and a note to applicant regarding the disposal of any waste from the stable use be attached to any grant of permission.

Local Residents and the General Public

29. Representations have been received from four local residents (from the four properties in Barrington Court), objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:
 - a. Another application for stealth encroachment/creep into the countryside.

OFFICIAL

- b. Overbearing proposal that dwarfs even the sizable properties built on what was once permanent agricultural pasture.
- c. Encroachment into the countryside on land that was not previously developed/occupied by buildings.
- d. Concern the scale is more akin to a country mansion or a hotel rather than the 4 bedroom dwelling as described.
- e. Potential increase in noise and disturbance with facilities such as cinema, bar, swimming pool as it will likely become a “party house” with such enabling facilities.
- f. Size of building will cast significant shadow to the west.
- g. Overlooking from the positioning of some of the windows.
- h. Loss of privacy from the proposed first floor rear terrace.
- i. Proposal moves non-agricultural build into the environment with the likelihood of further development of a ménage or other buildings in the future.
- j. Impact on ecology.
- k. Residential amenity – loss of privacy/overlooking from first floor windows and balcony particularly if trees are removed, glare from large areas of glazing, proposed dwelling is disproportionate to existing surrounding buildings, increased noise and disturbance from vehicles, lack of privacy for future residents.
- l. Why are the windows needed in the storage area above the garage? Concerns it will also become habitable space.
- m. Increase in traffic (gardener, pool maintenance etc on top of the new occupants).
- n. Increase in noise from additional vehicle movements along the existing loose aggregate driveway.
- o. Impact of the proposed building on the carbon footprint and pollution of the surrounding area.
- p. Impact on neighbours’ ability to work from home.
- q. Impact on Conservation Area – the scale and design of the proposed modern house is out of character with the Conservation Area and surrounding properties, loss of brick outbuilding and historic tennis court, alterations to access to provide visibility may harm character of area.
- r. Overdevelopment compared to the original application for 5 dwellings on the site approved when “The Poachers” was demolished.

- s. Inappropriate development in the Greenbelt.
- t. Loss of light at the end of the neighbours' rear gardens.
- u. Impacts on mental health and wellbeing of neighbours.
- v. Proposal is entirely over the top and garish for this setting.

PLANNING POLICY

30. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1), the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019), the National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) and the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide.

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

31. The following sections in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are of relevance:
- Chapter 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
 - Chapter 9 – Promoting Sustainable Travel
 - Chapter 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places
 - Chapter 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
 - Chapter 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

32. The following policies within LPP1 are of relevance:
- Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy 2 – Climate Change
 - Policy 3 – Spatial Strategy
 - Policy 8 – Housing Size, Mix and Choice
 - Policy 10 – Design and Enhancing Local Identity
 - Policy 11 – Historic Environment
 - Policy 17 – Biodiversity
33. The following policies of LPP2 are of relevance:
- Policy 1 – Development Requirements
 - Policy 11 – Housing Development on Unallocated Sites within Settlements
 - Policy 12 – Housing Standards
 - Policy 17 – Managing Flood Risk
 - Policy 18 – Surface Water Management
 - Policy 22 – Development in the Countryside
 - Policy 28 – Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets
 - Policy 37 – Trees and Woodland
 - Policy 40 – Pollution and Land Contamination

34. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide sets out guidance as to local character and materials, height, scale and massing, achieving privacy and guides for amenity space. It states that *“Infill development should respect the existing massing, building form and heights of buildings within their immediate locality”*. It also provides guidance on garden sizes for new dwellings.
35. In addition to the above planning policies, there is a statutory duty under section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 for Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the (listed) building or its setting and to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

APPRAISAL

Principle of a Dwelling

36. The village of Sutton Bonington is not a settlement identified for growth within Policy 3 (Spatial Strategy) of the Local Plan Part 1. Objections have been received stating that the proposal would be harmful to the Greenbelt, however the site is not within the Greenbelt and therefore Policy 21 from the Local Plan Part 2 and the relevant tests that must be applied to Greenbelt development are not applicable in this instance.
37. The application site is adjoining the edge of the village, and therefore an assessment as to whether the development is in the settlement or open countryside must be made.
38. Policy 11 in the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) deals with “Housing Development on Unallocated Sites within Settlements”, whereas Policy 22 (LPP2) deals with “Development within the Countryside”.
39. Policy 11 is applied to assess development within the built up area of settlements and requires such developments to be of an appropriate scale and location, to be of a high standard of design that does not adversely affect the character or pattern of development by reason of scale, bulk, form, layout or materials, that the site should not make a significant contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area by virtue of its character or open nature, that the proposal should not result in the loss of a heritage asset (designated or otherwise), that the proposal should not be unduly prominent or have an adverse visual impact from locations outside the settlement, that it should not have significant adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity and that appropriate parking provision should be made.
40. Policy 22 states that “Land beyond the Greenbelt and the physical edge of settlements is identified as countryside and will be conserved and enhanced for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscape, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources, and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all.”
41. It is not possible to clearly define the site as an “infill plot” as per the Residential Design Guides purposes as it is not surrounded/flanked by residential development on either side. Furthermore, the site is not classified as

previously developed land (PDL, sometimes referred to as brownfield land) according to the definitions contained within the NPPF, however the section on Rural Housing within the NPPF is of some assistance. Paragraph 78 states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Furthermore, paragraph 79 reminds decision makers that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the five prescribed circumstances stated apply.

42. The application proposes a new dwelling, on the edge of the existing built form of the village with existing residential dwellings on two sides (4 Park Lane to the north-east and the properties in Barrington Court to the north-west). Part of the residential garden of 8 Park Lane adjoins the south-eastern boundary of the site, but the remainder of that boundary adjoins existing equestrian uses and the fourth (south-western) boundary of the proposed dwelling would be bound by the proposed paddocks (noting that the current use of the site is for equestrian uses).
43. It is considered that the proposed siting of the dwelling is not isolated as it adjoins the existing built form of the village with no fields or other land between the proposal site and the built up part of the village. For the same reasoning it is also considered that the site is not located beyond the physical edge of the settlement. Furthermore, whilst the village of Sutton Bonington is not identified within Policy 3 of the Core Strategy as a key settlement for growth, the village does have an identified allocated site for the development identified for up to 80 new dwellings within the LPP2 (Policy 10). On this basis the village is considered to be in a sustainable location capable of supporting modest levels of residential growth. Therefore, officers consider the site to be acceptable in principle for small scale development on unallocated sites and as such Policy 11 is considered the most appropriate against which the application should be assessed.

Principle of a stable building

44. The application proposes a new single storey stable building containing three loose boxes and a tack room, measuring 15 in length, 3.8m in depth and 2.95m to ridge with a shallow pitch (2.2m to eaves) and a projecting overhang of 1.1m across the buildings frontage. The building would be located in the south-eastern corner of the site. The stables would be accessed by a track running along the south-eastern boundary of the site. The principle of a stable building in the equine paddocks is accepted as it is noted the current use of the site comprises a number of equine paddocks that contain field shelters accessed by a central track and a sand school for exercising horses. It is also noted the neighbouring parcel of land to the south-east also contains horses and brightly coloured gymkhana jumps. In this instance, as the stable building including the tack room would be located beyond the edge of the existing built form of the settlement, Policy 22 is considered relevant in the determination of this part of the proposal. Equestrian development is listed within the policy as an acceptable form of development within the countryside, subject to compliance with other criteria set out therein.

Impact on Character and Appearance of Area

45. Policy 11 of the LPP2 supports housing development on unallocated sites, subject to a number of criteria being met, as detailed in paragraph 39 above.
46. The proposed dwelling would be set back considerably from Park Lane with intervening properties to the north-east of the application site fronting onto Park Lane and accessed off the existing private drive. As such, whilst officers accept that the proposed dwelling does have a large footprint, as it would be of a comparable height to the dwellings located to its north-west (being 10.1m high) and the degree of set back from Park Lane and Main Street, the dwelling would not be prominent from public vantage points to the north, north-east and west. Furthermore, whilst there is a footpath running along Pasture Lane to the south-west of the application site and another running broadly west from a location to the south along Park Lane, due to the proposed siting of the dwelling, its location alongside the current built edge of the village and the distances between the site and the footpaths, it is not considered the dwelling would be overly prominent in the landscape as it would be read against the backdrop of the existing built form of the village.
47. For the avoidance of doubt the site is not located within the Conservation Area. As such, the statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 does not apply in this instance. However, in accordance with provisions within the NPPF, it is necessary to consider the impact of the proposal on the setting of the Conservation Area. Despite the large frontage of the dwelling, measuring 28.6m wide, and scale of the building, any views of the dwelling from the Conservation Area would be glimpsed between the existing two storey buildings along Park Lane (and behind them, namely 2 and 4 Park Lane and the existing stable building). Therefore, it is not considered the proposed dwelling would cause harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.
48. In terms of the pattern and grain of development within this part of the village, dwellings on the south-western side of Park Lane and Main Street are predominantly linear in their form. However there are a number of residential properties, both to the immediate north-east (2 and 4 Park Lane), and also to the north-west in the form of Barrington Court and the older development of Gables Lea, which have been constructed behind properties fronting onto Park Lane and Main Street, projecting to the rear of the frontage development. The proposed residential curtilage would be aligned with that of the neighbouring property to the north-west, belonging to 3 Barrington Court and the proposed dwelling would project no further to the south-west than that property. As a result, the siting of the proposed dwelling and its curtilage to the rear of no.4 is not considered to project further into the countryside than the immediately adjoining, established pattern of development in this part of the settlement.
49. The proposed development would not result in the loss of any buildings or structures to form the dwelling, however at the time of the site visit by the case officer, existing features were noted, including the grass equine paddocks enclosed by timber post and rail fencing, the simple black stained field shelters within the paddocks and the sand school, all of which would be altered/removed as part of the proposal. As previously described the site is flanked on one side by a relatively modern development on part of a former village farm. The land beyond that neighbouring development still retains an

agricultural operation and there is a large agricultural barn located along the boundary of the application site, projecting into the countryside beyond the proposed siting of the new dwelling. This barn is an acceptable, established agricultural structure associated with the neighbouring farming operation. Nevertheless, the lack of public open view of and across the site without any intervening structures and planting, and the distances from which those views are obtained, are not considered to result in the application site making a significant contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area by virtue of its character or open nature that would be lost as a result of the proposal.

50. The land is currently used for equine related activities, as is the neighbouring land to the south-east. The proposed stable building location is within the corner of a field that is largely screened by existing mature hedgerows and the proposal is of a scale and design that is not considered to significantly impact on the character and appearance of the open countryside.

Highway Safety

51. The Highway Authority are content that the proposal is unlikely to result in a significant impact on the public highway. They note that the proposed dwelling is to be served via a private drive leading from Park Lane which currently serves 2 dwellings and a stable building and that no alterations are proposed to the access.
52. Therefore, subject to a condition requiring that the proposed parking and turning facilities are provided prior to the occupation of the proposed new dwelling the Highway Authority are not objecting. On this basis officers are satisfied that adequate parking facilities would be provided for the new dwelling. Furthermore, given that the stable building is unlikely to result in any significant number of vehicle movements it is also not considered to significantly impact on the public highway. As such the proposal is considered to satisfy the requirements of Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of LPP2 in respect of access and parking.

Ecology

53. The application site comprises a relatively large, flat open expanse of land used for equine purposes for the current occupants of 4 Park Lane. As such the land is predominantly grassed paddocks with the exception of the sand school. There are no buildings (that might serve as habitats) to be demolished on the site. The field shelters within the paddocks are small, free standing, open fronted timber structures with no insulation or roof voids to speak of and only serve to shelter animals from inclement weather. The applicant advises that the site is normally occupied by horses that are grazed and exercised in this location, although they were not present on site at the time of the officer visit. Nevertheless, the presence of a number of horses on the site is likely to discourage the site being used as habitat for any protected species other than in the landscaping around the site and any protected flora is unlikely to survive in such a location as it risks being trampled, eaten or mown.
54. There are no trees or hedgerows within the site, although the site boundaries do comprise a mixture of hedging, trees and planting. The application does not propose the felling, alteration or removal of any of the existing landscaping on the boundaries of the site and as a result officers are satisfied that there is

unlikely to be any impact on any protected species on the site or their habitats. Therefore, it is considered that the site likely to have limited ecological value and in this instance no protected species survey was considered necessary.

Impact on Trees

55. As previously mentioned, whilst there are no trees within the site there are a number of trees/hedgerows that form the boundary of the site. None of these landscaping features are proposed to be altered as a result of the application and, therefore there is no impact on the trees. Nevertheless, to supplement the existing landscaping on the boundaries of the site a landscaping condition is recommended requiring details of protection measures to ensure that none of the existing landscaping is harmed during the development and also to understand what additional landscaping might supplement the existing boundary treatments on the site.

Residential Amenity

56. In terms of the impacts upon existing residents, a significant number of concerns have been raised by the neighbouring occupiers summarised elsewhere in this report.
57. The proposed dwelling is shown to be built on the same 'building line' as the existing property at 4 Park Lane, in so far as the main dwelling would not be any closer to the existing common boundary with the dwellings on Barrington Court, although the garage element would be situated closer to the boundary. In the granting of the various planning permissions for the dwellings on both Barrington Court and Park Lane (see history section above), these separation distances are established, having been previously judged to be acceptable in planning terms. This proposed dwelling is of a similar height to the existing dwellings being circa 10.1m high to ridge with a sloping roof form. Furthermore, the proposal would not be introducing any living accommodation any closer to the dwellings and their private gardens at 2 and 3 Barrington Court than currently exists between 4 Park Lane and 1 Barrington Court (and to a lesser extent 2 Barrington Court).
58. Officers have reviewed the proposed siting of the dwelling which would be set 8.7m off the common boundary with the dwellings on Barrington Court. Openings are proposed at ground and first floor level in the side elevation of the property facing 3 Barrington Court, with the ground floor openings serving the study and the open plan sitting, dining, living and kitchen area. At first floor level the openings would serve two separate en-suite bathrooms and a secondary opening to a bedroom. Officers noted that the common boundary currently comprises timber post and rail fencing with hedgerow planting, including hedgerow trees, although they have not yet filled out or reached full maturity yet.
59. Nevertheless, the separation distances between the main body of the dwelling and the nearest residential property at 3 Barrington Court is 29.8m. This is far in excess of the standards set out in the residential design guide. It is considered that due to the presence of the landscaping at ground floor level on the common boundary and the separation distances involved that there would be no significant harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers in either the property itself or when using their rear gardens due to these

factors. The windows at first floor level in this elevation serve en-suite bathrooms and as a secondary opening to a bathroom, with the principal opening being to the rear (south-west) elevation. Officers have discussed the matter with the applicants who are willing to obscure glaze these openings and it is considered that a condition to this effect could be justified.

60. The application also proposes a balcony, slightly off-center, on the rear elevation of the dwelling with open sides and a gabled roof canopy feature above it to protect the uses from the elements and also to introduce a feature in the roof structure to break up the long expanse of built form. This balcony would be set in a further 7.8m from the side elevation of the house, which itself is 29.8m from the rear of the nearest neighbouring dwelling. The neighbouring property is also located at an angle and the proposal would not result in windows directly facing each other. As a result of the separation distances of in excess of 37m and the angle involved, officers are satisfied that the relationships between the proposed rear balcony and the neighbouring property, including their rear garden which would be 16.5m away at its closest point, is acceptable in planning terms and complies with the guidance contained within the residential design guide.
61. It is noted that the proposed garage would be closer to the common boundary with Barrington Court, maintaining a distance of 2.4m between the garage and boundary. However, again the separation distances to the neighbouring properties are measured at between 22.6m and 28.1m. Again, the boundary treatment comprises newly planted hedging and no openings are proposed in the rear elevation or roofslope of the garage, which would have storage accommodating in the roofspace. Officers are satisfied that, subject to a condition restricting any new openings being formed in the rear elevation and roofslope of the garage structure, the impact on the neighbouring occupiers would be acceptable in planning terms. This would potentially not be caught by the existing permitted development right restrictions as it could be argued that the elevation in question is to the rear, and not the side, and therefore not covered by the legislation.
62. The proposed materials, being brick and tile are considered to be representative of the majority of dwellings constructed in this part of the village and are judged to be suitable and acceptable in this location, subject to suitable samples being provided and a condition is recommended in this respect.
63. The proposal, whilst for a single, detached four bedroom dwelling is a large dwelling. It is acknowledged that the building does have a very large footprint, at circa 539m², however it would be sited in a plot of circa 2,230m² and therefore would only occupy approximately 24% of the plots proposed residential curtilage. The dwelling would be much larger than any other dwelling in the immediate surroundings. Nevertheless, the height is of a comparable scale to the neighbouring residential properties in this part of the village, and whilst only occupying approximately 24% of the resultant residential plot, it is not considered to be an over-development of the plot, due to the plots generous proportions. Furthermore, given its broadly central location and distances from neighbouring buildings, it is not considered to dwarf any adjoining structures as stated in the objection letters.
64. The proposal seeks to reduce the mass of the building through the use of features such as front and rear gables and projecting elements of the building,

along with a variety of ridge heights creating articulation and subservient elements such as the garage, pool building and garden room. At its widest point (including the garage and swimming pool), the property would be circa 37.2m wide and at its deepest (again including the front garage projection along with the garden room and swimming pool building, both of which are single storey) the property would be 31.9m deep (around 15.2m for the main two storey element of the building, excluding the first floor terrace). However, as mentioned, the garage is positioned so that it sits forward of the front elevation and to the side of the side elevation, connected to the main body of the building 'corner to corner', and the swimming pool, which is located to one side of the dwelling along with the rear projecting garden room are single storey features. The dwelling is also proposed broadly centrally within the plot to create open space around it on all sides. For these reasons officers are satisfied that the overall mass and form of the building is not a dominant feature on its surroundings. Given the significant separation distances, the orientation of the neighbouring properties, and to a lesser extent the current boundary screening, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would result in significant harm through overlooking, overshadowing, nor appear overbearing.

65. Objections have also been raised regarding the increased noise impacts on adjoining properties from the additional traffic using the existing gravel driveway that currently serves 2 and 4 Park Lane, as this would serve as the access to the site. Officers are advised that no complaints having been made to colleagues in the Environmental Health Department regarding this activity/noise, however officers do note that Environmental Health colleagues are not objecting to the proposal. It is not considered that the traffic associated with a single dwelling, albeit a large one, and stables would result in a significant increase in vehicle movements along the driveway. Whilst conditions have been sought by Environmental Health these are in relation to a construction method statement, matters of lighting and the disposal of animal waste from the site.
66. Officers are mindful that the proposed dwelling and garaging would serve as a buffer between the properties and the existing driveway, with the extension to the driveway being minimal to the frontage of the proposed property. The application form also states that the drive to the frontage of the property would be tarmac with a block paved courtyard. Furthermore, the proposed track serving the proposed new stables, whilst indicated to be graveled, would be sited further from the existing residential properties than the current driveway. It is also anticipated that vehicle movements along the stable track would be minimal, likely comprising visits from the vet, farrier and for the horses to attend any shows, events or races accordingly. It is considered reasonable to condition that the stables are to be for the use of the occupants of the proposed dwelling only and that no livery or other similar commercial activities should take place with regards to the use of the stables or the paddocks proposed so as to minimise vehicle movements and impact as a result of any increased vehicular movements and their associated noise to and from the stable site.
67. On this basis, officers are satisfied that the level and use of the tracks serving both the proposed dwelling, but also the paddocks and stables, would be of a domestic scale and nature and it is not considered that the proposal would result in a significant increase in activity/use of the driveways which would cause unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to the neighbouring properties.

68. Concerns have also been expressed that due to the level of facilities proposed within the dwelling, the property may become a 'party house' with resultant nuisance to the amenity of the existing neighbouring residents. Whilst officers accept that the range and type of facilities such as swimming pool and snug/cinema may result in friends/relatives of the future occupants wanting to visit the property it does not follow that such activity would necessarily give rise to unacceptable noise and nuisance. Regardless the proposal is still a single dwelling despite the range of facilities proposed and therefore no more or less likely to result in any noise issues than any other dwelling in the Borough.
69. It should be clearly stated that any property of any size and in any location is capable of hosting parties/gatherings. Officers note that the location of both the swimming pool and the cinema room are not on the common boundary with the neighbouring residential properties who have voiced such concerns. No bar is stated within the dwelling, despite the objectors concerns, although as with all residential properties, this does not preclude the presence of alcohol on the premises. Therefore, officers do not consider that the range of facilities is any more likely to cause a nuisance or detract from the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, however if noise and disturbance did arise from the property, the Borough Council has appropriate powers through the public protection legislation to investigate and take appropriate action where necessary.
70. Objectors have also voiced concerns regarding potential future applications for a garage conversion and another sand school, citing the applicant's history of applications on the site. Questions have also been asked regarding the need for more stabling. The application clearly seeks to separate the site from the existing facilities afforded to 4 Park Lane, which include the stable courtyard that is also used for storage and vehicular parking. If the stables courtyard building is retained by 4 Park Lane, then the proposal property cannot be guaranteed access to these facilities, and it is understood that this is why the new stable building is proposed for use with the reconfigured paddocks that also form part of the proposal. The Committee are reminded that they can only consider the proposals before them, and not to speculate what may happen in the future. Furthermore, the fact that the applicant has previously sought planning permission to develop the site is not a reason to refuse the current proposal, as it merely demonstrates that historically they have gone through the correct planning procedure and that all the previous planning applications have been assessed against the relevant policies, and granted permission.
71. The proposed openings in the first floor front elevation of the garage would not result in any loss of privacy to any neighbouring land user/occupants of any adjoining properties and therefore they are judged to be acceptable in that respect. As previously stated, it is considered reasonable to remove the permitted development right so that no new openings could be inserted in the rear roof slope without first applying for planning permission.
72. Officers have also considered the relationships to the current dwelling at 4 Park Lane, which has a large balcony on its rear elevation facing the application site. This balcony would face towards the front elevation of the proposed dwelling. The balcony would be located approximately 21m from the front elevation of the building and therefore officers are satisfied that this is acceptable to prevent any unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy. Officers

note the proximity of the side elevation of the garage to 4 Park Lane, and again it is considered reasonable to remove permitted development rights for any new openings in the elevation and roof slope facing 4 Park Lane as it could conceivably be argued that these are not side elevations, but in fact part of the front elevation and therefore not covered by the relevant Permitted Development restrictions.

73. The front of the proposed dwelling would have a flat roofed, covered porch with what appears to be a potential balcony above. However, the entrance hall is a double height, vaulted area and as such at first floor level access would also not be possible onto this feature. Therefore, officers are satisfied that this is unlikely to be used as a terraced area, that may otherwise be unacceptable in terms of relationship between the site and 4 Park Lane.
74. In terms of the amenities of future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, it would be positioned within a wide plot, with a large private garden area to the rear and side with off-street car parking and turning areas to the front. As detailed above, given the orientation of the neighbouring properties and the distances from them, officers are satisfied that current and future residents would be afforded an adequate level of privacy and amenity.

Conservation and Listed Buildings

75. The proposal site lies outside the Sutton Bonington Conservation Area, although the private driveway meets the Conservation Area's south-west boundary. While the site of the proposed dwelling house is set well back from the highway, its shared private drive is close to the Grade II listed building at 6 and 8 Park Lane (commonly known as Hobgoblin Farmhouse or Repton Grange) and the Grade II listed Old Walling and Doorway in Garden of Number 6, approximately 7 Metres North East of The House. Therefore, the impact of the proposal on the special interest of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area must be given consideration.
76. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
77. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that, when considering development in Conservation Areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. As the site is not within the Conservation Area, the legal duty under Section 72 does not apply in this instance, however, policy requires that the impact on the setting of the area must be considered.
78. In the determination of the planning application for 4 Park Lane it was considered that that dwelling would not have any significant adverse effect on the character of the Conservation Area nor on the setting of the Listed Buildings. Officers consider that due to the location of the proposed new dwelling, and the existence of the intervening buildings along the private driveway serving the existing properties on Park Lane site in relation to the listed buildings, and the publicly visible parts of the site from the surrounding

area, that this proposal would not alter that previous assessment. That is to say that the current proposal for a new dwelling would not adversely impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and continue to preserve the setting of the neighbouring Listed Building(s), a goal considered to be desirable within section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

79. Nevertheless, the expertise of the Conservation Officer has been sought on this matter and they agree with the officer's assessment that the proposal would not harm the special interest of the Conservation Area as it is set well back from the highway and would not be visible from the public realm within the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the Conservation Officer agrees that the proposal would not harm the special interest of the Listed Buildings by virtue of distance, intervening development and the lack of intervisibility between the properties. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the significance of any heritage assets or their settings.

Flooding/Drainage

80. The site is partly located within Flood Zone 1 and partly within Floodzone 2 on the Environment Agency's Flood Zone maps. Floodzone 1 has a low possibility of flooding. The application proposes siting the dwelling on that part of the site within Floodzone 1, but the stable building would be constructed entirely within Floodzone 2 based on the submission details. The technical expertise of the Environment Agency has been sought who initially requested clarification regarding the proposed drainage for the swimming pool, which the applicants confirmed would be drained into the existing combined sewer that exists on the site. The Environment Agency had not formally responded at the time of writing this report, however officers are satisfied that the principle of a new dwelling within Floodzone 1 and a small stable building within Floodzone 2 are likely to be acceptable uses compatible with the Floodzone designations. Nevertheless, the Committee will be advised on any further comments from the Environment Agency via the late representations procedure.
81. In order to ensure that the surface water run-off rates from the site are controlled, a condition is recommended which would require a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water run-off limitation measures to be submitted for approval, and the development carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Sustainability

82. In order to promote sustainable development and construction, conditions are recommended which would require the dwelling to be constructed so as to limit the water consumption of the property to no more than 110 litres per person per day, and require the installation of an electric vehicle charging point for the property.

CIL

83. The application is CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) liable due to its size and proposed use and whilst the applicants have provided the necessary paperwork (Form 1) it does indicate that they would be seeking relief under the self-build clause.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

84. The proposal would contribute an additional dwelling to the Borough's housing supply within what is considered to be a sustainable location. In accordance with the requirements of Policy 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2), it is considered that the proposal being a single dwelling in the settlement of Sutton Bonington is in accordance with the Local Plan Part 1, Core Strategy Policy that allows for development for local need only outside of the key settlements.
85. The proposal, for the reasons set out in this report, whilst sizable, is considered to be of a high standard of design and not to adversely affect the character or pattern of development in the area by reasons of its scale, bulk, form, layout or materials. The site's location is also not considered to make a significant contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area by virtue of its character or open nature.
86. The proposal does not result in the loss of any existing buildings considered to be heritage assets. The proposal is also not considered to have an adverse visual impact or be unduly prominent from locations outside of the settlement for the reasons set out in the report.
87. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal would undoubtedly change the relationship between the neighbouring dwellings and the application site, change does not automatically equate to harm, and for the reasons set out the proposal is not considered to cause significant adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents. Finally, the proposal is considered to provide suitable access and parking provision for the level of development proposed. For all these reasons the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy 11 of the LPP2.
88. Subject to conditions, the proposal would not result in harm in relation to highway safety, trees, ecology, residential amenity or flooding. The proposal therefore accords with the policies contained within the Rushcliffe Local Plan and the policies contained within the NPPF.
89. The proposed development was not the subject of pre-application discussions. Negotiations have however taken place with the agent during the course of the application to clarify matters raised in relation to the drainage arrangements and the relationships to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. This has resulted in a more acceptable scheme and the recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

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 must be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plan(s)/drawings/documents listed in the drawing schedule received on the 24 June 2021.

[For the avoidance of doubt having regard to Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

3. The dwelling and stable buildings hereby permitted shall not be constructed above damp proof course level until details of the facing and roofing materials to be used on all external elevations, together with details of the door and window frames, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. Thereafter the dwelling shall only be constructed in accordance with the materials as 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 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies.]

4. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be constructed above damp proof course level until a hard and soft landscaping scheme for the site, including details of the boundary treatment to all the site boundaries, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. The hard landscaping shall be completed prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved. The soft landscape planting shall be completed no later than the first planting season (October - March) following occupation of the dwelling hereby approved.

If, within a period of 5 years of from the date of planting, any tree or shrub planted as part of the approved scheme is removed, uprooted, destroyed, dies or become diseased or damaged then another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted must be planted in the same place during the next planting season following its removal.

Once provided all hard landscaping works shall thereafter be permanently retained throughout the lifetime of the development.

[To ensure the development creates a visually attractive environment and to safeguard against significant adverse effects on the landscape character of the area having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014); Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) and Chapter 12 (Achieving Well-designed Places) of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)].

5. The development hereby permitted must not commence and no preparatory operations in connection with the development hereby permitted (including demolition, site clearance works, fires, soil moving, temporary access construction and / or widening, or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall take place on the site until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations', has been submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority and all protective fencing has been erected as required by the AMS. The AMS must include full details of the following:

- a) The timing and phasing of any arboricultural works in relation to the approved development;
- b) Detailed tree felling and pruning specification in accordance with BS3998:2010 Recommendations for Tree Works;
- c) Details of a Tree Protection Scheme in accordance with BS5837:2012 which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent to the site which are to be retained or which are the subject of any Tree Preservation Order;
- d) Details of any construction works required within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 or otherwise protected in the Tree Protection Scheme;
- e) Details of the location of any underground services and methods of installation which make provision for protection and the long-term retention of the trees on the site. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, no services shall be dug or laid into the ground other than in accordance with the approved details;
- f) Details of any changes in ground level, including existing and proposed spot levels, required within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 or otherwise protected in the approved Tree Protection Scheme;
- g) Details of the arrangements for the implementation, supervision and monitoring of works required to comply with the AMS.

[This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that appropriate controls are secured prior to development commencing, to protect the health of existing trees and hedgerows on the site during the construction of the development having regard to regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014); Policies 37 (Trees and Woodlands) and 38 (Non-Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) and Chapter 15 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)].

6. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the associated parking and turning provision, as shown on the approved plans referred to under condition 2 of this approval, has been constructed. Thereafter the parking and turning areas must be retained on the site throughout the life of the development and must remain available for vehicle turning at all times.

[To ensure that there is adequate provision for vehicles to turn around within the site having regard highway safety and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

7. The development shall not be constructed above damp proof course level until a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water run-off limitation measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Borough Council. Thereafter the measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development and the dwelling shall not be occupied until the approved

scheme has been implemented.

[To ensure that adequate surface water drainage provision is secured for the site, in accordance with Policy 18 (Surface Water Management) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

8. The construction of the dwelling hereby permitted must not proceed above damp proof course level until a scheme for the provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Point(s) (EVCP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme must include details of the type, number and location of the proposed EVCP apparatus. Thereafter, unless it has been demonstrated that the provision of an electric vehicle charging point is not technically feasible, the dwelling shall not be occupied until such time as the site has been serviced with the appropriate electric vehicle charging infrastructure, in accordance with the approved scheme. The electric vehicle charging infrastructure shall thereafter be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

[To ensure the development is capable of promoting sustainable modes of transport and to comply with Policy 41 (Air Quality) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

9. The residential dwelling hereby permitted shall be designed to meet the higher 'Optional Technical Housing Standard' for water consumption of no more than 110 litres per person per day.

[To promote a reduction in water consumption and to comply with criteria 3 of Policy 12 (Housing Standards) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies].

10. The development hereby permitted must not commence and no preparatory operations in connection with the development (including demolition, site clearance works, fires, soil moving, temporary access construction and / or widening, or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall take place on the site until a site specific Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP must include details outlining:
 - a) appropriate provision for the parking of vehicles within the site belonging to construction operatives and/or visitors;
 - b) areas for loading and unloading plant and material
 - c) the location and appearance of any site compound/material storage areas, including heights of any cabins to be sited and details of any external lightings;
 - d) the hours of operation
 - e) details of how noise (including construction works and deliveries) will be controlled and managed during the site clearance and construction processes
 - f) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during the site clearance and construction processes

The approved CMP must be adhered at all times throughout the site clearance and construction periods for the development.

[This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that the site can be developed in a safe manner and limit the impacts upon residential amenity and highways safety throughout the construction phase, having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identify) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

11. Prior to the installation of any security lighting / floodlighting on either the dwelling or the stable buildings hereby approved, details of the lighting, its design and location together with a lux plot of the estimated illuminance and mitigation measures to minimise any impact on neighbouring properties and wildlife should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

[To ensure the appearance of the development and any impacts on neighbours is acceptable and that the development contributes to the enhancement of biodiversity on the site having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity and Policy 17 (Biodiversity) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014); Policy 38 (Non-Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019); Chapter 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)].

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no enlargement or any other alteration shall be carried out to the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

[To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over any future enlargements and/or alterations that may harm the amenities of neighbouring properties, the appearance of the dwelling or the character of the area having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identify) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

13. Notwithstanding the provisions Schedule 2 Part 1 Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no outbuildings or other structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

[To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over any future outbuildings and other structures within its curtilage that may harm the amenities of neighbouring properties or the character of the area having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identify) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Schedule 2 Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or

any order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no window openings or rooflights (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be inserted into the north-west (side) elevation of the dwelling, the north-west (rear) elevation of the garage (including the internal stairwell) or the north-east (side) elevation of the garage hereby permitted without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

[To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the insertion of any additional window openings or rooflights that may adversely affect the amenities/privacy of neighbouring properties having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identify) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

15. The three windows at first floor level in the north-west (side) elevation of the dwelling hereby permitted serving two en-suites and a bedroom must be:
- a) non-opening, and;
 - b) fitted with glass which has been rendered permanently obscured to Group 5 level of privacy or equivalent.

Thereafter, those windows must be retained to this specification throughout the lifetime of the development.

[To preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties, having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identify) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

16. The stables and paddocks hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the associated dwelling and not as a riding school, livery stables or any other business or commercial use.

[For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the approved use has an acceptable relationship to the amenities of neighbouring properties, highway movements and the character of the area having regard to Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identify) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 1 (Development Requirements) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019)].

Notes to Applicant

Please be advised that all applications approved on or after the 7th October 2019 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Further information about CIL can be found on the Borough Council's website at <https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningandgrowth/cil/>

This permission does not give any legal right for any work on, over or under land or buildings outside the application site ownership or affecting neighbouring property, including buildings, walls, fences and vegetation within that property. If any such work is anticipated, the consent of the adjoining land owner must first be obtained. The responsibility for meeting any claims for damage to such features lies with the applicant.

OFFICIAL

All wastes should be disposed of in an appropriate manner. Field heaps of manure should not be located where there is a risk of run-off to nearby field drains; or within 10m of a water course; or within 50m of a well/spring/borehole that supplies water for human consumption. There should be no burning of wastes on site. The keeping of horses/ponies should not give rise to nuisance (for example from odours or flies) to nearby premises.

During and post construction, a sensitive lighting scheme should be implemented to prevent disturbance to commuting and foraging bats in the local area. Lighting should be directed away vegetative features within the site and along boundaries, and light overspill of over 1lux should be avoided within these vegetated areas.

This Authority is charging for the discharge of conditions in accordance with revised fee regulations which came into force on 6 April 2008. Application forms to discharge conditions can be found on the Rushcliffe Borough Council website.

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

Any security / floodlighting should be designed, located and installed so as not to cause a nuisance to neighbouring residents in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Note for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light (01/20).

Condition 9 requires the new dwelling to meet the higher 'Optional Technical Housing Standard' for water consumption of no more than 110 litres per person per day. The developer must inform their chosen Building Control Body of this requirement as a condition of their planning permission.