

**SUMMARY of LATE ITEMS**

---

**5.1 20/00891/FUL Central College Nottingham, High Road, Chilwell**

**Residents objection report** (received 28.6.21) which includes objections (largely appear to have been received already by the Council but are not individually dated) summarised into the categories below, a copy of the Cottage Grove, Chilwell Conservation Area Appraisal and newspaper articles containing stories in relation to student living accommodation/areas/behaviour:

- 1 Students
- 2 Noise and disturbance
- 3 Being overlooked
- 4 Conservation area
- 5 Traffic, Access & Parking
- 6 Public hearing
- 7 Devaluing of homes
- 8 Appearance & height of buildings
- 9 Retirees living with students
- 10 Overloading of services, GP's etc
- 11 Phasing of the plans
- 12 Drugs
- 13 Planning application
- 14 Flooding
- 15 Mental health & safety
- 16 General.

Further comments included:

- Site is within 20m of a watercourse (culvert) and therefore FRA is not accurate
- Full name of applicant is not given
- Development does not address or meet any requirements regarding environmentally sensitive design construction, reducing the risk of flooding and promoting the use of low carbon technologies
- "The future master plan" does not correlate with the Design Access Statement Phasing Drawings and therefore is misleading
- Dale Lane will be used as an access in further applications submitted.

**Objection on behalf of residents** submitted by planning consultant (received 5.7.21):

- Reaffirms key issues raised within representations listed in the committee report in relation to scale, number of students in the area, proposed conditions not solving issues in relation to noise and amenity, lack of parking, requirement for ongoing liaison with residents as development progresses, confirmation that flooding will not be exacerbated (as no response from Severn Trent Water)
- Unclear if college management plan is listed in condition 2 or if that is sufficient to control residents parking demand on site
- Neighbours will have no sight of noise, construction and demolition details through discharging conditions
- S106 should provide for maintenance and management of overall site and establishment of community liaison group to inform of progress of planning applications
- References policies from Nottingham City Council Local Plan Part 2 as Broxtowe P2LP is silent on houses of multiple occupation

- Development doesn't comply with Nottingham City Council Local Plan Part 2 policies in relation to HMO's, student accommodation, design, use, context and place making.

**Objection from resident** (received 6.7.21) advising a local resident has had property sale fall through because of proposed phase 2 redevelopment (includes email from affected resident). Proposed development having adverse effect on residents trying to sell their properties to escape from proposed student village.

## **5.2 21/00049/FUL Babbington Hall, Westby Lane, Babbington**

**Letter from agent** (received 5.7.21) in response to call-in reasons summarised as follows:

- Principle of development supported by para 145 (g) of NPPF and does not discriminate as to whether very special circumstances applied when buildings were first granted permission
- Buildings do not only exist because of very special circumstances - there has been significant amount of development at site over past 50 years and beyond
- Business is no longer viable
- Openness should be assessed both spatially and visually. Proposal results in reduction in built form (spatial) and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment concluded impact on views is 'negligible' (visual)
- No planning grounds for polytunnel, 100m to south west of site (outside site boundary), to be removed and it serves as exercise area to support work of Babbington Rescue.
- Request for condition 12 to be amended to cater for stray and abandoned dogs but minor technicality and accept wording of condition in principle that kennels are not to be used for general boarding
- In relation to density concerns, one unit was removed.

**Email from agent** (received 6.7.21) accepting condition 12 wording cannot be amended.

## **5.3 20/00645/FUL 9 Glebe Street**

**2 objections from residents** (received 17.6.21 & 2.7.21) summarised as follows:

- Misleading committee report
- In paragraph 2.1 of the report, the description of the host dwelling relates to the "as existing" rather than the approved scheme/proposed scheme which does not truly reflect the likely relationship between the proposed new dwelling and the likely remodelled primary dwelling
- Report at 6.3.2 shows the proposed dwelling in situ next to the existing with only a dotted outline of the approved primary dwelling revision. This does not truly reflect what is likely to result if/when both are built and is therefore misleading (additionally misleading as 21/00328/FUL (awaiting determination) is for an enlarged dwelling)
- Committee must consider both 20/00645/FUL and 21/00328/FUL together to determine combined effect on conservation area
- Acknowledged by planning and conservation that there will be some harm (paragraph 6.2.15) and therefore both applications must be considered simultaneously
- 20/00645/FUL should be withdrawn and a report submitted to include 20/00645/FUL and 21/00328/FUL
- Inadequate assessment of level of harm to the scheme in line with the NPPF

- Does not explicitly state the level of harm would be less than substantial or where this harm arises from and then relates to the positives of the scheme
- The test makes no positive references
- Queries whether the Council have a 5 year housing land supply. If so, the need for housing carries less weight
- As the character changes, lose the “preserve and enhance” principle
- Area will change from relaxed and spacious to cramped with mixed development.

#### **5.4 21/00184/FUL Land between Ellis Grove and Wilmot Lane, Beeston**

An **amended boundary treatment plan** has been received (1.7.21) increasing the height of the proposed fence on the boundary with Barrydale Avenue from 2m to 2.5m.

**Addition and correction to condition 2** (in bold):

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings (dates in brackets as to when received by the Local Planning Authority):

- Proposed site plan 105E (8.6.21)
- Proposed colour site plan 106D (28.5.21)
- **Boundary Treatments as proposed 107D (1.7.21)**
- Proposed ground floor plan 110C (28.5.21)
- Proposed first floor plan 111B (28.5.21)
- Proposed second floor plan 112B (8.3.21)
- Proposed elevations sheet 1 120D (28.5.21)
- Proposed elevations sheet 2 121B (28.5.21)
- Proposed elevations in context 122D (28.5.21)
- Proposed elevations sheet 1 – Landscape removed 125C (28.5.21)
- Proposed elevations sheet 2 – Landscape removed 126B (28.5.21)
- External stores as proposed sheet 1 108C (19.5.21)
- External stores as proposed sheet 2 109B (28.4.21)
- Planting plan 383-P-002 Rev B (11.6.21)
- Proposed terrace sections 155A (28.5.21)
- Hard Works Plan 001A (11.6.21)
- Site location plan 100A (8.3.21).

**Email from resident** (4.7.21) stating 2.5m high fence is sufficient to address concerns regarding people in car park/visitors garden area causing overlooking. Queries whether boundary treatment plan should be included in condition 2 or whether reference in condition 12 is sufficient. Seeks clarity on height of bar terrace enclosure to avoid confusion as report states 1.6m high but plans appear to show 2m high screen.

**Correction** to paragraphs 1.1 and 6.4.3 of report following receipt of email from agent (5.7.21): bar terrace balustrade is 2m high (not 1.6m).

#### **5.5 21/00353/REG3 86 Queens Road South, Eastwood**

No late items received.

**5.6 21/00254/FUL Awsworth Junior and Infant School, The Lane, Awsworth**

No late items received.

**5.7 21/00313/FUL 14 Cherry Tree Close, Brinsley**

No late items received.

**5.8 21/00291/FUL Pavilion, Long Lane Recreation Ground, Attenborough**

No late items received.