

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 13 MARCH 2019

Present: Councillor M Handley, Chair

Councillors: D Bagshaw  
L A Ball BEM  
J S Briggs  
T P Brindley  
M Brown  
T A Cullen  
R I Jackson  
R D MacRae  
G Marshall  
J K Marsters  
P J Owen  
P D Simpson

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M Radulovic MBE.

54. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

55. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting on 13 February 2019 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

56. NOTIFICATION OF LOBBYING

The Committee received notifications of lobbying in respect of the planning applications subject to consideration at the meeting.

57. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

57.1 18/00737/FUL

Change of use from a public house (Class A4) to a house in multiple occupation comprising of three flats (total 18 bedrooms) including side extension above flat roof, dormers to front and rear and external alterations  
Queens Hotel, 189 Queens Road, Beeston, NG9 2FE

Councillor P Lally had asked that this application be determined by the Committee and the item had been deferred by the Committee on 13 February

2019 to allow for discussions with applicant about the provision of more parking on site and reduction in the intensity of the development.

There were a number of late items for the Committee to take note of including two letters of objection from neighbours and a correction to the report at paragraph 2.1 which should have stated that the report went to Committee on 13 February and not 9 January 2019.

Dr Amy Labbate, on behalf of the applicant, Mrs Elizabeth Rodrigues, objecting and Councillor L A Lally, Ward Member, made representations to the Committee prior to the general debate.

The debate started with concern over the quality of the development, the lack of facilities for inhabitants and the perceived lack of consideration that the applicant had given to the Committee's suggestions for revisions to the plans.

The Committee also discussed the impact on the local community including night time disturbance from students living at the property and that the number of dwellings would have a negative effect on parking in the area and neighbour amenity.

**RESOLVED that planning permission be refused, with the precise wording of the refusal to be delegated to the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Head of Neighbourhoods and Prosperity.**

#### Reason

The proposed development, by virtue of the intensity of occupation, would have a detrimental impact on neighbour amenity in terms of noise and disturbance and loss of privacy, and would result in unacceptable parking problems due to the insufficient provision of on-site parking, contrary to Policies E34, H4 and T11 of the Broxtowe Local Plan, Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy and Policy 17 of the Draft Part 2 Local Plan.

#### 57.2 18/00516/FUL

Erect 10 one bed apartments

147 – 151 Queens Road, Beeston, Nottinghamshire, NG9 2FE

This planning application was first brought before Committee on 9 January 2019 at the request of Councillor P Lally. The item was deferred to allow further consideration to be given to increasing the provision of car parking spaces on site and to reducing the size of the building.

The Committee noted that there were two late items, both letters from neighbours.

Mrs Heather Blackwell, objecting, and Councillor L A Lally, Ward Member, made representation to the Committee prior to the general debate.

The Committee noted that there had been a slight reduction in the height of the building and the addition of one car parking space. It was felt that given the size of the plot, the number of flats and potential residents represented over intensive development and that it would impact negatively on neighbouring properties through loss of privacy. Member's also considered census data suggesting that Beeston had a lower than average level of car ownership to be out of date and irrelevant to the proposal, given that parking was known to be a problem in the area.

There was concern that the development was not of a decent quality because some of the proposed dwellings were below the size stipulated in the government's recommendations for housing standards, it was out of character with the rest of the area, there was no outside space and only one parking space to be shared by all of the residents.

**RESOLVED that planning permission be refused, with the precise wording of the refusal to be delegated to the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Head of Neighbourhoods and Prosperity.**

#### Reasons

The proposed building by virtue of its size and scale represents an over intensive development of the site which would be out of keeping with the character of the area. Insufficient parking has been provided on site which would result in parking problems in the immediate area. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policies H7 and T11 of the Broxtowe Local Plan (2004), Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014), and Policy 17 of the Draft Part 2 Local Plan (2018).

#### 57.3 18/00628/FUL

Construct seven dwellings, including associated access road, garaging, parking and landscaping  
Southfields Farm, Common Lane, Bramcote, Nottinghamshire, NG9 3DT

Councillor J C Goold had requested that the application be determined by Committee.

The Committee gave due consideration to the late items, which included two emails from the applicant with pictures, one email from the applicant which was copied to members of the Committee, and an email from Bramcote Conservation Society.

Mr Frank Taylor, the applicant, addressed the Committee prior to the general debate.

In debating the item, the Committee discussed the preservation of the Green Belt, whether the existing buildings would be suitable for conversion for residential use, the poor state of the roads to the site and the pleasing landscape in which the site was set. The Committee also compared the proposed scheme to a scheme that had already been granted planning permission. It was considered that the proposal

that had been given planning permission offered most protection to the character the Green Belt.

**RESOLVED that planning permission be refused, in accordance with the recommendation, for the following reasons.**

- 1. The application site lies within the Nottinghamshire Green Belt and the proposal of seven dwellings would constitute inappropriate development and therefore by definition would be harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore, it is concluded there would be an unacceptable impact on openness which is the essential characteristic of the Green Belt. It is considered that very special circumstances have not been demonstrated and there are no other considerations which would clearly outweigh the policy conflict and by definition, the harm to the Green Belt. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policy E8 of the Broxtowe Local Plan 2004, Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy 2014, Policy 8 of the Draft Part 2 Local Plan (2018) and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018.**
- 2. The proposed dwellings represent a suburban character which is out of keeping with the rural character of the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to the aims of Policy E8 of the Broxtowe Local Plan 2004, Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy 2014, Policies 8 and 17 of the Draft Part 2 Local Plan (2018) and Section 13 of the NPPF 2018.**

#### **Note to applicant**

**The Council has acted positively and proactively in the determination of this application by communicating with the agent throughout the course of the application.**

#### **57.4 18/00849/FUL**

**Construct two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions  
4 Muriel Road, Beeston, Nottingham, NG9 2HH**

Councillor S J Carr had requested that this application be determined by the Planning Committee.

There were no late items for the Committee to consider.

Mr Laborde, the applicant, Mr Colin Failes, objecting and Councillor S J Carr, Ward Member, addressed the Committee prior to the general debate.

It was noted that a number of neighbouring properties had benefited from similar, if not larger extensions. There was also concern that it would be unfair to allow one householder's decision to extend their property to impact on their neighbour's ability to build on their own property.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.**
- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Site Location Plan (1:1250) received by the Local Planning Authority on 14 December 2018 and Proposed Block Plan (1:500) and Proposed Elevations and Ground/First Floor Plans received by the Local Planning Authority on 21 February 2019.**
- 3. The walls shall be finished in a matching render and the roofs constructed with tiles of a type, texture and colour so as to match those of the existing house.**
- 4. The ground floor window in the south west (side) elevation and roof light in the south west roof slope shall be obscurely glazed to Pilkington Level 4 or 5 (or such equivalent glazing which shall first have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) and retained in this form for the life time of the development.**

#### **Reasons**

- 1. To comply with S91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
- 2. For the avoidance of doubt.**
- 3. To ensure a satisfactory standard of external appearance and in accordance with the aims of Policy H9 of the Broxtowe Local Plan (2004) and Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014).**
- 4. In the interests of privacy and amenity for nearby residents and in accordance with the aims of Policy H9 of the Broxtowe Local Plan (2004) and Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy (2014).**

#### **Note to applicant**

**The Council has acted positively and proactively in the determination of this application by working to determine it within the agreed extended determination timescale.**

57.5 18/00662/FUL

Retain two storey rear/side and single storey rear extensions, including rear dormer (revised scheme)

## 84 Boundary Road, Beeston, Nottingham, NG9 2QZ

A request had been made by Councillor S J Carr that this application be determined by Committee.

There were no late items and no public speakers.

Debate centred on concerns that the quality of the building of the extension was not high, that the appearance was incongruous and that it would not have been given planning permission be built in this way had the applicant gone through the correct process. It was noted that because of the difference in brick colour and roof height at the front of the building was such that it made the extension appear to be a different building. The appearance at the rear of the property was also considered to be out of keeping with its surroundings, in particular the dormer window.

**RESOLVED that planning permission be refused and enforcement action be taken, with the precise wording of the refusal to be delegated to the Chair of the Planning Committee and the Head of Neighbourhoods and Prosperity.**

### Reasons

1. The side extension is considered to be out of keeping with the materials of the existing house and to have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the use of non-matching bricks, the irregular roof design, the use of the white uPVC strip and the lack of a set down in the ridge height.
2. The rear dormer is considered to be of poor design and unduly dominates the roof due to its size, flat roof and non-centralised window. It is therefore out of keeping with the style and proportion of the original building, to the detriment of the appearance of the property.

Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to the aims of Policy H9 of the Broxtowe Local Plan (2004), Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 17 of the Draft Part 2 Local Plan (2018)58.

## 58. INFORMATION ITEMS

### 58.1 Appeal Statistics

The Committee noted that the position remained unchanged from that reported to it on 22 March 2017 and that the Council was not therefore at risk of special measures based on the figures reported to it on that date.

### 58.2 Delegated Decisions

The Committee noted the decisions determined under delegated powers between 19 January to 22 February 2019.