

## Report of the Chief Executive

## Appeal Decision

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	<b>24/00280/FUL</b>
<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>Broadgate House Broadgate Beeston Nottinghamshire NG9 2HF</b>
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	<b>Construction of nine student accommodation self-contained studio flats and changes to the basement car park layout</b>

**APPEAL ALLOWED****COMMITTEE DECISION TO REFUSE****RECOMMENDATION BY OFFICER – APPROVAL****REASON FOR REFUSAL –**

*The proposed development fails to provide an appropriate standard of amenity for general needs housing, particularly in respect of internal space, but also shared facilities, contrary to Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014) and Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan (2019), paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework and the relevant nationally described space standard.*

**LEVEL OF DECISION: WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS**

The inspector considered the main issues to consider were:

- whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with regard to private internal space and the provision of shared amenity space.

The Inspector noted that the room sizes were below the Technical housing standards Nationally Described Space Standard, 2015 (NDSS). However, no adopted local policies within the development plan require compliance with the NDSS. As such, failure to meet the recommendations made in the NDSS, in this case, does not provide sufficient justification for refusal of planning permission when considered against the development plan as a whole.

The Inspector noted also that the proposed internal floor spaces provided by the development would be consistent with other purpose-built student accommodation schemes granted planning permission within the area. Furthermore, the internal floor spaces of each proposed studio room are consistent with other rooms within the building and benefit from access to shared external space and their proximity to other shared facilities within the building.

In terms of shared facilities, the Inspector found the proposal would result in little change to the existing shared facilities within the building and some additional bicycle storage. As such, The Inspector concluded that the shared facilities within the property were more than adequate to accommodate the modest increase in use that would result from an increase of 9 occupants.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons given above the appeal was allowed.