

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2 JUNE 2020

<b>Application No:</b>	19/02146/FUL	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposed detached house	
<b>Location:</b>	7 Sycamore Road, Ollerton, NG22 9PS	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Priceville Properties Ltd - Mr Brian Ketchell	
<b>Agent:</b>	Alan Bennett B.D.C. Ltd - Mr Alan Bennett	
<b>Registered:</b>	05 December 2019	Target Date: 30 January 2020
	Extension of Time Requested Until 5 <sup>th</sup> June 2020	
<b>Link to Application</b>	<a href="https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=Q1ZLSP_LB04M00">https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&amp;keyVal=Q1ZLSP_LB04M00</a>	

### Introduction

Members may recall that this application was deferred by the Planning Committee in March this year. Members deferred the application in order for Planning Officers to negotiate on the siting of the dwelling and to enable to garden of 7 Sycamore Road to be made larger.

This updated report will firstly explain the progress made on this application since the March 2020 Planning Committee. The report will then summarise consultation and third party responses received since the 3<sup>rd</sup> March Planning Committee. An updated assessment of the proposal in the overall planning balance will then be made.

For the avoidance of doubt the original Committee report has been re-provided below. Any amendments to this report are in bold with deleted text crossed through ~~like so~~. There were no late items from the previous Committee relating to this application.

Local Ward Member Cllr Donna Cumberlidge has called in this Planning Application to the Planning Committee.

### The Site

The application relates to garden land to the side/rear of the two storey semi-detached dwelling located at No. 7 Sycamore Road, close to the junction of Oak Avenue, Sycamore Road and Birch Road. The site is in a residential area that mainly consists of two storey semi-detached houses strongly coherent in architectural style and character.

### Relevant Planning History

14/00017/FUL Proposed Dwelling- Application withdrawn 24 February 2014.

## Relevant Planning Appeal

18/01795/FUL- Erection of a pair of semi-detached houses on land adjacent to 1 Oak Avenue and 10 Sycamore Road, Ollerton. Refused by Planning Committee on 4 December 2018, as recommended, for two reasons summarised as:

1. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity by virtue of both the proposed new dwellings and one of the existing dwellings (10 Sycamore Road) being served by insufficient private amenity space. The proposal would also result in an unacceptable and direct overlooking impact onto the rear garden area of the rear neighbouring property to the south (12 Sycamore Road).
2. The proposal would be out of keeping with its surroundings, by virtue of the car parking dominated layout in contrast to the open and green frontages of neighbouring plots. The elevation design of the proposed dwellings would be at odds with the uniform style of the neighbouring traditional, two-bay properties. Furthermore, any development on the site would create a cramped appearance which would set a precedent for further residential development on most of the street corners of the estate. This would erode the original open nature of the planned colliery village and would be cumulatively harmful to the layout and character of the planned village.

An appeal was lodged and dismissed on 18 September 2019 after the Inspector concluded the benefits that would arise from the proposal would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of the proposed development (Ref: APP/B3030/W/19/3229291).

## The Proposal

~~The application proposes the erection of a new two storey detached dwelling measuring approximately 6.0 metres wide by 8.0 metres in length, 4.9 metres to the eaves and 8.2 metres to the ridge. It would include a lean to porch and single eaves gabled dormer to the front, and comprise of an open plan kitchen/dining area, living area and w.c. to the ground floor and 3 no. bedrooms, one with en-suite, and a bathroom to the first floor. One off street parking space would be provided to the front.~~

**The application proposes the erection of a new single storey dwelling of a stepped design that would follow the shape of the plot. The proposed new dwelling would be set back c. 5.7 metres from the road, with a lawned area and two off-street parking spaces to the front. It would include a flat roof behind a simple parapet, and a single large format timber panelled opening to the front elevation to mimic the appearance of a garage door. A c.2.0 metre high brick wall would connect the proposed 'garage' dwelling to the existing property at 7 Sycamore Road. The proposed new dwelling would comprise of two bedrooms, bathroom, kitchen and an open plan living/dining room to the rear, with modest garden areas to the side and rear.**

## Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 3 properties have been individually notified by letter.

## Planning Policy Framework

### The Development Plan

#### **Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019)**

Spatial Policy 1 – Settlement Hierarchy  
Spatial Policy 2 – Spatial Distribution of Growth  
Core Policy 3 – Housing Mix, Type and Density  
Core Policy 9 – Sustainable Design  
Core Policy 14 – Historic Environment

#### **Allocations & Development Management DPD**

DM5 – Design  
DM9 – Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

### Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2019  
Planning Practice Guidance

### Consultations

**Ollerton (and Boughton) Town Council (10 January 2020)** – Support proposal

**(21 May 2020)** – No comments received at the time of writing this report

#### **Conservation/heritage consultation response 31 December 2019 –**

We are in receipt of your request for heritage advice on the above proposal.

7 Sycamore Road is identified on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record as being part of the New Ollerton Colliery Village (ref MNT25087) and of Local Interest. The heritage asset is focussed on the planned settlement of New Ollerton, developed in the 1920's by the Butterley Company. 7 Sycamore Road is therefore part of a non-designated heritage asset.

### Legal and Policy Considerations

Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance.

The importance of considering the impact of new development on the significance of heritage assets, furthermore, is expressed in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – revised February 2019). Paragraph 197 of the NPPF advises that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Additional advice on considering development within the historic environment is contained within the Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes (notably GPA2 and GPA3). In addition, 'Historic England Advice Note 2: making changes to heritage assets' advises that the main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, aside from NPPF requirements such as social and economic activity and sustainability, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, durability and adaptability, use, enclosure, relationship with adjacent assets and definition of spaces and streets, alignment, active frontages, permeability and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate. It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting (paragraph 41).

### Significance of Heritage Asset(s)

New Ollerton was a planned model village of 832 houses, and developed between 1922 and 1932. These former worker houses retain a level of homogeneity and group value, despite changes and adaptations in the modern period. The attached aerial photos from the 1930s shows the planned nature of the colliery village, with generous garden plots. Sycamore Road forms part of the original layout of the planned village, and the corner plots to the crossroads with Birch and Oak Road are distinctive, being laid out at 45 degrees with cross-plot gardens. Thought went into the layout of the worker's housing, with spacious garden plots and a uniformity to building design.

At the heart of the planned colliery village is the distinctive Church of St Paulinus, dated 1931 and designed by Naylor, Sale and Woore for the Butterley Company (ref M10678). The Southwell & Nottingham Church History Project state: "It was built deliberately at the geographical centre of the New Ollerton colliery village as a 'cathedral for the new coalfield'. It was the intention of the company that: 'if this was to be done it would be done properly'. On 16th April 1926 Eustace Mitton, the mining agent, wrote to Sir Giles Gilbert Scott, the architect of Liverpool Cathedral, asking him to submit plans for a church and vicarage at Ollerton. On 9 July Sir Giles was brought by company car to survey the site at Church Circle which had been chosen as the focal point and centre of the new colliery village. Sir Giles submitted plans, but the company, with boldness verging on the foolhardy, rejected his designs and dismissed him as architect. Ultimately the church was designed by Messrs Naylor, Sale, & Woore of Derby and built by Messrs Greenwood of Mansfield at a total cost of £8000 of which the Butterley Company contributed £5000. A further £500 and the land for the site was donated by Lord Saville of the nearby Rufford Estate. The church was consecrated on 1st October 1932."

Although New Ollerton has subsequently expanded as more housing has been built, the church has always retained its position as a focal point in the community and continued its close links with the mining community as long as mining continued in New Ollerton.

### Assessment of Proposal

The proposal seeks approval for a new dwelling between 7 Sycamore Road and 1 Birch Road.

Conservation objects to the proposed development.

The four semi-detached properties fronting the Sycamore Road crossroads with Birch Road and Oak Avenue are laid symmetrically to the junction at 45 degrees. Cottages along Birch Road front the roadway. This plan-form and layout reflects the original town planning of New Ollerton. Whilst it is accepted that domestic clutter and modern outbuildings have some visual impact on the

original layout of the colliery houses, they broadly retain their significance and spaciousness at the junction. An infill new dwelling as proposed will result in a cramped arrangement which shall fragment and erode the original colliery village layout. This is harmful to the significance of the heritage asset.

The design of the new house does not reflect the architecture of the colliery village housing furthermore. The houses on the street are all semi-detached forms with either a central gable feature and gable stacks, or hipped roofs with central ridge stack. In contrast, the proposal allows for a narrow 2 bay frontage with lean-to porch and single eaves gabled dormer with no chimney. The gable width and roof pitch do not appear to reflect the established vernacular either.

If built, the new dwelling would erode the homogenous character of the colliery village. Due to the limitations of the plot, it would not be possible to create a semi-detached property, and whilst I accept that the design of the house could be individually improved to better reference the vernacular architecture of the street, this would not fundamentally overcome our objection to the cramped layout and erosion of the original planned layout of Sycamore Road and Birch Road.

**20 May 2020 –**

**Many thanks for consulting us on the amended plans for the above proposal. As you will recall, we objected to the two storey dwelling in the context of impact on the significance of the planned colliery village.**

**Having reviewed the revised plans and details, Conservation has no objection to the proposed development.**

**The applicant consulted us on revised plans, and I am happy to confirm that the submitted plans reflect those discussions.**

**The amended plans have been significantly changed. The dwelling now proposed takes a single storey form, and is subservient in scale and mass to the adjacent housing stock. The design has a contemporary appearance in urban design terms, but is discreet and not unduly prominent, ensuring limited impact on the character and appearance of this part of the former colliery village (the development is largely concealed behind a 'garden wall').**

**We have no objection to the general palette of materials proposed, or the detailing. The scheme should otherwise be conditioned to ensure that the development takes the form envisaged by the LPA.**

Representations have been received from 2no. local residents/interested parties which can be summarised as follows:

- Overbearing impact
- Loss of privacy
- Not in keeping with surrounding properties
- Loss of light (to kitchen in adjacent property at 1 Birch Road)

**The following objection has been received from one household following receipt of amended plans:**

**While looking at the new proposal for a building on what was a garden I would just like to say I am saddened at the thought of losing another green space also I still feel this building would look totally out of place amongst these houses that have been here about a hundred years now so I would like you to consider my objection to this proposal and once again thank you for your time**

### **Comments of the Business Manager**

#### *Principle of development*

Spatial Policy 1 'Settlement Hierarchy' of the Amended Core Strategy (Adopted March 2019) identifies the Sherwood Area (Ollerton & Boughton, Edwinstowe) as a Service Centre and a focus for service provision for a large local population and a rural hinterland. Between 2013 and 2033, 30% of the overall housing growth is expected to be delivered within the Service Centres, including the Southwell Area, Sherwood Area and Mansfield Fringe Area (Spatial Policy 2 'Spatial Distribution of Growth').

The site lies within a sustainable location and therefore the broad principle of development in the area is acceptable subject to other considerations which are set out below.

#### *Housing Need*

Core Policy 3 'Housing Mix, Type and Density' identifies a **District wide** need for **housing smaller houses** of ~~3~~ **2** bedrooms or ~~more~~ **fewer** within the District.

~~The proposed new dwelling, by virtue of being a family house of 3-2 bedrooms, would contribute positively towards meeting the housing needs of the District, as outlined in Spatial Policy 2 'Spatial Distribution of Growth' and Core Policy 3 'Housing Mix, Type and Density' of the Amended Core Strategy (Adopted March 2019). Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the Council has an up to date plan and can demonstrate a deliverable five year housing land supply.~~

**The Council's most recent Housing Market and Needs Assessment (DCA, 2014) suggests there is demand for 1 and 2 bedroom properties, although a district wide housing needs survey has recently been commissioned for 2020, which may update this position. It is therefore considered the proposed development has the potential to contribute positively towards meeting the housing needs of the District.**

#### *Impact upon visual amenity and character and appearance of the area*

Core Policy 9 'Sustainable Design' requires new development proposals to, amongst other things, "achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is capable of being accessible to all and of an appropriate form and scale to its context complementing the existing built and landscape environments" and "demonstrate an effective and efficient use of land that, when appropriate, promotes the re-use of previously developed land and that optimises site potential at a level suitable to local character".

In accordance with Core Policy 9, all proposals for new development are assessed with reference to the design criteria outlined in Policy DM5 'Design' of the Allocation and Development Management DPD.

Core Policy 14 'Historic Environment' of the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019) requires the continued conservation and enhancement of the character, appearance and setting of the District's heritage assets and historic environment, in line with their identified significance.

In accordance with Core Policy 14, all development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, including new operational development and alterations to existing buildings, where they form or affect heritage assets should utilise appropriate siting, design, detailing, materials and methods of construction. Particular attention should be paid to reflecting locally distinctive styles of development and these should respect traditional methods and natural materials wherever possible. (Policy DM9 'Protecting of the Historic Environment' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD).

Sycamore Road forms part of the original layout of the planned village, and the corner plots to the crossroads with Birch and Oak Road are distinctive, being laid out at 45 degrees with cross-plot gardens. The area is characterised by inter-war semi-detached properties, symmetrically designed, wide 2-bay, 2-storey, red bricked dwellings with open frontages and spacious plots with, generally, generous gardens. This has created an open, pleasant and unspoilt street scene. Due to its history, officers consider the area to be a non-designated heritage asset.

The application site is currently an open area in between two pairs of semi-detached properties, one of which is on a corner plot, close to a junction with other residential roads. Open spaces like these are a characteristic feature of the area and provide an openness that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. ~~The proposed new dwelling would result in the loss of one of these open areas to the detriment of the pattern of development and the spacious character of the area. Furthermore, although the proposed new dwelling has been set back at an angle to respect the established building line, the introduction of a single detached dwelling would undoubtedly be at odds with the established character of the area and, by virtue of its scale and detached form, introduce a vertical emphasis on a prominent corner within the estate, setting a precedent for similar forms of development, the cumulative effect of which would be harmful to the established character and appearance of the area.~~

~~In addition, the proposed layout is considered to be car parking dominated. The submitted block plan shows that the parking area to the front of the proposed new dwelling, taking up the majority of the front amenity area. As the proposal results in the loss of side garden area serving no. 7 Sycamore Road, any parking serving this property would also have to be to the front of the plot and this is also shown on the submitted block plan. This is out of keeping with the character of the area where the majority of the dwellings have shared side driveways with parking to the side / rear. Front plots are relatively open in nature and most are lawned.~~

~~It is acknowledged that there are examples of in fill developments elsewhere in the wider estate. However the distinctive and original street scene remains intact and prominent at this junction of Oak Avenue, Sycamore Road and Birch Road. The recent planning appeal decision relating to land adjacent to 1 Oak Avenue and 10 Sycamore Road, i.e. the opposite side of the same junction, supported the Council in its decision to refuse the development of a pair of semi-detached houses for this reason.~~

~~Finally, the proposed new dwelling is of a standardised design which does not reflect the locally distinctive architectural style of the existing properties in this area.~~

~~The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to the provisions of Policy DM5 'Design' which requires new development to reflect the local distinctiveness be in keeping with the general character and density of existing development in the area and not set a precedent for similar forms of development, the cumulative effect of which would be to harm the established character and appearance of the area. It is also contrary to CP9, CP14 and DM9.~~

**The proposed new dwelling would take the form of an ancillary garage building, a form of development that is not uncommon within the planned village and can be seen in association with a number of the corner plots within the estate. Whilst the proposed development would result in the loss of one of these open areas it would follow the pattern of subservient, ancillary development seen within the area.**

**The scale of the proposed new dwelling has been carefully considered and reduced from that which was previously proposed to be only single storey, again following the established pattern of ancillary structures. This would represent a form of development which is subservient and to some degree 'hidden' retaining the legibility of the original planned village and which would be in-keeping with the established character and appearance of the area. Whilst the proposed design does not reflect the vernacular styling of the planned village exactly, the proposed new dwelling would be faced in brick laid in stretcher bond to match the vernacular to enable the building to sit sensitively within the context. The Council's Senior Conservation Officer has considered the revised plans and details and raised no objections to the proposed development.**

**The proposed car parking layout has been amended to provide enough space for a lawned area between the proposed new parking and the parking at 1 Birch Road to avoid a frontage which is overly dominated by cars.**

#### *Impact upon residential amenity*

Policy DM5 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD requires new development to respect the amenities of the surrounding land uses to ensure that there is no adverse impact by virtue of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing issues.

The application site is located at the corner of Sycamore Road and Birch Road between the two pairs of semi-detached properties at 7 and 5 Sycamore Road to the east and 1 and 3 Birch Road to the west.

~~The proposed dwelling would be set back at an angle to respect the established building line, and sited approximately 1.5 metres off the boundary shared with the neighbouring property at 7 Sycamore Road. Due to the angle of the site and boundary line the proposed new dwelling would be sited approximately 3.0 metres off the boundary shared with the neighbouring property at 1 Birch Road to the front, decreasing to approximately 0.75 metre off the boundary to the rear.~~

**The proposed new dwelling would be set back at an angle to respect the established building line, and sited approximately 3.0 metres off the boundary shared with the neighbouring property at 7 Sycamore Road to the front, decreasing to approximately 1.5 metres off the boundary to the rear. Due to the angle of the site and boundary line the proposed new dwelling would follow but be offset from the boundary with 1 Birch Road by approximately 1.0 metre.**

The proposed development would result in a reduction in the private amenity space for the owners/occupiers of the property at 7 Sycamore Road, although a close boarded fence has already

~~been erected around the perimeter of the application site demarcating this. Although the private garden space for the prospective owners/occupiers of the proposed new dwelling and the neighbouring residents at 7 Sycamore Road would be significantly smaller than that enjoyed by other neighbouring residents, it is not considered the proposal would result in an unacceptable reduction of external amenity space. Notwithstanding this, the proposed new dwelling would be a prominent addition to the rear of the neighbouring property at 7 Sycamore Road, and have an enclosing and overbearing impact on their garden. Considering the position and height of the proposed new dwelling in relation to the movement of sun, some overshadowing is also likely to occur.~~

~~The owner/occupier of the neighbouring property at 1 Birch Road has expressed concerns about loss of light into their kitchen, although their property includes a car port/caravan to the side which already reduce the amount of light into their property. Notwithstanding this, it is considered the proposed new dwelling would have an enclosing and overbearing impact on the neighbouring property by virtue of being sited slightly forward of their front elevation and close to the boundary.~~

~~The proposed new dwelling would include ground and first floor windows to the side elevations although these would be small in size and serve the hall, landing and en-suite bathroom. It is therefore considered there would be no adverse impact upon the neighbouring residents in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.~~

**Members considered the previous scheme would result in an unacceptable reduction of private garden space for the neighbouring residents of 7 Sycamore Road. The remaining private amenity space for the owners/occupiers of the property at 7 Sycamore Road would be approximately 25% larger than that which was shown on the previous scheme. Although the private garden space for the prospective owners/occupiers of the proposed new dwelling and the neighbouring residents at 7 Sycamore Road would be significantly smaller than that enjoyed by other neighbouring residents, it is considered that a reasonable amount of private amenity space would be provided and it is acknowledged the Council does not have minimum garden sizes.**

**Concerns regarding over-bearing and loss of light in relation to the previous proposal have now been addressed and alleviated by the proposed reduction in height of the new dwelling to be single storey with a maximum height of approximately 2.6 metres. The proposed new dwelling would include large windows to all primary living spaces, however these would be at ground floor level only and present no adverse impact upon the neighbouring residents in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.**

**It is considered appropriate to remove householder permitted development rights from the proposed new dwelling, to ensure any future extensions or alterations can be given due consideration by the Local Planning Authority, due to the size of the plot and enable consideration on the impact upon the amenity of adjoining residents.**

#### *Access and parking*

Policy DM5 'Design' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD states that provision should be made for safe and inclusive access to new development.

~~The proposed width and length of the proposed driveway would seem to exceed that specified by the Highway Authority as acceptable for a single private driveway (3.3 metres if bounded by a fence). The proposed car parking spaces have been designed to meet the minimum size~~

**standards specified by the Highway Authority i.e. 2.4m x 5.5m.** The Highway Authority also requires driveways to be surfaced in a bound material (not loose gravel), to be drained to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the public highway, and to be served via a dropped vehicular footway/verge crossing in all instances. **The driveway is proposed to be served via a dropped vehicular footway crossing and tarmac surfaced. Further details would need to be secured by condition on an approved application to satisfy the relevant requirements.**

#### *Planning balance and conclusion*

~~Whilst the proposed new dwelling would contribute positively towards meeting the housing needs of the District, this would be to a limited degree, and would not outweigh the demonstrable harm that would be caused to the area in terms of the impact on its character and appearance and the living conditions of neighbouring residents.~~

**The proposed new dwelling has been sensitively designed to ensure limited impact on the character and appearance of this part of the former colliery village and would have no adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and provide safe access in accordance with Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy DPD and Policy DM5 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD.**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

~~**That planning permission is refused for the following reason(s)**~~

- ~~1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed new dwelling would be at odds with the established character and appearance of the area, by virtue of its scale, form, mass, car parking dominated layout, design, materials and standardised detailing, and introduce a vertical emphasis on a prominent corner within the estate, setting a precedent for similar forms of development, the cumulative effect of which would be harmful to the established character and appearance of the area, which is considered a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Core Policies 9 'Sustainable Design' and 14 'Historic Environment' of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019) and Policies DM5 'Design' and DM9 'Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013) which together form the relevant parts of the Council's up to date Development Plan. No material considerations outweigh the harm identified.~~
- ~~2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the siting and scale of the proposed new dwelling would also result in an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents by virtue of an enclosing, overbearing and overshadowing impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policy DM5 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013) as well as the NPPF which forms a material planning consideration. No material considerations outweigh the harm identified.~~

**That planning permission is approved subject to the conditions and reasons shown below**

**01**

**The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than three years from the date of this permission.**

**Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**

**02**

**The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plans, reference 101 received on 05 May 2020.**

**Reason: So as to define this permission.**

**03**

**Notwithstanding the submitted details, no works in relation to the following details shall be commenced until samples have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Bricks**

**Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.**

**04**

**Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the access to the site has been completed to a standard that provides a minimum width of 5.45m and surfaced in a bound material (not loose gravel) for a minimum distance of 5.0m behind the highway boundary in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety.**

**05**

**Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (and any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), other than development expressly authorised by this permission, there shall be no development under Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Order in respect of:**

**Class A: The enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse, including extensions to the property and the insertion or replacement of doors and windows.**

**Class C: Any other alteration to the roof of a dwellinghouse.**

**Class D: The erection or construction of a porch outside any external door of a dwellinghouse.**

**Class E: Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse.**

**Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority retains control over the specified classes of development normally permitted under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any amending legislation).**

Informatives

~~1. You are advised that as of 1st December 2011, the Newark and Sherwood Community~~

~~Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule came into effect. Whilst the above application has been refused by the Local Planning Authority you are advised that CIL applies to all planning permissions granted on or after this date. Thus any successful appeal against this decision may therefore be subject to CIL (depending on the location and type of development proposed). Full details are available on the Council's website [www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/](http://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/)~~

## **01**

**The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1st December 2011 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website at [www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/](http://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/)**

**The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is not payable on the development hereby approved as the gross internal area of new build is less 100 square metres**

~~1. The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. Working positively and proactively with the applicants would not have afforded the opportunity to overcome these problems, giving a false sense of hope and potentially incurring the applicants further unnecessary time and/or expense.~~

## **02**

**This application has been the subject of discussions during the application process to ensure that the proposal is acceptable. The District Planning Authority has accordingly worked positively and pro-actively, seeking solutions to problems arising in coming to its decision. This is fully in accord Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).**

~~2. Refused Drawing Numbers: Sketch Design 1018-1 and Block Plan 1018-2~~

Background Papers - Application case file.

For further information, please contact Amy Davies on ext 5851.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website [www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk](http://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk).

**Lisa Hughes  
Business Manager – Planning Development**

Committee Plan - 19/02146/FUL

