

PLEASE HELP US PROTECT LADY BAY

SUBJECT: Planning application 19/000478/FUL. The proposal to demolish 2 semi-detached bungalows 49 and 55 Trent Boulevard and replace with 4 detached dwellings (which could be houses or flats).

See Rushcliffe Borough council website to view plans and all documents.

ACTION required by 2nd JULY.

Dear Householder,

We are letting you know that in November 2019 Rushcliffe Borough Council refused the application above. An appeal has been lodged to overturn the decision by the appellants P Buckingham and B Meadon (who own the bungalows and wish to develop the site). The grounds for refusal were: the scale and layout of the proposed dwellings would result in a) a cramped appearance and would be unsympathetic to, and have an adverse impact on street scene and character of the area AND b) an unacceptable overshadowing and loss of light would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties, especially 47 Trent Boulevard.

FYI, both 49 and 55 Trent Boulevard are rented out and are multi-occupancy. 49TB has been rented out to students for many years and is advertised as having 7 bedrooms. The bungalow has already been extended on the ground floor (- no planning permission is required for an extension up to 7m). 55 Trent Boulevard has 3 bedrooms, 1 reception room and a large kitchen/diner which is currently occupied by tenants.

On the attached page are a list of reasons you may wish to use should you wish to support the council in their refusal, and challenge the appeal. These suggested reasons are supported by the local ward councillors, Richard and Sue Mallender, and also the Chair and Vice Chair of the Lady Bay Community Association.

The appellants have also submitted revised plans in the event the appeal is turned down. The same ideas/reasons for objecting to the appeal also apply to the revised plans. Whereas the objections for the appeal should focus on the grounds for refusal, all objections are permissible for the revised plans - please refer to comments made last year on the original application and the revised plans on the RBC website.

Note if you would like the ideas/reasons sent you on email please contact:
santa_traff@hotmail.com

See below the instructions for the APPEAL vs THE REVISED PLAN.

APPEAL Instructions

Either:

- Email your objection to North1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk OR
- Post your written objection IN TRIPLICATE to The Planning Inspectorate, 3D, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN

Quote Reference APP/P3040/W/20/3252176

All comments need to be received by 2nd July.

If you have any queries please contact the above (and not the RBC case officer Mr Jeff Hall)

If you require an acknowledgement of receipt of your comments and/or a copy of the decision letter, please state this in your correspondence.

COMMENTS on REVISED PLANS

The objection follows normal process i.e. objecting online, sending email to the case officer, or in writing (one copy only).

If you have any queries you could contact the case officer Mr Jeff Hall on 0115 9148228, email JHall@rushcliffe.gov.uk, address RBC Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Rd, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 7YG.

New Planning Reference 20/01180/FUL

Remember to include the date, your name and address in any correspondence re appeal or the revised plans.

The Decision Process:

1. The appeal centres around the subjective opinion of one planning officer who recommended approval at the planning committee meeting November 2019.
2. The decision by RBC councillors was overwhelmingly to refuse the application: 7 for, 3 against and 1 abstention
3. The design has not been revised to mitigate the grounds for refusal.
4. The appeal contains no new evidence.
5. Two previous applications for single and second storey extensions have already been refused on this site for the same reasons - their size, scale, massing, siting, overbearing nature, and adverse effect on the amenities of the neighbouring dwellings.
6. The grounds for refusal are therefore still valid: scale and layout of proposed development results in cramped appearance resulting in being unsympathetic and out of character with street scene, and unacceptable and loss of light to neighbouring properties especially 47 TB.

Scale, Layout and Character:

7. The appeal claims that the variations in house style and material in Lady Bay sets a precedent for the proposed development. However, there are no 'variations' in Lady Bay that set a precedent for terracing and shoehorning 4 tall narrow dwellings with only a 1m gap between them. This is completely out of character with and unsympathetic to the long-established Lady Bay area. Houses in Lady Bay, regardless of styles, have a sense of scale, massing, density, space and proportion, which this proposal does not.
8. The numbering of the properties misrepresents the plot size. 49-55 should be 49 and 55. In effect it is proposed to replace two semi-detached single storey bungalows (built in the 1940's on gardens) with 4 x 3 storey detached dwellings. The bungalows were built as semis rather than detached to cater for the plot size and not to impact neighbouring properties.
9. The design and cramped appearance will be visually unattractive and detract from Lady Bay's strong sense of place and character.
10. The design and appearance of the proposed dwellings is a pastiche of the surrounding architecture

Overshadowing / loss of light:

11. Inaccuracies in the reports submitted to the planning committee last year affect the validity of the claim that loss of daylight and sunlight is acceptable to neighbouring properties of 47 and 57 Trent Blvd. These inaccuracies have not been rectified and there has been no proper test conducted for adequate light.
12. The guidelines notwithstanding, it cannot be good practice to approve a design where the family rooms of neighbouring properties look out on brick walls.

Over intense development and adverse effect on neighbouring amenities:

13. The cramped appearance is due to overintense development resulting in a detrimental effect on the surrounding area in terms of light, privacy, car parking, traffic and safety.
14. The design is not only out of character and adversely affect the street scene, but it also seems unworkable. The narrow frontage of each plot is expected to accommodate 2 car parking spaces, bins and access to the front door. The site therefore cannot accommodate the design, and car parking will spill over into the road (causing safety issues with the school, buses, ambulances, football and cricket traffic). Note that Trent Boulevard is the main arterial road through Lady Bay.
15. There is still no clarity on what the end designation of each dwelling might be (i.e. houses or flats), and therefore no clarity on the potential number of residents, cars and bins.
16. The design of the dwellings anticipates a later change of use from houses to flats. Note that the planning application is being made by two property developers with a specialism in multi-occupancy lets. The current bungalows fit this pattern, with one being advertised for 7 students. The highways committee report states that 8 car parking spaces for the 4 proposed dwelling are adequate/acceptable. The proposed development with 16 bedrooms and 8 'reception' rooms will dramatically increase that number without provision for adequate/extra parking.

Wider but relevant concerns:

17. Economic, Environmental and Social planning guidelines continue to be ignored. From a sustainability perspective the council should not be demolishing serviceable and much needed bungalows. The bungalows are needed by the elderly, the disabled or people who live in Lady Bay and want to downsize. The proposed dwellings are unlikely to meet any affordability criteria. The dwellings will increase the carbon and concrete footprint against guideline advice. There is no eco aspect to the proposed new builds contrary to stated guidelines. The dwellings are not DDA compliant. There is no 'Building for Life' assessment despite the number of dwellings being proposed. There is no light survey/test being proposed despite inaccuracies in the report and the overshadowing and overbearing nature of the proposed dwellings. It is disappointing to see that these factors were not taken into consideration by the planning department when the application was originally put forward for approval
18. This is a case of commercial profit for a very few at the expense of a long-established cohesive community of many.