

## Report to Planning Committee

**Application Number/s: 2018/0727, 2018/1186 & 2018/1166**

**Location: 22 Kighill Lane, Ravenshead, Notts, NG15 9HN**

Proposal: Erection of 6 dwellings

Case Officer: Graham Wraight

Three applications were submitted on the site for the erection of 6 dwellings, all three applications were refused permission. The first application, 2018/0727, was refused for three reasons; a lack of information with regard to viability; impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and being out of character with the area. The second and third applications, 2018/1186 and 2018/1166, were, following changes to the layout and additional information on viability, refused permission for one reason only, being out of character with the area.

The appeals were considered together at an informal hearing held on the 5 November, as outlined in more detail below, the first appeal was dismissed whilst the later two appeals were allowed.

Appeal 1 (2018/0727) – the Inspector agreed with the Council on all three reasons for refusal in that the dwellings proposed to be erected were too large and prominent within the streetscene so as to be detrimental to the character of the area. The resultant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties would also have been harmful. Furthermore, insufficient information had been submitted to determine whether or not the appeal was viable without requisite contributions. **The appeal was dismissed.**

Appeals 2 and 3 (2018/1186 and 2018/1166) – changes were made to the applications through reducing the size of units proposed to be erected as well as information submitted with regard to viability for the applications. Both the Council and Inspector agreed the impacts on viability and residential amenity were now acceptable.

With regard to the character of the area, Officers considered that the layout of the development would be inappropriate given the character of the area, lack of tandem and backland development and that a more comprehensive form of development for the larger allocated site would be more appropriate. However, the Inspector felt that given the site was allocated and a lack of co-operation between landowners, some form of tandem and backland development would be acceptable, as well as respect the character of the area. **The appeals were allowed**, subject to conditions.

**Recommendation:** To note the information.