# Dispute erupts over boundary wall in Nottinghamshire estate



A dispute has erupted among residents in a Nottinghamshire estate over the construction of a newly built boundary wall. Located in Mornington Crescent, Nuthall, the wall, which stands at six feet tall, has been met with significant backlash from neighbours who claim it adversely affects the aesthetics of the area, labeling it a "monstrosity" that resembles a "prison."

The wall was erected during extension works at a property owned by Jonathan Lewis, who has found himself at the centre of the controversy. Lewis challenges the objections, asserting that the wall was constructed in compliance with the planning permission provided by Broxtowe Borough Council. "All of this is just a complete and utter overreaction," he stated. Lewis further expressed his opinion that the wall enhances the neighbourhood's appearance and noted that several other properties in the vicinity have similar structures. "You only have to look across the road and they have a six foot wall," he remarked, defending the legality and aesthetics of his project.

Conversely, Anthony Wilson, a neighbour and veteran, has voiced strong opposition to the wall, claiming it was built higher and closer to the public footpath than originally proposed. He described the council's approval of the structure as an "absolute travesty," asserting that it has severely impacted the entrance to the estate and altered its overall presentation. "Fifteen people objected to the wall but not a single one was contacted," Wilson complained, lamenting the visual and community harmony that he feels has been disrupted.

Another local resident, Tony Pinkstone, echoed Wilson's sentiments, stating, "It’s completely destroyed the street scene. This estate was always attractive with open front gardens." Pinkstone expressed concern that the wall's presence could lead to a decrease in property values due to the harsher environment it creates.

In response to these complaints, a spokesperson for Broxtowe Borough Council reiterated that the wall was constructed in accordance with the approved plans and considered all relevant comments made during the planning process. They also mentioned that any legal issues or covenants are not planning matters, highlighting that minor adjustments to the wall's position were made and subsequently approved as a non-material amendment to the original plans.

In a separate issue affecting the city, there has been a noticeable trend of Nottingham residents opting to obtain taxi licenses from the City of Wolverhampton Council, approximately 60 miles away, rather than from Nottingham City Council (NCC). This trend is attributed to the significantly lower fees charged by Wolverhampton, where drivers can obtain a one-year license for just £49, compared to £148 in Nottingham.

Currently, the City of Wolverhampton Council licenses 701 drivers who reside in Nottingham, while NCC has not disclosed the number of drivers licensed in the city, stating that the information requires a request under the Freedom of Information Act. NCC has been making efforts to encourage local drivers to be licensed with them instead, resulting in a reported increase in applications, although specific data on this trend has not been provided.

Wolverhampton's licensing process has attracted criticism from local Nottingham taxi drivers, who feel overwhelmed by competition from out-of-town licenses. Asif Maqsood, spokesman for the Nottingham Taxi Owners' and Drivers' Association, noted that the influx of drivers from Wolverhampton has significantly impacted local businesses. Maqsood expressed concerns about the expertise of some drivers, stating their lack of familiarity with the area leads to obstructive parking habits, particularly on busy nights in local hotspots such as Old Market Square.

Both councils maintain that it is illegal for them to refuse licensing based on an applicant's address, a practice that is not permitted under current legislation. Despite the challenges posed by the high volume of applications received by Wolverhampton, they continue to process requests and manage compliance matters.

In summary, tensions remain high in both the Nuthall estate over the contentious boundary wall and among Nottingham taxi drivers navigating the competitive landscape created by cross-border licensing practices.
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* <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1985/70/contents> - This URL points to the Transport Act 1985, which governs licensing of taxi drivers and is relevant to the challenges faced by Nottingham taxi drivers due to cross-border licensing.