

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 10th February 2016 at Worksop Town Hall

Present:

Councillor H Richards (Chair)

Councillors H Burton, S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, G A N Oxby, D G Pidwell, M W Quigley MBE, M Richardson, S Scotthorne, A Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: D Askwith, B Alderton-Sambrook, P Cooper, C Crossland, J Davies, J Elliot, K France, M Freeman and A Redmond (Item a1 only).

(Meeting commenced at 6.30pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting, read out the Fire Evacuation Procedure, and also enquired as to whether any member of the public wished to film the meeting or any part thereof. Two members of the press and the Council's Senior Communications Officer responded. The Fire Evacuation Procedure and the recording and social media policies were read out before each application for the benefit of Members of the public not present at the start of the meeting.)

61. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence received.

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were read out before the appropriate Item for the benefit of members of the public who were not present at the start of the meeting.

(a) **Members**

Councillors K H Isard, D Pidwell, M Richardson and T Taylor declared non pecuniary interests in applications 15/01037/FUL and 15/00971/OUT. They remained in the meeting.

Councillors H Burton, S Fielding, G Freeman, G Oxby, M W Quigley, H Richards and S Scotthorne declared non pecuniary interests in application 15/00971/OUT. They remained in the meeting.

Councillor A Smith declared non pecuniary interests in applications 15/00971/OUT and 15/01309/FUL. She left the meeting during application 15/01309/FUL.

(b) **Officers**

B Alderton-Sambrook declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application 15/00602/COU. She left the meeting during the item.

63. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13TH JANUARY 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 13th January 2016 be approved.

64. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 4TH JANUARY AND 25TH JANUARY 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 4th January and 25th January 2016 be received.

65. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

Members were advised that the Development Management (Control) End of Year Performance 2014/15 report would be presented to the Committee in June. The quarterly performance report will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes List be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

66. REPORT(S) OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION

(a) **Public Interest Test**

The Head of Regeneration had deemed that all Items on the Agenda were of a non-confidential nature.

(b) **Planning Applications and Associated Items**

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01037/FUL	Harworth Estates	Hybrid planning application seeking a) full planning permission for alterations to existing site access points: extension and alterations to existing internal spine roads; car parking area for use in connection with the previously approved country park ; creation of development platforms; change of use of part of site for open storage (use class B8); and associated infrastructure and outline planning permission for offices (use class B1a), employment uses (use classes B1a/c, B2 and B8), residential development (use class C3) and ancillary retail and food/drink uses (use classes A1 and A3) and associated works at Welbeck Colliery, Budby Road, Cuckney, Mansfield

The application sought a mix of both full and outline permissions over a total site area of 29.7ha. The development is employment led with an element of residential development and ancillary retail/ café uses. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and site plans.

In relation to the ecological impacts the application is supported by a Mitigation Strategy and Development Management Plan. Appropriate conditions are recommended to mitigate any impact.

The proposal does not present any highway, ecological or amenity issues. The approval of the development would result in a significant development which would alter the landscape and character of the area.

The development is considered to be sustainable and would provide economic and social benefits including highway improvements, future ecology enhancements, drainage and other infrastructure to be secured through a S106 agreement.

The proposal is in accordance with National Planning Guidance which is in favour of the delivery of new and suitable sustainable development, and the release of sites for such use where a local planning authority does not have a five years supply of housing land.

A summary of responses from statutory consultees was contained within the report.

Mr E Peat spoke as a representative from Harworth Estates. He advised that they have been working with the Welbeck The Future Group regarding the development of the site. The intention is to provide continuity of employment on the former pit site. As part of the development of the wider site a 11.2 MW solar farm has been built and is now operational. The northern part of the colliery is being restored to create a country park open to public. Planning permission has previously been granted for a biogas plant which will be completed in the summer. This application seeks full planning permission roads and access and outline planning permission for various uses to complete the development of the site. The site could create up to 250 jobs in a high quality environment. Full consultation has been carried out and there have been no objections to the proposal. A number of parties have expressed their interest in the site. The proposal would enable the development and regeneration of the area to continue.

An elected Member commented on the historical significance of the former munitions store on the site. It was suggested that the developer could discuss with residents a way to commemorate the site.

Observations of the Council's Planning Policy; the Council's Environmental Health Officer; the Council's Tree Officer; The Council's Parks and Open Spaces Team; the Environment Agency; the Health and Safety Executive; NATS; Gamston Airport; Nottinghamshire County Council Highways; Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Policy; Network Rail; Severn Trent Water; Meden Vale for the Future were taken into consideration. Also taken into consideration were comments from a local resident.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

(B Alderton-Sambrook left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/00602/COU	Mr and Mrs F Stokes	Change of use of land to proposed showpeople's permanent quarters and construct new access at land to south east of Park House, Styrrup Road, Oldoctes

The application sought permission for change of an agricultural site to a showpeople's permanent quarters. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

An overview of the sites planning history was given. In 2011 planning permission was refused for change of use and a subsequent appeal was dismissed by the inspector.

A summary of responses from statutory consultees was given:

- In terms of ecology Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Policy have commented that the survey submitted with the application was carried out in 2013 and is not up to date. However they have commented that with the nature of habitats on the site it is unlikely that the nature conservation interest has changed significantly. The survey has confirmed no direct impact and conditions are proposed to mitigate any impact. They have no objection on landscaping and visual impact grounds and additional planting is proposed.
- Nottinghamshire County Council Education are not seeking an education contribution.
- Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have no objection subject to conditions.
- Natural England have no comments.
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have raised the issue that the ecological information submitted is almost three years old. They have commented however that the layout of the development and land use are largely unchanged from the provision application.
- Environmental Health have requested additional information in relation to the likely noise impact particularly in relation to the proximity of Park House Farm.
- Styrrup-with-Oldcotes Parish Council object to the application on the grounds of the size of the development; the lack of amenities in the village; the proximity to nearby dwellings; highway concerns; and access. A summary of the comments were contained within the report.
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council's Planner Ecologist has commented that the area is not ecologically sensitive. They have commented that there may be some increase in traffic and local disturbance.
- Blyth Parish Council object to the proposal on the grounds of the rural setting; potential noise impact; additional traffic; and the impact on the character of the area. A late representation has also been received which reiterates the Parish Council's comments.
- Ranskill Parish Council object to the application on similar grounds as the previous application.
- Harworth Town Council asked a series of questions and no subsequent response from the Town Council has been received.
- The local County Councillor has objected on behalf of several villages.
- The local Bassetlaw MP has submitted a letter of objection on behalf of local residents.

754 letters of objection from local residents have also been received. A summary of the grounds for objection was summarised in the Committee report.

Members were advised of the planning issues to consider. Much of the submitted detail relies on information that is not up to date, the current proposal is considered unsustainable and recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment have not identified any specific need for travelling showpeoples sites. On balance the proposal is considered unacceptable and contrary to policy. There are no material considerations that justify a departure from these policies.

Councillor D Smith spoke as Chairman of Styrrup-with-Oldcotes Parish Council. He advised that he is objecting on behalf of the Parish Council and the adjacent Parish Councils who strongly object to the proposal. The level of objection to the application is demonstrated with over 700 letters of objection. This application is similar to the previous application which was refused and dismissed on appeal. The Inspector concluded that the harm to rural setting was considered so great that it was not outweighed by any other matter. This application has moved the application site and would be 12 metres from Park House. The proposed screening would be ineffective and the character of the village and amenity for residents and surrounding villages would be impacted forever. The application would set a precedent for other applications. The site is not appropriate and there would be no benefits for the community. The proposal would not enhance the natural or historic environment of the area. The Council were commended for the emerging concept of localism and this is localism in action. He urged the Committee to reject the application.

Mr R Weighill spoke in objection to the application on behalf of local residents. He advised that:

- The Leader of the Council stated his support for localism. The number of objections shows the local opinion.

- There is no difference between this application and the previous rejected application.
- The proposal would be incongruous and inappropriate.
- The proposal would not enhance the character of the area or landscape.
- The development would be an intrusion into the countryside and have a significant impact on visual amenity.
- The use of the site would be semi-industrial creating noise and pollution.
- The land is of a good grade and alternative brownfield sites should be explored.
- The village would be overlooked and dominated.
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council have stated that there is no unmet need for sites in the Doncaster area.
- No employment would be generated from the application.
- The proposal would result in an increase in traffic and reduction in residential amenity.
- He asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor B A Bowles spoke as ward Member for Blyth on behalf of local residents. He advised that residents are concerned regarding the detrimental impact of the development on the village of Oldcotes and adjacent villages. Many residents have written to the Authority expressing their objections. He raised objections on the grounds of the visual impact; the proximity to neighbouring properties and the intrusion into the countryside. Policy DM6 of the Core Strategy states that such sites need to demonstrate the scale and design of the site is appropriate to its surrounding location and would not lead to unacceptable air or environmental pollution, noise or other nuisance or risk the health and safety of residents on and adjacent to the site. The proposed site would mainly be used to store, maintain and test rides and equipment. He raised concerns regarding visual amenity and the noise impact. Environmental Health have shown concern regarding the maintenance and testing of rides at the site. Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council's Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment shows that only two out of an available 24 pitches have been taken up since 2008. The location is unsuitable for development. The proposal is likely to lead to an increase in traffic and noise disturbance. There is a lack of facilities in Oldcotes and the development would place a strain on the limited facilities in Blyth. He asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Mr N Baseley spoke as the agent on behalf of the applicant. He commented that most people have attended a fair but few people recognise the housing needs of these people and their equipment. The housing needs of showpeople are difficult to accommodate conventionally and sites can rarely be secured in urban areas due to competition with developers. Few new sites are coming forward and families are forced to live in cramped conditions. The Council has an unmet traveller site requirement. The key driver of this application was to address the Inspectors comments in the previous appeal decision. It is now considered that landscaping concerns have been addressed and there are no statutory objections. He added that the needs of his clients are as important as that of the settled population. He asked the Committee to approve the application.

Members made comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- The amount of local objection.
- Highway safety.
- Localism.
- Increase in traffic and noise disturbance.
- The suitability of the site.
- The Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment.

Observations of Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Policy; Nottinghamshire County Council Education; Nottinghamshire County Highways Authority; Natural England; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; Bassetlaw Environmental Health; Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council; Blyth Parish Council; Ranskill Parish Council; Harowrth Town Council; local County Councillor Sheila Place; and local Bassetlaw MP John Mann were taken into consideration. Also taken into consideration were 754 letters/ emails of objection.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as listed.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as listed.

(B Alderton-Sambrook re-joined the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/00971/OUT	Harworth South Ltd	Outline planning application for an employment park comprising of up to 235,000 sqm of B1(c), B2 and B8 uses and ancillary development (EIA development)

The application sought outline planning permission for an employment park and ancillary development. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and site plans.

The site lies outside of any development boundary and extends to approximately 81 hectares of farmed agricultural land. The application is submitted in outline form with details of access. The proposed scheme includes two new points of access into the site, forming a new link road. A T-junction would be formed on Blyth Road and a new roundabout access on Bawtry Road. A minor junction onto Snape Lane is also proposed.

The building heights parameters plan provides indicative details of the maximum proposed height of the buildings.

The site offers the opportunity to make provision for a large scale distribution centre with various industrial units and flexibility regarding potential uses.

Construction of the development is anticipated to commence in 2016, with 50% completed by 2021 and a completion year of 2026. The site could contribute significantly to the economy of the District.

Consideration of planning issues and responses from statutory consultees were summarised within the report. In terms of the visual impact the proposed built form would be significant however mitigation is proposed and will go some way to reduce the impact. In relation to ecology there are no designations on the site and the vast majority of the site is of low ecological value. There are also ecological enhancement opportunities.

The site is in Flood Risk Zone 1 which is low probability. The flood risk assessment concludes that, subject to mitigation, the development could proceed without being subject to significant flood risk.

Noise mitigation measures can be addressed through an Environmental Management Plan. A site of such size has scope for significant planting and landscaping and would offer some mitigation for visual and noise disturbance. Members were advised that there would be an opportunity at the reserved matters stage to comment on the details of the scheme.

Members were advised that the proposal is finely balanced. The development seeks to deliver a high level of economic growth in the area and a much needed step change. The beneficial impacts would be significant and local planning policy seeks to support good quality opportunities. Overall it is considered that the economic growth and prosperity opportunities outweigh the impact of the scale on the landscape and concerns of local residents.

Members were advised of a late representation which had been circulated prior to the meeting. In response the Development Team Manager clarified that there had been no departure from policy.

Mr C Yorke spoke in objection on behalf of local residents Mr and Mrs Bancroft. He advised that they have major concerns regarding the development and the significant adverse impact on their residential amenity. The proposal would change the character and amenity of the property. The proposal is speculative without identifying the demand for the development. The proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and is unsuitable development. The proposed scale and height are inappropriate and would have an overbearing effect. The proposed mitigation would not protect nearby properties. He explained that they felt that tighter conditions and controls are needed. The site layout and building height should not be approved at this stage and he suggested deferring the application if appropriate. He added that the development is unsuitable and would have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. He requested that Members refuse the application.

Mr J Orange spoke in objection on behalf of Blyth Awareness Community Group. He advised that there have been numerous objections from the public consultation which have been largely ignored or minimised. He noted that the application would be weighed up between the impact on residents and the creation of jobs. He commented that the allocation of three minutes to speak was not enough for him to delve into all the issues. He commented that he felt the report was biased. He advised that the application is for a speculative development. The Case Officer has assessed the application against policy CS4 which relates to Harworth and Bircotes although the site is within Styrrup. He added that the application should be refused or at least considered in a different form.

Councillor J Evans spoken in support of the application. She noted that Harworth and Bircotes Town Council support the application. She advised that the application is for sustainable development which would invest in the community and growth of the area. In the 1990's the area lost three major employers which had a major effect on the area. This proposal would in the long term create more than 3,000 jobs, jobs in an area that are much needed. Employment opportunities of this scale bring a number of benefits - it would help address unemployment in the area, create job security, improve residents' quality of live and boost the local economy. The development would be a flagship business enterprise in Bassetlaw and for the future of young people living in our area. The application is an opportunity for local communities. She added that she hoped the Committee would vote favourably and make a real difference.

Councillor B A Bowles spoke in objection as ward Member for Blyth. He advised that the proposed development is in Styrrup not Harworth and has the biggest impact on Blyth. The developer has excluded these communities and only consulted Harworth. He asked that the application be refused or deferred until appropriate consultation has taken place. The letters in support of the application are from local business and are the same letter. The nearest business is around 4 miles away and the proposal would have no impact on them. There is no guarantee that the jobs created by the development would be for Bassetlaw residents. The development is not an appropriate scale and it would be many years before screening is effective. The development would be detrimental to residents'. He asked how the traffic impact on Blyth could be considered minimal and commented on the existing problems in Blyth with HGV's.

Mr D Mitchell spoke as the agent of behalf of the developer. He advised that they welcome the officer recommendation and have been in discussions with the Council for five years. The development would be employment led growth towards south Harworth and Bircotes. Consultation has been carried out and letters have been sent to interested groups. The application seeks outline planning permission and will be carried out in several phases. The development would be investment into the District and create jobs. 600 jobs would be created for the District in a short period of time. The development would be a step change for the District and the developer wants to demonstrate that the A1 corridor and Harworth and Bircotes are open for business. The site was proposed in the site allocations document and is a site that the Council have been in support of in the past. He acknowledged that there have been no statutory objections and the developer has worked hard to addresses any issues. He recognised the local objection to the development and added that the developer was keen to keep a dialogue.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented regarding:

- Is the site designated as a greenfield site?
- The agricultural grade of the land.
- The parish council area that the site is in.
- The consultation process.
- Neighbourhood Plans.
- The needs of the settlement of Harworth and the needs of the rural villages.
- The economic benefits.

In response to questions raised the Head of Regeneration confirmed that due process had been followed. The Design and Access Statement submitted by the applicant involves a section regarding consultation. Further to this, the Development Team Manager discussed the content of the Statement of Community Involvement and the consultation that had taken place as set out in that document. As part of the planning process that statutory consultation has been carried out in accordance with the correct procedure and statutory bodies have been consulted. It was confirmed that there is no obligation for the developer to undertake consultation but it did appear that it had taken place voluntarily from the submitted information. The Planning Service have accorded correctly with statutory requirements.

During the discussion Councillor T Taylor made suggestions regarding the rationale for Councillor J Evans supporting the application. Councillor T Taylor retracted her comments and apologised. Councillor J Evans wanted to come back to the comment however the Chair recommended that this was not the forum to open a debate on the matter.

Observations of Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Policy; Nottinghamshire County Council Director of Environment and Resources (Highways); Highways England; Historic England; the Council's Conservation Officer; the Council's Environmental Health Officer; the Environment Agency; the Nottinghamshire County Council Flood Management Team; Sever Trent Water; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; the Council's Tree Officer, the Coal Authority; Blyth Parish Council; Styrrup Parish Council; Harworth and Bircotes Town Council; and Doncaster Metropolitan Borough council were taken into consideration. 131 letters of objection from local residents and 10 letters of support were also taken into account. Also received were comments from North Notts Regeneration and Investment Team; NATS; a letter of objection from a local District Councillor; and objections from Blyth Awareness Community Group

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01611/RSB	Ms Judith Clark and Sandra Favill	Outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of up to 32 dwellings and the formation of a new access onto Station Road (resubmission of p/a 15/00565/OUT), land south of Station Road, Walkeringham

The application sought outline planning permission for a residential development with all matters reserved. The applicant has submitted an illustrative layout showing 32 dwellings. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and site plans.

The site is located outside of the development boundary. The site lies approximately 200 metres to the east of the Grade I listed church and adjacent to an area of archaeological interest.

The application is identical to the application presented to the Committee in November 2015 where Members resolved to refuse planning permission, contrary of officer recommendation. The previous application is currently the subject of an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.

There are no statutory objections to the application, a summary of the responses were contained within the report. Walkeringham Parish Council have objected to the application and 20 letters of objection from local residents have been received. A letter of objection from a planning consultant, on behalf of local residents, has also been received.

Members were advised that the site is located in a sustainable location and would have no significant detrimental impact on the area. The application complies with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy. The application would help address the Council's current shortfall in housing land supply.

Councillor C Howard spoke on behalf of Walkeringham Parish Council. He commented that eight weeks ago the original application was refused and that this resubmission only offers minor changes. A Neighbourhood Plan is currently being prepared and as a matter of principle the application should be refused until the plan is in place. The development is outside of what was a well-established village envelope. Applicants are rushing for greenfield developments until new planning controls are in place. This application is opportunistic. There are new properties in the village that are unsold. Walkeringham has few amenities, the post office is closed, and the school is full. The village had a minimal bus service with a threat to reduction. He asked Members to reject the application and remain consistent.

Mr A Northcote spoke in objection on behalf of local residents. He advised that:

- Walkeringham is no longer a working rural service centre. The village has lost its post office and village store.
- The village should no longer be classified as a rural service centre. The school is oversubscribed and there is a limited bus service.
- The housing land supply shortfall to be addressed in rural service centres has already largely been met. Applications in Walkeringham have already been granted and there are pending applications.
- If this application was approved it would undermine the objectives of the Core Strategy in terms of settlement hierarchy.
- He asked that the application be refused on the grounds of lack of services and facilities.
- The school is oversubscribed and has no room to expand.

Councillor J Sanger spoke in objection as ward Member for Beckingham. She commented that it was a stressful time again for residents. She advised that:

- Parking is an issue in the village.
- The school is full and the contribution allocated may not benefit the school.
- There are sewerage problems in the village.
- The A161 runs through the village.
- Pedestrian safety is a concern on the busy junction.
- There is no shop or post office in the village.
- The pub does not open every day and there is nowhere to eat out.
- There is a limited bus service and no buses after 6.00 pm.
- Currently a post office operates two mornings a week; however this may not be permanent.
- The number of houses proposed would change the character of the village.
- The site is outside of the village envelope and this has been ignored because of the lack of a five year housing land supply.
- The development is unsustainable.
- She added that residents look to the Committee to fight their corner. She asked Members to please save the village for the future and make a lot of residents happy.

Mr J Imber spoke as the agent on behalf of the applicant. He advised that the appeal for the original application is ongoing however this application was submitted to address concerns raised. He commented that if this application was granted the appeal would be withdrawn. The services and facilities study requires a rural service centre to have three services from a list, Walkeringham still has these. If the village was reassessed it would still be classified as a rural service centre. The bus service is identical to the service in Beckingham and the inspector allowed an appeal as it was considered adequate. Concerns have been raised regarding school capacity however Nottinghamshire County Council have no objection subject to conditions. The Section 106 agreement is required to solely address the needs of the development, therefore the contribution would benefit the school. The proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework and is in accordance with local planning policy. He asked Members to follow officer advice and approve the application.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented regarding:

- The limited facilities and services in the village.
- Larger properties are not needed in the village.
- Sustainability.
- The Council's lack of a five year housing land supply.
- School capacity.
- The site is outside of the village envelope.
- The limited bus service.
- The benefits new residents could bring to the village.

An elected Member commented that the Committee should not be pressured by the agent's comments that if the application was granted the appeal would be withdrawn.

In response to questions raised the Head of Regeneration explained that Nottinghamshire County Council recognise that the school is at capacity and are seeking a contribution to address the need for additional places. The contribution would be defined in the S106 Agreement and may be spent nearby, not necessarily on the site. Nottinghamshire County Council do not believe that the school capacity can justify a reason for refusal and the impact can be mitigated. In terms of housing supply a breakdown of properties achieved against the target per annum was given.

Observations of the County Director of Resources (Highways); Nottinghamshire County Council (Strategic Planning); the Lead Local Flood Authority; Nottinghamshire County Council Education; Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way; Natural England; Historic England; the Council's Conservation Officer; the Council's Environmental Health Officer; the District Engineer; the Parks Development Officer; Severn Trent Water; the Environment Agency; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; and Walkeringham Parish Council were taken into consideration. Also taken into account were 20 letters of objection from local residents, a letter of objection from a District Councillor and a letter of objection from a Planning Consultant employed by local residents.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

(The Chairman exercised her casting vote)

(Councillor A Smith left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01309/FUL	Mr N Griffith – Ground Group	Erection of 39 dwellings (amended scheme from p/a 61/10/00012) and associated works, development land at Scrooby Road, Harworth

The application sought full planning permission to erect 39 dwellings. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and site plans.

Members were advised that the site is inside of the Haworth development boundary. The site is bounded to the north and east by a local wildlife site. To the south and west of the site are existing residential properties, a retail unit and a social club. Previous planning permission was granted in 2007 and 2010 to erect 36 dwellings.

No objections to the application have been received. Nottinghamshire County Council Education have requested a contribution towards primary school places. The Council's Parks Development Officer has requested a contribution towards the improvement of a play area. It is considered that the proposal complies with the provision of the Local Development Framework Policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Elected Members asked questions in relation to education contributions and the breakdown of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

In response to questions regarding CIL the Major Projects Officer explained that a percentage would go to the local community, Town Council and the remaining would be spent on strategic infrastructure. She advised that the Council has an exceptional circumstances policy. If the developer demonstrates that it is not viable to pay CIL and S106 contributions the Council can grant exceptional circumstances.

At a previous meeting a request was made for an officer from Nottinghamshire County Council Education to give Members a briefing on education contributions. The Development Team Manager commented that he has been trying to arrange this however Nottinghamshire County Council have no obligation to attend. He noted that he would follow this up.

Observations of Nottinghamshire County Council Policy; Nottinghamshire County Council (Rights of Way); Nottinghamshire County Council (Education); the County Director of Resources (Highways); the Lead Local Flood Authority; the Council's Environmental Health Officer; the Council's Parks Development Officer; Natural England; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; and Haworth and Bircotes Town Council were taken into consideration.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

(Councillor A Smith re-joined the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01324/FUL	Hale Pringle Ltd	Installation of a peak power generation plant (and associated infrastructure), land east of Tiln Lane, Retford

The application sought to install a Peak Power Generation Plant and associated infrastructure. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and site plans.

The proposal comprises of 16 generators, a fuel storage tank, warfare unit, four transformers and two HV units contained within a fenced compound. The stated purpose is to provide essential back-up power when there is a rapid surge in demand/ shortage in generation. The proposal is intended to typically operate during the hours of 16:00 to 20:00 through the winter period of November to March. The application is not considered to be detrimental to amenity and noise impacts could be mitigated though conditions.

Mr Oates advised that he had some questions regarding the application and subject to satisfactory answers would support the application. The application refers to noise generated and related codes being adhered to. Noise tests have been carried out at two sample points. No assessment has been made towards the prevailing wind and these properties are more likely to be effected. He added that he believed that further tests should be carried out. He asked if the noise level is higher than acceptable does the applicant have mitigation in place.

Ms S Allsop spoke as the agent on behalf of the applicant. She noted that there have been no statutory objections to the application. Noise has been considered by the applicant and a noise assessment has been carried out. The assessment concluded that the associated noise would be low. Necessary mitigation measures are dealt with through conditions. The premise of the development is to balance the network during power shortages. The government have stated that flexible power generation is needed. The site was selected as it is adjacent a solar development and the generator will provide a service when the panels are not operational. HGV access is established.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented regarding:

- The sustainability of the fuel.
- The amount of energy the development would produce.
- Deliveries once the development is operational.
- Bunding around the tanks.

Observations of Nottinghamshire County Council (Highways); Nottinghamshire County Council (Landscape and Reclamation Team); Nottinghamshire County Council (Policy Team); NATS; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; the Environment Agency; and the Council's Environmental Health were taken into consideration. Also taken into account were comments from a member of the public.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and additional conditions in relation to:

- Details of bunding to be agreed.
- Delivery times to be restricted once the development is operational.

(The Chairman exercised her casting vote)

FURTHER RESOLVED that the wording of the additional conditions be agreed at the next meeting of the Planning Consultation Group.

(The Chairman exercised her casting vote)

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

67. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

As there was no other urgent business to be considered, the Chair closed the meeting.

(Meeting closed at 9.50 pm.)