

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13th September 2017 at Worksop Town Hall

Present:

Councillor D Pidwell (Chair)

Councillors D K Brett, H Burton, G Freeman, M W Quigley, S Scotthorne, A Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: S Britt, A Dobb, F Dunning, J Elliott, J Hamilton and S Wormald.

(Meeting commenced at 6.30pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and read out the Fire Evacuation Procedure. He also enquired as to whether any member of the public wished to film the meeting or any part thereof; although there were several members of the public present, this was not taken up.)

33. FIONA DUNNING, INTERIM DEVELOPMENT TEAM MANAGER

The Chair informed Members that this was likely to be the last Planning Committee attended by Fiona Dunning, Interim Development Team Manager, who had joined the Authority for three months on an interim basis which lasted 22 months. He thanked her for all her work and support, particularly to himself as Chair, during her time at Bassetlaw.

RESOLVED that thanks be recorded to Fiona Dunning, Interim Development Team Manager, for her work whilst at Bassetlaw, also best wishes for the future.

34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G Clarkson, S Fielding, K H Isard and G A N Oxby.

35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor D G Pidwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item No. 6(c) - Planning Application No. 15/01457/FUL, to avoid pre-determination as in his role as Ward Member for Carlton he had attended meetings with the developers; he left the meeting and took no part in the discussion and voting thereof.

Councillor S Scotthorne declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item No. 6(c) - Planning Application No. 15/01457/FUL, to avoid pre-determination as in his role as Ward Member for Carlton he had attended meetings with the developers; he left the meeting and took no part in the discussion and voting thereof.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

36. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16TH AUGUST 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 16th August 2017 be approved.

37. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 17TH AND 31ST JULY 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held on 17th, 24th and 31st July be received.

38. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

There were no Outstanding Minutes.

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

39. REPORT(S) OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND NEIGHBOURHOODS

(a) Public Interest Test

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

(b) Proposed Designation of Misson Conservation Area and Approval of Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Following Public Consultation

Members' approval was sought to designate a Conservation Area in Misson and also for the Misson Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan which was appended to the report.

Conservation Areas are established to make further provision for the protection and improvement of buildings of architectural or historic merit and of the character of such areas. The report, presented by the Principal Conservation Officer, outlined the initial consultation during 2015, the proposed Conservation Area boundary, the Appraisal and Management Plan, outcomes of the consultation, and future reviews.

The proposed Conservation Area includes the historic core of the village, centred on the main thoroughfares of Middle Street, High Street, West Street, Gibdyke, Top Street, Dame Lane and Vicar Lane. Key historic buildings within the area include the medieval Church of St John the Baptist, a number of timber-framed 16th/17th century cottages, a range of 18th and 19th century farmhouses and cottages, several significant agricultural buildings, two Victorian Methodist chapels and several key areas of historic open space. Where possible, groups of modern dwellings of limited architectural merit were excluded from this boundary. In addition, large and modern industrial and agricultural buildings were also excluded. Photographs of some of the notable buildings were shown to Members.

Results of the consultation showed strong support for a Conservation Area. Misson Parish Council, the Misson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the Nottinghamshire Building Preservation Trust are also fully supportive.

If the Conservation Area is approved, the Planning Authority would have increased powers with which to assess the impact of a planning application on the character and appearance of the designated area, which will help to achieve broader planning objectives for environmental enhancement. The draft Management Plan outlined these powers and controls.

An elected Member raised reservations that the consultation had not been extensive with only 22 questionnaires being returned, and that the Conservation Area status will prohibit new development, particularly with regard to affordable housing. The Principal Conservation Officer advised that an extensive consultation exercise had taken place but participation is voluntary, and that any future development, including affordable housing, would be given due consideration, particularly in relation to siting, design and materials, but this does not mean that it would not be allowed.

It was noted that a referendum on the Misson Neighbourhood Plan had taken place on 7th September 2017 and that 86% of the votes were in favour of the Plan. Both groups had worked together closely for the benefit of the village.

RESOLVED that:

1. The designation of the proposed Misson Conservation Area boundary and the accompanying Misson Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan document be approved.
2. Delegated authority be conferred to officers of the Conservation Team to implement the designation of the Conservation Area and the approval of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (including any future minor changes required as a result of new legislation, new guidance or grammatical errors).
3. Any future cost implications for employee structure be reported to Cabinet.
4. Thanks be recorded to Michael Tagg, Conservation Officer, and his team for their work on the numerous Conservation Areas within the District.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/00758/OUT	Mr D Jacklin	Outline planning application with all matters reserved for residential development of up to 65 dwellings, including 23 social houses - land to the south of Fox Covert Lane, Misterton

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for residential development of up to 65 dwellings including 23 social houses. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location which is approximately 50m to the north of a Major Hazard Site and Accident Hazard Pipeline.

Whilst the site is located outside of but adjacent to the Misterton development boundary as defined in the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework, it is located within the Parish of Walkeringham and also within the Walkeringham Neighbourhood Plan designated area.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. The Health and Safety Executive has advised against the proposal due to the proximity of the site to the Major Hazard Site and Accident Hazard Pipeline. Both Walkeringham and Misterton Parish Councils object to the proposal and their concerns were outlined in the report. Four letters of objection have been received from local residents and their objections were also outlined in the report.

Parish Councillor Howard, Chair of Walkeringham Parish Council, spoke against the proposal, although the development will impact mostly on Misterton, on the grounds that:

- The site is an agricultural field and lies outside the development envelope.
- The site is not included in the Walkeringham Neighbourhood Plan which is currently being drafted.
- The size of the development is inappropriate for a village settlement.

- The development will result in the removal of soakaway fields and increase the flood risk to the village.
- The nearby fuel dump would be hazardous to the residents of the development.
- The demand for a large development is questionable, there are several new properties in the village which have remained unsold for many years.

Officers consider that, being located within the Consultation Distance of Major Hazard Sites/Pipelines, such development would result in an unacceptable risk to occupiers of the new dwellings. In addition, development would relate poorly to the existing built form of the village and be at odds with the rural character and appearance of the area. The development would also fail to demonstrate that it would have no adverse impact on highway safety or protected species.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse permission for the reasons as set out in the published report.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse permission for the reasons as set out in the published report.

(Councillors D G Pidwell and S Scotthorne left the meeting at this point, having declared non-pecuniary interests in the following item; and the Vice-Chair took the chair.)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01457/FUL	Network Space	Hybrid application for full planning permission for demolition of existing buildings (within all phases), amended site access, erection of main access road through phase one, associated drainage, infrastructure and site levelling, and plot formation works in respect of phase one and outline planning permission for the erection of up to 400 dwellings – former Firbeck Colliery, Doncaster Road, Costhorpe

Members were advised that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of the existing buildings, a new site access for the construction phase and updated main access road for phase one, with associated drainage, site levelling and other infrastructure works as well as the plot formation works for phase one. Outline planning permission was also sought for the erection of up to 400 dwellings on the site which are expected to be built in phases, and, as such, a 10-year consent was sought. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location which is the site of the former Firbeck Colliery and lies within the development boundary of Carlton-in-Lindrick.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. A supplementary report was tabled at the meeting which contained further consultation responses and proposed amendments to the Conditions, and these were outlined by the Case Officer. An amended plan was shown to Members with regard to the access to the development, which gave increased manoeuvrability space to the existing residents.

The Conservation Officer is concerned about the loss of non-designated heritage assets as these buildings have very clear historic and communal value relating to the mining heritage of the site. In particular, the engine house is the most significant, not only in it being the last remaining building of its age and type in the District (and wider area) but also in its prominence in the local landscape and in its communal value as a recognisable landmark of the former colliery which had employed many local people. No attempt has been made to show why all (or even some) of the heritage assets on the site cannot be retained and reused.

The site is a brownfield site and in a very poor environmental state. The previous planning permission established the principle of redevelopment of the site. It was noted that the housing at

this stage would be 100% market housing due to the current viability of preparing the site to be able to deliver residential development, although there will be an opportunity of reviewing the provision of affordable housing at later phases of the development as well as the provision of education contributions for primary school places. The viability and Section 106 contributions were detailed in the report.

Parish Councillor Jackson, Vice-Chair of Carlton-in-Lindrick Parish Council, spoke in support of the development on the grounds that:

- The site is the subject of anti-social behaviour and environmental issues.
- Although the retention of the industrial heritage is important, the site continues to deteriorate.
- Increased services and facilities will be needed to sustain such a large development.
- A footpath and cycle path should be provided for access to the Country Park.
- A memorial to the former miners, particularly those who lost their lives, should be incorporated.

Mr R Scott spoke on behalf of the residents who live at the entrance to the proposed development against the proposal on the grounds that:

- The new access route is very close to the busy A60 and the new development will block this and result in queuing traffic onto the A60.
- Flooding of the dyke adjacent Lawn Road will increase.
- There are bats in the area.
- The temporary access road through the Country Park must not be allowed to become permanent.
- There are shrubbed beds and five mature trees on the site which sympathetic landscaping could retain.

Ms H Richardson spoke in favour of the proposal as the planning consultant for the applicant, on the grounds that:

- The site is a brownfield site and lies within the development boundary.
- The proposal is a regeneration opportunity and will increase the range and quality of housing in the village.
- Previous planning permission has been granted for mixed use, including residential, and will increase the available land supply.
- Local benefits will be realised through the Section 106 Agreement, as detailed in the report.
- The Highways Authority has raised no objections, subject to conditions.
- The revised layout increases the manoeuvring area.
- As the development will have no adverse impact on amenity, the application should be supported.

Elected Members asked questions/raised issues in relation to:

- Nottinghamshire County Council will receive the majority of the Section 106 monies.
- The majority of the children will attend school in Langold, rather than the school in Carlton-in-Lindrick, and 300 houses are already proposed for Langold.
- A memorial to the miners is already being considered by the Parish Council and other groups.
- The site needs improving but landscaping to retain existing features is desirable.
- Could the Highways Authority be asked to include a "boxed" junction at the entrance to the development?

The Interim Development Team Manager advised Members that the Section 106 contributions are a direct result of the proposed development, and contributions from three developments will be

combined to provide improvements at the Cannon crossroads junction in Worksop. With regard to the education contributions, these are determined by the Education Authority. The Heads of Terms detail the Section 106 contributions and conditions. The development will also be subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy, identified as £5 per square metre multiplied by the BCIS Index in place at the time of the planning permission, and will be determined before/when development commences. With regard to affordable housing, viability of the scheme will determine any contribution, although as the scheme will be phased, any additional profits could be identified for the supply of affordable housing. The Highways Authority will determine any necessary highways measures but the Interim Development Team Manager proposed that an additional clause (v) be added to Condition 19 to ensure that access to the existing residential properties remains clear.

Planning permission has previously been granted on the site for a mixed use scheme which included residential. The site needs to be restored with dangerous structures removed. Whilst the proposal will result in significant changes to the site, including the demolition of the non-designated heritage assets, officers consider that it will be an improvement and will ultimately deliver housing to the District over the long term.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement, covering the agreed Heads of Terms and conditions as set out in the published report, together with the proposed amendments to Conditions 1, 3, 4, 5, 19 and 19, as set out in the supplementary report which was tabled at the meeting, and an additional clause (v) be added to Condition 19 to ensure that access to the existing residential properties remains clear.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement, covering the agreed Heads of Terms and conditions as set out in published the report, together with the proposed amendments to Conditions 1, 3, 4, 5, 19 and 19, as set out in the supplementary report which was tabled at the meeting, and an additional clause (v) be added to Condition 19 to ensure that access to the existing residential properties remains clear.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

40. 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 7.20pm.)