

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 29th March 2017 at Worksop Town Hall

Present:

Councillor H Richards (Chair)

Councillors S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, G A N Oxby, M Richardson, S Scotthorne, A K Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: B Alderton-Sambrook, C Crossland and S Wormald.

(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, there was no response.)

57. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Burton, D G Pidwell and M W Quigley MBE.

58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

59. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1ST MARCH 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1st March 2017 be approved.

60. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 6TH AND 27TH FEBRUARY 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 6th and 27th February 2017 be received.

61. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

62. 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) Appeal Decisions Received

Members were presented with one appeal decision.

An elected Member requested that the minutes from the Committee relating to an appeal decision be included with an appeal report in future for information

RESOLVED that the appeal decision be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00842/OUT	Mr Sooriah	Outline planning permission with some matters reserved, approval being sought for access, for a holiday lodge development of 12 lodges, with a village convenience store and community facilities, Eel Pie Farm, Great North Road, Markham Moor

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission with some matters reserved. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, indicative layout and photographs.

The Head of Regeneration advised of amendments to the Committee report. Comments detailed in the report from the ward Member are in fact from a ward Member but not the ward that this application is in. The relevant ward Member raised concerns by the local community and requested that the application be presented to Planning Committee.

The report also details that landscaping, layout and scale are under consideration and in fact this is not the case. This permission seeks the principle of development with access only being considered. Members were advised that the application had been advertised correctly.

Details of addresses of people who had made a representation in relation to the application, Parish Council comments and comments from the ward Member had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The application seeks permission for 12 holiday lodges on a 1.5 ha site. It was noted that no details had been submitted in relation to the water feature/ fishing pond at the centre of the site on the indicative plans. A subsequent planning application would be required for that development.

The site is currently a grassed field to the east of Eel Pie Farm buildings. The southern boundary abuts a drainage ditch to the side of Old London Road and the A638 lies to the east. The A1 lies to the far south.

The site is outside of any development boundary. The closest settlement is East Markham located to the southeast of the site.

To the southwest of the site is the Grade II Listed Markham Moor House with its associated listed structures. The House is surrounded by dense vegetation. Consent for B1, B2 and B8 uses has been granted immediately south of the application site, adjacent the listed building.

A summary of responses from statutory consultees was given.

- Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have no objections to the amendments made to the access and consider the scheme acceptable subject to conditions.
- The Council's Conservation Officer has considered the setting of Markham Moor House. Given the physical separation of the site by Old London Road the site has little visual association with the proposed site. When taking into account the recent permission for a commercial development this application is unlikely to have an adverse impact to the setting, subject to suitable scale, design and layout. The Officer recommends that the buildings on the site remain at single storey to reduce their impact on the setting of Markham Moor House.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority have not responded to the consultation.
- The Environment Agency consider that there are low risks associated with the development and have no objections.
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have advised that a detailed ecological assessment should be submitted prior to any development commencing.

Six letters of objection have been received and 33 letters of support, an overview of the comments was given. West Drayton Parish Council have submitted concerns regarding access.

Planning policy seeks to promote the establishment/ expansion of rural businesses. Information in relation to the need of the development has been provided by the applicant. The information has been verified and at that point in time and a need was demonstrated as there was no similar accommodation available.

In terms of the indicative retail unit, 100 sqm is considered to be small scale and would not impact on the town centre viability. A condition would be imposed limiting the floor area.

In relation to the character and appearance of the area given the location permanent residential dwellings on the site would be unacceptable. Conditions are proposed to limit the occupancy of the site.

Mr R Adam spoke in objection to the application. He advised that:

- He has lived in the village for 37 years.
- He is a retired farmer who used to farm the site.
- He owns the next field.
- The site is outside of the development area.
- The proposal is unsuitable for the village and surrounding areas.
- Industrial development has been granted planning permission across the road. The building is enormous and there will be high volume of traffic to and from the site.
- This development would add to the traffic problem. The turning into West Drayton is an accident hotspot.
- When outline permission was sought for the industrial site a S106 was to be agreed regarding highways.
- The site is near Markham Moor House which is a listed building.
- Lound Hall was granted planning permission for holiday lodges and is now a residential development.
- This development should not take place as it will become a residential site.

Mr R Musson spoke as the agent for the application. He advised that:

- There has been support for the application from the Parish Council, a ward Member and local businesses.
- The development has the support of Hoeseasons.
- The proposal is for 12 luxury holiday lodges made from ecologically friendly materials.

- There has been no objection from statutory consultees.
- The application complies with the LDF and NPPF as set out in the report.
- The proposal complies with the Bassetlaw regeneration and growth strategy. The development would attract tourism to the area and provide accommodation in the area.
- The developer has developed 7 similar sites in the UK which have high occupancy and receive good feedback from visitors.
- The architecture and design would blend with the natural environment.
- Any concerns can be addressed at the reserved matters stage or with conditions.

Elected Members asked questions/ raised issues in relation to:

- The size of the site.
- The distance from the site to the A1.
- Will the retail facility serve the local community or will the site be closed to the public.
- How the site would be managed.
- Imposing a condition to limit the length of stays.
- Limiting the number of months the site is in operation.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- The site is not identified as a brownfield site.
- The Council's lack of a five year land supply is not applicable as the site is not for residential use.
- Most of the supporters for the application do not live near the site.
- The industrial unit across the road will increase traffic.
- Noise.
- The height of the units.
- Promoting tourism in the area.

In relation to questions raised the Head of Regeneration advised that the proposed retail facility at 100 sqm is relatively small in planning policy terms. There are six retail outlets in neighbouring areas focused around Tuxford. It is considered that the proposal would enhance the rural offer. The applicant has suggested that the site will be open to the community.

Members were advised that a number of conditions are recommended to restrict occupancy and to ensure the site is not used as residential and a further two were discussed at committee to ensure that this remains the case.

In terms noise on the site arising from the strategic highway network close by, this would be down to consumer choice to choose whether to visit or not. The proposal is considered to comply with the NPPF supporting a prosperous rural economy and rural tourism.

It was proposed that amendments be made to conditions 3, the outline detail and to further limiting occupancy with an informative to be added regarding the preference for single storey units.

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as circulated, with the amendment to the following conditions

2. The appearance of the building(s), layout, scale and landscaping shall be only as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development commences.

Reason: This permission is granted in respect of an outline application which did not contain details of the matter hereby reserved for approval.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the details and specifications included on the submitted application form. Notwithstanding the indicative layout plan submitted, the access hereby approved shall be constructed only in accordance with the Site Access Design Plan No. 001 Rev A01 received 12 September 2016 and the principle of a Maintenance store as detailed in the Supplemental Statement Received 17 February 2017.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes the agreed form envisaged by the Local Planning Authority when determining the application.

17. The accommodation on the site shall be used for holiday purposes only and shall not at any time be used as a person's sole or main place of residence.

Reason: In order to encourage tourism and the protection of the environment in an isolated locality that otherwise would be unsustainable as a permanent residential development.

18. The owners / operators of the holiday park hereby permitted, shall maintain an up to date register of the occupiers of any individual lodge, including dates of arrival and departure and the occupants main place of residence, and shall make this information available within a reasonable timescale to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to encourage tourism and the protection of the environment in an isolated locality that otherwise would be unsustainable as a permanent residential development.

19. Occupiers of holiday lodges hereby permitted at the site will be restricted to a maximum 28 day stay duration within any three month timeframe.

Reason: In order to encourage tourism and the protection of the environment in an isolated locality that otherwise would be unsustainable as a permanent residential development.

FURTHER RESOLVED that an informative be added to notify the developer that single storey units would be preferable to minimise the impact on the nearby listed building.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

63. 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 7.40 pm.)