

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 2nd November 2016 at Retford Town Hall

Present:

Councillor H Richards (Chair)

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

Officers in attendance: C Crossland, F Dunning, J Elliott 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, this was not taken up)

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Burton, K H Isard and A K Smith.

23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor M W Quigley declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications 15/01068/FUL and 16/00968/OUT. He remained in the meeting.

Councillor S Fielding commented that she is a member of Shireoaks Parish Council but has not been present at meetings where the application for Woodend Farm has been discussed.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

24. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7th September 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 7th September 2016 be approved.

25. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 22ND AUGUST AND 10TH OCTOBER 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 22nd August and 10th October 2016 be received.

26. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

27. 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 an appeal decision.

RESOLVED that the Appeal Decision be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00550/OUT	Mr and Mrs D W & L A White	Outline application with some matters reserved, approval being sought for access, for residential development, land off Beckingham Road, Walkeringham

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, including details of access, to erect up to 25 dwellings. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, plans and photographs of the site.

Members were advised that the Committee granted planning permission for up to 32 dwellings on a nearby site. Both sites are outside of the settlement boundary.

The development would be served by access from Beckingham Road. The application site lies within the setting of Manor House which is a grade II listed building and St Mary Magdalene's Church which is a grade I listed building.

There have been discussions with the Council's Drainage Engineer regarding flooding issues in the village. The development should not have an impact on the existing situation, S106 requirements have been proposed. A summary of the S106 obligations was given.

Walkeringham Parish Council object to the development. Two letters of objection have also been received from local residents.

Councillor P Roberts spoke in objection on behalf of Walkeringham Parish Council on the grounds that:

- The site is outside of the well-established development boundary.
- The village envelope has been disregarded.
- Walkeringham is classified as a rural service centre but lacks a shop and has an irregular bus service.
- The village infrastructure is inadequate for the expanding population.
- There are drainage and broadband issues in the area.
- The school is at full capacity.
- Highway safety.
- The site has a history of flooding and it will not be alleviated by the planned flood alleviation scheme.

- The neighbourhood plan is currently being drawn up. Consultation and surveys have been carried out which have found that residents are not against development but want to restrict developments to ten to maintain the rural area.
- There has been planning permission recently granted in the adjacent field.
- The Parish Council asked the Committee to consider the issues and reject the application.

Mr A Wright spoke in objection to the application. He advised that:

- The application is factually incorrect.
- The Stables is a listed building.
- The report states that there are no vantage points where the listed buildings and proposal can be viewed, this is incorrect.
- The paddock driveway is directly opposite.
- The Manor House may be well screened but The Stables is not.
- Road safety is a concern. The road is dangerous and users ignore the 30 mile per hour speed limit.
- There is a large volume of traffic using the road.
- He asked how much consideration had been given to pedestrian and cycle safety.
- HGV's speed around the corner. Will it take a death before action is taken?
- In April his land was under water because of the inadequate sewerage system.
- He was unaware on the proposal until he was informed by a neighbour.

Councillor J Sanger spoke in objection as ward Member. She advised that:

- It has been another stressful time for residents.
- Any residential development on a site like this at Walkeringham, according to Policies DM4 and DM8 and the NPPF, will only be granted if it respects, complements and enhances the character of the built, historic and natural environment. This application does not meet any of the criteria.
- Walkeringham has a number of fields around it that characterise its village setting, if granted this application would destroy much of this.
- The field is at the gateway to the village within the setting of several listed buildings, heritage assets and important and significant features.
- The site and the one almost next to it for 32 dwellings are far too dense for the southern end of the village.
- She is dismayed that Highways have no comment regarding the A161 running alongside the site.
- It is and extremely busy and fast road.
- The listed Manor House wall, almost opposite the site, has been partially demolished twice in the past two – three months.
- Many accidents have occurred on the sharp bend over the years.
- If passed residents from 25 houses will be trying to cross the road to visit the public house, village hall and school.
- There could be up to 40 cars exiting from the site.
- Flooding is still a problem in Walkeringham with its drainage and sewerage problems in spite of the proposed £1m flood alleviation scheme.
- The development is unsustainable. Residents have few amenities, no shop, the post office for just two mornings each week, a school oversubscribed with little room for expansion and a poor bus service.
- The site is not suitable for development to help towards the Council's housing quota imposed by the government.
- She asked the Committee to refuse the application to protect Walkeringham's natural environment.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- The development boundary.
- The permanent and irreversible impact on the character of villages in Bassetlaw.
- The risk of flood zone 2 and standing advice.
- Nearby listed buildings.
- Public consultation.
- It is Council policy to respect the integrity of rural communities.
- The housing target can be reached without destroying the rural community.
- The school is oversubscribed.
- Children would be crossing a busy road to the play facilities.
- Lack of facilities and a limited bus service.
- The proposal could help to encourage and maintaining facilities in the village.
- Speeding is a police matter.

In response to questions the Development Team Manager advised that there are three categories of flood zones, flood zone two is at some risk of flooding but is not significant enough to prohibit development. The standing advice requires a risk assessment, details would be submitted at the reserved matters stage.

In regards to consultation the Council has undertook site and press notices and consulted adjacent neighbours.

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

Voting for taking this course of action:

FOR	Councillors D G Pidwell, H Richards and S Scotthorne.
AGAINST	Councillors S Fielding, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley, M Richardson and T Taylor.
ABSTAINED	None.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The site is located in a flood zone.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- Lack of sustainability.
- Impact on listed buildings and the historic nature of the village.
- The proposal is contrary to policies DM4, DM5 and DM11.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be approved at Planning Consultation Group.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01068/FUL	Braggott Homes Ltd	Erection of fifteen two storey detached dwellings, land adjacent to South Fields, Station Road, Beckingham

The application sought full planning permission to erect 15 dwellings with access from Station Road. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, photographs and elevations.

An overview of the sites planning history was given. In July 2013 outline planning permission was refused for residential development and subsequently allowed on appeal. An application was

submitted in February 2014 at the time the applicant was also appealing. In October 2014 a reserved matters application for access was approved.

The development comprises of a mix of four house type designs for four bedroom detached properties, including roof space accommodation, all with off-street parking provision. The house types are mixed around the site for a more organic appearance. The dwellings have been designed to minimise the impact of overlooking and loss of privacy.

A summary of the proposed S106 obligations was given.

Councillor S Whitehead spoke in objection on behalf of Beckingham Parish Council on the grounds that:

- Beckingham is a semi-rural village surrounded by greenfield and residents would like it to stay that way.
- The application proposes to build large executive houses which will outreach young families.
- Residents would like 2/3 bedroom properties so that young people have a chance to buy a property in the village.
- 15 dwellings would lead to many more cars in the village.
- A development of the proposed size would detract from the village.
- The scale of the development is unsustainable and there are no proposed improvements to current services.

Mr M Gough spoke in objection to the application. He advised that:

- Living on Willow Lane you sometimes take your life into your own hands when in the car, either leaving the entrance or turning into it, due to the speed of traffic coming into the village from the dual carriageway.
- There has been an attempt of a test to find out the speeds of vehicles in the village but why was it done during Easter when traffic was low.
- There are two conflicting stories about the sightlines.
- He was led to believe there would only be 12 dwellings on the plot. The three additional properties are very intrusive and make the site too dense.
- Southfields was built 15 years ago and overlooked a greenfield site that would never be built on. The house was built to make the most of the views and openness. The house has over 17 windows some of which are balcony doors and bay windows. Plot 7 directly looks into the large bay windows at the front of southfields.
- Rural communities are being destroyed
- Plot 4 is too close to the boundary and overshadows Southfields side garden and patio area.
- Plots 4 and 5 garages are also far too close to the boundary.
- The plans refer to a boundary fence and walls however there is no mention of any screening between Southfields and the site.

Councillor J Sanger spoke in objection as ward Member. She advised that:

- The site is too dense and a smaller number of dwellings would be more acceptable to residents and local needs.
- In the early stages if the Neighbourhood Plan residents said that they would like to see smaller houses such as bungalows and 2/3 bedroom houses, not executive type houses.
- Executive type houses preclude younger people, born and bred in the village, from being able to stay in the village, or return, which is rather sad.
- The detached house in the top corner of the site is going to be overlooked.
- There is noise of traffic on the roundabout to the south and traffic on the east which not only includes village traffic but HGV's.

- The site would be too dense. With fewer houses the dwellings would not be so close together and further away from the roadside and be able to have more garden space and parking.
- The pond could be more of a feature with more space otherwise it could be hazard and left uncared for.
- The sewage and drainage systems need urgent attention both off and on the site.
- The access will be extremely close to the busy roundabout which takes traffic from the A631, A620 and A161, plus village traffic.
- Walking can be hazardous at such a busy and fast junction.
- In 2011 Beckingham was classed as a village surrounded by open fields in the natural environment, this is its attraction and it needs to be protected.
- She asked the Committee to support the village environment by recommending a smaller number of houses/ bungalows on the site rather than 15 executive type houses which do not reflect local needs.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- Overdevelopment and over intensification of the site.
- Access.
- Accommodation in the roof space.
- The Neighbourhood Plan.

In response to questions raised the Development Team Manager advised that the proposed properties are two storey dwellings with rooms in the roof space. The dwellings would have the appearance of a two storey dwelling.

In regards to the Neighbourhood Plan it can be given little or no weight at this stage as it is in its early stages.

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

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

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00968/OUT	Mr & Mrs Burns	Outline planning with some matters reserve for a residential development for the demolition of existing farm buildings ad erect 73 dwellings and construction of new access, Woodend Farm and land, Coach Road, Shireoaks

The application sought outline planning permission with some matters reserved for a residential development for the demolition of existing farm buildings and erection of 73 dwellings on two separate parcels of land. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

The site is located outside, but adjacent, the development boundary and within the Shireoaks Neighbourhood Development Plan area. Woodend Farm House and its associated outbuilding are non-designated heritage assets. Shireoaks Footpath 14, a public right of way runs long the northern boundary of the site.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was given:

- The Council's Conservation Officer has commented that on balance subject to appropriate design, scale, materials and landscaping for the new dwellings in its vicinity, it is

considered that the scheme would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the non-designated heritage asset.

- Two letters in support of the application from local residents have been received.
- Shireoaks Parish Council object to the development.
- 13 letters of objection from local residents have been received.
- Bassetlaw Regeneration and Investment Team have commented that the application is not in conformity with the plan as it would work directly against the vision for the area and Community Objection 1 of the Shireoaks Neighbourhood Plan relating to maintaining a physical separation of the village from Worksop.

Members were advised that the development would help towards the Council's five year housing land supply shortfall.

Mr M Wild spoke in objection to the proposal. He sought to clarify if only access was to be determined and all other matters considered at reserved matters stage. He advised that the Parish Council and local residents object to the development. He advised that:

- Traffic issues would be exacerbated.
- He urged Members to consider a roundabout on Coach Road if the application is granted.
- The infrastructure of the village is not adequate.
- Access to the school would be compromised.
- There are concerns that the affordable housing is tucked away in one area.
- The Neighbourhood Plan has taken a long time to produce. Residents want to retain the nature of the village and its identity.
- The proposal is not in conformity with the Neighbourhood Plan and localism.

Mr T Eggington spoke in support of the application. He advised that he is a former District Councillor and Mayor for Mansfield. He advised that it has been suggested that local authorities are at fault for housing developments not coming forward and he challenged Mr Pickles at a LGA Conference. He has undertaken a lot of peer work and has championed Neighbourhood Plans. He commented that he was glad to see the residents of Shireoaks had taken up the challenge of producing a Neighbourhood Plan. There have been objections and concerns raised about the scheme but he assured the Committee the applicant could deliver a quality scheme to address concerns. He added that during his last year of officer three planning appeals had been lost and two of these had costs.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- The Neighbourhood Plan.
- Residents want the village to remain a village and keep its identity.
- Over intensification of the village.
- Supporting rural communities.
- Shireoaks has had its fair share of development.
- The application would block wildlife corridors.
- The Worksop development boundary.
- Destroying village life.
- Sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Comments from the Bassetlaw Regeneration and Investment Team.
- Comments from Highways and ecology.

In response to comments the Development Team Manager advised that the Neighbourhood Plan had been given weight as a material consideration. Officers have looked at the vision and policies and feel that the application is consistent with the vision for Shireoaks. The village would remain physically separated from Worksop by the A57 dual carriageway which maintains a wide physical boundary between the two settlements.

The site has not been included in any identified area in the Neighbourhood Plan and no sites for development have been identified.

In response to questions regarding the Shireoaks development boundary Members were advised that the village boundary in the Local Development Framework is currently described as the Worksop boundary.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to the conditions as circulated and a S106 Agreement.

Voting for taking this course of action:

FOR	Councillors M W Quigley, H Richards and M Richardson.
AGAINST	Councillors S Fielding, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, S Scotthorne and T Taylor.
ABSTAINED	Councillor D Pidwell.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

- The application would be to the detriment of the character of the village.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be approved at Planning Consultation Group.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

28. 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 8.15pm.)