

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 30th November 2016 at Worksop Town Hall

Present:

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

Officers in attendance: C Crossland, F Dunning, J Elliott, M Freeman 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)

29. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor H Burton.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor K H Isard declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 16/00725/FUL as the applicants company has supported past projects in Tuxford. He left the meeting during the Item.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

31. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2ND NOVEMBER 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 2nd November 2016 be approved.

32. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 17TH OCTOBER AND 7TH NOVEMBER 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 17th October and 7th November 2016 be received.

33. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

34. 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 two appeals decisions.

RESOLVED that the Appeal Decisions be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/01166/OUT	SP Scholey and the executors to W A Scholey	Outline planning application with some matters reserved, approval being sought for access, for residential development, land north of Arundel Drive and east of Great North Road, Ranskill

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission for a residential development with some matters reserved. The applicant has provided an illustrative layout showing 130 dwellings. The site is located outside of the Ranskill development boundary as defined in the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework.

The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

Members were advised that late comments had been received from Severn Trent raising no objection and the Council's Parks Officer requesting money in lieu of open space provision. A letter and email received from Ranskill Parish Council had been circulated Members.

The Principal Planner advised of an error in the report. An education contribution of £309,285 has been requested.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was given. 45 letters of objection from local residents had been received and a petition with 76 signatures. A letter from the County Councillor and local Member of Parliament objecting to the application has also been received.

In terms of planning considerations Members were advised that the site is outside but adjacent the development boundary. The Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing therefore there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The site is located in a sustainable location on the edge of Ranskill and is considered acceptable in principle.

Councillor A Cooke spoke in objection on behalf of Ranskill Parish Council he advised that:

- Ranskill Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Group are not against some new housing in the village, they appreciate that there has to be some however they do not want overdevelopment that will detract from the character of the village.
- Traffic is an issue and there are already issues in the area. The local Member of Parliament has recognised the problem and held a meeting regarding the concerns.
- Access on Great North Road would be dangerous.
- A ground survey is needed as there is ground movement in the village.

- A sink hole has opened up in the past on Great North Road suggesting a fault line on the application site. A detailed investigation is needed.
- The Bassetlaw Plan states that no single development should increase the number of dwellings in a village by 10% or more. There are around 600 dwellings currently in Ranskill, this application would increase the number by over 20% and there are other planned developments.
- Residents do not want to lose the character of the village.
- The site would be overdeveloped.

(Councillor M W Quigley joined the meeting during Mr Cookes' objection)

Councillor M T Gray, ward Member for Ranskill, spoke in objection to the application. He advised that the local County Councillor also objects to the application and has commented on the size of the development and impact on the village environment. The development will attract families however there is no capacity at the school. The additional traffic is a concern and the five way bottle neck will be exacerbated. Planning policy talks about raising the quality of life in rural areas, he questioned if this application would do that. He advised that despite development in the village there is still no village hall. He commented that if the application was granted that money could maybe be set aside for a village hall.

Mr C Darley spoke on behalf of the applicant. The applicant is a local family and a significant local employer. He advised that:

- Concerns have been addressed in the Committee report.
- All technical consultees have supported the application. The site is not an area at risk of flooding, there are no nearby listed buildings, the site is not within a conservation area, there are no protected trees on the site and there are no wider ecology issues.
- The site is close walking distance to bus stops and there is a good bus service.
- The shop, pub and chip shop are in walking distance from the site.
- New residents would help to sustain facilities in the village.
- The application would contribute to addressing the Council's five year housing land supply shortfall.
- 25% of the dwellings would be affordable homes for local people.
- The scheme would make a contribution to improving the children's play area.
- CIL will be payable and could be used locally for a village hall.
- The development is sustainable.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- The Council's current position of its current five year supply of housing land.
- What ground investigations have been carried out in relation to subsidence?
- Villages in Bassetlaw are being destroyed.
- The number of dwellings in the village would increase by 20% from one application.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- 25% affordable housing would bring younger people back to the village and help them get onto the property ladder.
- The significant impact on the local community.
- Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan.
- The possibility of a village hall.
- Library contributions.
- The excellent quality of officer reports and their professionalism.

In response to questions raised regarding subsidence, Members were advised that a geotechnical report has not been submitted as part of the outline planning application. If planning permission is approved it would be in the developers interest to undertake an assessment. The developer would have three years to submit details which could include a geotechnical report prior to commencement of development. The developer may share the outcome of the surveys as part of the siting of the dwellings.

In relation to affordable housing there is a range of housing that is classed as affordable. The Council's Strategic Housing Manager would recommend the best form of affordable housing for the site.

The Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan was designated in March 2016. The draft is in the process of being produced therefore at this stage has little or no weight.

The Development Team Manager advised that a contribution towards a village hall would not be possible as part of the S106 obligations. It could be possible to use CIL money from the developer towards a village hall.

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

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The size and scale of the development and the impact on the character of the village.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- Over intensification of the site.

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

(Councillor K H Isard left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00725/FUL	Walker & Son (Hauliers) Ltd	Land north east of Shireoaks Road, Worksop

The application sought full planning permission for 80 dwellings on the former Dormer Tools site. All former buildings on the site have been demolished. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

The proposal consists of 8 four bedroomed houses, 28 three bedroomed houses, 40 two bedroomed dwellings, including 27 bungalows, and 4 one bedroom dwellings (apartments). The site is accessed from the existing access onto Shireoaks Road.

The site is within the development boundary for Worksop. Immediately adjoining the site to the north is a designated Local Wildlife Site and also Ancient Woodland. The trees to the south of the site are covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

The requirement to protect existing or vacant former employment sites for economic development purposes has been addressed previously with the extant planning permission on site granted in September for residential development.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was given. Rhodesia Parish Council have expressed their disappointment that no senior citizen properties are included in the development. A letter has been received from the neighbouring business raising concerns in relation to the impact of associated noise and HGV movements on the potential residential dwellings. Members were advised that a number of conditions are proposed to address concerns.

A summary of the S106 obligations was given. The applicant has agreed the travel plan review contribution but in terms of public transport no contribution is offered as it is felt that the site is sustainable and accessible with bus stops at the entrance.

The applicant has submitted a viability assessment that demonstrates that it is not viable to deliver affordable housing. An overage clause is proposed after the sale of the dwellings so that any additional profits are shared with the developer and the Council.

Members were advised that some of the layout and design does not meet the minimum requirements in terms of amenity space but on balance is considered acceptable.

The application proposes open space to provide a buffer to the adjoining woodland. A condition is proposed to protect the trees during construction.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to education provision, school expansion and the impact of the development on the neighbouring businesses operations. Members commented that it was good to see a mix of units and in particular bungalows.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement, the conditions included within the Committee report, the additional conditions as circulated and the amendment of Condition 14 to read:

14. Before development commences, a noise survey shall be undertaken to identify existing noise levels on the boundaries of the site and any remediation necessary to provide adequate amenity to the residents of the proposed development. The survey shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and any remediation necessary shall be carried out before the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the proposed dwellings.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement, the conditions included within the Committee report, the additional conditions as circulated and the amendment of Condition 14 to read:

14. Before development commences, a noise survey shall be undertaken to identify existing noise levels on the boundaries of the site and any remediation necessary to provide adequate amenity to the residents of the proposed development. The survey shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and any remediation necessary shall be carried out before the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the proposed dwellings.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

35. 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 7.35pm.)