

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 4th January 2017 at Retford 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: B Alderton-Sambrook, S Bacon, C Crossland, J Elliott and M Freeman

(Meeting commenced at 6.45pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and apologised for the late start, 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)

36. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor H Burton.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor H Richards declared a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application No. 15/01304/OUT as she is employed by Ordsall Parish but is not, and has never been, employed by Discoes of Southwell and Nottingham Board of Finance. She remained in the meeting.

Councillor T Taylor declared a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application No. 15/01304/OUT as she is a member of PCC, and school governor nominated by PCC, for a church in the Discoes of Southwell and Nottingham. She remained in the meeting.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

38. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30TH NOVEMBER 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 30th November 2016 be approved.

39. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 17TH OCTOBER AND 12TH DECEMBER 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 17th October and 12th December 2016 be received.

40. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

41. 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

The Chair advised of a change of order so that a3, Planning Application no. 14/00503/OUT, would be taken first.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
14/00503/OUT	Linden Limited	Outline application for the erection of up to 175 dwellings including public open space, attenuation drainage basin and associated works, land west of Tilt Lane, Retford

The application had been previously considered at Planning Committee on 1st October 2014 where Members resolved to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement. The applicant has subsequently submitted a viability assessment that in their view shows that the development of the site is not able to support any affordable housing or S106 contributions. They have however offered some monetary contributions. The applicant's viability assessment has been reviewed by the District Valuer. The applicant and District Valuer have been unable to agree on the viability assessment estimates and assumptions. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

An elected Member commented on the significant difference between the figures of the applicant and District Valuer.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to a future meeting for further information and consideration. Members took a vote and the outcome of the vote was to defer the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/01411/FUL	Mr and Mrs P Wright	Proposed two houses with double garages off a private drive, Narnia and land, Eastfield, North Wheatley

Members were advised that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of two, four bedroom dwellings. The site is located outside of the North Wheatley development boundary.

To the east of the site is a site with extant planning permission. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

The proposed dwellings would be accessed from a private driveway; a total of five dwellings would be served from this access.

A summary of responses received from statutory bodies was given. The County Director of Resources (Highways), the District Environmental Health Officer and the District Engineer have no objection.

The District Regeneration and Investment Officer has commented that the proposal does not support Objectives 3,4 and 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly Objective 3 relating to the housing types needed by the local community.

Letters of objection have been received from North and South Wheatley Parish Council and a local resident.

Members were advised that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing. The application site would be located in a sustainable location and is not considered to be a detrimental impact on the character of the village.

Ms S Stillard spoke in objection on behalf of North and South Wheatley Parish Council. She commented that the report suggests that the Council's lack of five year outweighs any adverse impacts of the development however there would only be a gain of two houses and this would have a big impact on the village. She advised that:

- The site is not within the development boundary.
- The site is close to listed buildings and parts of the site are in an area of archaeological interest.
- The proposal is not supported by the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The development proposes more, large, four bedroom houses.
- There is a shortage of homes for first time buyers and residents who want to downsize.
- A survey found that 61% of residents would like to downsize and stay in the village.
- A news item this week said that 22% of new builds should be starter homes.
- The Parish Council are not opposed to new housing but want to see the right type of houses for the village.
- Building four, two bedroom houses would be a win-win situation for everyone.
- North Wheatley does not need more, large, four bedroom houses.

Mr P Scarborough spoke in objection to the application. He advised that:

- There are six parking spaces for Church Close on the opposite side of the road.
- Visitors have to park on the verge or road making the highway only one vehicle wide.
- The postman, hospital vehicles etc. park opposite Narnia.
- There would be a danger to pedestrians.
- The entrance is opposite the entrance to Church Close on the busiest part of the highway.
- He suggested that if planning permission is approved that the existing entrance to Narnia be altered.

Mr P Wright spoke as the applicant. He advised that in relation to comments regarding the site being of archaeological interest this has been checked and he has been assured that the site is not near any points of interest. He advised that before the application was submitted he consulted Highways regarding the best approach. In order to make this scheme acceptable it is proposed to remove the plot with extant planning permission to enable the two plots at the rear of Narnia to be served by the access. The proposal does not compromise privacy. Adequate parking provision is proposed with garages for two cars and a driveway. The application seeks full planning permission and a buyer may wish to make a further application to change the scheme.

In relation to questions raised, the Head of Regeneration advised that the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted and carries full planning policy weight. It was acknowledged that Neighbourhood Plans cannot be restrictive and should be about growth however no sites have been allocated for growth in this Plan as alternative sites to the proposal. Officers do advise Neighbourhood Planning Groups but cannot insist of the content of the Plans, that remit belongs to the community.

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.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01304/OUT	Southwell & Nottingham Diocese	Outline planning permission with some matters reserved for residential development of nineteen dwellings and construct new access, land north east of Dunelm, Church Street, Beckingham

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission for residential development with some matters reserved to erect up to 19 dwellings. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent, the Beckingham development boundary. The site would be accessed from Church Street.

A summary of responses received from statutory bodies was given. The County Highways Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way, the District Environmental Health Officer, the District Parks Development Officer, the District Tree Officer and the Drainage Board have no objection.

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have placed a holding objection until further ecological surveys have been carried out and appropriate mitigation measures put in place.

The District Councillor, County Councillor and Beckingham-cum-Saundby Parish Council have objected to the development. 48 letters of objection from local residents have also been received.

Members were advised that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of land for housing. The application site would be located in a sustainable location and is considered acceptable in principle subject to a S106 Legal Agreement. A summary of the S106 obligations was given.

Councillor S Whitehead spoke on behalf of Beckingham Parish Council. She commented that the Parish Council is in despair and are unable to carry out the will of residents. She felt that democracy was second to meeting government targets. She advised that:

- The lack of a five year housing supply overrides the views and wishes of residents.
- There is cumulative impact of planning applications that are placing an unnecessary strain on public services and amenities.
- Residents are not being listened to.
- Beckingham is losing its village nature.
- The village is overwhelmed with housing plans.
- There are non-designated heritage assets in the area. This development would be harmful to the setting of the non-designated heritage assets and Grade II listed church.
- The village is being urbanised.

- The preservation of flora and fauna should be important.
- The National Wildlife Trust have made a holding objection, this should be listened to.
- The current drainage infrastructure cannot cope and this proposal would exacerbate the problem.
- The greenspace should be preserved for the future.

Mr K Dyer spoke in objection to the application on behalf of local residents. He advised that he is a resident of Clayworth who has worked in Beckingham. He commented that he could not understand how Highways have not objected to the application as there are already existing highways and parking issues in the area. The residents who live opposite the church are opposed to the development. These properties have no driveways and have no option other than to park on Church Street. A new car park for the church should be provided to help alleviate parking problems. Existing properties that have driveways will have access made difficult by this application on a dangerous section of the road. Customers to the hairdressing salon opposite the site have to park outside the shop; this proposal would threaten the future of the business.

Councillor J Sanger spoke in objection to the application as ward Member for Beckingham. She advised that:

- The site and access are located on a blind double bend with the potential for a serious accident.
- The proposal would result in the loss of a green space, the only green space of its kind in the village.
- Residents thought that the application would be dismissed on safety grounds and regarding the settlement hierarchy.
- Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that development in settlements will be restricted to the area inside defined development boundaries and development within the open countryside will be strictly controlled.
- All material considerations of the LDF are relevant to this application – impact on residential amenity, highways safety and traffic, and noise and disturbance.
- If passed, the application contradicts and ignores many statements in the Bassetlaw Core Strategy.
- The views and aspirations of local people should be regarded as material considerations and given weight in the determination of planning applications.
- As a Service Centre Beckingham will accommodate carefully managed levels of housing growth.
- New developments should ensure no detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby residents and not be detrimental to highway safety.
- Any development must prove that it will not exacerbate existing land drainage and sewerage problems.
- This is the final straw for residents who will be distraught if the application is granted and the green amenity space was lost along with the footpath.
- The green space is the only space of its kind in the village and is enjoyed by ramblers, dog walkers and children. The space is a cherished part of village life and contributes significantly to the quality of life and enjoyment of the rural environment.
- The application should be refused as the site is not suitable for development.

The Head of Regeneration advised that whilst the site is located outside of the development boundary, paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that if a local authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing then planning policies are not considered up to date. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that additional permissions may be granted if developments are considered to help address the shortfall.

Elected Members asked questions/ raised issues regarding:

- The status of the existing footpath.
- Material planning considerations.

- The impact of the development on the Council's housing land supply.
- The detrimental impact on Beckingham and rural villages.
- Highway safety.
- The retention of hedgerows.
- The impact on the street scene.
- Access.
- The benefit of additional residents to local facilities and services.
- Car parking.
- The Council's lack of a five year land supply for housing.

In relation to questions raised regarding the achievability of the scheme and safe access if the hedgerows are retained in line with the Conservation Officer comments, the Principal Planner advised that there are a number of hedgerows around the site. Whilst realignment of access would result in the removal of the hedgerow along the frontage there would be conditions imposed to require replacement planting on the front of the site.

The Head of Regeneration advised that the type of units is indicative at this stage. In terms of the right of way she suggested that for the avoidance of doubt, a condition could be added to ensure that the footpath is incorporated as part of the development and does not conflict with vehicular traffic.

In relation to the Neighbourhood Plan Beckingham is a designated Neighbourhood Plan area however a draft neighbourhood plan has not yet been produced or submitted for examination, therefore no weight can be given to the Plan at this stage.

In terms of questions raised regarding the provision of a car park to ease issues in the area Members were advised that it is reasonable for Planners to ask that issues arising from the development proposed are mitigated and not existing problems.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to a Section 106 agreement, the conditions as circulated, and the inclusion of an additional condition to ensure the existing right of way is incorporated into the development.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to a Section 106 agreement, the conditions as circulated, and the inclusion of an additional condition to ensure the existing right of way is incorporated into the development.

FURTHER RESOLVED that wording of the additional condition be agreed at Planning Consultation Group.

(d) Development Management Performance Report 2016/17 Quarter 2

Members were presented with the quarter 2 performance report for the Development Management Function which covered the period 1st July 2016 to 30th September 2016. Previous year's figures were included for comparison.

Members were given a summary of the report. The measures of performance outcomes and current position for determining 'major', 'minor' and 'other' applications was given.

It was noted that local and national performance targets had been exceeded relative to application determination. The Head of Regeneration acknowledged officers for their hard work.

The outcome of appeals against refused applications allowed was also given; details of the applications were included within the report.

The Head of Regeneration advised that the government is introducing performance standards for appeals on minor and other applications, in a similar way to major applications. The Council is not

identified on the list of local authorities not adequately performing in appeals but more work will be needed to ensure that any refusals are defensible on appeal given that the qualitative performance falls short of the government target.

The Chair commended officers for their hard work.

RESOLVED that the report be received and the current performance data be noted.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

42. 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 8.20pm.)