

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 6th July 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, A K Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: C Crossland, F Dunning, K France and M Freeman.

(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, a Member of the public responded that he would be filming the meeting.)

8. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Burton and K H Isard. It was noted that Councillor Quigley would be late to the meeting.

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members; however, Councillor S Fielding stated for clarification that she is not on the Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Committee and does not belong to the anti-fracking group. She noted that she has campaigned for cross-border consultation where more than one local authority may be affected.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

10. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8TH JUNE 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 8th June 2016 be approved.

11. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 16TH MAY AND 6TH JUNE 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 16th May and 6th June be received.

12. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

13. 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 an appeal decision.

RESOLVED that the Appeal Decision be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

The Chair advised of a change in application order so that Item a6, Application 16/00189/FUL, would be taken first.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00189/FUL	Mr and Mrs Wright	Erect three two storey detached dwellings with detached garages, land adjacent Narnia, Eastfield, North Wheatley

The application sought full planning permission to erect three four-bedroom dwellings. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, site layout, proposed elevations and photographs.

Objections and responses from statutory bodies were outlined within the report. The main concerns raised by residents were summarised.

In terms of the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan, it is considered that the proposed development largely complies with the policies contained in the adopted neighbourhood plan. Whilst policies in the Plan identify preferred options that will be supported, in particular two and three bedroom dwellings for older people and first time buyers, it does not preclude or object to the erection of larger dwellings.

Mr D Langmead spoke in objection to the application. He advised that North and South Wheatley Parish Council object to the application. He objected on the grounds of:

- The proposal is contrary to planning policy.
- The NPPF and local planning policy emphasises the importance of sustainable development.
- Policy DM5 clearly states that new development should deliver housing of a type and size appropriate to site and locality.
- After four years of effort and many hours spent with Bassetlaw Planning Officers the Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan was approved with 83% of residents in favour of the Plan.
- A survey of residents found that 75% of homes in the area are occupied by single people however the local housing stock is mostly three and four bedroom properties. Many respondents to the survey want to downsize in the area.
- Policy 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan supports developments that will provide a mix of housing types and sizes that reflects the needs of local people particularly in the need for 2

and 3 bedroom dwellings in general and for older people and for first time buyers in particular.

- Policy 11 of the Neighbourhood Plan supports housing for older people that reflects their needs.
- Developments for new housing that are for the right type and in the right place would be supported.
- The NPPF, Core Strategy and Neighbourhood Plan are all in agreement and point towards a direction that the application should be refused.

Mr P Wright spoke as the applicant for the application. He advised that:

- The Neighbourhood Plan refers to preferred options but does not preclude the development of larger properties.
- Before the application was submitted highways were consulted and no objection has been raised.
- The sewers will not be a problem as when Narnia was built adequate sewers were ensured.
- The choice in terms of design and location has been carefully made to make sure that privacy is not compromised.
- The house designs are not out of character with the area. There are two storey dwellings and dormer bungalows in the area.
- Parking provision has been carefully considered to make sure the drives are sufficient.
- Each plot is large enough to accommodate four dwellings but was felt not to be in keeping with the area and would have an impact on residents' privacy.
- There has been interest from young families moving to the area.
- North Wheatley needs to be sustainable and attract people to the area with young families.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- The weight of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Disappointed for the community that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot resist certain types of development.
- The Council's lack of a five year housing land supply.

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as listed.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00773/CDM	Dart Energy (East England) Ltd	County matters application for single exploration well and three sets (each set containing up to 3 boreholes) of monitoring boreholes with associated development and on site security cabins for a temporary period of three years from commencement of site construction, north east of Beech Farm Barns, Retford Road, Blyth

Members were advised that the application was a Nottinghamshire County Council matter for which the District Council is a consultee. The application seeks permission to drill a single exploration well and three sets of monitoring boreholes, which would contain up to three sets in each, to sample ground water and gas. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, layout, proposed tower and photographs.

Members were advised of additional comments received since the publication of the report. A summary of the objections was given. In response, the Interim Development Manger advised that

Nottinghamshire County Council is the determining authority and is required to consider any objections. The planning system does allow for retrospective applications to be submitted and there is an open enforcement case on site in relation to buildings that have been erected without planning permission.

A rig would be erected, measuring approximately 60m high and be removed after 4 months. Planning permission would be for three years commencing from site construction. The relevant Environmental Licences would be determined by the Environment Agency.

Councillor P Thompson spoke on behalf of Blyth Parish Council. He advised that the main concern is the amount of traffic that will pass through the village. He advised that there are several conservation areas in the locality and historical buildings in the village, with the church being one of the oldest in England. The document that has been used in relation to traffic figures anticipates an increase of 3000 HGV's over a four month period. If gas is found and extracted the number of HGV movements would increase again and there will already be an increase in traffic from new developments at Harworth. There are issues with subsidence in the area with old mines in the area and no 3D seismic testing has been carried out. Before full fracking can take place 3D seismic testing is required so it should be carried for the planned 'mini fracking'. The water supply will be polluted and the arrangements are not clear for the disposal of this water.

Councillor C Willis spoke on behalf of Torworth Parish Council who objects to the proposal. She advised that the main concerns are regarding subsidence. The area is riddled with underground mining works with a mixture of collapsed and opening working mining works. The area suffers from frequent minor earthquakes and Ranskill has experienced a sinkhole. There are a vast number of geographical faults in the area and no 3D seismic testing has been carried out. Traffic is also a concern particularly when the A1 is closed and the applicant has not identified alternative routes. There are concerns about the increase in traffic on an already busy road. The site should be signed and signs erected to state that HGV's are turning. The site is located on a blind bend and there has recently been an accident at the location. She expressed disappointment and frustration that cabins have already been erected on site without planning permission and the Council have failed to act quickly. There is a feeling of distrust and lack of confidence within the local community regarding how any any future breaches of enforcement would be dealt with.

Mr A Szczecinski spoke in objection to the proposal. He advised that:

- The head of a mine is in proximity to the site.
- Harworth Colliery and two coal faces are close to the site.
- The Coal Authority have not mapped out of all the sites.
- For commercial viability ten boreholes would be required. Some would pass underground mine workings and the effect is unknown.
- The application should not proceed until underground issues have been assessed.
- As a minimum requirement the Council should require seismic testing to be carried out and the findings should be published for public scrutiny.

(Councillor M W Quigley joined the meeting at this point.)

Councillor M T Gray spoke in objection as Ward Member for Ranskill. He advised that:

- He has received lots of emails from residents.
- There have been mining operations in the area.
- Sites are controlled with method statements but look what happened in Blackpool and Japan.
- The area is a maze of mineshafts.

He asked if the proposal was a long term solution for energy needs or a short cut to disaster. He added that he could not support the application.

Elected Members asked questions/commented in relation to:

- The Council's actions in response to the breach of planning permission on site.
- The scope of the response and the comments made to the Misson Springs application.
- Vehicle movements and increase in traffic.
- Highway safety.
- The applicant's disregard for the planning system.
- Lack of information regarding mining in the area.
- Cumulative impact of traffic from new developments in Harworth through Blyth.
- 3D seismic testing.
- The consideration of a safe cycling route and consultation with local cycling clubs.

In response to questions raised the Development Team Manager advised that unfortunately the planning system allows for an applicant to submit a retrospective application. There is an enforcement case on site but as a planning application was submitted it was not expedient to take action at that stage.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – No objection.

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Object on the following grounds:

- Lack of information regarding the potential contamination risk.
- Lack of a modelling exercise in regard to the cumulative impact on the highways and highway safety.
- Lack of 3D seismic testing.
- Lack of community consultation in particular with local cycle clubs regarding a safe cycle route.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the final wording of the objection letter be delegated to the Planning Consultation Group.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01160/FUL	Legal & General Assurance (Pensions Management Limited)	Construct mezzanine floors to Unit 4 and Unit 2, refurbishment of front elevations including new entrances to new units, erect substation within car park and associated improvements to car park at Sandy Lane Retail Park, off Babbage Way, Worksop

Members were advised that the application sought to construct mezzanine floors to existing units, refurbish front elevations, erect a new substation and make associated car park improvements. The site had not been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting as Members were familiar with the site. Slides were used to show the site location, layout and photographs. An associated application follows.

The application proposes the sub-division of the largest retail unit (currently occupied by B&Q) into three units and the introduction of a mezzanine floor into each of the three 'new' units, as well as into unit 2, giving an increase in total retail floor area of 3049.9 sqm.

The site is located approximately 0.6km north of the defined Worksop Town Centre boundary. As the development is outside of the town centre a retail impact assessment has been undertaken. The main policy concern is regarding the impact on the town centre and retail viability. The Council have employed a retail expert to review the applicant's retail impact assessment. Three retail experts have been involved in impact assessments for the site and concluded that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the viability and vitality of the town centre.

It was noted that the sub-division of the units does not require planning permission. The erection of mezzanine floors and alterations to the unit fronts does require planning permission.

Mr P Daniel spoke in objection to the application. He advised that he works for B&Q and has been involved with the site for 19 years. The store has traded in Worksop since 1980 and is proud to provide a service to Worksop and the surrounding areas. The reduction in the unit would mean that store would close. The nearest stores for residents would be Doncaster or Sheffield. He advised that he wanted to defend the future of B&Q business and employees. He raised questions regarding the retail assessment and did not agree that there would not be an impact on the town centre. He commented that he did not know why a trader who cannot operate in the town centre was being forced to close by traders who could operate in the town centre. He commented that he was not aware of all the interested occupiers and that the units may sit empty.

Mr G Connell spoke as the agent on behalf of the applicant. He advised that he is a Planning Consultant who has been advising the applicant. The applicant wanted to look at how the retail park could be modernised and improved. He advised that matters raised have been responded to. The matters raised by B&Q are largely commercial matters and not material planning considerations. In terms of the loss of B&Q, Worksop has other retailers for example Screwfix, Wickes and local hardware stores that can meet the needs of local shoppers. An independent retail assessment has been undertaken and verified and concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the town centre. B&Q have submitted concerns through a planning advisor and these have been responded to. The modernisation of the stores would attract new retailers to Worksop. The size of the units required by potential occupants are not available in the town centre, shoppers would need to venture from the area.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- Parking provision.
- The impact on the struggling town centre.
- Detrimental impact for residents and shoppers.
- Loss of employment.
- The impact on the B&Q depot in Worksop.
- The units could be left empty.

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

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

- The proposed units would have an adverse impact on the town centre and employment prospects.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Planning Consultation Group.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01167/VOC	Legal & General Assurance (Pensions Management Limited)	Variation of condition two of P/A 13/01098/VOC to allow sale of food and drink up to 30% of floor space for Unit 4a and 5% for Unit 4c at Sandy Lane Retail Park, off Babbage Way, Worksop

Members were advised that application relates to the preceding application. The application sought to vary a condition of existing planning permission to allow the sale of food and drink. The site had not been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting as Members were familiar with the site.

Members were advised of an additional objection received to the application since the publication of the report from Councillor D R Pressley raising concerns that the sale of food and drink would take shoppers away from the town centre.

The Interim Development Manager advised of a typographical error on page 52 in relation to the proposed conditions. 1. ii) after the word Unit add "4a", iii) after the work Unit add "4C"

A retail impact assessment has been carried out and concluded that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the viability and vitality of the town centre.

Mr P Daniel spoke in objection to the application. He commented that the proposal raises questions regarding the viability of the town centre. He referred to his comments regarding the preceding application and added that he hoped B&Q would continue to serve the people of Worksop for many years to come.

Mr G Connell spoke as the agent on behalf of the applicant. He commented that independent consultants have advised that sequential tests have been met. The variation of condition is to meet the particular requirements of certain retailers. He commented that the applicant has interest in all of the units however there is a disclosure of details in place. The proposal would create more jobs than currently offered by B&Q. The applicant would not continue with the application if they did not have tenants in place. The applicant would not vacate tenants and leave the units empty.

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

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

- The impact of the sale of food and drink goods on the town centre and businesses on Gateford Road and the surrounding area.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Planning Consultation Group.

(The Chair advised of a five minute comfort break.)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
-----------------------	------------------	-----------------

16/00557/RSB

Mr K Rose

Erect one single storey dwelling and eight two storey dwellings with associated car sheds and parking and construct new access at land opposite Holly House, High Street, East Markham

Members were advised that application sought to erect a single storey dwelling and eight two storey dwellings. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, proposed layout, elevations and photographs.

An application for 12 dwellings was presented to the Committee in March with a recommendation and resolution to refuse planning permission. Officers have worked with the applicant to resolve issues and overcome the reasons for refusal. The significant changes from the previous application are in relation to the character of the properties and the properties proposed are now set back and have a more organic appearance.

The applicant originally proposed rendered properties but this was not considered acceptable and the scheme has been amended to show brick finished properties.

Councillor J Ogle spoke as Ward Member for East Markham. He advised that East Markham has been identified as a Rural Service Centre and since then the shop, pub and post office has closed. The primary school is full and alternative schools in the area are full. He commented that the application should be refused as the application is not a significant improvement from the previous application - the proposal is still out of character with the area. Local residents feel that the development is in too close proximity and is outside of the development boundary. Parking is not sufficient to ensure that there is no on street parking. East Markham has had its share of planning applications with 76 plots granted and unbuilt. He added that further improvements could be made to the proposal regarding overlooking and to fit in with the surrounding area.

An elected Member asked a question regarding the proposed conditions and how they could be enforced once the development has been finished. In response, Members were advised that permitted development rights would be removed as part of the conditions and any buyer should be made aware of this as it would be noted on land charges. If unauthorised works were undertaken it would be up to the Enforcement Team to take action.

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as listed.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00363/OUT	Nottinghamshire County Council	Outline application with all matters reserved for residential development, former Retford Oaks High School, Pennington Walk, Retford

Members were advised that application sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved for residential development. An illustrative drawing showing layout has been submitted but does not form part of the application. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and photographs.

The site is within the development boundary for Retford and the southern half of the site is within the Retford Conservation Area.

A summary of responses received from statutory bodies was given. Nine letters of objection from local residents have been received and two letters of support. Additional comments have been received from a local resident since the publication of the report who does not oppose the development principle, but has concerns regarding access, the number of dwellings should be no more than 30, the properties should be no more than two-storey and the open space and access strip on Pennington Walk should be retained.

Members were advised that in principle the development plan supports development within the development boundary. The principle is considered acceptable in planning policy terms and details would be agreed at the reserved matters stage. The recommendation is to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement. A summary of the S106 obligations was given.

Mrs K Martin spoke in objection to the application. She advised that she does not object to housing development as it would be an improvement to the site but has concerns. She advised that she lives next to an entrance that previously used by school children and is concerned if the access became a road. She raised issues in relation to traffic and parking in the area particularly in relation to access for emergency vehicles. She noted that she had spoken to her Ward Councillor who was unaware the application was being presented to Committee. She noted that she has a downstairs bathroom and is concerned about overlooking. She added that she does not object to development but is concerned regarding the proximity.

Elected Members asked questions in relation to the process to change the bridleway status and access. Members were advised that an informative could be added to express the Committee's concerns that no access should be proposed from Hatfield or the end of Pennington Walk.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to the a legal agreement and the conditions as listed.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement and the conditions as listed with the following informative note:

- It is unlikely that access will be acceptable from Hatfield Street or opposite 52-58 Pennington Walk. It is anticipated that the proposed access will be opposite 28-42 Pennington Walk. This section of Pennington Walk is a bridleway, and therefore there are no public vehicular rights. A legal change in the bridleway's status will would be required to allow vehicular access from this point.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00505/OUT	Mr M Doughty	Outline application with some matters reserved, approval being sought for access, for residential development at Manor Farm, Brecks Lane, Mattersey

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

Members were advised that the site is located outside of the development boundary. An overview of the relevant planning history was given. It is considered that the site is located in an unsustainable location and would be contrary to planning policy.

Councillor T Roberts spoke on behalf of Mattersey Parish Council. He advised that he is Vice-Chairman of the Parish Council and a Member of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Research for the Neighbourhood Plan has shown that the village population is ageing. The village needs new development to be sustainable and the application has the full support of the Parish

Council. Policy 5 of the NPPF states that isolated homes will not be supported; however, the development would not be isolated. The current methodology regarding settlements and sustainability is flawed and prevents future growth and development of the school. He suggested the policy should be more practical and sustainable. More residents would help to keep the post office and shops and local school viable.

Councillor M T Gray spoke in support as Ward Member for Ranskill. He advised that he has spoken to local residents, the Parish Council and also visited the site. He commented that the proposal would enhance the village and area and bring new people into the village which would help keep the shop and services open. He asked why the village was being asked to draw up a neighbourhood plan if it was not going to be taken into account. He endorsed the application.

Mr M Doughty spoke in support as the applicant. He advised that his family have been farming at Manor Farm since 1964. In 2004 they were forced out of egg production by supermarkets and now source free range eggs to provide to local customers. Throughout the planning process the proposal has had the support of the Parish Council and local residents. At a neighbourhood plan open event, residents were asked which sites they would like to see developed and Manor Farm was the site that residents would most like to see developed. The pre-application report stated that much of the site was brownfield land. He added that the development would not be isolated.

Elected Members commented that it was refreshing to see residents and a Parish Council in support of an application and who feel that the application would improve the lives of existing residents and services. Members commented that the application would help towards the Council's five year housing supply and form part of a cluster of dwellings.

The Interim Development Manager advised that the Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been adopted and if granted the application may set a precedent.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse planning permission for the reason as listed.

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission on the following grounds:

- The proposal would be part of a cluster of dwellings.
- The application would contribute to the Council's five year housing supply.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the proposed conditions and S106 agreement Heads of Terms be delegated to the Planning Consultation Group.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00286/FUL	Mrs E A Boyle	Erect four single storey dwellings, alter existing access and improvement alterations to Brough Lane at The Bungalow, Brough Lane, Elkesley

Members were advised that application sought full planning permission to erect 2-two bedroom bungalows and 2 three-bedroom bungalows. The application also seeks to widen Brough Lane and provide a passing bay and vehicular turning head. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location and photographs.

The site is located in the Elkesley development boundary. To the west of the site, the verges on Brough Lane have been identified as Regionally Important Geological Site.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was contained within the report. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have no objection. The proposed amenity space provided meets guidance requirements.

Councillor J Flear spoke on behalf of Elkesley Parish Council. He advised that:

- The Neighbourhood Plan is a legal document which took three years to create and was voted for overwhelmingly by residents.
- The Plan shows willingness for change regarding housing development and has set an extra target.
- This application would have dangerous consequences and the Parish Council is unhappy that it has been deemed necessary to widen the road to accommodate a development.
- The risk from the development is high as a lot of vehicles would be reversing up or down the hill.
- The density of the development is not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- The proposal is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan in relation to plot size and proximity to nearby properties.
- There is an increased risk to highway safety.
- The length of the national trail is only suitable for light traffic.
- No visitor parking is provided.
- Visitors accessing the Robin Hood's way have increased since the bridge opened.
- A similar proposal was refused in 2009.
- The application should be rejected.

Mrs J Smithson spoke in objection to the application. She advised that:

- She lives next to the site.
- The road is too narrow for cars and pedestrians to pass at any one time.
- The amount of traffic would more than double.
- The turning head would not help the situation.
- In 2009 an application was refused and there has been no change since then.
- The visibility splay would be inadequate. Vehicles would have to pull out into the road to see if anything was coming.
- There are at least 100 50ft conifers around the site.
- It is important that the access to the Severn Trent site is kept clear.
- The development is on the outskirts of the village with no lighting or snow clearance.

Mr Cockburn spoke as the agent of behalf of the applicant. He advised that four bungalows are proposed. Brough Lane would be widened to provide a passing bay and turning circle. The key to the proposal is that it meets local policy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Neighbourhood Plan has been approved but it states that Elkesley wants more housing than proposed by the Council and takes a positive approach to development. The proposed bungalows would meet local need. The proposal meets design guidance and is in the development boundary. The lane is open to all traffic and would be improved in line with highway requirements which would benefit local residents and Severn Trent Water. The development would help to address the shortfall in the Council's five year housing supply.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Density of the proposal.
- Access and highway safety.
- The character of the area.

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

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

- The proposal is out of character with the area and Brough Lane.
- Contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.

FURTHER RESOLVED that the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Planning Consultation Group.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

14. 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 9.30pm.)