

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 7th September 2016 at Retford Town Hall

Present:

Councillor H Richards (Chair)

Councillors H Burton, S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, G A N Oxby, D G Pidwell, M Richardson and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: B Alderton-Sambrook, D Askwith, C Crossland, F Dunning 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)

15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M W Quigley MBE, S Scotthorne and A K Smith

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor K H Isard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Planning Application No. 16/00015/FUL. He left the meeting during the item.

Councillor D Pidwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application No. 15/01477/OUT. He remained in the meeting.

Councillor M Richardson declared a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application No. 15/01477/OUT. She left the meeting during the item.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

17. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6TH JULY 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 6th July 2016 be approved.

18. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 13TH JUNE AND 15TH AUGUST 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 13th June and 15th August be received.

19. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

20. 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 three appeal decisions.

RESOLVED that the Appeal Decisions be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

(Councillor M Richardson left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01477/OUT	Mr M Pepper	Outline application with some matters reserved for mixed use development comprising of up to 182 dwellings, clean/green tech business park, innovative data centre and ancillary storage use, access and junction improvements, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage infrastructure, land north of Thievesdale Lane and west of Blyth Road, Worksop

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.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was given. Three letters of objection and a petition have been received from local residents.

Members were advised that an email has been received from a ward Councillor questioning the sustainability of the site, the number of jobs to sustain the increased number of residents and that the site was previously excluded from the site allocations process.

In terms of the principle of the development the site is located in a sustainable location in Worksop and therefore considered acceptable in principle. The site is not specially allocated in the Core Strategy but the site has the potential to provide an opportunity for economic development of the District and contribute to the wider aims of the District and area.

Highways have no objection subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement.

In relation to visual amenity a green infrastructure network providing landscape buffers is proposed to mitigate the impact and retain and enhance the existing landscape features and break up the mass of the built form.

In regards to residential amenity the application is for outline planning permission at this stage. Members will have the opportunity to consider the design and layout at the reserved matters stage and any impact it may have on residential amenity.

The site is considered to be of relatively low ecological value. The site does, however, offer opportunities for ecological enhancement measures in the form of habitat creation, landscaping and buffer planting.

The application would help to address the Council's lack of a five year housing land supply and is in a sustainable location. The application is in line with the Council's aspirations for regeneration and offers economic benefits.

Councillor C Thompson spoke on behalf of Blyth Parish Council. She advised that:

- Blyth is a village with a 17th century church, conservation area and two village greens visited by people from all over the world.
- Traffic is already a problem in the village causing particular problems for elderly residents and children crossing the busy roads.
- The character of the village is being destroyed. There are currently three planning applications that will greatly impact on the traffic travelling through Blyth.
- The cumulative impact of applications on traffic should be considered.
- The proposal will restrict parking on the high street which would be to the detriment of local businesses.
- The Parish Council request that a traffic modelling exercise be undertaken and the decision on the application be deferred.

Councillor V Bowles spoke on behalf of Carlton-in-Lindrick Parish Council. She advised that:

- The Parish Council strongly supports the application.
- The Parish Council have been working with officers and residents to form a neighbourhood plan.
- Local residents have expressed views that more housing is needed, particularly affordable housing.
- The proposal offers business and employment opportunities.
- The application has been included in neighbourhood plan consultation and has fair results from residents.
- The proposal complies with local and national policy.
- The application offers affordable housing, employment and links to North Notts College and young people.
- The proposal would be a beacon development for Bassetlaw attracting similar investment in the District.
- Local highways would be improved.
- The Parish Council has been assured that concerns raised have been addressed and the applicant has committed to a S106 Agreement.
- She urged the Committee not to waste the opportunity for Bassetlaw and approve the application with the conditions as stated.

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

- The Local Development Framework states an objective to reflect the needs of the local community and enhance places and how they function. This site does not comply with those objectives.
- He understood the Council's lack of a five year housing supply but there are currently 33 allocated sites that have not produced any housing.
- The development would destroy rural and agricultural land.

- He questioned if the planned major incinerator unit would need to be expanded due to the increase in the number of residents and raised health concerns.
- Traffic is a concern from and to Blyth.
- The rural landscape would be destroyed.
- Reducing car usage on this site would not work as there is only one shop within 1km and local schools are at capacity.

Mr N Baseley spoke as the agent for the application. He advised that:

- The application comprises of an exciting and innovative mixed use development.
- The application is an extension of the current urban area.
- 15% of the properties will be affordable housing.
- The development will be high quality and innovative.
- There is a commitment to work with North Notts College and provide links with young residents.
- The jobs created will be high quality and skills based.
- The development will support industries and small businesses.
- Businesses will be powered by renewable energy and any excess power will go into the grid.
- The development is sustainable.
- The development is not speculative; the applicant has secured a house builder.
- The proposal will deliver investment in the area.
- There is a commitment to deliver S106 obligations. The land owner is prepared to concede land values to provide what is required.
- Highway and junction improvements have been tested. The benefits will extend beyond the development itself.
- The applicant is committed to a high quality sustainable mixed use development.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- The creation of a ghost island.
- The number of jobs to be created.
- Traffic movements through Blyth.
- Economic benefits.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as listed and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as listed and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

(Councillor M Richardson re-joined the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00081/FUL	Beluga Homes	Residential development for 16 dwellings and construction of new access, land west of Wood Lea, Great North Toad, Ranskill

The application sought full planning permission to erect 16 dwellings and construct new access. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

A late representation from Ranskill Parish was circulated to Members at the meeting objecting to the application.

The site is located outside, but adjacent to, the Ranskill development boundary. The site is level, rectangular in shape and lies to the west of, and parallel to the A638. There is an existing hedge on the road side boundary for the majority of the frontage.

The proposed dwellings comprise of a mix of two and three bedroom detached and semi-detached properties.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was given. Two letters of objection from local residents have been received. The County Councillor has objected to the development.

Members were advised that the principle of the development is considered acceptable. In terms of visual amenity the site relates well to the existing settlement edge and would not therefore appear unduly discordant in terms of landscape character. The appearance of the proposed dwellings is considered acceptable and there would be no adverse impact on neighbouring properties in relation to overlooking, loss of privacy or domination. The application would help to address the Council's lack of a five year housing land supply.

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

- She does not object in principle to development of the site.
- She has concerns about the number of dwellings, traffic generation and the impact on road safety.
- There is limited visual egress.
- Safety for road users and pedestrians is a concern.
- Planning policy states that an application will only be granted if there are no detrimental impacts to highway safety.
- Two applications for a bungalow on the site have previously been refused. There is now now even more traffic.
- At 5.15pm she counted 43 vehicles passing north and south of the site.
- The A1 has been closed several times in the last few days and Ranskill becomes an alternative route.
- The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety for all of Ranskill.
- Highways have no objection. She questioned if Highways have observed traffic at peak times and when the A1 is shut.
- The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply however 16 dwellings will have a severe detrimental impact on residents, pedestrians and vehicles in Ranskill.
- When someone is hurt or killed it will be too late to reconsider the development.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- The siting of the affordable housing units.
- The appeal that was dismissed for the site in 1995.
- Density of housing proposed.
- Traffic egress onto the road.
- Provision of tuning heads.
- Ranskill does not have a village hall.
- The proposed layout is not respectful of the area.

In response to questions and comments raised Members were advised that the only reference to a village hall in the report is from an objector stating that there is no village hall. In terms of the appeal decision in 1995 planning policies have since changed and the five year housing supply was not an issue at the time. In regards to the siting of affordable housing units this will form part of the S106 negotiations and advice will be taken from the Housing Needs Team regarding the demand for the size of affordable housing in the area.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as listed and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as listed and the signing of a S106 legal agreement.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00655/COU	Mr and Mrs Green	Change of use of ancillary outbuildings to form a dwelling, Icy House, High Street, East Markham

The application sought change of use of ancillary outbuildings into a separate three bedroom dwelling with private garden and off street parking. The application includes changes to door and window openings. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was given.

Mr A Green spoke as the applicant. He advised that:

- They are not large developers.
- They also have planning permission for a small cottage on the side of the car park.
- They are ordinary local people born and bred in the village.
- Their children attend the local school.
- The house has been owned by the family for over 100 years.
- It was originally envisaged that the outbuildings would be used as a games room but have only been used for storage which seems a shame.
- A small dwelling would be of benefit to local first time buyers or those looking to downsize.
- There is sufficient off road parking and a garden to the rear.
- The proposal preserves privacy as the windows would be moved to prevent overlooking.
- The shape of the previous windows will be retained and bricked up.
- The design reflects the character of the buildings in the vicinity.
- There are no statutory objections.

The Chair commented that she was pleased to hear the shape of the original windows would be retained.

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.

(Councillor K H Isard left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00015/FUL	Strawsons Group Developments Limited	Hybrid planning application, comprising: A) Full application for new manufacturing building (Class B2) and two storey offices (B1), with associated parking and refurbishment and change of use to class A1/A3/B1 or D1 use for former Northern Rubber Tower Building. B) Outline application for the erection of a convenience supermarket (A1), freestanding hot food restaurant or take away (A3/A5) and a single storey building for non-food retail and leisure use (A1/D2) with associated access, car park, and service infrastructure

The application sought full planning permission for a hybrid application. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, site plan and photographs.

The application was to be reported to the August Committee but was withdrawn from that Committee at the request of the applicant. The report has now been updated with additional information received from the applicant.

An addendum to the report had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting and published on the Council's website which proposes amendments to conditions.

Members were advised of a late objection received from a local resident.

A summary of responses from statutory bodies was contained within the report. The Council's Conservation Officer maintains his objection due to the loss of the non-designated heritage asset.

The report is finely balanced and discusses the economic and social benefits and the impact on local residents.

A summary of the proposed buildings and layout was given. A red brick wall 2-3 metres in height is proposed on the north elevation to improve the outlook of residential dwellings on Poplar Street. A summary of S106 requirements was given.

Councillor J Anderson spoke as ward Member for East Retford West. He advised that:

- He supports the application.
- The application would allow one of Redford's oldest employers to design the site and accommodate modern processes and secure employment.
- The proposal is right for Retford, Bassetlaw and the future of the company.
- The proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The application seeks to provide a modern, fit for purpose, facility for the applicants who want to remain in Retford.
- The development is in line with policy to retain employment and business use.
- The impacts of the development do not significantly outweigh the social and economic benefits.
- Bassetlaw needs high tech businesses.

Mr T Pryce spoke as the applicant he advised that:

- The company employs 260 employees in Retford.
- The business supports local families and businesses.
- The applicant is an opportunity for the team to create further jobs, build an environment to attract skilled works and ensure for the future.
- Over the past ten years Icon has been a leading supplier of products.
- The team are involved with research with NASA and programmes with local universities.
- To meet the company's ambitions a modern ambitious environment is needed.
- He asked the Committee to support the application.

Elected Members asked questions/ commented in relation to:

- Commercial leases time.
- The loss of the Malthouse building.
- The industrial history of Retford.
- The landowner.

- The S106 legal agreement.

In response to questions raised Members were advised that 15 years is a standard commercial lease.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – grant planning permission subject to the signing of a S106 legal agreement and the amended conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – grant planning permission subject to the signing of a S106 legal agreement and the amended conditions as circulated.

(d) Development Management Performance Report 2016/17 Quarter 1

Members were presented a quarterly performance report for the Development Management function for quarter 1 2016/17. Figures for 2015/16 were provided 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. The outcome of appeals against refused applications allowed was also given; details of the applications were included within the report.

The Chair commended officers for their hard work.

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

(e) Development Management Scheme of Delegation for Determining Planning Applications

Members were presented with a report which seeks to review the Scheme of Delegation for determining planning applications. The current and proposed Scheme was appended to the report.

The report follows a resolution at full Council in March 2016 that a review be undertaken by the Committee to determine whether any future planning applications for energy related drilling for oil, gas or coal, for which the Committee is a consultee, should be automatically presented to Planning Committee.

This was also an opportunity to review the scheme in relation to the types of applications that are presented to Planning Committee. Proposed revisions to the scheme will capture smaller developments in rural villages that would have a big impact on the community.

RESOLVED that:

1. The report be received and the recommendations to amend the Scheme of Delegation be endorsed and referred to the Monitoring Officer to seek formal ratification by full Council.
2. The amended Scheme of Delegation be monitored and reported on in 12 months after implementation.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

21. 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 8.10pm.)