

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 8th June 2016 at Worksop Town Hall

Present:

Councillor H Richards (Chair)

Councillors S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, D G Pidwell, M W Quigley MBE, M Richardson and S Scotthorne, A K Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: 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.)

The Chair advised that applications 15/01160/FUL and 15/01167/VOC had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Burton and G A N Oxby.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor S Scotthorne declared a non-pecuniary interested in application 16/00231/FUL, as a member of the A1 Housing Board. He remained in the meeting.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4TH MAY 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4th May 2016 be approved.

4. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 18TH APRIL AND 9TH MAY

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 18th April and 9th May 2016 be received.

5. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

6. 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) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00321/FUL	Bassetlaw District Council	Demolition of redundant community centre and erect 4 two bed two storey flats and construction of new access, Community Centre, Beverley Road, Harworth, Doncaster, DN11 8HD

The application sought to demolish the existing community centre and erect 4 two bed two storey flats 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, site plans, photographs and the existing and proposed layout, elevations and floor plan. Members were advised that the application was an A1 Housing application.

The site is located in a residential area with a mix of two storey and bungalow dwellings. The site is located on the corner of Beverley Road and Sandymount West. The former warden's accommodation is attached on the western boundary.

The rear wall of the proposed building would be 6.13m from the boundary wall with bungalow to the north.

Members were advised that four flats are proposed each with their own access from the street. The ground floor flats have private amenity space and the first floor flats have proposed Juliette balconies. The amended scheme proposes that the windows on the second floor of the western end of the building be obscurely glazed and only openable above 1.6m high to prevent overlooking.

The Interim Development Manager that the advised that the site is in a sustainable location and is recommended for approval with a number of conditions.

Mrs M White spoke in objection to the application. She advised that she is speaking on behalf of local residents. She objected on the grounds of:

- The site is not compatible for flats.
- The site is surrounded by pensioner bungalows.
- Concerns that the bungalows on Sandymount Mount West will be overlooked.
- Imposition on privacy.
- The proposal is too close to the boundary.
- The close proximity to the neighbouring bungalow.
- Inadequate parking provision. Visitors will have to park on the street causing a safety hazard.
- There is a waiting list for bungalows.
- Bungalows would be more acceptable on the site.

Mr K Reshad spoke in support as the applicant. He advised that A1 Housing and the Council have been working in partnership to deliver affordable housing across the District. The proposal is considered to be an appropriate form of residential development. A1 Housing considered bids on properties in the locality as part of the process and found a shortage of this type of property. There is little accommodation for single people and couples in the area, this application would help address that need. The community centre closed in 2013 and has not been used since except as a polling station. It is not considered that the loss of the redundant community centre would be a significant community loss. The application would also help to address the Council's five year housing supply. The amenity of future and existing residents has been considered and plans have been amended to include obscure glazed windows. There are a mix of single and two storey properties in the area. He asked the Committee to grant the application.

Elected Members raised comments regarding:

- Flats in the locality are not appropriate.
- Concerns regarding proximity to the boundary and potential overshadowing.
- Parking is a concern as there is already parking issues in the area and the road is not very wide.
- There is a greater need for bungalows in the area.
- There is a mix of single storey and two story properties in the area.
- Highway safety.
- Inadequate parking.
- There is a mix of house styles in the area.
- The community centre would have generated traffic and parking.
- The design and proposed materials.
- Proximity to other dwellings.

An elected Member raised concerns regarding the windows that would only be openable above 1.6m and fire regulations. In response the Interim Development Manager advised that stronger fire doors would be required and the windows meet building regulations.

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>
16/00299/HSE	Mr D Corr	Extend existing roof line to form two additional rooms on the second floor.

The application sought to extend and construct a pitched roof above the existing two storey flat roof extension. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, floorplans, elevations, access, an aerial map and photographs.

Members were advised that the neighbours have objected to the application. The objector has submitted photographs as part of their objection. The Interim Development Manager advised that the extension will be viewed from the neighbouring property and the impact on amenity needs to be considered.

At present the roof space of the property is accessible but not habitable. The proposal would create two bedrooms and a bathroom.

It is recommended that a condition be imposed to ensure that the proposed roof lights are conservation style roof lights as the site is within the Conservation Area and can be viewed from the street.

The window on the eastern elevation facing 33 and 35 Eldon Street would be high level opening and obscurely glazed to protect residential amenity.

An elected Member commented that that the pitched roof would be a visual improvement.

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

(c) Development Management Performance Report 2015/16 Quarters 4

Members were presented a quarterly performance report for the Development Management function for quarter 4 2015/16, which covered the period between 1st January and 31st March 2015/16. Figures for 2014/15 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.

It was noted that local targets for determining applications had been exceeded and the Council is performing well which is credit to officers.

In terms of appeals the performance is higher than the local target. Officers are continuing to make sure that they have strong reasons or refusal. Where appropriate amendments are made to a scheme to make the proposal acceptable.

RESOLVED that:

1. The report be received and the Committee note the current performance data.
2. That the Quarter 1 performance figures for the financial year 2016/17 be presented to the July 2016 meeting of the Committee.

(d) Development Management End of Year Performance 2015/16

Members were presented with an end of year performance report for the Development Management Function between 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2016. Previous years figures were included for comparison.

Members were advised that there has been a general trend of improvement. There was a slight difference between the 2014/15 and 2015/16 performance figures due to the quantity of applications received.

It was noted that local and national targets had been exceeded. The Interim Development Manager acknowledged officers for their hard work in 2015/16.

In terms of appeals there was an increase in the number of appeals determined in 2015/16 with 32.3% of these being allowed. Appeals are a priority area for the Council and training is planned for officers and Members as part of the Committee training programme.

There has been a significant increase in the workload over the past year with an increase in planning applications and pre-application enquires. There has been an increase in the number of planning applications approved indicating that planning officers are working with applicants.

In relation to the Planning Enforcement Service the number of enquires has remained consistent. The two officers have a high caseload with some cases taking a considerable amount of time. It was noted that the cases where no action was taken officers try to negotiate with landowners/applications to reach a solution where possible.

An elected Member noted an error on page 72 of the Agenda. The last column of the table should read 2015/16. A typographical error was also noted on page 68 at 4.9.1 which should read 86.17%.

An elected Member asked how many appeals had cost the Council to defend and how much they have cost the Council. In response the Interim Development Manager advised that the majority are householder developments which are not a great cost to the Council as a written representation is submitted. The main cost to the Council is officer time to prepare for an appeal.

The Chair commended officers for their hard work and improvements to performance.

RESOLVED that:

1. The report be received.
2. The Head of Regeneration continues to delegate responsibility to the Interim Development Team Manager to operate mechanisms to improve the existing performance levels and the service provided.
3. The next Development Management Performance Report be submitted to the Committee in August 2016.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

7. 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 7.20pm.)