

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018 at Worksop Town Hall**

#### **Present:**

Councillor S Fielding (Vice in Chair)

Councillors D Brett, H Burton, G Clarkson, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley, A K Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: B Alderton-Sambrook, K France, C Hopkinson, M Joyce, B Pinkney and M Tagg (Agenda Item No. 6(b) only).

(Meeting commenced at 6.30pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and read out the Fire Evacuation Procedure. He also enquired as to whether any member of the public wished to film the meeting or any part thereof; one member of the public indicated that he would be recording Application No. 17/01239/RSB - Sundown Adventureland.)

#### **24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K H Isard, D G Pidwell and S Scotthorne.

#### **25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

##### **(a) Members**

Councillor M W Quigley raised a non-pecuniary interest in planning application 18/00069/OUT.

It was noted that all Committee Members had received an email in relation to Application No. 18/00069/OUT. Councillor G A N Oxby noted that he had also received an email from the ward Councillor.

##### **(b) Officers**

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

#### **26. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2018**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018 be approved.

#### **27. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 25<sup>TH</sup> JUNE AND 23<sup>RD</sup> JULY 2018**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 25<sup>th</sup> June and 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 be received.

#### **28. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST**

Members were advised that the outstanding report will be presented to a future meeting.

**RESOLVED** that the Outstanding Minutes List be received.

## **SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC**

## **Key Decisions**

None.

## **Other Decisions**

### **29. REPORT(S) OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND NEIGHBOURHOODS**

#### **(a) Public Interest Test**

The Head of Regeneration had deemed that all Items on the Agenda were of a non-confidential nature.

#### **(b) Proposed Article 4(1) Direction for Misson Conservation Area**

Members were presented with a report which sought authorisation for the making of an Article 4 Direction to restrict permitted development rights in respect of the Misson Conservation Area. Members were advised that Misson Conservation Area was designated in September 2017, as part of the consultation process there was strong support from the public and the Parish Council for and Article 4(1) Direction in the Misson Conservation Area. A summary of the definition of an Article 4 Direction was given.

It was noted that the reasoning for an Article 4(1) Direction in Misson Conservation Area is the strong public support through the consultation period and that there are over 50 unlisted buildings in Misson which are regarded as having a positive impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area that are not currently subject to controls regarding permitted development rights.

Members were advised that if the Article 4(1) Direction is made, representatives will be invited for a period of six weeks from the date of notification. If confirmed after this process a further report will be presented to the Committee to seek authorisation for confirmation of the Article 4(1) Direction.

In response to questions raised the Conservation Officer confirmed that an Article 4(1) Direction is a common next step following designation of a Conservation Area.. In terms of consultation there will be a press notice, site notices and letters delivered.

#### **RESOLVED that:**

1. The making of the Misson Article 4(1) Direction be approved.
2. Delegated authority be conferred to officers of the Conservation Team to implement the making of the Misson Article 4(1) Direction.
3. Following consultation a further report be brought to a future Planning Committee to authorise confirmation of the Article 4(1) Direction, or otherwise.
4. Any future cost implications for employee structure be reported to members.

#### **(c) Appeal Decisions Received**

Members were presented with four appeal decisions.

An Elected Member suggested that a forum would be useful for Members to discuss appeal decisions in greater detail.

**RESOLVED** that the appeal decisions be received.

#### **(d) Planning Applications and Associated Items**

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/00069/OUT	MLN (Land and Properties) Ltd	Outline Planning Application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for access), for up to 60 dwellings and other associated work, land west of Longholme Road, Retford.

Members were advised that the application sought outline permission with some matters reserved for up to 60 dwellings and other associated works. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

Amendments to the report had been circulated prior to Members prior to the meeting, District Councillor M storey and John Mann MP have objected to the application, a summary of the objections was given.

The site lies outside but adjacent to the development boundary of Retford which lies immediately to the south of the site. The north-east corner of the site adjoins the Longholme Pasture Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The site is roughly rectangular shape and occupies an area of approximately 2.8 hectares. Is it accessed from the east of Longholme Road.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees were given. The relevant policies and site planning history was set out within the report. If granted the application would be subject to a S106 Legal Agreement, a summary of the obligations was given.

53 letters of objection have been received from local residents. One letter in support has been received.

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing. Currently the Council has a 3.7 year supply; therefore the proposal would be in accordance with policies CS1 and CS3. On balance it is considered that the benefits of the application outweigh the adverse impacts, the application would be a significant contribution to the housing land supply, there would be economic benefits and the site is in a sustainable location.

Ms S Bland spoke in objection to the application, she commented that:

- Local residents object the proposal.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- There are more sustainable sites within the development boundary.
- More suitable sites have been identified by the public and the Council.
- The Council has already met their housing targets for the previous 12 months.
- The site will be overdeveloped and not in keeping with the character of the local area.
- During the consultation meeting the public was told that there would be only 55 dwellings on the site.
- The area of green space has been removed from the application.
- There are visibility and highway safety issues which have not been addressed. There is a blind bend to the site.
- The proposal would increase traffic congestion.
- Two accidents have already occurred outside of the primary school. Children from this development will attend this primary school causing more congestion in the area.
- The application should not be granted for the safety of local children.

Councillor Shaw spoke in objection to the application as Ward Member for East Retford East, she commented that:

- There are safety objections.
- The consultation which took place for the original application showed green space and this has now been taken away.
- A financial contribution is proposed to enhance an offsite play park. There is no play park nearby which is important for health and wellbeing.
- Longholme Road enters on a blind bend.
- Blue light services will have to navigate the access and the Fire Service Chief has voiced concerns.
- The junctions are busy and HGVs go down to Claborough and Gainsborough.
- School places will be under pressure.
- Incidents have already occurred outside the Primary School in recent years, this large development will increase traffic congestion around this area.
- The site will be overdeveloped.
- The application will lead to further development pushing the town boundaries further out of Retford.
- The existing infrastructure is not fit for purpose.
- Doctors surgeries need to be considered.
- A wildlife survey is needed.
- There are flooding issues.

Mr W Walters spoke in support of the application as the Agent, he commented that:

- The Case Officer has presented the issues and given a balanced view.
- The site had previous residential planning permission and was considered as part of the local plan process at that time.
- Retford is a key settlement in Bassetlaw with infrastructure and services to accommodate growth.
- Appeals have been allowed in less sustainable locations because of the lack of a five year housing land supply.
- The play area was originally proposed on the site however the Council's Parks Officer preferred an offsite contribution.
- 25% of the dwellings are for affordable housing.
- The site is in a sustainable location.

Elected Members asked questions/ raised issues relating to the following:

- Have Severn Trent been consulted?
- Surface water and drainage.
- Flooding issues.
- Concern's regarding the access.
- Highway Safety.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- The Council's housing land supply.
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust comments regarding surveys of ponds on site.
- Land ownership.
- The loss of open space.
- The sites planning history.
- Sustainability.
- The density of the site.
- The contribution towards play park enhancements.
- The grade of the land.

In response to questions raised regarding consultees responses it was confirmed that Severn Trent had been consulted but they did not respond. The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Council's Drainage Engineer have no objections to the application.

In relation to Highway Safety issues Members were advised that Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have no objection subject to conditions. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust originally raised objection and recommended that full surveys should be carried out on all the ponds on site before planning permission is granted, subsequently further information has been submitted and this objection has been withdrawn subject to the imposition of conditions.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION** – Grant subject to the execution of a S106 agreement and the conditions as circulated.

Voting for taking this course of action:

**FOR:** None.

**AGAINST:** Councillors D Brett, H Burton, G Clarkson, S Fielding, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley, A Smith and T Taylor.

**ABSTAIN:** None.

**COMMITTEE DECISION** – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- The adverse impact on Highway safety and capacity.
- Flood risk and sewerage issues.

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

(A five minute comfort break was taken)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01239/RSB	Sundown Adventureland	Proposed 49 Holiday Lodges, 32 Touring Caravan Pitches, 14 Glamping Pods, Reception Area with Managers Accommodation, Store and Play Areas, Parking and Associated Infrastructure (Resubmission of planning application 16/01363/FUL), Land at Elmwood Lodge, Sundown Adventureland, Rampton Road, Retford.

Members were advised that the application sought planning permission for 49 holiday lodges, 32 touring caravan pitches, 14 glamping pods, a reception area with managers accommodation, store and play areas, parking and associated infrastructure. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Amendments to the report had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The site is located between the villages of Treswell and Rampton but lies within the Treswell with Cottam Parish area. The site comprises land immediately to the east of Sundown Adventureland, with agricultural land to the north east and west, and extends to some 5.8 hectares.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees were given. The relevant policies and site planning history was set out within the report.

Treswell with Cottam Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, South Leverton Parish Council and the ward Councillor object to the proposal. Nine letters of objection have been received from local residents and five further letters of objection to the amended plans. Two letters of support have been received.

Members were advised that the Treswell with Cottam Neighbourhood Plan is at the examination stage and therefore can be given significant weight. It is considered that the application conforms with the Neighbourhood Plan which supports rural enterprises and employment opportunities.

The application is considered to be in accordance with local and national planning policy and would encourage local tourism.

Parish Councillor G Lazenby spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Treswell with Cottam Parish Council, she commented that:

- The development is contrary to policy DM1.
- The scale and design is inappropriate and would not compliment surrounding land uses.
- The development will dominate the landscape.
- The development is not in character with the local area.
- There are highway safety concerns.
- 12,000 vehicles enter the site in a day; this is before any increase in traffic due to development.
- The safety of pedestrians, horse riders and runners is a concern and here is no pavement.
- The Parish Council disagree with the decision not to relocate the entrance and exit.
- The proposal will dominate the landscape and threaten the rural nature of the area.
- The Neighbourhood Plan is nearing completion and states that development will be supported when it is demonstrated that the scale and mass etc. are appropriate and there is no negative traffic impact.
- The proposal would comprise the amenity value of the community.

Mr Watkin spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Treswell and Rampton Parish Councils, he commented that:

- The proposal is not in keeping with the local area.
- The amount of traffic would be exacerbated.
- The development is too large.
- The site already has issues with traffic congestion.
- If the application is granted the access should be moved onto Treswell Road to finally give residents some peace after 30 years.
- There will be additional disturbance during the evening.
- Traffic congestion will increase.

Councillor T Critchley spoke in objection to the application as Ward Member for Rampton, she commented that:

- The access is inappropriate and unacceptable.
- Large scale expansion plans would dominate and change the scenery.
- Sundown has already expanded often without planning permission and without the opportunity for public comment.
- The development is contrary to policy DM1, DM4 and paragraph 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The surrounding land uses are agricultural with protected species on site.
- Elmwood Lodge could have been used at the managers' accommodation.
- There are no surface water or sewage drainage plans.
- There is currently traffic congestion.
- There is no footpath into Rampton.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact.
- Noise levels would increase.
- The application is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The employment benefits to the local community would be negligible.

Ms R McAlster spoke in support of the application as the Agent, she commented that:

- Sundown Adventureland is a valued local attraction.
- 2018 marks the 50<sup>th</sup> year of the business.
- Sundown has a quarter of a million visitors each year and is the second most visited attraction in Bassetlaw.
- Recently Sundown has been rated as the 6<sup>th</sup> best theme park on TripAdvisor.
- Given the number of customers there is a demand for accommodation. Visitors will be able to enjoy other local attractions which will benefit the area.
- 100 members of staff are employed by Sundown.
- The development will have economic benefits.
- The lodges have been moved from the areas nearest local residents.
- Various access points have been explored.

Members raised questions/concerns in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan; the access to the site; the environmental assessment; and the enforcement of conditions. In response to questions raised regarding the Neighbourhood Plan the Case Officer advised that it is considered that the application is in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan as it supports local business development.

Members were advised that conditions have been proposed to mitigate the impact in terms of lighting and noise. Information is to be agreed by the local authority before commencement of the development.

Members sought clarity in relation to the proposed access. It was proposed that the application be deferred to a future meeting to allow for clarity to be sought, this was seconded and a vote was taken.

**RESOLVED that** the application be deferred to a future meeting to allow for clarity to be sought regarding the proposed access.

(e) Development Management Performance Report Quarter 1 2018-19

Members were presented with a report which provided details of the quarterly performance record for the Development Management function for the first quarter of 2018/2019.

Members were advised that 100% of major applications have been determined and 96.9% of minor applications were determined which exceeded the local target.

During quarter 1 of 2018-19 a total of nine appeal determinations were made. Out of these, three were allowed and six were dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate, equating to a performance of 33%.

Planning Enforcement for Quarter 1 of 2018-19 was outlined in the report.

Members thanked the Officers for their good report, continued hard work and team effort during the year.

**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.

31. 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 8.53pm.)