

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 20th June 2018 at Worksop Town Hall

Present:

Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)

Councillors D Brett, H Burton, G Clarkson, S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, M W Quigley and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: D Askwith, J Elliot, K France, C Hopkinson, M Joyce, B Pinkney and M Tagg (Agenda Item 6b).

(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; this was not taken up.)

8. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G A N Oxby, S Scotthorne and A Smith.

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillors S Fielding declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 6(b), she remained in the meeting.

Councillor M Quigley declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 6(b) and Application No. 17/01104/OUT, he remained in the meeting.

Councillor T Taylor declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 6(b), she remained in the meeting.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

10. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23RD MAY 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd May 2018 be approved.

11. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 8TH AND 21ST MAY 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 8th and 21st May 2018 be received.

12. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

In relation to Minute No. 74(b) Members were advised that the report is set out within the agenda.

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

13. 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 Confirmation of an Article 4(1) Direction for Former North Border Infants and Nursery School and Former Serlby Park Academy Primary School, Shrewsbury Road, Bircotes

Members' approval was sought for the confirmation of an Article 4 Direction.

The former North Border Infants and Nursery School and the former Serlby Park Academy Primary School are regarded as non-designated heritage assets. The school buildings were constructed in the 1920's and are of considerable historical and architectural interest.

The consultation responses received indicated that the site has a lot of community and social value.

The Academy moved from the building a number of years ago and since then the building has not been secure or in use. The site has now become an area where Anti-Social Behaviour occurs.

The Academy submitted a Prior Approval Application to demolish the building. An immediate Article 4(1) Direction was made in March 2018 and will expire in September 2018. The Prior Approval Direction was refused following the 'made' direction. If the direction is not confirmed, the council cannot refuse a further prior approval application for demolition, from 8th September 2018 onwards.

Public consultation on the immediate direction was carried out for six weeks. The consultation responses were set out to Members in the report. The Town Council undertook its own consultation with the local residents, 84/94 people do not want to see the school buildings demolished.

Various ideas have been put forward for reuse of the school buildings.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- Responses from the Council consultations.
- Who the landowner is.
- If the application was to demolish all the buildings on the site or just certain buildings.

In response to the questions raised the Conservation Officer advised that two site notices were put up, adverts were put in the press and Nottinghamshire County Council, the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, Harworth Bircotes Town Council and the landowner had been consulted. Only one comment was received directly, and the Town Council took it upon themselves to undertake their own consultation. In terms of the landowner, the Town

Council are interested in taking it on. The red line and buildings outlines in red shows the land/buildings proposed to be covered by the Article 4(1) Direction.

RESOLVED that:

1. The 'confirmation' of the 'Former North Border Infant and Nursery School and Former Serlby Park Academy School' Article 4(1) Direction be approved.
2. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Regeneration to implement the 'confirmation' of the 'Former North Border Infant and Nursery School and Former Serlby Park Academy Primary School' Article 4(1) Direction.
3. Any future cost implications for employee structure be reported to Cabinet.

(M Tagg left the meeting)

(c) Appeal Decisions Received

Members were presented with three appeal decisions.

RESOLVED that the appeal decisions be received.

(d) Planning Applications and Associated Items

| <u>Application No</u> | <u>Applicant</u> | <u>Proposal</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 17/01104/OUT | Mrs Natalie Sarah Holmes | Outline application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for access) for 15 self-build plots and adopted shared residential access ways, land south of Station Road, Beckingham |

The chair advised Members that this application was deferred from the previous meeting.

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with some matters reserved for 15 self-build plots with access from Station Road to serve the development. Slides were used to show the site location.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent to the development boundary. The site is level almost circular shape and lies to the south of Beckingham Village. There is an existing hedge on the road side boundary for the majority of the road frontage. The site is bounded by the A631 bypass to the west, the roundabout to the south, Station Road to the east and Willow Lane to the north.

The site has a total area of 0.95 hectares and lies to the south east of Southfields, a large two storey dwelling. The 15 self-build plots would be served by a single point access from Station Road.

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

Members were advised that the separation distance from existing properties is acceptable and it is unlikely that there will be any adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

The financial implications were outline to Members as follows; the amendments to the trigger points for the Section 106 legal agreement are to pay 25% upfront and to pay the remaining 75% prior to the occupation of more than 50% of the dwellings to be constructed. Prior to commencement of development on the site to pay 50% of the Education Contributions and prior to the occupation of the 8th dwelling to pay the remaining 50% of the Education Contributions.

Mr Gough spoke in objection, he commented that:

- He lives in the main house and had the paddock with the house.
- The main house faces the paddock and the intention was for the green belt land to always be a paddock.
- He purchased the house when the owner of the land went bankrupt. Bankruptee still owns the land which has been separated from the house.
- The Planning Scheme would not be implemented.
- How will it be enforced and how will conditions be policed with 15 self-build plots.
- It could be a long time before all of the dwellings are built, creating a lot of noise and disturbance for a long time.
- What if not all plots or only some are sold?
- The 15 individual plots will all be different house types.
- Unsafe access road.

Councillor Sanger spoke in objection as Ward Member of Beckingham. She advised that the site has access from Low Street. It was changed from Station Road in 2012 or 2013. Therefore, it is the south of Low Street. She referred Members to page 12 in the agenda where her previous comments from the previous meeting are given. The application seems to change by the minutes; the application seems to have been rail-roaded through from the beginning. Is it planning without sanctions? It will not be used against Bassetlaw's quota, it will take too long to complete. If the legal agreement is signed there are certain obligations to follow, will these be long and drawn out and just disappear into the distance, i.e. the number of houses built before the payment is due. Who will pay for the implementations and maintenance of SUDs as detailed in the agenda. Should some of these be conditions? If passed can we ask for the Education Contributions to go to the school? She expressed how unhappy she is with the application and other residents including Mr Gough whose lounge is on the western corner. She asked that the application be refused.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- The sites planning history.
- The time it will take for self-builds to be built and contribute to the five year housing supply.
- The enforceability of the Section 106 Agreement on self-build plots.
- Who pays the Section 106 contributions?
- Reference to the condition regarding the hedges.
- If the site is sold in to 15 individual plots will it mean one reserved matters application or 15?
- How can 15 different types and style of houses be safeguarded?
- The infrastructure, roads and drains.
- If all the plots are sold and built on it will be out of character with the village.

In response to the questions raised the Solicitor advised that the hedges are owned by Nottinghamshire County Council. The condition has been added should the hedges be removed in the future. The Solicitor advised that Section 106 enforcement is the same for any development. A robust approach is taken and there is a team dedicated for the collection of Section 106 contributions. The registered land owner enters into the Section 106 agreement. The purchaser will be aware of the conveyancing process. The land shouldn't be sold without ensuring the payments being made.

In response to questions raised the case officer advised Members that there is no limit to the planning application that can be submitted.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to Section 106 agreement and conditions as circulated.

Voting for taking this course of action:

FOR: Councillors S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard and D G Pidwell.

AGAINST: Councillors D Brett, H Burton, G Clarkson, M W Quigley and T Taylor.

ABSTAIN: None.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- Cumulative impact on Beckingham.
- The number of dwellings is too dense for the area.
- The development would not be of a scale appropriate to the size/role of the settlement.
- Contrary to policy and would detract from the village scene and visual amenity.

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

(C Hopkinson left the meeting)

| <u>Application No</u> | <u>Applicant</u> | <u>Proposal</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 18/00507/CONR | Persimmon Homes Nottingham | Removal of condition 8(i) of previous planning application reference number: 01/11/00311 – Outline application for major residential development of up to 198 units including roads, accesses and open space, land off West Hill Road, Ordsall |

Members were advised that the application sought removal of the first limb of condition 8 of the outline planning granted under 01/11/00311. Paragraph (i) required highway improvement works to the Babworth/Ordsall Road junction. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject to a site visit prior to the meeting.

The case officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees were given. The relevant planning history was set out within the report.

The applicants in support of this proposal have submitted a review of the junction dated 16th April 2018. In summary its findings were that:

- There were a low number of incidents over the most recent five year period.
- The operation of the mini-roundabout has been better than anticipated and the benefits of a traffic signalisation are much more marginal that originally thought.
- The cumulative impact is much reduced.
- Overall the case for signalisation at this junction is unlikely to be cost effective.

The County Highway Authority has considered the evidence and is no longer able to justify the retention of this condition. They have taken into account the number of properties approved and the quality of data used and the scope of the survey undertaken.

The second limb of the condition 8(ii) for the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on West Hill Road has already been implemented and as such the entire condition falls away.

Councillor Anderson spoke in objection to the application as the ward Councillor of Ordsall Road, he commented that:

- There should be a permanent direction control for the flow of traffic at the junction.
- Smart traffic management to minimise problems.
- Traffic lights are easily identified with signs and lights. Drivers speed over the current mini roundabout that is in place which leads to consequences.

- Two bus stops are close to the junction which elderly people use for public transport. Traffic lights would ensure the safety of this busy road.
- Improvement works to the junction will create speed control for the road users.

Councillor Troop spoke in objection as the Ward Member of Ordsall, she commented that:

- The mini roundabout currently in place is not safe.
- A signalised junction would be much safer.
- There is more residential development and the increase in traffic has not been reviewed.
- A recent traffic survey has indicated that there are more commuters at peak times, 1000 vehicles use the A620 in one hour.
- Traffic surveys show the junction to be busy; therefore, any safety improvements should be made.
- The bus stops are used frequently by people with a disability.
- Sustainable Transport is outlined in the draft conditions to promote walkers, cycling and public transport.

Mr S Parfitt spoke as the Transport Consultant in support of the application, he commented that:

- Relevant test have been achieved by the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The quality of traffic data has improved.
- Video recordings have been taken over a whole day.
- In terms of Highway Safety only three recorded accidents have taken place over the past five years, none of which included a cyclist.
- 198 dwellings in the area, one vehicle travels through the junction every 1-2 minutes during peak hours.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- The survey undertaken.
- The new Crematorium further down the road, the impact on traffic it has had and the highway adjustments that have been made.
- The increases in traffic as children get older and learn to drive.
- Not enough evidence, only two weeks' worth.
- The right to appeal if the application was turned down.
- Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Authority only accepted limited data.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to a modification agreement (S106) and amended conditions.

COMMITTEE DECISION - Grant subject to a modification agreement (S106) and amended conditions.

| <u>Application No</u> | <u>Applicant</u> | <u>Proposal</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 17/01300/OUT | Serlby Land Settlement | Outline application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for access) for residential development 32 dwellings, land west of Great North Road, Ranskill |

Members were advised that the application sought outline permission with some matters reserved for the erection of 32 dwellings. The means of access to the site is to be considered at this time. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent to the Ranskill development boundary. The site is within an area of Archaeological interest.

Planning permission was granted in June 2017 for the erection of 23 dwellings, on the same site as that currently proposed.

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.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to the five point access to the site and how the play equipment is managed.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 agreement and conditions.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 agreement and conditions.

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 8.07pm.)