

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 28th March 2018 at Retford Town Hall

Present:

Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)
Councillors D Brett, H Burton, S Fielding, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley, A Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: L Brown (Application No. 17/01520/RSB) D Askwith, K France, C Hopkinson and M Joyce.

(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.)

76. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

77. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

78. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7th March 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 7th March 2018 be approved.

79. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 26TH FEBRUARY AND 12TH MARCH 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 26th February and 12th March 2018 be received.

80. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

There were no Outstanding Minutes.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

81. 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) Appeal Decisions Received

Members were presented with three appeal decisions.

The Chair commented that he was pleased with the outcome of the Whitewater Clay Pigeon Shooting Club appeal. The appeal was made against several conditions including opening hours and noise attenuation. The Inspector upheld the Planning Committee decision.

RESOLVED that the appeal decisions be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01520/RSB	Mr & Mrs D W & L A White	Outline planning application, with some matters reserved, approval being sought for access for residential development (resubmission of 16/00550/OUT), land off Beckingham Road, Walkeringham

Members were advised that the application was presented to the previous meeting of the Committee where Members resolved to defer the application for clarification on information referred to by one of the speakers. The application sought outline planning permission, with details of access, to erect up to 25 dwellings with access from Beckingham Road to serve the proposed development. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the previous meeting.

The site is outside of, but adjacent, the Walkeringham Development Boundary. The Site lies to the south of Walkeringham Village and there is an existing hedge on the road side boundary. The site is bounded by the A161 to the west, an area of tree planting to the south, Birdcroft Lane to the north and agricultural land to the east.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. Details of relevant planning policy and the sites planning history was contained within the report. Two letters of objection have been received from local residents and a letter of objection from the ward Councillor.

In relation to clarification sought at the previous meeting regarding information presented to the Walkeringham Neighbourhood Plan Group Members were advised that the Neighbourhood Plan is only in the beginnings of its production. The Group are preparing an evidence base to support their intentions and working towards producing a draft plan. The site assessment work referred to at the previous meeting is not a public document and has no weight in determining planning decisions as it was not complete and has not been subject to any consultation.

Given the Councils' housing land supply figures and the sustainability of the site the proposal is considered acceptable. Walkeringham is considered a rural service centre and it is considered that the proposal would help to maintain existing facilities in the village. The application proposes affordable housing and financial contributions for education and play equipment. It is not considered that there would be a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the area. The current application is considered to address drainage issues and the Lead Local Flood

Authority and Council's Drainage Engineer have no objections. The proposal is considered to comply with local and national planning policy.

Councillor P Roberts spoke in objection on behalf of Walkeringham Parish Council. He advised that:

- Walkeringham has a history of flooding.
- The drainage system cannot cope with the current demand.
- Part of the site is in flood zone 2. Policy states that developments will be not permitted where there are superior sequential sites available in other parts of the District.
- The site is located away from the built up area in Walkeringham in the countryside and in the gateway to the village.
- Any development on the site would have a negative impact on the local character of the area.
- The Land Availability Assessment on the Council's website states that this site is not suitable for development due to the separation from the built development. What has changed?
- The Parish Council has serious concerns about road safety and the road is an accident blackspot.

Mr J Roberts spoke in objection to the application. He advised that his main concern is road safety. The curvature of the road is greater than shown in the block plan. There is a blind corner around the Manor House wall with little chance of improvement as the House is a listed building. There have been several accidents on this part of the road with vehicles hitting the Manor House Wall, going through the fence and through the boundary of the application site. During the rush hour traffic vehicles turning right towards the school will have to cross the busy main stream of traffic.

(Councillor M W Quigley joined the meeting)

Councillor J Sanger spoke as Ward Member for Beckingham. She commented that she was beginning to fear the worst regarding the result of the application. Almost everything has been said relevant to reasons for refusal. She commented that she could not understand why the Bassetlaw Land Available Assessment paper 2017, the background paper for Bassetlaw's Local Plan, states that the land is not suitable for development. Why are our planning officers writing one thing and doing another? She advised that she has recently passed the site and it is on a slight slope, not level as stated in the documents and the field is very wet. The A161 is extremely busy, has anyone visited the site and monitored traffic all day? If some of the sites around the village were smaller, of maybe five or six dwellings, then villagers may not be so unhappy. Walkeringham villagers have worked extremely hard for more than two years on their Neighbourhood Plan, another six months or maybe less and they will be at the stage where the Plan can be taken into account. This site is not in the Neighbourhood Plan but the wish of villagers for smaller development sites is. If this development goes ahead the linear village character will be spoilt forever, particularly at the entrance to the older part of the village. So many houses are crammed for profit. Who do we turn to keep our villages as villages? Surely the number of houses planned in Harworth and Bircotes, where the area is happy for them to be built, would go some way to reach Bassetlaw's quota and so help our villages avoid such dense developments. She asked for all the reasons as stated this evening and at the last meeting that Members refuse the application for the sake of future generations in the village.

Elected Members asked questions in relation to:

- The Land Availability Assessment.
- The flood risk.
- The availability of other sites within the development boundary.
- The need for development in the village.

In response to questions raised the Neighbourhood Planning Officer advised that the evidence work as part of the neighbourhood plan is not a public document. The Land Availability Assessment (LAA) is a public document and looks at all land availability in the District. The LAA is a desktop exercise and does not look at sites in detail and does not preclude development. The document highlights the sites issues but is a different process to a planning application. The documents are evidence based documents at this time and there is no weight given to the documents in decision making.

In relation to questions regarding the flood risk the Case Officer advised that only a relatively small part of the site is classed as Flood Zone 2. The inspector raised issues in the appeal and the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment with this application that addresses issues. The application is for outline planning permission therefore layout will be agreed at the reserved matters stage.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to a S106 Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to a S106 Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

(Councillor M W Quigley did not take part in the vote)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01243/OUT	Mansion House Group Limited	Outline planning application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for access and layout) for the erection of four retail units (Class A1) and an 82 bedroom hotel (Class C1) with pub restaurant (Class A3/A4) together with associated parking and hard and soft landscaping, land at High Grounds, High Grounds Road, Rhodesia

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with some matters reserved, for the erection of four retail units and an 82 bedroom hotel with pub restaurant together with associated parking and hard and soft landscaping. Slides were used to show the site location.

The site forms part of a larger development know as High Grounds and is situated on the A57 at the roundabout junction with Sandy Lane. High Grounds contains a mixture of uses. The site is approximately 1 mile from the centre of Worksop. The settlement of Rhodesia lies to the north-west, the A57 to the east and open agricultural land to the south and west. The site itself is currently overgrown scrub land, relatively level and adjacent to the main access road. The proposal comprises of a hotel a pub/restaurant and for non-food retail units with associated car parking, servicing and access arrangements.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. The relevant planning policies and the sites planning history was set out within the report. A letter of objection has been received from a local resident and a local business.

The site is within the development boundary of Worksop and the site is an existing established mixed use industrial, commercial and retail site. A retail assessment has been submitted and it has been established that it has passed the sequential test. The principle of the development has been established and there is no conflict with local or national planning policy. The development represents an opportunity for regeneration and growth.

Elected Members commented that if granted planning permission they would like to see the development come forward on the site.

Councillor G A N Oxby expressed his disappointment that a site visit was not undertaken. Councillors S Fielding and T Taylor also expressed concerns.

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

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

(d) Local Validation List Update

Members were presented with a report which detailed the need for a revised Local Validation List and sought approval to consult on the revised List.

National Planning Policy and Guidance (NPPG) require a Local Validation List which is up to date to clearly set out the validation requirements for applications for development. Such a list should not have been adopted for more than two years before a given planning application is determined.

The Local Validation List should be fully adopted and circulated locally. The three stage adoption process is set out in paragraph 44 of the NPPG. The draft List is the first stage and the consultation stage is the second stage. The proposed timescale for consultation is eight weeks commencing on 28th March 2018.

Failure to provide an up-to-date validation list is likely to have consequences with regard to disputes with agents and applicants about what is required to process a planning application, leading to delays or the need to attach conditions to planning permission which may have been avoidable had a local validation list been in place. It is also considered that the Council would be in a weaker position with regard to encouraging use of its pre-application service which could potentially give rise to further delays and have adverse financial implications.

RESOLVED that:

1. The need for an up-to-date Local Validation List and its contents be noted.
2. That the draft Local Validation List be issued for consultation.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

82. 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 7.29pm.)