

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 6th December 2017 at Retford Town Hall

Present:

Councillor D Pidwell (Chair)

Councillors H Burton, G Clarkson, S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, S Scotthorne, A Smith and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: D Askwith, J Elliott, M Freeman, C Hopkinson, M Joyce and S Wormald.

(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; although there were members of the public present, this was not taken up.)

55. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G A N Oxby and M W Quigley.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

57. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8th NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 8th November 2017 be approved.

58. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 16TH OCTOBER AND 6TH NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 16th October and 6th November 2017 be received.

59. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

60. 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 two appeal decisions.

The Chair commented that the inspector on both decision supported the officer decisions. He drew Members attention to the inspectors expanded definition of sustainable development.

RESOLVED that the appeal decisions be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

The Chair advised of a change in Agenda order so that applications A2 and A3 would be taken first.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/00670/FUL	SJB Professional Equine	Proposed change of use of land to professional equine services including erection of single storey stable building with hay store, formation of ménage, car parking and vehicular access, land fronting Main Street, Dunham on Trent

Members were advised that the application sought change of use of land to professional equine services. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located to the east of Dunham-on-Trent, outside of the development boundary. Access to the site would be from the A57 via Ash Close. The site is currently a grassed field.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways, the Environment Agency, Environmental Health, Historic England and the Council's Tree Officer have no objection. The Council's Conservation Officer has commented that the development would result in a degree of harm to the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St Oswald and fail to preserve its setting.

Dunham, Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council have objected to the development on the grounds of highway safety. 40 letters of objection from local residents have been received and a petition with 46 signatures.

Members were advised that the site has the potential to bring economic development to the District. National and local planning policy generally supports the development. The impact on the countryside is considered to be minimal and the use requires a rural location.

In relation to residential amenity, Environmental Health have raised no objection. It is considered that the concerns of residents can be addressed. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework this is a balancing act where the harm will be adjudged against the benefits of the proposed development

In regards to the heritage impact the harm is considered to be less than substantial. Existing tree and hedges would provide screening and could be enhanced to mitigate the impact to the Church.

Councillor P Eghan spoke on behalf of the Parish Council. He advised that there are two homes directly across the road from the site and the impact has not been mentioned. It is considered that there would be a degree of harm to the Church therefore the development is failing to protect the heritage asset. He commented that:

- The site is in a flood risk zone.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy CS1 as it is outside of the development boundary.
- The development would be contrary to Policies CS9 and DM1. There is local objection to the application and other sites available.
- The proposal is for a large scale development in a small village.
- There are highway safety issues.
- Floodlighting is a concern.
- There would be noise and smells from the site.
- There are protected trees on site.
- The development would increase vehicle movements in the area.
- The application contravenes policies DM3, DM11, DM13 and paragraph 14 of the Core Strategy.
- The applicant does not live in the village.

Mrs C Booth spoke in objection to the development. She advised that:

- The site is outside of the village envelope.
- The size of the development would be overbearing in the village.
- The size of the development is larger than the whole of Ash Close.
- There are concerns about floodlighting.
- There would be a huge detrimental impact on wildlife in the vicinity.
- Over 100 residents would lose their quiet homes.
- Increased traffic, smells and light pollution are a concern.
- There is no car parking facility accounted for.
- There is no public transport in the village or village facilities. The village is unsustainable for growth.
- There are eight or more facilities within 8 miles.
- There is no stipulation on working hours.
- The application is contrary to Policy DM3 as it would exacerbate highway issues.
- There are blind bends in the village and there have been 11 accidents in the past months.
- The entrance is dangerous.
- There would be an increase in vehicles.
- Lives would be put at risk if the development goes ahead.
- She asked the Committee to keep the village safe and refuse the application.

Miss S Brumpton spoke as the applicant. She advised that:

- She is a 25 year old with a passion for equestrian.
- Her obsession with riding started when visiting horse trials.
- In the past six years she has gone from not riding to competing.
- She is very hard working and hopes to become professional and compete for GB in the Olympics.
- There is no training facility within 25 miles of the area or stables for a team of horses.
- The development would give others access to facilities without travelling.
- She hopes to launch a career for herself and give others the opportunity.

Members asked questions/ raised issues in relation to:

- Proposed floodlighting.

- Car parking and car park surfacing.
- The number of horses to be accommodated in the stable block.
- Flood risk.
- Job opportunities.
- A decision to refuse another equestrian business in the District on the grounds of the rural location, it was outside of the development boundary and the impact on the character of the area.

In response to questions raised Members were advised that there are pre-commencement conditions proposed which require details of lighting and surfacing for hard surfaces to be submitted to the local authority and agreed in writing before work commences.

The Case Officer advised that the stable block could accommodate a maximum of ten horses, four for the applicant and six to be available for livery.

Members were advised that every application is taken on a case by case basis. The impact of the development is considered to be less than substantial and the benefits are considered to outweigh that harm. It is not considered there are any issues regarding the impact on the landscape.

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

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

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/01077/FUL	C.S.Scaffold Limited	Proposed new buildings, change of use of land and buildings to create a new tourist attraction including the conversion and extensions to existing brick barns to provide a cafe/ice cream parlour, craft units, toilets, conversion and external alteration to existing dutch barn to use as a farm shop, erect new buildings to create a building for educational use, reception building, stable block with associated ménage and paddock, seventeen holiday lodges, change of use of land for siting of touring caravans, outdoor animal enclosures and adventure play space and crazy golf and alter existing access, Pear Tree Farm and Land to North West, Gainsborough Road, Beckingham

Members were advised that the application proposes a new building, change of use of land and buildings to create a new tourist attraction. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located to the west of Beckingham village but outside of any development within open countryside. The site is accessed directly off the main A631 and is on elevated land above the road on undulating land which rises from north to east. The pigeon cote, which is a grade II listed building, is excluded from the red line application site.

The site has a long planning history; details were set out in the report.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. Highways; Nottinghamshire County Council; the Council's Conservation Officer; the Environment Agency; the Lead Local Flood Authority; the Internal Drainage Board; Environmental Health; and National Air Traffic Safety have no objection.

Beckingham cum Saundy Parish Council supports the application. One local resident has objected to the proposal on highway safety grounds.

The principle of the development in the countryside for this type of development is generally supported. The site is relatively isolated and there would be no adverse impact to residential or visual amenity. The proposal seeks to enhance tourism in the District.

Councillor J Sanger spoke as Ward Member for Beckingham. She commented that the development would enhance the area and hopefully provide employment for local people in the area. The proposal is supported by the Parish Council and villagers.

Mr J Rigby spoke as the agent behalf of the applicant, he advised that:

- The support from Councillor Sanger and the Parish Council is welcomed.
- Detailed discussions have been held with the Parish Council.
- The client has had success and is a local businessman.
- The application seeks to transform a series of redundant farm buildings to a tourist attraction.
- The attraction is aimed at local families to be an enjoyable day out and learning opportunity.
- The development would have economic benefits.
- The tourism sector is underdevelopment and has significant potential.
- There has been no objection to access arrangements.
- Detailed technical reports have been submitted.
- The proposal is consistent with planning policy.

Members commented that:

- The proposal would bring tourism to the area and provide an opportunity for local people.
- The proposal is welcomed and situated in a beautiful part of Bassetlaw.
- The development would provide jobs in a rural community.
- The accommodation should only be for holiday use and conditions need to be robust.

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

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as circulated and the imposition of the additional condition as follows:

16. Occupiers of holiday lodges and caravans hereby permitted at the site be restricted to a maximum 28 day stay duration in any three month time frame.

(The meeting was adjourned for a short break)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
14/00503/OUT	Linden Homes Ltd	Outline application for the erection of up to 175 dwellings including public open space, attenuation drainage basin and associated works, land west of Tilt Lane, Retford.

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission for the erection of up to 175 dwellings including public open space, attenuation drainage basin and associated works. Slides were used to show the site location.

Members were advised that the original application on the site was considered at Planning Committee on 1st October 2014 where Members resolved to grant planning permission subject to

a S106 Agreement. Subsequently the applicant submitted a viability assessment and the S106 Agreement was never signed therefore a Decision notice was not issued.

The application was due to be reported to Planning Committee in January 2017 after an initial review of the applicant's viability assessment by the District Valuer. The applicant and the District Valuer had been unable to agree on the viability assessment, as there was a significant difference between figures Members deferred the application. The viability assessment has now been subject to a further independent assessment.

The applicant has reviewed the overall scheme and are now offering Section 106 contributions as detailed within the report. The application would also be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy however, as this is an outline application the actual amount will depend on the net floor space at the reserved matters stage.

The Case Officer advised that the main difference between the application granted in 2014 and this application is that in 2014 25% affordable housing was proposed, this application would provide 9 affordable houses (5.14%) on site.

Mr D Larder spoke in objection to the application, he advised that:

- J Mann MP held a meeting and told residents that the development would not go ahead as the site is outside of the development boundary and good agricultural land.
- Councillors should represent residents.
- There are other sites in the area.
- Two research studies have not been taken into account. The UK is rapidly running out of land to produce food and this application would destroy Grade II agricultural land. Morrison's have produced a report to say much of our future food will be locally produced because of global warming and Brexit.
- There has been a reduction in the affordable housing contribution which is an extremely important matter.
- Traffic rat runs will be created and there are not enough traffic lights.
- The Lane is already chaos at school time.

Mr Maynard spoke in support as the applicant, he advised that the application was resolved to grant in Oct 2014 however it become apparent there were issues that impacted viability. Whilst the site may look straightforward there are significant issues for instance drainage, highways and a steep bank that requires earthworks. An independent assessment has been undertaken and Linden Homes are happy to accept the findings. Linden Homes would like condition 8 rewording as there is a small pinch point in terms of ownership that means a 3m cycle way cannot be delivered at that point. They would also like condition 9 rewording to provide flexibility towards highways works.

Members asked questions/ raised issues in relation to:

- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- It is frustrating the site has not come forward faster.
- The Section 106 Obligations.
- Community Infrastructure Levy.
- The site is compact for the number of houses proposed.
- The Council's lack of a five year housing land supply.
- The proposed cycle path.

In response to the applicants comments about changing the wording of proposed conditions Members were advised that if Members resolved to grant the application any changes would need to be presented to the Planning Consultation Group for approval.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement and the conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement and the conditions as circulated.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/00962/OUT	Mr S Difuria	Outline planning application for residential development and community allotments, land between Walkeringham Road and Vicarage Lane Beckingham

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for residential development and community allotments. The applicant has provided an illustrative layout of the site showing 30 dwellings. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of the Beckingham development boundary. Beckingham Bridleway No.15 runs adjacent the eastern boundary of the site. Marsh pond, located 444m to the north east, is a local Wildlife Site.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. No objections have been received from Highways; Rights of Way; the Flood Risk Management Team; Environmental Health; the District Parks Development Officer; the Neighbourhood Planning Officer; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board. Letters of objection have been received from the Parish Council, ward Councillor and seven local residents.

The Case Officer advised that the site is located outside of, but adjacent, the development boundary. The Council currently has a lack of a five year land supply for housing. The proposal therefore is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

Councillor J Sanger read of comments on behalf of Councillor B Sofflet, Beckingham-cum-Saundby Parish Council, who was unable to attend the meeting. Whilst the Parish Council consider this to be the most attractive and suitable development put before them, in the context of the proposed development in the village and the size of the site (30 dwellings) they are asking that planning permission be refused for the development. They have concerns around any increased traffic load to Walkeringham Road, both during the construction phase and afterwards with the increased residential traffic. As a council they have already received unrelated complaints and concerns about the traffic speed and visibility without any additional volume from this development. In keeping with their concerns for the adjacent development the objections are as follows:

- Taken within the wider context of proposed development within the village they question the sustainability of the site, and are concerned at the negative and irreversible impact that this will have on the character of the village.
- The site sits outside of the existing settlement boundary, which is contrary to Policy CS1 of the Bassetlaw Development Framework, and is currently laid to arable farmland, affording open views across the Trent Valley.
- The largest “estate-style” development within the village currently comprises a dozen properties and any development of this scale would not be in keeping with the village character. There is little need for allotment provision within the village (plots are currently vacant), the site would be better served by using the additional space to reduce the density of housing.
- They further fail to see how the plans conform with Policy DM9 of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework.

- They ask that the Committee also consider the wishes of the 7 local residents directly impacted by the plans that have written in with some 16 concerns, which are laid out in the report.
- The District Councillor has also objected in writing to the proposals.
- As a Parish Council they are in favour of measured and sustainable development which complements and augments the character of the village. Unfortunately they do not feel that the outlined plans do this, but rather detract from the charm and visual amenity. Should it be approved, they would ask that Members request the single storey properties to be at the western boundary of the site, adjacent to the road with the housing set further back along the eastern side.
- A development of this size and nature is not in keeping with the rural setting and would add to the creeping urbanisation of the community.
- They do not feel that the services within the village are sufficient to accommodate a population increase of around 10% (assuming 1 person per bedroom).
- They ask that planning permission for this application be refused.

Councillor J Sanger spoke as ward Member for Beckingham. She advised that she agrees with the Parish Council's comments. Bungalows are needed along the front of the site. She commented that she likes the idea of allotments however, will the Parish Council have to maintain them.

Members asked questions in relation to the proposed community allotments. Members raised concerns about the management of the allotments.

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

Voting for taking this course of action:

FOR: Councillors S Fielding, G Freeman, S Scotthorne and A Smith.
AGAINST: Councillors H Burton, G Clarkson, K H Isard, D G Pidwell and T Taylor.
ABSTAINED: None.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- Lack of sustainability.

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

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
16/00877/FUL	J and W Property Developments Ltd.	Residential development for 33 Dwellings, garages, landscaping construction of new access and associated works, land to the rear of 1-29 Vicarage Lane Beckingham

Members were advised that the application sought full planning permission for the erection of 33 dwellings. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent, the Beckingham Development Boundary. Beckingham Bridleway No. 15 runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. No objections have been received from Highways;

Nottinghamshire County Council Education; Nottinghamshire County Council Flood Risk Management Team; the District Parks Development Officer; Environmental Health; National Air Traffic Services; Natural England; Notts Wildlife Trust; Severn Trent Water; and the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board. A holding objection has been received from Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way until information regarding hedgerows is provided. Letters of objection have been received from the District Councillor, previous County Councillor, Parish Council and 16 local residents.

The Case Officer advised that the Council currently has a lack of a five year land supply for housing. The proposal therefore is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

Councillor J Sanger read of comments on behalf of Councillor B Sofflet, Beckingham-cum-Saundby Parish Council, who was unable to attend the meeting. The Parish Council have concerns around any increased traffic load to Vicarage Lane, this is a narrow road with no carriageway demarcation lines, or parking restrictions. In keeping with their concerns for the adjacent development their objections are as follows:

- Taken within the wider context of proposed development within the village they would question the sustainability of the site, and are concerned at the negative and irreversible impact that this will have on the character of the village.
- The site sits outside of the existing settlement boundary, which is contrary to Policy CS1 of the Bassetlaw Development Framework, and is currently laid to arable farmland, affording open views across the Trent Valley.
- The proposed 33 dwellings are, in their opinion, too dense to comply with Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan, a similar sized area to the south and east of the site currently supports 12 single storey dwellings. The largest “estate-style” development within the village currently comprises a dozen properties around Church View on a similarly sized plot.
- They further fail to see how the plans conform with Policy DM9 of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework.
- They would ask that the Committee also consider the wishes of the 16 local residents directly impacted by the plans that have written in with a cumulative spread of some 28 concerns, which are laid out in the report.
- A District and County Councillors have also objected in writing to the proposals.
- As a Parish Council they are in favour of measured and sustainable development which complements and augments the character of the village.
- A development of this size and nature is not in keeping with the rural setting and would add to the creeping urbanisation of the community.
- Services within the village are not sufficient to accommodate a population increase of around 10% (assuming 1 person per bedroom).
- Once again, they ask that the Committee refuse planning permission for this application.

Councillor J Sanger spoke as ward Member. She advised that:

- There has been no consultation or meaningful input included from villagers.
- In 2011 the village said it wanted mainly bungalows and 2/3 bed houses in any new build and they are still saying the same.
- This development is mainly 4/5 houses and no affordable housing because it is not economical for the developer. In other words there is not enough profit, therefore the village suffers and villagers are ignored.
- The site is a dense, overbearing arrangement totally out of keeping with the village. Parts of this development are tightly packed like old back to back houses of Victorian times. The village is being urbanised outside the village envelope.
- The plan goes against a number of policies in the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and the Bassetlaw Development Framework; particularly DM4 which states development must respect the character of the area and not have a detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby residents.

- There are dormer bungalows down Vicarage Lane on the southern boundary of the site and also across the road from the site, why can't the line of bungalows continue along the frontage of the site?
- The plan contains large two storey houses, overshadowing the bungalows across the road taking away their privacy.
- The village started a neighbourhood plan about a year and a half ago but most of the planning applications for Beckingham were too far advanced for the plan to make a difference and villagers were despondent and lost interest.
- This site and the next one are really the last two fields attached to the village.
- This end of the village is busy with traffic but does not have the heavy lorries seen at the southern end of the village, unfortunately it does often have speeding vehicles wishing to avoid the cameras on the dual carriageway.
- Beckingham is overdeveloped by sites already approved, making it unsustainable without significant investment. The school is full, the doctor's surgery at Misterton is at breaking point, there is only a small shop and post office, no public house, a poor bus service and sewage and drainage needing attention.

Mr T Quiltor spoke in objection to the application. He advised that he understands Nottinghamshire County object to the application due to the impact on the village. The development does not meet the affordable housing requirement. The developer is looking at profit over the village interests. The application proposes more bus stops that are not needed.

Mr Jones spoke in support as the applicant. The application has been a three year process working closely with the Planning Department. There have been numerous amendments to the application in consultation with the Planning Department. The number of dwellings overall has been reduced to 33 and a number of houses have been changed to bungalows. They have worked closely with highways to address issues. The developer will provide a range of homes needed in the District.

Members asked questions/ raised issues in relation to:

- The percentage of houses and bungalows.
- Affordable housing.
- The impact on the character of the village.
- The lack of infrastructure in the village.
- The size of the gardens.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.

Councillor T Taylor clarified that the County Councillor who commented on the application was her predecessor.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

Voting for taking this course of action:

FOR: Councillors A Smith.
AGAINST: Councillors H Burton, G Clarkson, S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, D G Pidwell, S Scotthorne and T Taylor.
ABSTAINED: None.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- There is no affordable housing contribution.
- Lack of sustainability.
- The impact on the character of the village.

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

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01156/OUT	Mr Smith	Outline application all matters reserved for erection of 20 dwellings, land south of Bawtry Road Everton

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the erection of 20 dwellings. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The proposed site is 1.9 hectares in area. The site is outside of the Everton development boundary adjacent to the Everton Conservation Area. Public footpath Everton FP20 runs along the eastern boundary of the site.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given, as detailed in the report. No objections have been received from Nottinghamshire County Council; the District Conservation Officer; the District Parks Development Officer; Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; the Environment Agency; and Doncaster Sheffield Airport. Letters of objection have been received from Everton Parish Council, the District Councillor and local residents.

Members were advised that notwithstanding the Council's shortfall in five year housing land supply, it is considered that the proposed residential development would be at odds with the rural character and appearance of the area. The development would also be likely to result in the unacceptable living conditions for new residents due to noise distance from an existing local business.

Councillor D Bardsley spoke on behalf of Everton Parish Council. He advised that:

- The Parish Council strongly object to the application.
- The site is the gateway to the village and important to the Conservation Area.
- Planning Policy DM4 states that development should respect its wider surroundings, the proposal relates poorly to the village and the Conservation Officers comments cement that view.
- The site is not screened from all views.
- The proposal does not compliment the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. A recent appeal decision gave moderated weight to the Plan.
- The development fails to comply with the Listed Buildings Act.
- The development would harm the character and setting of the Conservation Area.
- The harm outweighs the lack of a five year land supply.
- The proposal would detract from the character of the village and would not preserve its character.

Mr A Ballarini spoke in objection to the development. He advised that the proposal is contrary to local policy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that development should enhance the local environment. A footpath crosses the site and the footpath to the north has views across the site which is an important part of the landscape. A Neighbourhood Plan question found that 94% of residents thought the landscape was the most important feature of living in Everton. The site is an introduction to the built form of Bassetlaw and the village. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that development should conserve and enhance the natural environment. The Neighbourhood Plan is being development, there has been three calls for land to be put forward and this site has never been identified. The land is grade 3, poorer quality land should be used.

In response to questions asked in relation to the potential impact of the existing agricultural business on future residents Members were advised that the building was allowed on appeal in 2013 and could be used at all hours and days of the year. The site is 30m away from the building. In regards to the dwellings granted planning permission on the site in front of this site if these were not implemented the development on the street would not appear linear.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as listed.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as listed.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

61. 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 9.07pm.)