

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 6th February 2019 at Retford Town Hall

Present:

Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)

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

Officers in attendance: B Alderton-Sambrook, D Askwith, K France, M Freeman, B Pinkney and W Wilson.

(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.)

68. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

69. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor G A N Oxby raised a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Applications 18/01308/RSB and 17/00976/FUL.

Councillor S Scotthorne raised a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application 18/01148/FUL.

Councillor G Clarkson raised a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application 17/00976/FUL.

Councillor D G Pidwell raised non-pecuniary interests in Planning Applications 17/00976/FUL and 18/01148/FUL.

Councillor S Fielding raised a non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application 17/00976/FUL.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

70. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9TH JANUARY 2019

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 9th January 2019 be approved.

71. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 10TH DECEMBER 2018 AND 14TH JANUARY 2019

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 10th December 2018 and 14th January 2019 be received.

72. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes List be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

73. 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.

RESOLVED that the appeal decisions be received.

(c) Planning Application and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/01308/RSB	Mr Anthony Bamford	Outline application with all matters reserved for residential development of 10 dwellings and construct new access (Resubmission of planning application 18/00088/OUT), land at The Croft, West Moor Road, Walkeringham.

Members were advised that the application sought an outline application with all matters reserved for residential development of 10 dwellings and the construction of a new access. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Head of Regeneration advised Members that the application is a resubmission of planning application 18/00088/OUT, which is currently under appeal. Subsequent information has now been submitted recently that wasn't in the previous application.

The site is located to the west of the village with access from West Moor Road and currently forms part of land rear of The Croft/The Magic Stud. The site is level and has an area of 0.9 hectares. The access to the site will be through The Croft and the existing stable blocks, which is within the development boundary of Walkeringham.

Walkeringham Clay Pits Local Wildlife Site (LWS) is located approximately 500m to the west of the site. Walkeringham Pasture Local Wildlife Site (LWS) is located approximately 750m to the north east of the site.

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

Councillor Pat Hooton spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Walkeringham Parish Council, she commented that:

- Walkeringham Parish Council object to the application and have sent comments in to both the original application and the current application.
- All objections are material planning considerations.
- The proposal is contrary to policy CS1.

- The site lies outside the development boundary.
- The local residents of Walkeringham identified preferred areas for development for the draft Neighbourhood Plan, this site was not one of the sites identified.
- Walkeringham has a history of flooding and cannot cope with the current demands.
- She strongly urges Members to refuse the planning application.

Mr Ferry spoke in objection to the application as a local resident, he commented that:

- He spoke last year when the original application was at Planning Committee and the same objections still apply as nothing has changed.
- He lives at Honey Suckle House so will be affected the most by the development.
- The access to the site will cause disturbance to them entering/exiting their drive.
- Flooding is already a problem. A survey was carried out upon the purchase of their house on flooding; this survey concluded that the property has a medium to high risk of flooding.
- In Walkeringham two sites have been granted for development, nothing is happening on these sites?
- Do we really need another site that is outside the development boundary?

Members commented that they will support the officer's recommendation to refuse the application as infrastructure is non-existent and as the site is outside of the development boundary.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as detailed in the report.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as detailed in the report.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/00976/FUL	Opus North (Worksop) LLP	Demolition of two residential properties (No 6 & 8 Blyth Road) and erection of proposed discount foodstore (class A1), two non-food retail units (class A1), one non-food retail unit with garden centre, restaurant (class A3/A5), access, customer car parking, landscaping and associated works. Land east of Carlton Road, Worksop.

Members were advised that the application sought demolition of two residential properties (No 6 & 8 Blyth Road) and the erection of proposed discount food store, two non-food retail units, one non-food retail unit with garden centre, restaurant, access, customer car parking, landscaping and associated works. 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 between Worksop Conservation Area and Mr Straw's Conservation Area, part of the site being within Mr Straw's Conservation Area and is an area of archaeological interest.

The site is currently vacant brownfield land, crossed by public footpaths 85, 86 and 87, that are tarmacked and separated from the rest of the site by 2m high mesh fencing.

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

Members were advised that a retail impact assessment had been done and indicated that the proposal will bring a turnover of £32.2 million by 2023 and is estimated that £5.6 million will be directly diverted from the town centre. The applicant has offered £300,000 up front mitigation towards the impact on the town centre and free car parking for up to three hours.

The Chair declared that all committee Members had received correspondence from the Priory Centre and Asda about their views on the proposed development.

Mr Jeremy Williams spoke in support of the application as the agent, he commented that:

- He is the director of ID Planning.
- The site has already been granted planning permission for a Tesco superstore.
- They are keen to regenerate the fenced off, unattractive site.
- Lidl is an alternative store.
- B&M Bargain's home store, which sells bulky goods, is proposed for the site.
- The proposal will be beneficial for the town.
- Residents currently have to travel out of town to fulfil shopping needs.
- The development will bring a variety of different retail stores to the town.
- The retail assessment completed indicated that the development will lead to some trade being diverted from the town centre. However, this is not considered to be a big effect for retailers.
- The proposal will attract shoppers back to the town centre.
- The development will provide 200 jobs.
- Improvements will be made to retail and a rundown site.

Members raised questions/comments regarding the planning permission granted for the Tesco on site and the impact the development will have on the town centre.

The Head of Regeneration advised to Members that Tesco have got permission to build a replacement store for their Gateford Road store on the site and that permission has been implemented with some engineering works, however there is an associated restrictive condition that necessitates the closure of the Gateford Road store in order to minimise retail impact on the town centre.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as detailed in the report.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the reasons as detailed in the report.

(Councillor D G Pidwell and S Scotthorne left the Committee table and joined the audience)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/01148/FUL	Avant Homes Limited (Central Division) & Wyndthorpe Development	Residential Development of 151 dwellings, construct new access with associated infrastructure and landscaping. Land east of Doncaster Road, Costhorpe, Worksop

Members were advised that this full application sought approval for a residential development of 151 dwellings, construction of a new access with associated infrastructure and landscaping. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The case officer advised that a re-consultation exercise had taken place and extra information has been added to the report since it was withdrawn at Planning Committee in January 2019. Extra documents had been tabled for Members including a letter and plan from Councillor Pidwell as Ward Member, 9 letters of objections from local residents and a letter from the applicant's agent.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent to, the Carlton-in-Lindrick development boundary. The site is located to the east of Doncaster Road (A60) and to the east of the former Riddell Arms PH. The site is 5.85 hectares in area, currently the land is in agricultural use.

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

Councillor Lynne Billau spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Carlton-in-Lindrick Parish Council. She advised that:

- The Parish Council, Members and an independent Planning Inspector have recently approved a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish. The Planning Inspector said “the plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. It is clear that all sections of the community have been actively engaged in its preparation. It is a first class example of a Neighbourhood Plan”.
- During the consultation process for the Neighbourhood Plan the local community emphasised that downsizing bungalow provision within the village is needed.
- Of the 151 dwellings proposed only three will be bungalows which are three bedroomed, it is therefore disappointing to note that whilst there are two bedroomed houses within the proposal there are no plans for two bedroomed bungalows for the elderly and more mature residents who wish to downsize and stay within the village.
- In addition you will have noted the proposal for some three storey accommodation on the site. The Neighbourhood Plan includes policies to ensure existing much valued eastern views alongside the A60 highway are maintained. The approval of any three storey properties would contravene those policies.
- She advised that particular attention also needs to be given to the adequacy and size of the landscape buffer between proposed properties on the application and existing properties on Pinfold Drive. The buffer zone on the plan does not appear to comply with measures included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Cllr Billau concluded that it would be more than helpful if the necessity for the development of this greenfield site can be clarified for the benefit of residents when there is widespread support for priority to be given to the development of the brownfield site at Firbeck Colliery which already benefits from outline planning permission.

Councillor Val Bowles spoke in objection to the application on behalf of the Neighbourhood Planning Group. She advised that:

- They appreciate that the developer consulted the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group during the course of preparing their application; it was extremely helpful in the completion of the plan.
- Under policy 1 of the plan: Sustainable Development; an Independent Housing Assessment was undertaken which showed that 22% of residents wished to downsize during the next 2-10 years, and the top two types of accommodation requested were two/three bed semi-detached houses and bungalows, the least preferred housing was four bed dwellings.
- They are pleased to note that 23 affordable houses are included in the application but disappointed to note that only three, three bed bungalows are included. The responses to the consultation expressed the view that Carlton needs more suitable accommodation for the elderly.
- Policy 8: Development and Design Principles states ‘the height of new buildings shall be in keeping with the height of neighbouring properties and demonstrate how heights of the development will not be overbearing or dominant in the existing street scene’.
- There are only three dwellings in Carlton with more than two storeys and are all within the Conservation Area.
- The recent decision to refuse the Warwick Avenue application was based upon policies 6 and 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, object to the inclusion of three storey dwellings on the site.
- In the view of the recent announcement that Bassetlaw has a 7.9 years housing supply, it would be helpful for confirmation in the public domain that the application before you is necessary.

- The Neighbourhood Planning Group does not object in principle to the site, but the larger brownfield site at Firbeck Pit has already been granted permission.
- The Neighbourhood Plan is going to Referendum later in the month and Members have expressed great concern that the Firbeck Pit site will remain an eyesore, a Health and Safety problem and a target for anti-social behaviour.

Mrs A Emmerson spoke in objection to the application as a local resident, she commented that:

- She lived at 40 Pinfold Drive and is representing the local residents in the village.
- She understands the need for new housing in our towns and villages but is greatly saddened by the loss of the green fields in the village, especially as there is a brownfield site for development of 450 houses at Firbeck Pit has already been granted.
- It is essential that the housing mix reflects the needs of the local community as represented in the Neighbourhood Plan and Bassetlaw's housing needs for the elderly.
- The Five Year Housing Statement already shows a deliverable housing supply; only a small number will be suitable retirement style properties.
- Carlton's ongoing Neighbourhood Plan and surveys show that 21% of the population over the age of 65 have expressed a desire to downsize to two bed houses or bungalows and stay in the village.
- The proposal only shows three bungalows, this does not meet the needs of the village.
- She believes that any development in the village should consider the needs and requirements of the residents in the village.
- Amenity will be comprised by this development.
- The Neighbourhood Plan specifies that there should be a green buffer between the existing estate and the new development. This buffer adjacent to the boundary is only 8 metres wide.
- Instead of a green buffer there will be a hammer head and 20 car parking spaces, this will cause noise disturbance from traffic and a loss of privacy.
- She has spoken with the developer about their concerns and made suggestions for alternative layouts but from this there was no avail.
- Mrs Emmerson asked that Members reject the application on the grounds that it is contrary to policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and because if the adverse impact the development will have on the amenity of the village.

Councillor Scotthorne spoke in objection to the application as the Ward Member, he advised that:

- He has sent in his objections to the application which are listed in the report.
- Highway safety is a concern on Doncaster Road, in the past four weeks; four RTA's have been on this road.
- The Neighbourhood Plan was put together when Bassetlaw did not have a five year land supply, as the site is outside of the Carlton in Lindrick development boundary and Bassetlaw has a 7.9 year land supply, this should be enough to refuse the application.
- Help is needed to maintain existing services in the village.
- The doctors and school are both oversubscribed already without further development in the village.
- Public transport is already an issue in the village.
- Local residents have expressed frustration about the development; signs had been put up by the developer to say that these houses are to be built "not before time". This has brought on a lot of confusion for local residents.

Councillor Pidwell spoke in objection to the application as the Ward Member, he advised that:

- He has a reputation for being pro-development and tonight he represents residents who recognise that new houses are required which are overall beneficial to the community.
- If the application was outline permission he wouldn't be objecting but as it is for detailed permission he is.

- Councillor Bowles gave details regarding three storey dwellings within Carlton in Lindrick, these need to be taken into account.
- The Neighbourhood Plan stipulates that there should be a green buffer between the site and Pinfold Drive. Map 2, which is integral to policy 4, depicts a wide buffer of 30 metres. The exact width is not defined in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The proposed detailed plans show that in one place the green buffer is only 8 metres wide, this is where the green buffer matters as it is opposite the existing property at 40 Pinfold. This means that their living room will look out onto a car park for 14 vehicles. This is extreme intrusion and will have an impact of noise and light to the residents at 40 Pinfold Drive.
- A similar site in Tuxford was refused by the Committee; the developer appealed but lost the appeal. In announcing her judgment the inspector gave a considerable weight to the loss of amenity for one existing house. That was for a bigger development than tonight's 151 dwellings.
- This example shows that this is perfectly reasonable to refuse or defer applications for large developments because of one resident's amenity would be adversely affected.
- Avant's proposed mix offers some three bed open market properties but over develops the four bed market and ignores the two bed open market properties.
- The community is disappointed with the lack of bungalows on the site as these are the property type that most associated with retirement housing.

Mr D Abbott spoke in support of the application as the agent, he advised that:

- He is the Associate Director of DLP Planning Ltd representing the applicant Avant Homes whom are delighted to have the opportunity to develop the application site East of Doncaster Road.
- Whilst the District can currently demonstrate a 5 year land supply, the application site benefits from an emerging allocation in Policy 4 of the Carlton-in-Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan. This plan carries significant weight from a material planning perspective having progressed through examination. As, such the principle for residential development of the site is firmly established.
- Emerging Policy 4 identifies key development requirements, such as the green landscape buffer between established properties to the south, provision of usable open space and appropriate housing mix.
- All these aims and objectives have been embraced, resulting in the exemplar scheme which is before you. The Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Group offer a position of no objection, reflecting the scheme adherence to their allocation policy aspirations.
- Through schemes such as 'Help to Buy' and part exchange incentives, the development would provide a wide range of house types that would appeal to both young couples and families, in turn freeing up house stock.
- The affordable housing has been limited to clusters of no more than nine plots in four district areas from a site user perspective.
- Written confirmation has been received from Avant Homes that they have an agreement in place with a registered provider, Derwent Living, who are firmly in support of the layout and mix of the affordable provision.
- The scheme appearance has been developed to assimilate well within the general locality of the site. From a design and materials perspective, the affordable provision will be constructed to the same external specification as the market plot provision.
- Work has been carried out closely with officers and key statutory consultees throughout the pre-application and submission processes, resulting in no statutory objections against the scheme.
- Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have been instrumental in the design for relevant highway layout, and in particular main site access.
- Bungalows are included in the development along with a small number of three storey dwellings, the latter proposed in one central location set back from the primary road by a

private drive. The purpose of this unit grouping is 'sense of place' design driven, with the aspiration to create a focal point crescent within the site.

- To ensure that the proposed infrastructure is in place to support the development on delivery, Avant Homes is committed to providing full suite of planning obligations requested in addition to CIL contributions in excess of £100,000.
- Avant Homes are comfortable with the Grampian condition proposed for the adjacent parcel land restricting future development.

(Councillor D G Pidwell and S Scotthorne left the meeting)

Members raised questions/comments regarding the following:

- The development will put strain on the school in the village.
- The site is within the Neighbourhood plan but concerned about the green buffer.
- Impressed that the application is for full planning permission.
- Concerned with the lack of smaller houses.
- Neighbourhood Plans need to be more specific when outline retirement homes.
- The large development will put strain on the village infrastructure.
- Has soil testing been done on the site and will this be monitored?
- How prominent will the three storey dwellings be on the site?

In response to questions/comments raised the Head of Regeneration advised that more detail had been asked from education, the projection figures were outlined to members in relation to proposed developments and available school places.

It was advised that the application was previously deferred in order to receive further information regarding an area behind the site that was identified in the Neighbourhood Plan but not within the red edge of the application site boundary. A condition can be on this piece of land to restrict further houses being developed given the ambition of the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver 150 in this location.

The Head of Regeneration relayed to Members that the definition of affordable housing had recently changed in the 2018 revision to the National Planning Policy Framework and this means that affordable housing is not solely available as social rent but in other forms too including discounted open market sale. Therefore, the identified 2 bedroom affordable units on the site could be made available for discounted sale and still meet the revised definition.

The Case Officer advised that the Neighbourhood Plan does require a mix of houses but doesn't specify a quantity; this development proposes a mix of units types and bedroom numbers. Therefore, the development has met the spirit of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Planning Officer outlined to Members the minimum housing number requirement for Carltons strategic growth as required by National Planning Policy, along with the suggested growth cap figures for Neighbourhood Plan development in the locality.. It was reiterated that the Neighbourhood Plan highlights a growth figure of 560 dwellings. This includes 400 on the Firbeck Colliery site (that has a resolution to grant permission but the permission has not been formally released yet), 150 from this site and 10 from a smaller site. Therefore the approval of this site meets with the agreed housing figure established in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Case Officer advised that surveys have been completed on the site for the soil, and that the Environmental Health Pollution Control Officer has has stated that the levels of contamination on the site are not harmful to public health.

The Chair raised an additional question regarding the location of the three storey properties and invited the case officer to comment on their acceptability. He responded that there are only six, three storey dwellings proposed in the development, these are all located in the centre of the site surrounded by other dwellings so will not be clearly visible amongst the wider development and

they have less impact upon the peripheral countryside. Further, land levels are lower inside the site than on the adjacent highway boundary so the development impact is lowered.

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.

(Councillor D G Pidwell and S Scotthorne returned to the meeting)

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

74. 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 8.35pm)