

PLANNING COMMITTEE

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

Present:

Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)

Councillors D Brett, 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: K France, C Hopkinson, D Jones, J Krawczyk and M Tagg (Agenda Item No. 6(b) only).

(Meeting commenced at 6.30pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting, introduced Members and officers 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.)

The Chair welcomed D Jones, Major Projects Planner and J Krawczyk, Planning Development Manager to their first meeting of the Committee.

75. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor H Burton.

76. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

77. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6TH FEBRUARY 2019

The Chair advised that since the last meeting there has been a referendum on the Carlton-in-Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan and the Plan has been made.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 6th February 2019 be approved.

78. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 21ST JANUARY AND 11TH FEBRUARY 2019

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 21st January and 11th February 2019 be received.

79. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes List be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

80. 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 Designation of 'Retford Station and West Fields' Conservation Area

Members were presented with a report which sought approval to designate a conservation area in Retford, incorporating land and buildings at Station Road, Victoria Road, Cobwell Road, Albert Road, Queen Street, The Crescent, Westfield Road and Pelham Road. A map showing the proposed conservation area was appended to the report.

Members were advised that as part of the review and appraisal process of the adjacent Retford conservation area in early 2012, a number of non-designated heritage assets were identified in this area. In addition, several suggestions were made by local residents with regard to establishing a Conservation Area, particularly around the railway station and the Queen Street/The Crescent areas. Due to work pressures, it was decided that no further conservation area designations would be pursued at that time.

There are several historic buildings (all currently regarded as heritage assets) within the proposed conservation area which are currently at risk of being lost or irreparably harmed, especially the former Ordsall Brewery. In addition, there have been several recent enquires for new development on small plots in several locations, that have also made the designation of the conservation area more pressing. Such schemes have the potential to cause harm to the character of the area if not properly considered in terms of the area's special character and appearance, this being a small and distinctive part of the town, essentially a Victorian suburb established after the construction of the Great Northern Railway.

With regard to pre-designation consultation, whilst it is good practice, the Council does not need to carry out consultation before it designates a conservation area. In certain circumstances, consultation may result in landowners carrying out works to buildings (including demolition) which would otherwise be considered harmful to the conservation area's character and appearance if designated.

The Planning Conservation Officer advised that if Members resolve to designate the Conservation Area, a letter, map, schedule and designation statement would be sent to every household in the area. Other interested parties would also be notified (e.g. Retford Civic Society, Nottinghamshire County Council, etc).

Members commented on the amount of work that had gone into producing the report and the excellent knowledge of officers.

RESOLVED that:

1. The designation of the proposed Retford Station and West Fields Conservation Area be approved.
2. Delegated authority be given to officers of the Conservation Team to implement the designation of the Conservation Area.
3. Any future cost implications for employee structure be reported to Cabinet.

(c) Planning Application and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/01507/OUT	Mr Scholey	Outline planning with some matters reserved, approval sought for access for residential development of up to 24 dwellings, land south of Rynes, Folly Nook Lane, Ranskill

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission with some matters reserved for a residential development of up to 24 dwellings, with approval being sought for access. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting. Slides were used to show the site location, an indicative layout plan and photographs.

Members were advised that the site is located outside of, but adjacent to, the development boundary and adjacent to the built form of village. The site consists of 1.03 hectares of agricultural land. The site forms part of a larger area of land for which planning permission for the erection of up to 130 dwellings was dismissed at appeal in September 2017.

A summary of consultee comments received was given.

Members were advised that officers consider that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the negative aspects.

Councillor A Cooke spoke on behalf of Ranskill Parish Council. He advised that:

- It is not the first time the site has come forward for development, the previous application was recommended to grant by officers, rejected by councillors and dismissed at appeal.
- Councillors represent the people they live with and see on a regular basis.
- Villages need to keep their identity and not merge with others. This application goes some way to merging with Scrooby.
- If approved the developer will come back for more until they get their 100 house target.
- Residents are not saying no to any development however they should be where they want them not where developers want them.
- He asked that the application be refused as the development is inappropriate.

Mr C Darely spoke on behalf of the applicant and landowner, he commented that:

- The applicant lives locally and is a significant employer.
- The officers recommendation to grant is in favour of the sustainable development.
- The applicant has sought to address issues from the previous scheme which was considered unacceptable.
- The Inspector at appeal did not rule out any development in Ranskill, she was concerned that the development was too large of this village. This application is five times smaller than the previous proposal.
- The location is considered to be sustainable, Ranskill is defined as a rural service centre. The site is in walking distance to bus stops, a school, shop and a pub. New residents would help to sustain these services.
- There has been no objection from Highways.
- There is no flood risk; a suitable service water scheme can be achieved.
- Contributions would be made towards open space, bus stops and affordable homes. A CIL contribution would also be made.
- The scheme has many benefits and would provide much needed housing.

Members asked questions/ raised questions in relation to:

- The number of existing dwellings in the village.
- The number of extant permissions in the village.

- The expected growth in the village.
- The proximity of the site to the waste management facility.
- Comments from Nottinghamshire County Council Policy regarding the sterilisation risk.
- The proximity of the boundary to Scrooby and the merging of the villages,
- The Inspectors comments at the previous appeal regarding the limited public transport, particularly during the evening and that the vitality of community could be maintained with fewer new houses.
- The Council now has a 7.9 year supply of land for housing
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- Ranskill are currently producing a Neighbourhood Plan, which identifies where residents would like to see development.
- Folly Nook Lane is narrow and lacks a pedestrian footpath.
- The S106 Agreement is light with no contributions requested by Highways or Education.
- The benefits of the scheme in terms of the local and wider economy and the social contribution of future residents.
- The Inspectors comments in relation to the previous scheme considered that the site was acceptable and made no adverse comments about the site itself.

The Major Projects Planner commented on the Inspectors comments regarding the previous appeal, where she did not preclude the development of any housing. Each application should be considered on its own merit and there is no demonstrable harm to justify a refusal of planning permission. The Council currently has five-year supply of land for housing which is a significant consideration but all the benefits of the development need to be weighed against any harm.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement and the conditions as detailed within the report.

Voting for taking this course of action:

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

AGAINST: Councillors G Clarkson, 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 Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply.
- The lack of pedestrian facilities provided which would be to the detriment of highway safety.

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

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/00467/OUT	Lindrick Park Development Limited	Proposed residential development of houses, apartments, bungalows with associated adoptable access road, private courtyards and parking spaces, land to the north of Claylands Avenue, Worksop

Members were advised the application was considered by the Committee on 15th August 2018 where it was resolved to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement. A decision on the application has yet to be issued as the S106 remains uncompleted. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

Members were advised that the officer recommendation within the report is to refuse planning permission however since the report was published the applicant has indicated that they want to sign the S106 Agreement.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to enable the recommendation to be amended to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement being signed within eight weeks.

Members were advised that if the applicant signs the S106 Agreement before the next then a report would not need to be presented to the Committee.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to enable the recommendation to be amended to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement being signed within eight weeks.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
15/01265/OUT	Mr and Mrs James Edward	Deed of variation of S106 Legal Agreement (vary the definition of affordable housing) Olinda, Southgore Lane, North Leverton, Retford

Members were presented with an item which sought to vary the deed of variation of a S106 Agreement. Outline planning permission was granted for residential development on 6th June 2017 subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement. An application for reserved matters for the erection of 13 dwellings was subsequently approved in November 2018. The approved scheme identified 3, two bed dwellings as affordable units.

The applicant seeks to amend the definition of affordable housing within the S106 Agreement as since the completion of the S106 Agreement the definition has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

Members were advised that the request does not seek to remove the requirement to provide affordable housing from the development only to update the definition.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – That the deed of variation be agreed.

COMMITTEE DECISION – That the deed of variation be agreed.

(d) Development Management Performance Report Quarter 3 2018-19

Members were presented with a performance report for the Development Management function for the second quarter of 2018-19.

Members were given a summary of the report. The measures of performance outcomes and current positions for determining 'major' and 'non-major' applications were given.

The outcome of appeals against refused applications allowed was also given along with planning enforcement.

Members commented on the excellent work of officers. It was noted that the Enforcement Officer had been off ill and that the service had done well to keep enforcement matters moving.

The Chair advised that it has been suggested that Notts County Council officers attend the annual training for Members.

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.

81. 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 8.19pm)