

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the virtual meeting held on Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2020 via Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** D Pidwell (Chair)

H Brand, D Challinor, S Fielding, G Freeman, G Oxby, M Quigley MBE, M Richardson, N Sanders, L Schuller and B Tomlinson.

Officers in attendance: B Alderton-Sambrook, E Hinsley, D Jones, J Krawczyk, J Lavender and S Wormald.

(Meeting commenced at 6.30pm).

The Chair welcomed all to the virtual Planning Committee and explained that councils have been enabled to hold virtual meetings in order to allow business to be conducted while maintaining social distancing due to the outbreak of Covid-19. He then introduced Members and Officers by doing a roll call. The Chair outlined that in the event of the livestream failing or Members losing connection the meeting would be adjourned to allow the connection to be re-established. He also reminded participants to take appropriate safety precautions from their place of livestreaming.

#### **85. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Charlesworth.

#### **86. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

##### **(a) Members**

A pecuniary declaration of interest was made by Councillor Pidwell for P.A.19/01360/OUT. He advised that he would leave the meeting prior to discussion of this item and Vice-Chair, Councillor Fielding would step into the role of Chair. A non-pecuniary declaration was also made by Councillor Schuller for P.A.19/01360/OUT. She remained in the meeting.

##### **(b) Officers**

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

#### **87. MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020 be approved.

#### **88. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 18<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2020 AND 2<sup>ND</sup> JUNE 2020.**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020 and 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2020 be noted.

#### **89. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST**

**RESOLVED** that the Outstanding Minutes List be noted.

## SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

### Key Decisions

None.

### Other Decisions

None.

## 90. 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) Planning Applications

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Location and Proposal</u>
19/01360/OUT	Muller Property Group	Land North Of Bigsby Road Retford <b>DN22 6SE</b>  Outline Planning Application with Some Matters Reserved (Approval Being Sought for Access) for Residential Development of up to 170 Dwellings (Resubmission of P.A. 18/01625/OUT).

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning application with some matters reserved (Approval Being Sought for Access) for a residential development of up to 170 dwellings (Resubmission of P.A. 18/01625/OUT) on land north of Bigsby Road, Retford.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent to the urban form of Retford, with two access points proposed off the end of Bigsby Road and Palmer Road. The indicative layout links the two access roads with cul-de-sacs further into the site. The site in question consists of 7.4 hectares of agricultural land, with a drainage ditch and a public footpath crossing the middle of the site and another public footpath running along the southern boundary. It is bound to the north and west by open fields, to the east Longholme Farm and to the south by existing housing. The site slopes gently downwards in a north easterly direction and is currently undeveloped.

Site plans and photographs were shown.

The Planning Development Manager presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees were given. No objections had been raised from statutory consultees. 70 letters of objection had been received along with one letter of support from members of the public and other interested parties. Retford Civic Society and the owner of nearby farmland have also raised objections.

The previous application was refused on the grounds that the development would result in an unacceptable impact on the surrounding landscape. However an independent landscape

architect has assessed the applicant's visual impact assessment and concluded that the impact on the surrounding landscape character would not be significant. It is therefore considered that the applicant has shown that the landscape and visual impacts identified will be limited and the development will not cause any demonstrable harm to the landscape character.

One of the main objections from residents has been the exacerbation of existing highways safety concerns. The Highways Authority have assessed the transport statement and proposed access arrangements and are satisfied that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact upon highways safety provided additional works to upgrade and signalise the Tiln Lane and Moorgate junction are implemented. School crossing patrols and road safety measures are also proposed in the vicinity of this junction.

Members of the public have also raised drainage and flooding concerns as there are surface water drainage issues in the area which would be worsened by this development. The Lead Local Flood Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council have not raised any objections to the proposal subject to conditions requiring a surface water drainage scheme.

The Planning Development Manager gave an overview of questions submitted by Members in advance of the meeting and his responses in relation to the weight of the Draft Local Plan, pedestrian cycle links throughout the site, maintenance of open spaces, offsite highway impacts, conditions on the improvement of hedgerows, whether there were any plans for the Council to dispose of land at the Tiln Lane / Moorgate junction and the notification of neighbouring occupiers.

Mr Middleton spoke in objection to the development on the following grounds:

- The loss of the only safe, green walking area in this part of Retford;
- Too few days' notice in the current pandemic when many residents do not have IT facilities. This is contrary to the Council's policy of listening to the voice of the community;
- This area becomes dangerously congested at the start and end of the school day. Driving down the road at these times is already difficult as cars are double parked and HGVs are regularly passing through while parents and children try to cross the road. There have already been two child fatalities within the last decade.
- Approvals for housing developments in safer locations already exist, including developments at the north end of Tiln Lane at Treswell Gardens.

Mr Steve Bourne, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application:

- Worked proactively with officers since the original application was refused to remove any issues;
- An external landscape consultant appraisal has confirmed that the visual impact would be extremely limited and the development would not result in any demonstrable harm to the landscape character;
- The Highways Authority has confirmed that there would be not be an unacceptable impact on highways safety with proposed contributions to junction capacity improvements and a school crossing patrol. The minor concerns on internal layout can be resolved at reserved matters stage;
- There will be contributions towards bus stops and services, an onsite locally equipped play area and to Retford Library to increasing stock levels;
- The education response is that there is existing capacity within the area;
- The provision of 25% affordable housing which equates to 43 dwellings;
- There have been no objections from any consultees;

- The overall benefits of the development will significantly outweigh any harm;
- The site will provide construction jobs and bring new households to the area providing financial support for local services and future growth opportunities;
- The development will increase the amounts the Council receives in council tax receipts and new homes bonuses.

Councillor Susan Shaw, Counsellor for Retford East spoke in opposition on behalf of the residents on the following grounds:

- There have been 70 objections to this proposed development and over 200 on the last occasion from people living in and around the area;
- Concerns regarding traffic around the school. HGV lorries often get stuck on Tiln Lane due to cars parked on either side of the road with children and parents arriving and leaving. This would be compounded by a development site under construction on Tiln Lane which will also impact on traffic when properties are completed;
- Another site has already been granted planning permission nearby at Longholme Road;
- The two proposed access points on Bigsby Road and Palmer Road are residential streets with cars parking along the road at all hours;
- Highways Authority states that there is a danger of over-capacity in the area and the transport assessment identifies the space around Tiln Lane and Moorgate junction as small and would be constrained;
- A traffic light system is proposed but residents feel that this will only compound the situation as HGV lorries will block access and egress points at that junction and will also create problems on traffic flow from Moorgate and off Tiln Lane;
- Inappropriate extension to countryside.

Members raised questions and concerns regarding:

- What the recommendation was last time the application came to committee;
- The environmental impact on air quality and the possible effects on children by exposure to additional fumes caused by adding traffic lights outside the school;
- Whether the Highways Authority consider that the effect on highways has been mitigated by the modifications proposed to the junction;
- Clarification on the potential contamination of the site and the grade of the agricultural land;
- The amount of traffic using the access points at Tiln Lane, Palmer Road and Bigsby Road and the proposed traffic mitigation measures;
- The development would be encroaching into the countryside, towards Clarborough and Welham and the loss of views;
- The storage and collection of bins;
- Clarification on whether the junction will be operating at capacity even after the signalisation and how the contribution would be allocated;
- Whether the development at North Road be a consideration to take into account;
- The limited car parking in Retford;
- Clarification on the mitigation measures for the school.

In response to the questions raised, members were advised that:

- Officers recommended the refusal of the application in May 2019 as it was felt that the development would be a discordant feature within its surroundings and would have a detrimental impact on the landscape character. The applicant has since commissioned a landscape visual impact assessment which concluded that there would be no

demonstrable harm caused by the development. This was also independently verified by a chartered landscape architect;

- There has not been an air quality assessment and there are no air quality issues have been identified in that area. The signalisation of the junction has already been approved and will increase its capacity;
- The Highways Authority consider that the impact is acceptable and can be mitigated, with several conditions and contributions being recommended;
- Environmental Health recommended that an investigation be conducted to ensure any contamination found is mitigated and remediated correctly. The land is classified as moderate quality with 96% classed as agricultural land, grade 3B, and 4% classed as non- agricultural;
- The Highways Authority uses systems to model and calculate trip generation and has concluded that the effect is acceptable;
- Bin storage and collection will be considered at reserved matters stage, the Council will ensure that there is enough room to store the necessary number of bins and that the highways enable access for refuse crews;
- The junction has been modelled at within 10% of its capacity and contributions would be used to make further improvements with the Highways Authority deciding how best to allocate the contribution;
- If there was any identifiable harm to the North Road development this could be a material consideration, however none have been identified;
- Not aware of any plans to expand car parks although this is for the Council to review;
- The impact is to be mitigated by a school crossing patrol in addition to the works at the junction.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION** – Grant subject to conditions and the execution of a S106 agreement/unilateral undertaking.

Voting for taking this course of action:

**FOR:** Councillors S Fielding and D Pidwell.

**AGAINST:** Councillors H Brand, D Challinor, G Freeman, G Oxby, M W Quigley, M Richardson, N Sanders, L Schuller and B Tomlinson.

**ABSTAIN:** None

**COMMITTEE DECISION** – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The access road is unsuitable for the amount of traffic that would be generated by this site;
- The harm to the landscape and encroachment into the countryside;
- The environmental impact as no air quality control assessment has been done;
- Highways safety, particularly with regards to the children at the nearby school;
- The site would be out of character with the existing settlement;
- The site would extend Retford further towards the villages of Clarborough and Welham;
- The severe impact on the junction at Tiln Lane and Moorgate and over capacity of road junctions.

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

Councillor Pidwell advised that he would now step aside as Chair with Councillor Fielding, the Vice-Chair stepping into the role.

(Councillor Pidwell left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Location and Proposal</u>
19/01280/FUL	Bersahill	Land At Common Lane Harworth <b>DN11 8LW</b>  Demolition of Two Dwellings and Erection of Twenty Six New Dwellings with Construction of New Road off Common Lane.

Members were advised that full planning permission was being sought for the demolition of two dwellings and erection of 26 new dwellings with construction of a new road off Common Lane in Harworth. The land is currently an open and overgrown parcel of land following the demolition of the majority of the former late 20th century local authority Airey style houses. Two houses remain on site (with one still occupied) as does the hard surfaced access road into the site from Common Lane.

It is proposed to demolish the two existing houses and redevelop the whole site with 26 new dwellings. The mixture of the dwellings as proposed is as follows:

- 9 x 3 bed detached bungalows;
- 4 x 2 bed semi-detached bungalows;
- 8 x 4 bed detached house;
- 5 x 3 bed detached house.

Site plans, photographs and dwelling designs were shown.

The Major Projects Officer advised that there were no objections from any consultees. He also clarified that NCC Highways Authority have not objected to the site on highways safety grounds or its impact on the highway network but advised that the scheme does not make the best use of the site as regards to access and linkages to the surrounding area.

There were no letters of objection and Harworth and Bircotes Town Council is supportive of the scheme, commenting that the bungalows had been requested by residents.

The site is adjacent to a Grade 2 listed barn but it is not considered that the development will be harmful to its setting and the Council's Conservation Officer is also supportive of the scheme. There is existing access to the site from Common Lane which will be used for 25 of the dwellings with plot 24 being accessed by a private drive off Styrrup Road. The Applicant has provided information on electric charging points on site and arrangements for residents with mobility issues. A bat survey of the existing houses and a newt survey of the surrounding area have been completed and the Wildlife Trust are satisfied with the mitigation measures included in the report. A contribution has also been requested to improve the nearest play area.

The Major Projects Officer gave a summary of questions submitted by Members prior to the meeting and his responses which related to the highways safety of the access point for plot 24 and the wildlife enhancements.

Councillor June Evans spoke in support, on behalf of Harworth and Bircotes Town Council on the following grounds:

- An ideal use of a brownfield site;

- Within settlement boundaries;
- The addition of 26 dwellings will have a minimal impact on infrastructure;
- A great improvement to the site and will remove the current eyesore;
- The mix of housing, including affordable homes, which reflects the needs of the community;
- The provision of electric vehicle charging points, including for mobility scooters;
- 10% gain in biodiversity.

Members raised questions and concerns regarding:

- Whether the site is owned by the local authority;
- The offer to the occupants still living on site;
- Whether the public consultation was a consideration in the proposal to grant the application;
- Whether any work had been undertaken with the Highways Agency in response to their concerns over vehicle manoeuvrability;
- The location of the nearest recreation park.

In response to questions raised, Members were advised that the Council does own the land and is working in partnership with a company to deliver housing. The residents still living on site will be offered one of the new properties with that property being built first to allow the occupant to be rehoused prior to development of the rest of the site. The public consultation did not have an impact of the proposal to grant the application as no letters of support or objection had been made other than from the town council. There were discussions with the Highways Authority however the alterations they requested would have made the development undeliverable. The closest recreation ground is currently the Tommy Simpson recreation ground but there are plans to create another in the vicinity of the site which this contribution would go towards funding.

Members commented that it was good to see developers working with the community and looking at the local needs. The provision of specialist care affordable housing was also praised.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION** – Grant permission subject to S106 agreement.

**COMMITTEE DECISION** – Grant planning permission subject to S106 agreement.

**91. 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 ended at 8:35pm).