

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the virtual meeting held on Wednesday 22nd July 2020 via Microsoft Teams

Present: Councillor D Pidwell (Chair)

Councillors H M Brand, M Charlesworth, S Fielding, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley MBE, M Richardson, N Sanders, L Schuller and B Tomlinson.

Officers in attendance: C Hopkinson, 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.

92. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Challinor.

93. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

94. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24TH JUNE 2020

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 24th June 2020 be approved.

95. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 15TH AND 29TH JUNE 2020.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 15th and 29th June 2020 be noted.

96. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes List be noted.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

97. 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

Members were presented with one appeal decision which was dismissed by the Inspector. The Planning Development Manager gave a summary of the decision.

RESOLVED that the appeal decision be received.

(c) Planning Applications

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Location and Proposal</u>
20/00512/FUL	Gleeson Regeneration Ltd	Residential Development of 127 Two, Three and Four Bedroom Dwellings, Ancillary Works and Construct New Access (Re-submission of 19/00852/FUL) Land west of Queen Elizabeth Crescent, Rhodesia (access from Mary Street, S80 3JF and Cecil Close, S80 3HU).

Members were advised that the application sought full planning permission to erect a residential development of 127 two, three and four bedroom dwellings, ancillary works and to construct new access.

The application is a resubmission of an application that was refused at Planning Committee on 1 April 2020 and is now the subject of a forthcoming appeal. The reasons for refusal were outlined within the Committee report. The application is almost identical to that which was previously refused permission, save for the creation of a turning head in the south east corner of the site and the provision of a footpath link to Rhodesia Bridleway 2.

Slides were used to show site plans, proposed access, layout, floorplans, elevations and photographs.

The Planning Development Manager presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. No objections had been raised from statutory consultees. Eleven letters of objection had been received and a petition containing 80 signatures. A local Ward Member has also objected to the application. A summary of comments received was contained within the report.

Following the publication of the Committee Agenda a late objection has been received from the Diocese of Southwell and Nottingham Trust who run Haggonfields Primary School. They have raised concerns that Notts County Council have not requested any contribution towards education provision when an education contribution was required previously and from other

schemes in the area. They raise comments about the standard of the school, classroom size and toilet facilities which need improvement. They do not feel that Notts County Council's position is justified and that they have not engaged with the school.

The Development Team Manager advised that the decision is a balance and permissions should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In relation to the previous reasons for refusal the applicant has submitted a Highways Impact Assessment and the Strategic Highways have not raised an objection to the development and have stated that the necessary road infrastructure improvements required to mitigate the cumulative traffic impact would be funded by CIL. In regards to education Nottinghamshire County Council have assessed the current capacity within local schools and have confirmed that based on current data there is a projected surplus of places within the Primary Planning Area, they have confirmed that a contribution toward primary education improvements is not required in this instance. Therefore it would not be justified to request a contribution.

Members were advised that there are two nearby sites of ecological importance. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have indicated that the development could benefit the adjacent local wildlife site, Lady Lee Quarry, by diverting surface water run-off into the water into the pond. Fluctuating water levels has been known to dry out, impacting on the wildlife that uses the pond.

Mr J Short had submitted a written statement in objection to the development which was read out to the Committee. The Committee were advised that whilst Mr Short's statement referred to photographs, the circulation of material was against the Speaking Protocol and the photographs would not be circulated to Members.

"The minor changes in this new application by Gleeson's are obviously there to allow for a re-submission. The reality is that nothing has changed with regards to the reasons for the application's refusal by the Planning Committee at the meeting on 1st April.

Whilst Gleeson's hold great emphasis on traffic movements at the A57 roundabout and having no major objections from County Highways – again one would assume the traffic generated figures for this development would have been submitted in isolation and not as a compounded problem associated with all the other combined developments both in and adjacent the village. The main issue, is still unaddressed and totally ignored by Gleeson's is the huge increase in traffic on the one entrance road into the village itself and over all the small village streets (not main roads).

Having already demonstrated the true volume of all the traffic from the village's combined development and the reality of access via Cecil Close in my original application. I would also draw your attention to Tylden Road, which is the main access road in and out of our village. Whilst the entrance/exit onto the Shireoaks/Worksop Road has been recorded there is little by way of fact regarding it's continuation onto Steetley Lane at the western end of the village. This country lane is practically a single track road with a 3 ton weight limited single lane humpback bridge. On entry to the village there is a height restriction railway bridge on a blind bend that prevents lorries or delivery traffic entering the same. This is the only viable way out of the village when the main road is closed due to a traffic incident or as in the recent past when it was closed for over a week due to fires at the recycling centre (on more than one occasion) and is further reason to refuse this development on both the level of traffic and safety concerns associated with it.

Again, I would re-iterate the point that the housing stock is not needed and all of the new development within a mile or two of our village have had the infrastructure put in place first,

by way of new roundabouts to main carriageways, new service requirements before building has taken place and non on it over small village roads or streets.

I enclose photographs for the planning record regarding one road in and out on the village and my concerns about the suitability of these roads to withstand further traffic movements can be clearly seen from these images.

Photo 1 – western end of village onto Steetley Lane (recently white lined by County Highways) reflects the single vehicle carriageway width with its safety and congestions issues.

Photo 2 – eastern end of Tylden Road. The motorists view from the village approaching the blind humpback canal bridge taken from the opposite carriageway as a vehicles stationary at junction are not visible when viewed from behind on the same side of carriageway.”

Councillor D R Pressley, ward Member for Worksop North West, spoke in objection on the following grounds:

- The small village of Rhodesia only has one shop, the post office.
- The application seeks to use a small cul-de-sac for all site traffic. The Committee will be aware how tight the road is from previous site visits.
- Residents will have to endure noise from the development that could take years to complete.
- Construction traffic will block drives and children will be in danger from HGV deliveries.
- The constriction traffic will have to use the road past the school causing difficulty for parents and children.
- The development would increase the size of Rhodesia by a third without any new infrastructure, new shops or facilities. The application will only bring for existing residents more houses, construction and noise.
- Further dwellings are not needed, Bassetlaw has a ten year housing land supply.
- Up to 250 cars could use Cecil Close.
- The application would increase traffic in the area, there is a lack of infrastructure and no new facilities.

(Due to technical issues with the Applicants sound the meeting was adjourned for ten minutes)

As the issues with Applicant's sound could not be resolved, the Applicant proposed that he submit his written presentation, which could then be read on his behalf.

A written statement was read out on behalf of Mr M Jackson, the Applicant, in support of the application:

“Chair, my name is Matt Jackson and I am Land Director for Gleeson Regeneration. The application before you was previously refused and unfortunately we were unable to attend that committee due to the covid pandemic situation and lock down that ensued around that time. We have subsequently re-submitted the application with additional information addressing the reasons for refusal.

As a reminder of what Gleeson are all about now we are back up and running at almost full capacity following the easing of lock down measures, we specialise in the provision of entry level housing aimed at first time buyers, giving customers at the lower end of the housing market a chance to afford to buy their own home.

The proposal before you is for the development of 127 such homes. We take special care in ensuring selling prices are affordable to young first time buyer. On this development we intend to sell new houses with a starting price of around £120,000 for a two bed family home.

When sold with “Help to Buy” our 2 bed at Queen Elizabeth Crescent would have a reduced initial mortgageable sum of £90,000, making it affordable to a working couple on the minimum wage. The weekly cost of this ‘Help to Buy’ mortgage, based on a 2 year fixed rate product would be in the region of just £70/week. Often much more affordable than renting even a Local Authority house.

In the aftermath of the pandemic, Gleeson are determined to focus on selling to key workers who have done so much to help this country through the emergency. Since the beginning of May, Gleeson have offered our Key Worker Priority Programme including £1000 of free customer extras or 6 months mortgage paid (up to the value of £2000) and 48hr priority in reserving plots prior to general public release, among other initiatives. It is our intention going forward to prioritise these people and our hope is that ¾s of our future sales are to such key workers. It has to be said that historically around 2/3s of Gleeson customers would have been from this group in any case.

Gleeson will also roll out our Community Matters programme on this site, covering a number of things from apprenticeships to sponsorship of local junior sports teams.

I am also pleased to confirm Gleeson do not and will not sell homes to landlords or sub-letters ensuring that our homes are only sold to those who actually need them.

The development at Queen Elizabeth Crescent Rhodesia is for 127 plots and will see an investment of around £10.1 million by Gleeson. Experience tells us that around 1 third of this (around £3.3 million) will be spent on wages, either directly employed labour, or indirectly via suppliers, subcontractors etc. with a large proportion of this being within the local economy.

One of the areas of concern when the application was previously heard at committee was the impact of construction traffic on the immediate area. In this regard we are happy to provide a detailed construction management plan.”

Members asked questions/ raised comments regarding:

- The comments submitted by the Diocese of Southwell and Nottingham regarding Haggonfields Primary School.
- The education contribution which was requested in April with the original application that is no not required for this application.
- The condition of the building is not the developer’s responsibility to improve, this is a matter between the Trustees and Notts County Council.
- The development offers affordable housing and property types that are in demand in the District.
- Access, traffic and highway safety.
- The infrastructure in the area needs improving.
- The site is a great site on the edge of the countryside. There are industrial units nearby for employment and supermarkets.
- The proposed road link and land ownership.
- The original application included a contribution towards transport and bus stop improvements.

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

- Notts County Council refresh their pupil projections annually. The requirement for an education contribution as part of the previous application was based on last year’s projections. Based on this year’s projections a contribution is not required.
- The requirements of the S106 are based on considerations at this point in time. CIL requirements must be necessary and must be able to demonstrate that they are

required. At this point in time it would be unreasonable based on the local education authorised comments to request an education contribution.

- As part of the original application in April the developer was happy to pay the education contribution that was required at that time. The applicant is paying for ecological enhancements as part of the application and has shown clear intention to mitigate the impact of the development.
- Strategic Highways look at the wider highways network and identify any required improvements cumulatively.
- Condition 14 will address construction traffic and agree a route.
- In relation to transport and bus stop provision Notts County Council are do not require a contrition from the scheme as improvements will be funded from elsewhere.

An elected Member proposed that the application be deferred to a future meeting for clarity on the education contribution, the proposal was seconded. Members voted on that course of action and it was resolved not to defer the application.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to conditions and the applicant entering in to a S106 agreement.

Voting for taking this course of action:

FOR: Councillors M Charlesworth, G Freeman, M W Quigley MBE, M Richardson and D Pidwell.

AGAINST: Councillors H M Brand, S Fielding, G A N Oxby, N Sanders, L Schuller and B Tomlinson.

ABSTAIN: None

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- The lack of clarity regarding the education contribution and primary school capacity.
- The proposed narrow access on Cecil Close and Mary Street.
- Increase in traffic and highway safety concerns.

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

98. 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 8:27pm).