

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 16th September, 2020 at MS Teams

Present: Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)

Councillors: S Fielding H M Brand
D Challinor M Charlesworth
G A N Oxby M Richardson
N J Sanders L Schuller

Officers in attendance: E Hinsley, J Krawczyk, J Lavender, S Wormald.

Apologies: G Freeman
M W Quigley MBE
B Tomlinson

(The meeting opened at 6.30 pm.)

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.

106 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Freeman, Quigley and Tomlinson.

107 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

108 Members

There were no declarations of interest received by Members.

109 Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

110 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 AUGUST 2020

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 26th August 2020 be approved.

111 MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 10 AND 24 AUGUST 2020

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 10th and 24th August 2020 be noted.

112 OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

RESOLVED that the outstanding minutes list be noted.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

113 REPORT(S) OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION

114 Public Interest Test

(Ms B Alderton-Sambrook, Head of Regeneration, has deemed that all Items on the Agenda are not confidential)

115 Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Location and Proposal</u>
19/01653/FUL	Rose & Co Developments Ltd	Land South Of Ranskill Churchyard, Great North Road, Ranskill, DN22 8NW. Erect 20 Dwellings (A Mix of 3, 4, and 5 Bedroomed Properties) With Associated Parking and Access and the Provision of Communal Open Space.

Members were advised that the application sought full planning permission to erect 20 dwellings (a mix of 3, 4 and 5 bedroomed properties) with associated parking and access and the provision of communal open space on land south of Ranskill Churchyard, Great North Road, Ranskill, DN 22 8NW.

The application site lies to the north of the settlement form of Torworth and covers an area of approximately 1.5 hectares and is enclosed with mature hedgerows. There is an existing field access off the Great North Road. Torworth stretches north along the A638, with the majority of the settlement lying to the east of the road. The settlement forms a continuous ribbon until it meets the southern edge of the Site. The northern edge of the site is bounded by the Ranskill Church Graveyard with the church lying some 270m further north.

It is proposed to erect 20 dwellings on the site with a new access being taken from Great North Road with the proposed dwellings being served by a private driveway which would extend through the site. In order to meet visibility splays three trees will need to be removed from Great North Road, however it is proposed to plant 48 trees within the development along with hedgerows.

Slides were used to show site plans, proposed access, layout and landscaping, dwelling designs and photographs of the current site.

It should be noted that Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have concerns regarding the internal layout of the site, specifically around vehicles emerging from the dwellings on to the private driveway.

Torworth and Ranskill Parish Town Councils have objected to the development and 11 letters of objection have also been received which included the following:

- The coalescence of the villages of Torworth and Ranskill;
- The site is outside the designated village boundary;
- Loss of agricultural land and natural habitats;
- The adverse impact on the serenity of the graveyard;
- Dwelling designs not in keeping with village character;
- Noise and disturbance caused by the construction;
- The detrimental impact on visual amenity;

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Overdevelopment, there is no need for another 20 dwellings.

The applicant has submitted a landscape and visual impact appraisal which concluded that the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the village setting and is only visible at a short distance. To assess the developments impact the Council contracted an independent chartered landscape architect who concluded that the scheme would not have a substantial visual impact on the surrounding landscape.

Councillor Paul Nicholls spoke in opposition on behalf of Ranskill and Torworth Parish Councils on the following grounds:

- The site falls outside of the development boundary;
- The development was included during its neighbourhood plan, however its overall rating (38%) was low compared to other sites and so it did not progress;
- The site is too close to the cemetery;
- Erosion of the villages separate identities;
- The site is not within walking distance of local amenities which will increase stress on highways, exacerbate parking and access issues.

Mr James Helliwell spoke in objection on the following grounds:

- Enough residential land has been identified within Torworth and Ranskill for 10 years and therefore this site is not necessary;
- Torworth residents would be expected to cover the additional costs from the increase in their settlement even though the site is in Ranskill who would therefore receive financial support;
- The development is not seeking to address the affordable housing issue;
- Concerns that the peaceful atmosphere of the adjacent cemetery will be affected;
- The application seeks to retain all internal roads privately which could potentially lead to a future gated community and hinder assimilation with the wider local community;
- The Highways Authority have recommended a refusal as the development would not offer a suitable and safe means of access;
- The Ranskill village plan has identified a suitable site to the north of the village which could accommodate 111 houses;
- The loss of open countryside and the coalescence of the two villages.

Mr Dean Dixon, the applicant, spoke in support of the application on the following grounds:

- The company supports the local economy by using local trades from Worksop, Retford and the surrounding areas;
- This development would maintain job security for the existing team as well as creating additional jobs;
- There are also 12 apprenticeships ongoing at present with additional roles to be generated should this development progress;
- All properties are spacious family homes on above average sized plots, including affordable homes, both houses and bungalows, all ranging between three and five bedrooms;
- The development has been designed to recreate the historic feel and heritage of Torworth, with the use of traditional materials and the plotting of houses around a courtyard.

In response to questions submitted by Members in advance of the meeting the Planning Development Manager advised that the County Council as the education authority have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate places arising from this development; the local planning authority do not consider the internal layout to have a detrimental effect on

PLANNING COMMITTEE

highway safety; it is considered that the removal of three street trees is mitigated by the planting proposed within the site; the nearest play facilities are approximately 850 metres away on Mattersey Road, Ranskill.

Members raised questions and concerns relating to:

- Clarification on the development's relation to Ranskill and Torworth Parish Councils;
- Whether any mining subsidence surveys have been completed to as the area has suffered from mining subsidence in the past;
- Whether building envelope boundaries can be used as a reason for refusal;
- The removal of trees and hedging;
- The Highways Authority's concerns regarding access to the site
- The Highways Authority's concerns regarding footways and pedestrian access;
- Whether there are any concerns around the refuse team being able to access and manoeuvre around the site;
- Regarding the removal of trees, is this a series of trees which would then be rendered visually inconsistent;
- The responsibility of the planted trees;
- The responsibility of the roads on the internal layout;
- Whether species included in the landscaping plan are indigenous to the area;

In response the Planning and Development Manager advised:

- The parish boundary runs directly along southern site border meaning that although the site will lie in Ranskill Parish, it will effectively be an extension to Torworth. Torworth will see the impact of the development but Ranskill will receive the CIL monies. However this would not be a material consideration for a refusal as the company will be paying all required contributions and so mitigating its impact.
- The Coal Authority has not identified the area as being high risk for development so there was no requirement to undertake any surveys. However footing and foundation solutions will have to be agreed with Building Control to ensure they are suitable for the land being developed.
- As neither village has a current neighbourhood plan it is considered that the core strategy is out of date and as such the boundaries cannot be afforded a great deal of weight and should not be used as a reason for refusal;
- The only removal of hedgerows is to facilitate the access point and the updated report shows that it is not considered that there is any unnecessary removal of trees or hedgerows;
- The Highways Authority has not raised concerns regarding access to the site. Their concerns relate to visibility on the internal layout, however, this can encourage safer driving and given the type of development the driveway will be predominantly used by residents and visitors.
- The proposed footways are a metre wide which the Highways Authority considers to be inadequate however officers have assessed this and determined it to be an acceptable arrangement as the character that the developer is attempting to capture would otherwise be eroded;
- A refuse wagon would be able to access, manoeuvre around the site and leave again safely;
- As the trees are not evenly spaced and in fact quite irregularly positioned this should not look incongruous;
- The maintenance of the landscaped areas on the site would fall to the applicant who has submitted a landscape management plan and a biodiversity management plan has also been set as one of the conditions;

PLANNING COMMITTEE

- The maintenance of roads would be the responsibility of the developer as a private driveway;
- Trees in the landscaping plan include, lime, white beam, apple, pear, cherry, scots pine, silver birch, field maple and magnolia.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant subject to conditions and the execution of a S106 agreement/ unilateral undertaking with the obligations as detailed within the Infrastructure/ Contributions and Highways sections of the Report.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant subject to conditions and the execution of a S106 agreement/ unilateral undertaking with the obligations as detailed within the infrastructure/Contributions and Highways sections of the Report.

116 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.

(The meeting closed at 8.00 pm.)