

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of the virtual meeting held on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> January 2021 via Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** Councillor D Pidwell (Chair)  
Councillors H M Brand, D Challinor, M Charlesworth, S Fielding, G Freeman, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley MBE, M Richardson, N Sanders and L Schuller.

Officers in attendance: E Hinsley, 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.

#### **143. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B Tomlinson.

#### **144. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

Councillor D Challinor declared a Level 2 Pecuniary Interest in PA 18/01210/OUT and left the meeting during this item.

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

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

#### **145. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2020**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020 be approved.

#### **146. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 30<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER AND 14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2020.**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 30<sup>th</sup> November and 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020 be noted.

#### **147. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST**

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

### **SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC**

#### **Key Decisions**

None.

## Other Decisions

None.

### 148. 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 Decision

Members were presented with one appeal decision. This related to application no. 19/00852/FUL - the erection of 128 two, three and four bedroomed dwellings, ancillary works and construct new access at land west of Queen Elizabeth Crescent, Rhodesia. The application was refused by Planning Committee and the appeal was then allowed.

Following a request by Members, the Planning Development Manager would contact Nottinghamshire County Council's Highways Authority and Education Contributions Team and ask if they could deliver a presentation of the next Planning Committee Training in May 2021.

#### (c) Planning Applications

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Location and Proposal</u>
18/01210/OUT	Harworth Estates	Land South Of Scrooby Road And North Of Snape Lane, Harworth.  Outline Application with all Matters Reserved for the Construction of up to 1300 Dwellings, a Public House/Restaurant, Public Open Space, Associated Remediation and Demolition, Access and Egress into and out of the Site, Proposed Estate Road and Associated Infrastructure.

(Cllr Challinor left the meeting).

Members were advised that permission was being sought for an outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 1300 dwellings, a public house and restaurant, public open space, associated remediation and demolition, access and egress into and out of the site, a proposed estate road and associated infrastructure.

The Planning Development Manager (PDM) delivered the report. The application site was the former Harworth Colliery. Part of the site has been developed with a new ASDA supermarket and housing as part of a previous planning permission. Work was ongoing on the adjacent land where the new housing was being built to provide the already approved infrastructure for the site and remediate the land to its former use before it could be safely developed.

Site maps, layouts and photos of the site in its current state were shown to Members.

There were no objections from statutory consultees other than Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) who raised an objection about the viability of the application. However, since

the report was written, the County Council withdrew their objection. Harworth Town Council wrote in support the application.

One letter of objection was raised by a member of the public.

Planning Policy CS1 contained limited weight in this decision-making process, however the Harworth and Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan provided a clear growth strategy for the settlements which included that the old colliery site should be redeveloped for mixed-use which would benefit the community now and in the future. Significant weight was given to the Neighbourhood Plan in the consideration of this scheme. It was considered that the principle of the development was acceptable and the site was already under an extended planning permission for its development.

Matters such as appearance, landscaping and layout would be reserved for consideration at a later stage. The applicant submitted an indicative masterplan which demonstrated how the site could be development. The proposals would bring a significant positive benefit to the community due to regeneration of the site, which if not developed, would continue to blight the character and visual impact of the land south of Harworth.

Access to the site from Scrooby Road and Blyth Road were already approved for development during the outline and subsequent reserved matters application for the northern part of site.

NCC Highways Authority raised no objections to the scheme, subject to conditions that highway elements were adequately provided for.

Doncaster Borough Council raised no objections towards the scheme.

As it was previously a colliery site, contamination of the ground through former mining processes was to be expected. In 2019, Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) confirmed the Contamination Remediation Works were acceptable, therefore it is considered unnecessary to impose a condition for the submission of a Land Contamination Survey as this had already been investigated and dealt with by the applicant.

Council consultees identified what infrastructure contributions were required to mitigate the negative impact of the development upon the area. The applicant submitted a viability assessment which was independently reviewed and verified by a Viability Assessor, who identified that the applicant could only provide £2.04 million in infrastructure contributions if affordable housing was not to be provided within the development. The County Council objected to the application as the applicant was not able to provide all of the contributions required. However, since the agenda for this meeting was published, the County Council withdrew their objection as the applicant agreed to make a further £1 million in contributions, bringing the total of S106 contributions to £3 million. The County Council recommended that these contributions should be used on primary and secondary education infrastructure improvements, as well as allowing for more flexibility in the S106 agreement to fund transport improvements in the area.

The applicant was in current discussions with Homes England to provide affordable housing within these developments.

In conclusion, priority was given for the redevelopment of the colliery site, which was a specified policy in the Harworth and Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan, and the benefits that this development would bring to the community. This was balanced against the negative impact of the scheme on the infrastructure of the area.

No questions from Members' were submitted to the Planning Development Manager prior to the meeting.

Joanne Neville of the Harworth Group, the Applicant, spoke in support of the application, outlining the following:

- Approval of this scheme would secure the regeneration of this brownfield site and its development for the next ten years;
- The delivery of the Simpson Park development was well underway with the Harworth Group having sold serviced land parcels to Jones Homes and Kier for the early phases;
- Should planning permission be granted, the Harworth Group was expecting to submit another planning application in a few weeks' time comprising enabling works including remediation, earthworks, infrastructure, roads and sewers to unlock the delivery of the next 600 homes as part of phase 2. The enabling works would cost up to £5 million and would commence in the spring this year. This investment was necessary to de-risk the site and attract large house builders with which to sell serviced land parcels for delivery of the next 600 new homes;
- The new homes would be built and occupied from next year onwards;
- The site was a challenging site given its previous use and the Harworth Group have undertaken extensive intrusive ground investigations to understand the conditions of the land they are building on;
- The Harworth Group have worked hard to put together a package of S106 obligations to mitigate the impacts of the development. This was evidenced within their viability report and cost plan, which has also been verified by the District Valuer;
- Unfortunately, whilst the Harworth Group continue to discuss with Homes England and their RP partners ways of delivering affordable housing, they were not able to commit to deliver any affordable housing outside of the existing £2 million S106 pot;
- As the PDM had already explained, the Harworth Group were able to reach an agreement with NCC such that they withdrew the objection and they subsequently agreed to commit a further £1 million to the S106 pot to enable additional education delivery towards the Serlby Park Academy extension. They were able to do this by further reducing profit margins as they recognised the long term nature of this scheme. This brought total of S106 contributions to £3 million.

In response to questions from the Committee, the PDM advised that:

- The wood to the east of the site will remain through a condition imposed in the reserved matters/detailed application to follow;
- The Viability Consultant concluded that the scheme would be viable with S106 contributions worth £2 million without the provision of affordable housing. It was regrettable that the scheme could not deliver affordable housing, but the developer would undertake a lot of remediation works to enable the regeneration and redevelopment of the site. Once completed, the development would bring significant benefits to the area. The developer agreed to reduce their profit margins to allow a further £1 million towards education infrastructure contributions, which was over and above what the Viability Consultant had recommended and was a positive move by the developer;
- Any further planning applications in Harworth would be carefully considered by the Local Planning Authority and the Committee. As it was a brownfield site, its remediation and decontamination would be a substantial financial investment and the delivery of housing on this site was achieving that remediation. The Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Plan allocated this site specifically for housing and redevelopment. As it stands, the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan does not anticipate any further large scale

housing developments in Harworth and nor any further growth into the countryside surrounding the settlement;

- The County Council were undertaking a Waste Audit in Harworth and £80,000 of the developers' S106 payments would go towards new waste and recycling facilities. If the County Council made any improvements in the time between the two planning applications, then the audit would not need to be referenced when the developer puts in their following application for enabling works;
- Any improvements to the highways would come out of the £3 million S106 payments. There were no formal plans at this time for improvements to the two mini-roundabouts in Harworth and the infrastructure works would focus on the wider road network in Harworth, but the County Council were aware of traffic issues with those mini-roundabouts;
- S106 contributions are made in a phased manner as accordance with the agreement between the Local Authority, the County Council and the applicant. Payments towards education infrastructure must be made at a time when the county can use them to make the necessary improvements and so the development is not stifled. Likewise, with education contributions. SIL payments are also phased throughout the course of the development.

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

**COMMITTEE DECISION** – Grant planning permission.

149. 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 7:40pm).