

Castle House Great North Road Newark NG24 1BY

Tel: 01636 650000

www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

**Dear Councillor** 

# **FULL COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 15TH OCTOBER, 2019**

I now enclose, for consideration the following minutes that were unavailable when the agenda was published.

# Agenda No Item

18 j) Planning Committee - 8 October 2019 (Pages 2 - 11)

### NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of **Planning Committee** held in the Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark, Notts, NG24 1BY on Tuesday, 8 October 2019 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor R Blaney (Chairman)

Councillor I Walker (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor L Brazier, Councillor M Brock, Councillor M Brown, Councillor L Dales, Councillor Mrs M Dobson, Councillor L Goff, Councillor R Holloway, Councillor J Lee, Councillor Mrs P Rainbow, Councillor M Skinner, Councillor T Smith, Councillor K Walker and

Councillor Mrs Y Woodhead

ALSO IN Councillor R Jackson and Councillor Mrs S E Saddington

ATTENDANCE:

APOLOGIES FOR There were none.

ABSENCE:

## 97 <u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS</u>

Councillors Mrs L Dales and I Walker declared personal interests as they were Council's appointed representatives on the Trent Valley Drainage Board.

Councillors M Skinner and L Goff declared personal interests in Agenda Item No. 13 – Site of Robin Hood Hotel, 1-3 Lombard Street, Newark (19/01575/S19LBC), as the item had been considered by Newark Town Council; the Members confirmed they would keep an open mind.

Councillor T Smith declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 9 – Garage Units Off Lansbury Road, Bilsthorpe (19/01526/FUL), as family lived in close proximity.

The Director – Growth and Regeneration declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item No. 16 & 17 – The Buttermarket, between 27 and 28 Middle Gate, Newark (19/01410/FUL & 19/01411/LBC), as he was the applicant on behalf of the Council.

### 98 DECLARATION OF ANY INTENTIONS TO RECORD THE MEETING

The Chairman advised that the proceedings were being recorded by the Council and being broadcast live on social media.

## 99 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 SEPTEMBER 2019

AGREED that the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager - Planning Development, which sought retrospective planning permission for the removal of a garden shed and seating structure and the erection of a single storey summerhouse and a single storey outdoor bar.

Councillor R Jackson, local Ward Member for Dover Beck spoke in favour of the application. He commented that the applicant had sought planning advice from the Council and was told that he did not need planning permission for the summer house or bar as he was replacing two existing structures. The applicant was subsequently undertaking tree work and invited the Council Officer to look at the tree work, at that stage the Council Officer informed the planning business unit of the new structures that had been erected. The applicant had full support from Thurgarton Parish Council.

Members considered the application and a Member commented that the applicant was enquiring about the demolition for a garage and a two storey extension and it was for that reason the Council Officer came to view the property. There was also no objection to the bar, however the bar and summer house had been included in one Another Member commented that she was supportive of the application. conservation team and was annoyed regarding retrospective applications. However wooden summer houses do not last that long and the hedge would grow taller and hide the summer house from street view. As such, it was not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

AGREED (with 10 votes For, 3 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that contrary to Officer recommendation full planning permission be approved.

In accordance with paragraph 12.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

| Councillor  | Vote       |
|-------------|------------|
| R. Blaney   | Against    |
| L. Brazier  | For        |
| M. Brock    | For        |
| M. Brown    | For        |
| L. Dales    | For        |
| M. Dobson   | For        |
| L. Goff     | For        |
| R. Holloway | For        |
| J. Lee      | Absent     |
| P. Rainbow  | For        |
| M. Skinner  | Abstention |
| T. Smith    | For        |
| I. Walker   | Against    |
| K. Walker   | For        |
| Y. Woodhead | Against    |

### 101 KELHAM HALL LTD, KELHAM HALL, MAIN ROAD, KELHAM (19/01307/S73M) (MAJOR)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought to vary condition 2 attached to planning permission 17/01021/FULM to amend the approved plans as it was the intension to alter the proposed scheme to incorporate additional hotel bedroom suites and other minor changes.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from the Agent.

Members considered the application and felt that the hotel would be good for tourism and the local economy. A Member commented that the increase in bedrooms from 70 may spoil this luxury hotel in agreement with the comments received by the Parish Council.

AGREED (with 13 votes For and 1 vote Against) that planning permission be approved subject to the conditions and reasons contained within the report and the schedule of communication.

## 102 MANOR FARM, MOOR LANE, EAST STOKE (19/01418/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development following a site inspection, which sought full planning permission for the erection of a two bed bungalow.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from the Conservation Officer. The application represents the resubmission of an application that was previously refused by Planning Committee and subsequently dismissed at appeal. The revised proposed was considered by Officers to overcome the previous reasons for refusing the application and would now preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area subject to conditions.

Members considered the application and some Members considered the proposal acceptable, other Members commented upon the close proximity of the gables and window to the neighbouring property and felt that car parking was very tight.

AGREED (with 11 votes For and 3 votes Against) that full planning permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report.

### 103 ASHLEIGH, GREAT NORTH ROAD, SOUTH MUSKHAM, NEWARK (19/00782/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development following a site inspection, which sought planning permission for the erection of three dwellings with associated off road parking and private gardens.

Councillor Mrs S E Saddington local Ward Member for Muskham spoke against the application on the grounds of highways safety as the entrance was only a small distance away from a traffic island with five roads leading off it. Three dwellings were considered too many and it was felt that the proposal had been carefully designed to

allow access to the land at the back for future development. The Parish Council had objected on the grounds of no local need for the proposed properties. The development was in flood zone 2, Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board had commented regarding the surface water run-off. It was commented that when an accident occurred on the A1, the Great North Road was heavily congested. The report also included out of date information as it incorrectly stated that North Muskham had a Post Office and shop. The issue of flooding was raised as South Muskham had flooded in the past and whilst the dwellings may be built higher as the site was in flood zone 2, the impact of these properties made neighbouring properties more vulnerable.

Members considered the application and commented on the poor visibility when exiting the site. The hedgerow to the side of the properties and close proximity of the properties would make them very dark which Members considered harmful to health. The design of the two houses and the layout was not in keeping with the character of the area.

AGREED (with 6 votes For, 5 votes Against and 3 Abstentions) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be refused on the grounds of design, layout and proximity to neighbouring properties.

In accordance with paragraph 12.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

| Councillor  | Vote       |
|-------------|------------|
| R. Blaney   | Against    |
| L. Brazier  | For        |
| M. Brock    | Abstention |
| M. Brown    | For        |
| L. Dales    | Against    |
| M. Dobson   | For        |
| L. Goff     | For        |
| R. Holloway | For        |
| J. Lee      | Absent     |
| P. Rainbow  | Abstention |
| M. Skinner  | Abstention |
| T. Smith    | Against    |
| I. Walker   | Against    |
| K. Walker   | Against    |
| Y. Woodhead | For        |

### 104 GARAGE UNITS OFF LANSBURY ROAD, BILSTHORPE (19/01526/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development following a site inspection, which sought full planning permission for the demolition of the existing garage court and development of one two bed dwelling.

Councillor T Smith declared a personal interest in the item and left the meeting.

Members considered the application and the local Ward Member commented that the Parish Council and residents of Lansbury Road were against this. The removal of the garages would cause problems for parking on Lansbury Road as the driveways to some houses only accommodated one vehicle with the majority of properties having two vehicles. The turning circle was important, unless you reversed down the road. Members felt that whilst a bungalow would be useful this was not the correct position for one bungalow which would create parking issues for the current residents due to the removal of twelve garages and a congested road.

It was commented that the design of the proposal did not fit with the area being for a bungalow in the corner of the site and that the site should not have been considered for development as it is too constrained.

Councillor L Goff was not present for entire item and did not take part in the vote.

AGREED (unanimously) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be refused on the grounds of the design and layout of a constrained and tight site.

In accordance with paragraph 12.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

| Councillor  | Vote                          |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| R. Blaney   | For                           |
| L. Brazier  | For                           |
| M. Brock    | For                           |
| M. Brown    | For                           |
| L. Dales    | For                           |
| M. Dobson   | For                           |
| L. Goff     | Did not take part in the vote |
| R. Holloway | For                           |
| J. Lee      | For                           |
| P. Rainbow  | For                           |
| M. Skinner  | For                           |
| T. Smith    | Not Present                   |
| I. Walker   | For                           |
| K. Walker   | For                           |
| Y. Woodhead | For                           |

### 105 HORSTEAD, STATION ROAD, BLEASBY (19/01288/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of a new dwelling.

Members considered the application and it was commented that this property had been run down for many years and the proposed works would be an improvement in appearance for neighbouring properties. It was noted that the existing property is prominent in the street scene. Concern was raised regarding the additional garage which was outside the land identified by the red line in the plan. The pote from the Agenda Page 6

Internal Drainage Board was also raised which emphasised the water course and the proposed garage would therefore require consent. It was suggested that a condition be added to withdraw the permitted development rights and the Internal Drainage Boards comments be included as a note to the applicant that consent was required.

A vote was taken and lost to defer the item for a site visit, with 5 votes For and 9 votes Against.

AGREED (with 11 votes For and 3 votes Against) that full planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions contained within the report, the additional condition to remove permitted development rights and the note to the applicant that consent was required from the Internal Drainage Board regarding the water course.

## 106 RENAISSANCE, KIRKBY HOUSE, 29A ALBERT STREET, NEWARK (19/01225/FUL)

The application was withdrawn from the agenda.

## 107 2 BRACKNER LANE, BILSTHORPE (19/01287/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development following a site inspection, which sought planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings on the site and the erection of a two storey three bed dwelling and an attached flat roof garage.

Members considered the application and the local Ward Member commented that the applicant had worked hard to amend the design of the property. The materials used would be cladding which reflected the materials used in the industrial estate and therefore would be in keeping and did not have a negative impact. It was commented that Bilsthorpe did need to develop and grow. Other Members commented that the front of the building would face the side of the neighbouring bungalow which was considered not acceptable. It was also commented that the surrounding residential buildings were rural brick and not metal cladding; the building was therefore not in keeping with the residential buildings in close proximity. The property was also in the open countryside and whilst the height of the property had been lowered, the footprint was larger than the existing dwelling. It was considered that the Council's policy in the open countryside should be adhered to.

A vote was taken to approve the application and lost with 4 votes For, 9 votes Against and 1 Abstention.

Councillor J Lee entered the meeting during the debate and therefore did not take part in the vote.

AGREED (with 9 votes For, 4 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that planning permission be refused for the reasons contained within the report.

## 108 SITE OF ROBIN HOOD HOTEL, 1 - 3 LOMBARD STREET, NEWARK (19/01575/S19LBC)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager — Planning Development, which sought to vary conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 to allow alterations to façade of retail Unit 3, minor internal alterations and update historic fabric to be retained in relation to planning permission 18/01021/LBC; Partial demolition of the former Robin Hood Hotel with retention of the façade, eastern gable and parts of the roof and internal fabric and integration with three No. units for flexible retail (Class A1), financial and professional services (Class A2), café/restaurant (Class A3) and leisure (Class D2) uses.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from the following: Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust; Newark Town Council; Historic England; and Heritage Lincolnshire.

Members considered the application acceptable.

Councillor M Brown left during the presentation and did not take part in the vote.

AGREED (unanimously) that delegated authority be given to issue the decision subject to the conditions and reasons contained within the report, following the expiry of the consultation period provided that no new material considerations are brought to light.

## 109 LAND ADJACENT 8 HARRISONS WAY, NEWARK (19/01118/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought full planning permission for the erection of a one bed bungalow.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from the Agent.

Members considered the application and felt that the constrained site overlooked by 2-storey semi terraces meant that the proposed bungalow is poorly designed and not in keeping with the neighbouring properties with resultant amenity impacts and asked for this to be included as an additional reason for refusal.

AGREED (unanimously) that full planning permission be refused for the reasons contained within the report, with an additional reason relating to the design not being in keeping with neighbouring properties.

## 110 9 OLD HALL GARDENS, CODDINGTON, NEWARK (19/01315/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development following a site inspection, which sought planning permission for a proposed garage extension and room over with external alterations.

Councillor D Armstrong, Coddington Parish Council spoke against the application in accordance with the views of Coddington Parish Council, as contained within the report.

Members considered the application, the local Ward Member commented that the proposal was not in keeping with the area and the design was overbearing on the neighbours. Other Members commented that whilst this was a very large property on a relatively small plot, the property could not be seen from the entrance to Old Hall Gardens and would not have an impact on light or amenity to the neighbouring property.

A vote was taken and lost for refusal with 6 votes For, 7 votes Against and 2 Abstentions.

A Member suggested that as the committee may be minded to approve the application a condition be placed on the garage to remain a garage, that permitted development rights be removed and that construction deliveries be after 9am. The Director — Growth and Regeneration confirmed that the removal of permitted development rights and an additional condition regarding the garage was acceptable; the condition for deliveries given that this was a domestic dwelling was unreasonable.

AGREED (with 8 votes For, 6 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that full planning permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report, the removal of permitted development rights and the additional condition for the garage to only be used as a garage.

### 111 THE BUTTERMARKET, BETWEEN 27 AND 28 MIDDLE GATE, NEWARK (19/01410/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager — Planning Development, which sought the alterations and conversion of units 4, 9, 10 and 11 to form a single unit; blocking up of window and door on Chain Lane; Re-design of shopfront on Middlegate. Change of allowable uses within the building to incorporate use A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 and D2.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from Newark Town Council.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that full planning permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report.

### 112 THE BUTTERMARKET, BETWEEN 27 AND 28 MIDDLE GATE, NEWARK (19/01411/LBC)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager — Planning Development, which sought alterations and conversion of units 4, 9, 10 and 11 into a single unit including demolition of internal partitions and centralising of incoming services along with all required strip out; new opening into mall area; new floor levels within units; tanking and damp proofing works to basement and creation of extract ducting through the building; block up window and door to Chain Lane and re-design of shopfront to Middlegate.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from Newark Town Council.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions contained within the report.

## 113 BLIDWORTH COMMUNITY LEISURE CENTRE, BLIDWORTH (19/01489/FUL)

The application was withdrawn from the agenda.

## 114 <u>7 ALLENBY ROAD, SOUTHWELL (19/01648/FUL)</u>

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the erection of a single storey side extension, installation of dropped kerb and erect new pedestrian gate to side.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from Southwell Town Council, which had agreed unanimously to no objection to this application.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that planning permission be approved subject to the conditions and reasons contained within the report.

### 115 MILESTONE, SARACENS HEAD HOTEL, MARKET PLACE, SOUTHWELL (14/00152/LBC)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought to demolish disintegrated Milestone at Saracens Head Hotel and replace with a relica.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that Members confirmed that they were minded to approve the application subject to referral to the Secretary of State and subject to the conditions contained within the report.

## 116 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

## 117 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

# 118 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

That, under section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 7 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Meeting closed at 6.18 pm.

Chairman