



*Castle House
Great North Road
Newark
NG24 1BY*

Tel: 01636 650000

www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE - THURSDAY, 6TH JULY, 2023

Please find enclosed the third Schedule of Communications to be considered at 6 July 2023 Planning Committee.

Yours faithfully

Helen Brandham
Democratic Services Officer

Very Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
5 Land South of Staythorpe Lane, Staythorpe 22/01840/FULM	Agent	06.07.2023	Amended Landscape Mitigation Plan (Drawing No:4951-DR-LAN-101 H V2) and Amended Construction Compound (Drawing No: UK008_02_LYP) to reflect new infrastructure layout	Up-date all conditions to reflect these latest Drawing Numbers.
6 Appleby Lodge, Barnby Road, Newark	NCC Highways	06.07.2023	<p>Email from Notts CC Highways Manager to Robert Jenrick MP in response to concerns from residents and a request from local members for a traffic survey to be undertaken:</p> <p>The requirements for information provide in support of planning applications is determined by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), they decide as part of the validation required to accept a planning application what supporting information is required to enable the application to be determined. In this instance the application was validated and consulted upon without any supporting Transport Statement, presumably because it did not meet the threshold required by the LPA to request either a Transport Statement or Assessment.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this the Highway Authority are able through their consultation response to request further information be provided by the applicant should we consider the information is insufficient allow us to determine the planning application. In making any such recommendation we must be mindful of both</p>	Noted. This email provides further clarification on the Highways Officers comments and does not alter the recommendation.

		<p>national and regional planning policy, as well as whether the request would be considered reasonable by a planning inspector. The simple rule of thumb applied in such situations is whether the Authority would be prepared to recommend refusal and defend a planning appeal if the requested information was not provided.</p> <p>Barnby Road is a lightly trafficked road, with an annual average daily traffic flow (AADT) currently recorded of 950 vehicles. To put this into context, during the day, this averages at around 1 vehicle per minute, increasing to 2 vehicles per minute at school start and finish times. A more recent count to the east of the rail crossing on Barnby Road shows that the AADT has reduced from 950 to 550 since Covid. Whilst we would anticipate the area around the school to have a higher flow, this shows that through traffic has decreased and therefore it is likely that the AADT of 950 near the school has also decreased.</p> <p>The traffic flow was observed to be light on a site visit which also noted that traffic associated with the school is transient and largely disappears within the half hour window associated with school pick up/drop off. It has also been observed that during school pick up/drop off that vehicles are driving in a slow and controlled manner, which is reflected in the reported injury accident statistics – there are no reported injury accidents in this vicinity in the last 3 years, either during the periods of school pick up/drop off times or the rest of the day.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Whilst some atypical vehicle manoeuvres were observed during the school periods, such as 3-point u-turns, they do not appear to cause issues other than minor delay to one or two other vehicles. In addition to no injury accidents occurring, this view is supported by our having no reports on record of any complaints being made by residents of or visitors to this area in respect of highway issues.</p> <p>When considering the numbers of vehicles generated by the proposed development, we have previously found national data which identifies that Gypsy and Traveller sites will generate circa 1 vehicle per unit in peak hours, an increase when compared to standard domestic dwellings which could generate circa 0.6 vehicles. Applying this to the proposed development would mean that we would anticipate 8 additional vehicles in peak hour. In the context of the general reduction of traffic post covid across the local highway network it is very difficult to argue that the limited impact of traffic generated by the proposal would be significant.</p> <p>After considering the information which was submitted in support, it is our view that a recommendation of refusal against this application for 8 Gypsy and Traveller units on highway grounds would not be able to be defended when measured against Government policy, specifically the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 111 which says "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”.</p> <p>As part of coming to this conclusion, we have also considered local policy alongside the accident and traffic data held by the County Council.</p> <p>Making a comparison to a standard residential development, 8 peak hour movements would be equivalent to the traffic generated by 14 dwellings. Guidance contained within both our own highway design guide and the DfTs guidance on transport assessment suggests the level at which we would require some sort of formal assessment to be 50 dwellings or 30 peak hour trips. It is clear that this development falls significantly below these thresholds, consequently it is unlikely that a request for a traffic survey would be considered reasonable in planning terms, and even if one were carried out, it would be likely that the development would be proven to not have a severe or unacceptable impact in terms of both capacity and safety (against the thresholds fully described previously in the email to Councillor Smith). We appreciate that our view is not the same as that of your constituents, but our role is to offer our professional opinion, impartially and against thresholds that could be defended at appeal if an application were to be refused by the LPA on that basis. I trust that given the above insight into that which we have considered you can appreciate why we are unable to request that the applicant submits a traffic survey and that we are unable to offer an objection to this application.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>6 Appleby Lodge, Barnby Road, Newark</p>	<p>Local Resident</p>	<p>06.07.2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns relating to the ecological impact of the development and the potential impact on amphibians, particularly the Common Toad. - There has been a notable decrease in Toad population since 1987 - Recent date published by Froglife shows that Common Toads have decreased 68% over the past 30 years. - This paddock is part of a larger area of land that has acted as a buffer zone between Barnby Road and the main line railway. This should continue to be acknowledged and remain as an open break, enabling it to act as a green corridor to provide safe passage for wildlife. - Currently only 3.22% of land in England is effectively protected for nature. - Taking into account future planned housing developments that that are to expand between Beacon Hill, Clay Lane and Coddington, this paddock and associated land between the railway and Barnby Road should be kept development free. - Concerns relating to light pollution and the impact on wildlife. - Concerns that applications have already been refused on this site. - Concerns in relation to pedestrian safety during school hours. 	<p>Noted. These comments are all covered within the committee report and do not alter the recommendation. For absolute clarity, there have been no previous planning applications on this specific parcel of land.</p>
<p>9 Willow Hall Farm 23/00890/OUT</p>	<p>Case Officer</p>	<p>06.07.2023</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, it is noted that the red line depicting the extent of the application site on the plans submitted do not match. The agent confirmed on 20 June 2023 that the Site Location Plan 1B is the correct plan and the other plans are for context/supporting information only. For clarity it is suggested that the 'note to applicant'</p>

				<p>is updated to reflect this as follows.</p> <p><u>Notes to Applicant</u></p> <p>01</p> <p>The application is refused on the basis of drawing no. JPD/MSE/4091-1B (Site Location Plan) which the planning agent confirmed was the correct plan depicting the extent of the application site by email on 20.06.2023. The following documents and plans were submitted in support and for context purposes only:</p> <p>JPD/MSE/4091-5 (Site Plan) Context only JPD/MSE/4091-4B Outline proposal JPD/MSE/4091-3C Outline proposal JPD/MSE.4091-2 Site Plan (existing) Planning Design and Access Statement, 23.05.2023 Ecological Appraisal by CBE Consulting, January 2022 Flood Risk Assessment (map)</p> <hr/>