

NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of **Planning Committee** held in the Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark, NG24 1BY on Wednesday, 19 June 2024 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor A Freeman (Chairman)  
Councillor D Moore (Vice-Chair)

Councillor C Brooks, Councillor L Dales, Councillor K Melton, Councillor E Oldham, Councillor P Rainbow, Councillor M Shakeshaft, Councillor M Spoor, Councillor L Tift and Councillor T Wildgust

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor A Amer, Councillor P Harris, Councillor S Saddington and Councillor T Smith

17 NOTIFICATION TO THOSE PRESENT THAT THE MEETING WILL BE RECORDED AND STREAMED ONLINE

The Chair informed the Committee that the Council was undertaking an audio recording of the meeting and that it was being live streamed.

18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

The Chair advised the Committee of other registerable interests declared on behalf of Councillors L Dales, A Freeman and K Melton as appointed representatives on the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board for any relevant items.

19 LAND OFF STAYTHORPE ROAD, AVERHAM - 23/00317/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the construction and operation of Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), transformer/sub-station and associated infrastructure.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, on the grounds that the proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received following publication of the agenda from the local residents and agent.

Mr P Grant spoke against the application as contained as representations within the report.

Councillor I Bradey representing Averham, Kelham and Staythorpe Parish Council, spoke against the application in accordance with the views of Averham, Kelham and Staythorpe Parish Council as contained within the report.

Mr C Calvert agent for Pegasus Planning Group Ltd, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and concern was raised regarding fire risk, if there was a fire from one of the batteries and the land was flooded at that time, the fire could spread through the flood water. 92% of the land was within Grade 3A agricultural land, it was commented that the cumulative impact regarding this should be studied. A Member commented upon the time frame of 40 years and stated that something had to be done regarding national policy to address that as it was too long. Lithium batteries were also discussed and the risk of them exploding, catching fire and creating toxic gases, an issue of concern to local people. A Member commented that there was information contained on British Standards which covered the way the batteries were manufactured, a lot of issues in the past was reported to have been through the manufacturing process which had been resolved. The different types of batteries were discussed and the differing opinions about the spacing between the layout of the batteries from the 2.5 metres proposed to a suggested 6 metres. It was commented that with the flood zone in that area, if there was a flood, even letting the unit burn, it was felt that a larger configuration between units should be provided. It was commented that a low carbon future was key to this application, the grid implications were local and the proximity to the grid made sense.

Councillor L Tift left the meeting at the end of the presentation and was absent for the debate and vote.

AGREED (with 5 votes For and 5 votes Against, the Chairman used his casting vote in support of the application) that Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report, as amended by the Late Items Schedule and the completion of a Section 106 agreement for the matters set out within the report.

*Councillor L Tift returned to the meeting at this point and then left the meeting.*

20 LAND ADJACENT STAYTHORPE SUBSTATION, STAYTHORPE ROAD, STAYTHORPE - 23/00810/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the laying of an underground cable run linking Battery Energy Storage System to Grid Connection Point at Staythorpe Substation.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Mr C Calvert agent for Pegasus Planning Group Ltd, spoke in support of the

application.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (with 8 votes For and 2 votes Against) that Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report.

21 SHADY OAKS, EAGLE ROAD, SPALFORD - 24/00088/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the proposed additional five pitches for gypsy/traveller use.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, as this was the reason to defer the determination of the application from the Planning Committee on 6 June 2024, to allow Members to view the context of the site.

Members considered the presentation from the Assistant Business Manager - Planning Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received following publication of the agenda from the agent.

Mr J McArthur, representing Spalford Parish Meeting, spoke against the application in accordance with the views of Spalford Parish Meeting as contained within the report.

Members considered the application and it was commented that Spalford had no services, amenities or bus network. There were also no footpaths or street lighting around this site and not enough proposed car parking. The site was also in flood zone 3. Shady Oaks referred to this site as a caravan park and not a GRT site. It was felt that the proposal would alter the nature of the hamlet. It was commented that the Authority had submitted a Draft Review of the Allocations and Development Management DPD in front of the Planning Inspectorate which should afford some weight. The cumulative impact of the proposal was not good for the hamlet community or for the people who would live on this site.

The Chair commented that the cumulative impact of the population on a small hamlet had never been tested. The proposed application could increase the population by an additional 36 people against a hamlet of 91 people.

A Member commented that given the location and what had been proposed would not dominate the village itself. There was a specific policy challenge regarding the GRT sites which was not being met in the district. The site was not being integrated with the community as it was hiding away behind a tall conifer hedge. Families would also choose to live here and not forced, the conditions therefore may be better than their current residence.

The Chair commented that not everyone wanted facilities where they lived, this was a hamlet, with developments around it. There was a shortfall in the district for GRT sites, however it was commented that we should not make do with bad sites to deal with that issue. The LA should try and get the best for the GRT community and the local community.

The Business Manager – Planning Development commented that the Review of the Allocations and Development Management DPD was with the Inspector and the examination would take place November 2024. Limited weight should be attached to this plan review, as the outcome of the plan was unknown at present and there could be changes insisted by the Inspector. The plan would also need to be considered and agreed by Full Council.

A vote was taken and lost to approve the application with 9 votes Against and 1 abstention.

AGREED Proposer Councillor Freeman and Seconder Councillor Moore (with 8 votes For and 2 Abstentions) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) the status of draft development plan, this site is not an allocated site;
- (ii) additional 5 pitches on hamlet with impact from additional population;
- (iii) development not well planned;
- (iv) does not promote opportunities for healthy lifestyle, e.g. does not include amenity block / amenity areas; and
- (v) the enclosure with existing soft landscaping created a sense of isolation.

In accordance with paragraph 13.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against Officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

| <b>Councillor</b> | <b>Vote</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|
| C Brooks          | For         |
| L Dales           | For         |
| A Freeman         | For         |
| K Melton          | Abstention  |
| D Moore           | For         |
| E Oldham          | For         |
| P Rainbow         | For         |
| M Shakeshaft      | For         |
| M Spors           | For         |
| T Wildgust        | Abstention  |

22 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 6.26 pm.

Chair