

## NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of **Planning Committee** Broadcast from the Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark, Notts, NG24 1BY on Tuesday, 28 April 2020 at 2.00 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 and Councillor  
Mrs Y Woodhead

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor D Lloyd (for minute 191)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor K Walker (Committee Member)

### 185 REMOTE MEETING LEGISLATION

The meeting was held remotely, in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

### 186 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

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

Councillor M Skinner declared a personal interest in item 9, as he was a Board Member of Active4Today.

Councillor Mrs P Rainbow declared a prejudicial interest in item 6 and did not take part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chairman, on behalf of all Members declared a personal interest in item 9 as the applicant was Arkwood Developments, a wholly owned Council Company.

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

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Council was undertaking an audio recording of the meeting which was to be webcast.

### 188 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 31 MARCH 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2020 were approved as a correct record of the meeting, to be signed by the Chairman.

### 189 URGENCY ITEM- REPORT OF DECISIONS TAKEN 31 MARCH 2020

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Executive detailing the decisions taken following the recommendations made by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 31 March 2020. The meeting was held in a virtual manner, according to legislation enabling meetings to be held remotely. However, at the time of the meeting, the detailed regulations had not been published, therefore the Planning Committee made recommendations for the Chief Executive to consider and determine under the urgency provisions.

AGREED that the report be noted.

190 ORDER OF BUSINESS

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chairman changed the order of business and Agenda item 9 was taken after Item 5. The agenda resumed its stated order thereafter.

191 LAND AT LORD HAWKE WAY AND BOWBRIDGE ROAD, NEWARK 20/00275/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Director- Growth and Regeneration, which sought the construction of residential development for 87 dwellings and associated works which had been previously considered by the Committee at its meeting on 31 March 2020 (resubmission of 19/01790/FULM). The current application was a re-submission of the previously refused scheme in an attempt to overcome the reason for refusal relating to parking and drainage.

During the presentation to Members, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development, Members were reminded of the importance of considering the application 'afresh' and that previous planning history was a material planning consideration. It was also noted that Members had been issued with separate guidance clarifying the governance and management arrangements of Arkwood Developments, which was wholly owned by the Council. In addition, the Director- Growth and Regeneration clarified that the Covid-19 Pandemic was unlikely to be considered a material planning consideration capable of attracting more than limited weight, as separate legislation had been issued regarding the Pandemic.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published relating to updated plans to show additional parking spaces on other site plans, such as boundaries and landscaping. Late representations had also been received from the Local Ward Member Councillor R. Crowe and Notts County Council Highways raising no objections with the proposed development.

Councillor E Cropper, Newark Town Council, spoke in objection to the proposed development, urging the Committee to protect the open space for residents, raising concerns about the impact of the development on traffic congestion in the area, the size of some of the proposed properties, and the lack of measures to reflect the 'Climate Emergency' declared by the Council.

Councillor D. Lloyd, Local Ward Member, spoke in support of the application, noting

that the land had been allocated for housing development, the proposed application exceeded parking space requirement and also provided bungalows. The site was well serviced by local amenities and if approved would help reduce anti-social behaviour on the site and provide support for revisions to parking required along Bowbridge Road towards the town centre.

Members considered the application. Some members raised concerns regarding the application, including over intensification of the proposed development, the impact on traffic in the area and the loss of open space. However other Members noted the increased parking provision and movement of drainage by the applicant to address the previous reasons for refusal. No concerns had been raised by Highways with regard to the traffic and the density of the proposed development was well within Policy requirements. In discussion, Members agreed to amend Condition 17 to require consultation with Local Ward Members with regard to the monies for provision of play equipment for children and young people.

AGREED ( 7 for, 6 Against, 2 abstentions ,with the Chairman having used his casting vote for ) that Planning Permission be granted, with the conditions detailed in the report, the amended conditions 2, 10, 13, and 17 detailed in the schedule of communication after the agenda was published, and the further amendment to condition 17 to require consultation with the Local Ward Members regarding the exact locations of where the provision for Children and Young People should be spent

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Vote</b>
R. Blaney	For
L. Brazier	Against
M. Brock	For
M. Brown	Against
L. Dales	For
M. Dobson	Against
L. Goff	Against
R. Holloway	For
J. Lee	Against
P. Rainbow	For
M. Skinner	Against
T. Smith	Abstain
I. Walker	For
K. Walker	Absent
Y. Woodhead	Abstain

There being an equity of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote in support of the motion to approve planning permission.

*(Councillor Mrs Y Woodhead was not present for the entire Officer presentation and*

*did not take part in the vote).*

192 LAND REAR OF 49 THE ROPEWALK, SOUTHWELL 19/02064/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the erection of 5 dwellings at land rear of 49 The Ropewalk, Southwell, Nottinghamshire. Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planner- Planning Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

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

Councillor M Brock, Local Ward Member, felt that the proposed development was overbearing, and cited concerns raised by Southwell Town Council and the Civic Society. In discussion, Members felt that the proposed development was over intensive and over bearing, and would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties and amenities.

The motion to approve planning permission was put to the vote and fell. Therefore it was duly proposed and seconded to refuse planning permission, contrary to Officer recommendation.

AGREED (10 for, 2 Against, 1 abstention) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be refused for the following reasons

On the grounds that In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, by virtue of number of units, the proposal would result in an over intensive layout of development which is incongruous and detrimental to the character of the area. The cramped nature of the development would result in insufficient private amenity space for each of the dwellings with the exception of the bungalow, separation distances for plots within the site but also to neighbouring plots namely no. 49 and 49a The Ropewalk where the massing and scale of the proposed Plot 5 would have an overbearing impact. As such the proposal is deemed contrary to Core Policy 9 of the Amended Core Strategy and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD as well as the NPPF which forms a material planning consideration.

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

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Vote</b>
R. Blaney	For
L. Brazier	For
M. Brock	For
M. Brown	Against
L. Dales	For
M. Dobson	For
L. Goff	For

R. Holloway	For
J. Lee	Against
P. Rainbow	Absent declaring an interest
M. Skinner	Abstain
T. Smith	For
I. Walker	For
K. Walker	Absent
Y. Woodhead	For

193 FIRST FLOOR AT ROBIN HOOD HOTEL, KIRKLINGTON ROAD, RAINWORTH 19/02237/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought conversion of first floor space into 6 apartment units, 5 x one Beds and 1 x Studio, external entrance and fire exit staircase introduced on the facade facing the existing car park at First Floor at Robin Hood Hotel, Kirklington Road, Rainworth.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published which was an amended site location plan, extending the application site to include the parking and bin storage area.

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

Councillor T Smith, Local Ward Member spoke raising concerns with the application. Whilst he felt that the first floor of the building should be put to use, the proposed application would lead to cars passing the pedestrian walkway into the store, and he felt that this could lead to an accident.

Other Members of the Committee echoed the concerns raised, and also considered the parking area, which it was felt was too small to accommodate sufficient parking and delivery vehicles. On being put to the vote, the motion to approve planning permission fell unanimously and it was therefore duly proposed and seconded that planning permission be refused, contrary to Officer recommendation.

AGREED (Unanimously) that Planning Permission be refused, against the Officer Recommendation, for the following reasons-

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would not provide appropriate and effective parking provision for future residents of and potential visitors to the proposed apartments, which would result in an unjustified loss of parking provision for the existing Tesco Express store. In addition, the proposed location of dedicated resident's parking spaces to the north east corner of the application site would exacerbate existing safety issues within the existing Tesco car park which would be further exacerbated when deliveries to Tesco Express are taking place, putting pedestrians at increased risk of collisions with vehicles entering and exiting the site. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the provisions of Spatial Policy 7 'Sustainable Transport' of the Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted

March 2019) and Policy DM5 'Design' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD which require development proposals to ensure provision is made for safe and convenient access for all and the loss of parking provision to be justified.

194 LAND ADJACENT OLD NORSE HOUSE, STATION ROAD, BLEASBY 20/00041/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought Change of use of land from paddock land to residential use and erection of three bay garage with store above, for use by Old Norse House.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from the Chairman of Bleasby Parish Council containing the Parish Council objections to the proposed development.

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

In discussion, the Committee were in agreement that the proposed development was too large, and overbearing to neighbouring properties. Members also felt that agricultural and paddock land should not be used for the residential development.

AGREED (Unanimously) the Planning Permission be refused, contrary to Officer recommendation, for the following reasons

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would result in the unjustified loss of paddock land, contrary to the locational criteria outlined in Spatial Policy 3 'Rural Areas' of the Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019), which supports the development of sites within the existing built extent of the village, including dwellings and their gardens, commercial premises, farm yards and community facilities but not the development of undeveloped land, fields, paddocks or open space which form the edge of built form. Furthermore, the development fails to comprise any of those identified as being acceptable within the open countryside within Policy DM8 'Development in the Open Countryside of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013). No material considerations outweigh the harm identified.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed garage and store would be inappropriately located outside of the residential curtilage of the dwelling it is proposed to serve and result in an adverse and unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents at the property known as Horstead by virtue of an enclosing and overbearing impact on their rear garden and property. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of Policy DM5 'Design' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013) which requires development proposals to have regard to their impact on the amenity or operation of surrounding land uses and where necessary mitigate for any detrimental impact. No material considerations outweigh the harm identified.

195 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

196 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

Meeting closed at 4.40 pm.

Chairman