

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 Thursday, 9 November 2023 at 4.00 pm.

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

Councillor A Amer, Councillor C Brooks, Councillor L Dales, Councillor P Harris, Councillor J Lee, Councillor K Melton, Councillor P Rainbow, Councillor S Saddington, Councillor M Shakeshaft, Councillor M Spoor, Councillor L Tift and Councillor T Wildgust

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor E Oldham

61 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillor Mrs S Saddington declared having an other registerable interest on application Nos. 22/00975/FULM – Land at Knapthorpe Lodge, Hockerton Road, Caunton and 22/00976/FULM – Field Reference Number 2227, Hockerton Road, Caunton, as she had attended Parish Council meetings where the applications had been discussed.

The Chair advised the Committee of a blanket 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.

Councillor J Lee declared having an other registerable interest as a member of the Fire Authority and a Member of Nottinghamshire County Council.

Business Manager – Planning Development declared an other registerable interest on application No. 23/01604/FUL – Lorry and Coach Park, Great North Road, Newark On Trent, as the Council was the applicant.

62 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.

63 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5 OCTOBER 2023

AGREED that the minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

64 ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chairman with the permission of the Planning Committee changed the order of business on the agenda. Agenda Item 6 – Oak Tree Stables, Sand Lane, Besthorpe (22/01203/FULM) was taken as the first item for decision, the agenda resumed its

stated order thereafter.

65 OAK TREE STABLES SAND LANE BESTHORPE NG23 7HS - 22/01203/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the use of the land as a residential caravan site for gypsy/traveller families (8 No. pitches) and conversion of existing stable to form amenity building and warden’s office.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, for the reasons that there were particular site factors which were significant in terms of the weight attached to them relative to other factors and they would be difficult to assess in the absence of a site inspection; and the proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case 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 local residents.

Karen Grundy, representing Besthorpe Parish Meeting, spoke against the application in accordance with the views of Besthorpe Parish Meeting as contained within the report.

Members considered the application and it was commented that this was not an allocated gypsy/traveller site and had not been put forward and allocated against the allocations plan criteria. The allocations plan was further advanced and had been considered at Full Council and had delivered thirty-four pitches and had identified further pitches within that plan. It was questioned whether it was correct for an Officer recommendation to be made before it had been considered by the Planning Policy Board and before assessment of responses had been undertaken, which would alter the Council’s weighting. It was questioned whether it was appropriate for this item to be deferred until an outcome had been reviewed.

The Business Manager – Planning Development confirmed that the consultation period for the allocations document had closed. The Planning Policy team would be analysing the responses to the Local Plan which at present had very limited weight. More weight would be applied after approval by Full Council in the coming months but would not be significantly more to assist in determination by the Planning Committee. The Director – Planning Growth also informed the Committee of the process of the Development Plan and confirmed that the plan was not at an advanced stage to attach any weight to the application to be considered.

A Member sought clarification regarding how many pitches the application could have if it had had been an allocated site. The Planning Case Officer confirmed that the site could accommodate twenty-two pitches.

AGREED (with 8 votes For and 5 votes Against) that full planning permission be approved, subject to the conditions contained within the report.

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the construction of a solar farm, access and all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.

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

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case 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 Planning Case Officer; Local Residents; Averham, Kelham and Staythorpe Parish Council; and the Agent. Additional late representations had been received from local residents.

Councillor D Catenach, South Muskham & Little Carlton Parish Council, spoke against the application in accordance with the views of South Muskham & Little Carlton Parish Council as contained within the report.

Members considered the application and commented that the solar panel farm had an overbearing impact and there was no biodiversity. Members were cynical regarding the two applications received separately, rather than one application which would have been determined by the Secretary of State. It was also raised that a planning policy regarding solar farms within the district would have been useful. It was commented that the ideal place for solar panels to be installed was on roof tops of businesses, schools, public buildings, warehouses, factories etc., the electricity generated could then be sold to the National Grid or shared within the community. Concern was raised regarding the narrow roads within that area, and problems encountered with the planning site visit bus that morning, which was unable to park safely on the highway. Concern was therefore raised regarding construction traffic if the committee were minded to approve the application. Concern was further raised regarding the runoff of rainwater from this site which may exacerbate the problem of flooding in that area. The Planning Case Officer confirmed that there was a 900mm bund included in the planning conditions. It was also confirmed that increased surface water run off rates were not known to increase with solar farm developments and there was potential for downstream betterment. The Planning Case Officer also confirmed that there was an error in the planning report and confirmed that the two access points were new. It was commented that the land should be used to grow crops rather than importing food due to the economic climate.

The Chair commented, in relation to the Great North Road solar scheme that the Council was only a consultee and this was a national infrastructure project.

Members raised concerns that the solar panel farms were being submitted to the Council piecemeal and felt that the Council did not have any framework to make decisions. Concern was also raised regarding the glint and glare from the solar panels

on the pilots of Caunton Airfield, which was in close proximity to the application site.

Councillor A Amer entered the meeting during the Member debate.

Councillor A Amer and Councillor D Member did not take part in the vote as they were not in the meeting for the duration of the Officers presentation.

A vote was taken and unanimously lost to Approve planning permission.

Moved Councillor A Freeman and Seconded Councillor S Saddington
AGREED (unanimously) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) Loss of agricultural land;
- (ii) Loss of agricultural land over a forty-year period; and
- (iii) Landscape visual character impact.

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

Councillor	Vote
A Amer	Did not vote
C Brooks	For
L Dales	For
A Freeman	For
P Harris	For
J Lee	For
K Melton	For
D Moore	Did not vote
E Oldham	Absent
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
M Spoor	For
L Tift	For
T Wildgust	For

Councillor D Moore left the meeting at this point.

67 FIELD REFERENCE NUMBER 2227 HOCKERTON ROAD CAUNTON - 22/00976/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the construction of a solar farm, access and all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.

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

At this point in the meeting, in accordance with Rule 2.7, the Chairman indicated that the meeting had been ongoing for three hours and a motion was required to be proposed and seconded to extend the meeting for the duration of one hour.

AGREED (unanimously) that the meeting continue for the duration of one hour.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case 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 following: local residents; Averham, Kelham and Staythorpe Parish Council; Planning Case Officer; and the Agent.

Councillor D Catenach, South Muskham & Little Carlton Parish Council, spoke against the application in accordance with the views of South Muskham & Little Carlton Parish Council as contained within the report.

Members considered the application and commented that this application was a link in a chain that would visually strangle Nottinghamshire. This was an economical disaster for future generations. It was questioned who could predict what would happen ten-forty years in the future, and the solar panels had a life span of around forty years. The impact would be devastating and would be the death of the beautiful landscape in Nottinghamshire that Members wished to protect. This was agricultural land and should remain that. The community was losing a massive area where they could walk and enjoy the countryside and not walk through acres of solar panels. It was commented that Wheaten House (to the east of the site) may also suffer from the glint and glare from the solar panels until the trees had grown in significant height and when they had grown, the residents would have lost their view. It was also questioned whether Caunton Airfield had an interest in the site, as it was considered strange that they had not submitted any comments, given the potential glint and glare to light aircraft and gliders. The Planning Case Officer confirmed that they had been told that the landowner of the site was also the landowner of the Airfield but that this had not been confirmed in the submission and the operator of the Airfield had been consulted separately on the Application. A Member suggested that the footpaths be widened to 30 metres and the northern boundary have a biodiversity buffer. The Planning Case Officer confirmed that this could impact the generating capacity of the scheme which would conflict with the description of the development and therefore could not be imposed by condition. The scale of the development at 49.9MW was such due to economies of scale where these schemes become viable and most efficient, reducing the capacity of the Solar Farm by removing areas for panels could impact the viability of the scheme.

A debate took place regarding whether the application should be deferred to discuss the possibility of widening the footpaths and adding the biodiversity buffer to the northern boundary. The Director – Planning & Growth advised the Committee that if they were minded to defer the application in order to discuss the footpaths and biodiversity buffer, if that was to the satisfaction of the applicant, that would indicate that all other matters were acceptable.

A vote was taken and lost for approval, with 1 vote For and 12 votes Against.

Councillor D Moore, having left the meeting during part of the Officer presentation took no part in the vote.

Moved Councillor J Lee and Seconded Councillor L Tift

AGREED (with 11 votes For and 2 Abstentions) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be Refused for the following reasons:

- (i) Visual impact on landscape;
- (ii) Loss of agricultural land 3B;
- (iii) Loss of agricultural land for forty years.

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

Councillor	Vote
A Amer	For
C Brooks	For
L Dales	For
A Freeman	Abstention
P Harris	For
J Lee	For
K Melton	Abstention
D Moore	Absent
E Oldham	Absent
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
M Spoors	For
L Tift	For
T Wildgust	For

The time being 9.00pm the Chairman sought Planning Committee approval to continue business for a further one hour.

AGREED: that the Planning Committee continue for a further hour.

68 GLEBE COTTAGE, MAIN STREET, NORWELL, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE, NG23 6JN - 22/01504/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought a new proposed dwelling and a cart shed.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, for the reason that there were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that need to be carefully addressed.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case 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 Nottinghamshire County Council Highways.

Councillor A Robertshaw, Chair of Norwell Parish Council, spoke in support of the application in accordance with the views of Norwell Parish Council as contained within the report.

Members considered the application and it was commented that the applicant had worked hard with the Planning Case Officer to address any issues raised and had addressed them. The property was in flood zone 1 and had never flooded. There had been unanimous support from Norwell Parish Council, and it was considered in keeping with the rest of the village. Other Members commented that this was back land development in a conservation area, the planning principles were clear and if approved would set a precedent for future applications.

AGREED (with 6 votes For, 6 votes Against and 1 Abstention, the Chairman used his casting vote in support of Refusal) that the report be refused for the reasons set out within the report.

69 MILL FARM, GONALSTON LANE, HOVERINGHAM, NG14 7JJ - 23/01159/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the proposed change of use of an agricultural buildings for weddings and events, including external alterations to the buildings and proposed use of field for associated car parking. Proposed change of use of main farmhouse for use as holiday accommodation and use of one room for wedding ceremonies.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, for the reason that there were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that need to be carefully addressed.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case 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 Planning Case Officer and Agent.

Councillor R Jackson as Local Ward Member (Dover Beck) spoke in support of the application on the grounds that the proposed application was suitable for redundant farm buildings to create a business and jobs in the open countryside.

The Planning Case Officer confirmed that the hedgerow had been removed along the access track and passing places created and an investigation regarding that was taking place separate from the application.

Members considered the application and some Members liked what had been done, which was an improvement from the old buildings. Changes had been made which didn't appear detrimental. Other Members commented that the application should not be approved and a wedding had taken place there recently without permission. Members commented that the Committee was being asked to accept a business which wasn't being run as alleged in the application and that other development had taken place on site that was disingenuous.

The Planning Case Officer confirmed that the applicant had submitted a business case, which would subsidise the applicant's income in the summer months when the farm was less profitable. The Planning Case Officer confirmed that the public benefit would not amount to special circumstances.

AGREED (with 10 votes For, 2 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out within the report.

The time being 9.00pm the Chairman sought Planning Committee approval to continue business for a further one hour.

AGREED: that the Planning Committee continue for a further hour.

70 LAND ADJACENT TO FOSSE ROAD, FARNDON- 23/01429/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the erection of a four bedroom bungalow.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case 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 Planning Case Officer following advice from the Environment Agency.

Councillor J Kellas Local Ward Member (Farndon and Fernwood) spoke in support of the application and commented that the application continued to be supported by Farndon Parish Council and some residents. There was a development to the north-east of the site that had been built in 2017 in flood zones 1 & 2 which created a precedent for the application. The application site had never flooded in the past and the proposed development would make the site visually appealing. The access road to the site would be raised and was in flood zone 2.

Members considered the application, and it was commented that by raising the access the proposed development would not have an impact on neighbouring properties by flooding. Other Members commented that they could not support the development as the access road was in flood zone 2.

AGREED (with 9 votes For, 2 vote Against and 2 Abstentions) that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out within the report with the omission of the last sentence starting "In addition,.....".

The Chair with the permission of the Planning Committee Members changed the order of business on the agenda and moved to Agenda item No. 12 – The Coach House, Church Hill, Bilsthorpe – 23/01186/FUL, due to the number of speakers registered to speak.

71 THE COACH HOUSE, CHURCH HILL, BILSTHORPE, NG22 8RU - 23/01186/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the demolition of an existing detached garage and outbuildings and the erection of a single storey dwelling.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, for the reason that there were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that need to be carefully addressed.

Members considered the presentation from the 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 and neighbouring residents.

Councillor Holloway Local Ward Member (Bilsthorpe) spoke in favour of the application and felt that there was scope when looking at heritage harm for different viewpoints. The reasons for refusal related to Core Policy 9 & 14 and DM 5 & 9. The proposal was low level single storey. It was pavilion style architecture which may have architectural merit in the future. The garden was large and accessible and would not affect the overall amenity of the neighbouring properties. The applicant had included items to increase biodiversity. The conservation area in Bilsthorpe covered many ages and styles of properties over the years. The previous vicarage had been changed into a much more modern building than neighbouring properties, which added to a distinctive character of this area. This property sat behind high gates and would have no visual impact on the surroundings.

Members considered the application and it was commented that the impact on the conservation area was when you could see it and it was considered that you could not see this property. This property could be a heritage asset in the future. Concern was raised regarding the solar panels and whether they could be incorporated in the design without an angle.

AGREED (with 7 votes For, 5 votes Against and 1 abstention) that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out within the report.

72 FIELD SIDE, 86 CAYTHORPE ROAD, CAYTHORPE, NG14 7EB - 23/01160/HOUSE

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought a proposed first floor and ground floor rear extension and single storey side extension. The erection of a canopy at principal elevation and replacement roof covering and windows.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee, for the reason that there were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed.

Members considered the presentation from the 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 applicant.

Councillor R Jackson Local Ward Member for (Dover Beck), spoke in favour of the application on the grounds that the current owners had bought the property whilst planning permission was still live and were trying to add a change to that. It was a very small semi-detached cottage amongst some very large houses, which were all newly built in that vicinity. The rooms were very small and the applicant was trying to create an extra bedroom and a larger living space and kitchen. He couldn't see any impact on the green belt, the neighbouring property had an extension to the side, which wasn't quite as large as what was being requested. The flood zone 2 was not an issue and this part of Caythorpe did not flood as it was higher than some parts of Caythorpe which did flood. The Parish Council fully supported this even though it was in part in the green belt. If the Planning Committee was to turn every planning application down because it was in the green belt Caythorpe would not evolve, if there was no change things would stagnate.

Members considered the application and some Members commented that there would be no harm to the green belt. Other Members felt the application should not be supported on the grounds of impact on the green belt and the size of the development.

Councillor K Melton did not vote as he was not in the meeting for the duration of the Officer presentation.

AGREED (with 7 votes For and 5 votes Against) that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out within the report.

73 MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman proposed that the meeting be adjourned given the time being almost 10.00pm.

AGREED: that the meeting be adjourned and the business remaining on the Agenda be considered at an extraordinary meeting of the Planning Committee, the date to be confirmed.

Meeting closed at 9.58 pm.

Chairman