

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 Tuesday, 5 October 2021 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor R Blaney (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs L Dales (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor L Brazier, Councillor M Brock, Councillor R Crowe, Councillor L Goff, Councillor Mrs R Holloway, Councillor Mrs P Rainbow, Councillor Mrs S Saddington, Councillor M Skinner, Councillor T Smith, Councillor I Walker, Councillor Wildgust and Councillor Mrs Y Woodhead

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Mrs M Dobson and Councillor T Wendels

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor K Walker (Committee Member)

49 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillor Mrs L Dales declared an other registerable interest as a Council's appointed representative on the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Upper Witham Valley Drainage Board.

Councillor Mrs S Saddington declared a non-registerable interest in Agenda Item No. 8 – The Bothy, Mill Lane, Caunton (21/01704/FUL) as she had visited the applicant.

Councillor R Blaney declared a non-registerable interest in Agenda Item No. 10 – Land Adjacent Hockerton Grange Farm, Kirklington Road, Hockerton (21/01516/FUL) as he was known to the applicant.

Councillor Mrs P Rainbow declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Agenda Item No. 12 – Seven Hills, Quibells Lane, Newark (21/01902/DEM)), as land she owned abuts the site.

The Director of Planning & Growth declared a pecuniary interest in Agenda Item No. 11 – 1 Beacon Hill Road, Newark.

50 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 would be webcast.

51 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2021

AGREED that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2021, were approved as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

(Councillor M Skinner entered the meeting at this point).

52 LAND OFF A17, CODDINGTON (20/01452/OUTM)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought outline planning permission for the development of site for distribution uses (Use Class B8) including ancillary offices and associated works including vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and landscaping.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager - 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; Coddington Parish Council; and Planning Case Officer.

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

Councillor Mrs M Dobson, adjacent Ward Member for Collingham Ward, spoke against the application on the following grounds: Approving a logistics park in the open countryside would cause more traffic and planning permission on this site had been refused on a number of occasions. This application was considered a speculative development and there was no guarantee that Curry's wanted extra space or any other business. They were supportive of jobs but that needed to be in the right place.

Members considered the application and commented that the economic growth of 525 jobs and income this development would bring was an attractive proposition. Members were however uncomfortable with development in the open countryside and the loss of green field land and the traffic impact that a development of this size would bring. It was commented that there were more appropriate sites in the district that could be secured. The current traffic problems around the show ground were discussed. The larger future master plan on this site also raised concern as Members hadn't been informed of the details. Members also commented that this was development on an archaeological site and hoped that would be closely monitored. Concern was raised regarding the creation of an additional roundabout on a dangerous section of road and the bridge in close proximity. The noise and impact of the existing site was commented as huge. The proposed shuttle bus into Newark was considered good and would ease traffic entering into Newark. During reserve matters the need for EV charging points was required. The visual impact of the current Curry's warehouse was different to this and it was considered that this wouldn't be as intrusive as the current warehouse. The closeness to the open break and Yew Tree Wood was also commented upon.

The Chairman informed Members that the local Ward Member Balderton North and Coddington - Councillor J Lee could not attend the meeting but had asked the Chairman to inform Members that he couldn't add any further comments and was supportive of and agreed with the Ward comments.

The Chairman commented that this was a speculative development, if there was a named tenant a different approach could be taken. It was further commented that if the named tenant was known the design of the structure could be amended to close

proximity of the existing buildings and perhaps the additional roundabout would not be required.

A vote was taken to approve planning permission and lost, with 3 votes For and 11 votes Against.

AGREED (with 13 votes For and 1 Abstention) that the application be deferred to allow officers to push the agent for a named occupier.

53 GROVE BUNGALOW, BARNBY ROAD, NEWARK NG24 2NE (20/02499/OUTM)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the residential development of 10 dwellings, following removal of Grove Bungalow and existing outbuildings.

The application was considered by the 2 March 2021 Planning Committee where it was resolved to approve the scheme in line with the officer recommendation. This resolution was subject to the completion of a section 106 legal agreement within 4 months of the date of the Planning Committee (by 2nd July) and that failure to do so would result in a refusal on the grounds that the scheme failed to secure an appropriate drainage scheme and developer contributions.

Since the committee, the applicant's agent had approached officers to advise that it had now become apparent that the proposed means of site drainage was not feasible. A revised drainage strategy had been put forward as detailed on drawing no. 100334_01_0500_01 (Proposed Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 of 1) and the indicative layout plan amended to reflect this strategy as shown on drawing no. 1506G/001 (Site Block Plan) contained within the report. This showed that surface water would now also need to be pumped off site in addition to foul sewage. An indicative area for the proposed pumping stations had been identified to the south-western corner of the site resulting in plot 5 indicatively moved east towards plot 6, bearing in mind that layout was not being fully considered at this stage.

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

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that planning permission is approved subject to:

- a) the conditions shown on the original report (with plan references updated where appropriate, condition 8 to have the words 'Unless the bungalow is demolished before 18 May 2021' removed and condition 16 amended to:

Revised Condition 16:

No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme based on the *principles* put forward by the approved Dice Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated July

2021 ref 100334/LD/November-19/01 Rev B has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development.

Due to the inherent complexities of the surface water proposals it is crucial that all elements of any surface water condition are discharged prior to commencement on site. The final surface water scheme to be submitted shall:

- Demonstrate that the development will use SuDS throughout the site as a primary means of surface water management and that design is in accordance with CIRIA C753.
- Limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to the 100 year plus 40% (for climate change) critical rain storm 5 l/s rates for the developable area.
- Provide detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details on any attenuation system, and the outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
- For all exceedance to be contained within the site boundary without flooding new properties in a 100year+40% storm.
- Evidence STW approval for connections to existing network and adoption agreement of site drainage infrastructure including pumping stations and associated rising mains.
- Evidence of how the on-site surface water drainage systems shall be maintained and managed after completion and for the lifetime of the development to ensure long term

Reason: A detailed surface water management plan is required to ensure that the development is in accordance with NPPF and local planning policies. It should be ensured that all major developments have sufficient surface water management, are not at increased risk of flooding and do not increase flood risk off-site.

and

- b) the completion of the section 106 agreement to secure the developer contributions set out in the original report (except the community facility contribution which is no longer sought) and the maintenance of the on-site pumping stations/drainage infrastructure where necessary within 3 months of the date of Planning Committee; and
- c) failure to do so would result in a refusal on the grounds that the scheme fails to secure sustainable development by failing to provide for the necessary infrastructure by way of developer contributions.

54 WAREHOUSE, THE WHARF, NEWARK (20/02498/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the Change of use and internal and external alterations to warehouse to new business hub, co-working office space and cafe (Classes E(b) and E (c)(ii)).

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

Members considered the application and commented that this was a great plan, which would bring a disused building back into use, there was also plenty of car parking in front of the building in public car parks. A Member commented that this building would be direct competition with the Beacon and may challenge that business, however given the pandemic, the world had changed and it was felt that there would be a demand for these facilities.

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

55 THE BOTHY, MILL LANE, CAUNTON NG23 6AJ (21/01704/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the erection of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case Officer, 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 a local resident.

The Planning Case Officer informed Members that there was a proposed change to Condition 13, which was the removal of Class AA: Enlargement of a dwelling house by construction of additional storeys within this condition.

Members considered the application and it was commented that this had been referred to the Planning Committee by the local Ward Member on the grounds of Health & Safety issues regarding the open sewer on site. Concern was raised that there was no main sewer servicing this area and there was an over spill to the open sewage drain at the Bothy. The Bothy was situated at the end of a private drive, which had been tree lined, but subsequently the trees had been removed in anticipation of planning permission. It was commented that the addition of this property would exasperate existing problems. The drive to the proposed development would be built over the existing open drain, here raw sewage could be seen going down the drain. Sewage was drained onto the adjacent field which ran onto a footpath connecting to the village, which was considered unhealthy. It was commented that the Council should not continue to allow permission to build

properties with inadequate sewage disposal. It was suggested that if the Planning Committee were minded to approve the application, a condition be imposed seeking the applicant to put in larger treatment plants.

The Chairman commented that the sewage issues were not strictly planning matters and the comments of the Council's Environmental Health as contained within the report made reference that the drain would run over private sewage and must comply with building regulations. He suggested that the application be deferred in order for advice to be sought from the Council's Environmental Health, regarding what mitigating matters might be desirable to the applicant, making clear the concerns that had been raised.

AGREED (unanimously) that the application be deferred to the 2 November 2021 Planning Committee, to allow discussions with Environmental Health on what mitigation measures would be desirable to compensate for the drainage impact to the surrounding area.

56 PLOT 3, LAND AT 10 EPPERSTONE ROAD, LOWDHAM NG14 7BU (21/01667/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for 'Plot 3', referred to as such in acknowledgment of the above planning history whereby the consideration of this plot was removed during the life of the application reference 20/02253/FUL.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager - 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 neighbouring party.

Councillor P Harrison on behalf of Lowdham Parish Council spoke in accordance with the views of Lowdham Parish Council, as contained within the report.

Councillor T Wendels Local Member for Lowdham Ward, spoke against the application on the grounds of significant impact to amenity space of No. 12 Epperstone Road. The roof line remained 0.61 metres higher than the adjacent bungalow. The footprint had increased from the previously submitted four bedroomed house and was 1.8 metres closer to No. 12 Epperstone Road, to maximise floor space.

Members considered the application and noting the objections of Councillor P Harrison and Councillor T Wendels it was suggested that a bungalow replicating plots 4 and 5 would be better and would provide best planning on site. Concern was also raised regarding the visual impact from the velux roof lights on to the garden of No. 12 Epperstone Road. Members also noted the proposed applications inability to deliver the 3 full parking spaces required by the SPD on cycle and residential car parking standard. Although the third space was only just short of the policy requirement, members considered that this was indicative of the cramped and compromised nature of the proposed development.

A vote was taken to approve planning permission and lost with 13 votes Against and 1 Abstention.

AGREED (unanimously) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be refused on the grounds of cramped and compromised position. An Informative to be added to state a 2 bed bungalow would be more sympathetic.

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
R. Crowe	For
Mrs L. Dales	For
L. Goff	For
Mrs R. Holloway	For
Mrs P. Rainbow	For
Mrs S. Saddington	For
M. Skinner	For
T. Smith	For
I. Walker	For
K. Walker	Absent
T. Wildgust	For
Mrs Y. Woodhead	For

57 LAND ADJACENT HOCKERTON GRANGE FARM, KIRKLINGTON ROAD, HOCKERTON (21/01516/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission to erect a two storey (rooms in the roof) L shaped 3 bedroomed detached dwelling with 3 parking spaces within the grounds.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Case Officer, 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 Planning Case Officer, with a proposed additional/amended informative.

Members considered the application and commented that they were struggling to see that the proposed application was not in the village envelope and given that there had been no comments received from Hockerton Parish Meeting and no objection from local residents, they felt that the application was acceptable.

A vote was taken and lost to refuse planning permission with 3 votes For and 11 votes Against.

AGREED (with 11 votes For and 3 votes Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be approved subject to reasonable conditions delegated to the Business Manager - Planning Development.

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
R. Crowe	Against
Mrs L. Dales	For
L. Goff	For
Mrs R. Holloway	Against
Mrs P. Rainbow	For
Mrs S. Saddington	For
M. Skinner	For
T. Smith	For
I. Walker	For
K. Walker	Absent
T. Wildgust	For
Mrs Y. Woodhead	Against

58 1 BEACON HILL ROAD, NEWARK NG24 1NT (21/02002/HOUSE)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the proposed two storey side extension (resubmission of 21/01283/HOUSE, to change bricks to white render on front and east (side) elevations).

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

Members considered the application acceptable.

(Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest the Director of Planning & Growth left the meeting).

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

59 SEVEN HILLS, QUIBELLS LANE, NEWARK NG24 2FE (21/01902/DEM)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which provided notification for Prior Approval for demolition of the existing Seven Hills Community Centre and associated ancillary buildings.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager - Planning

Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that prior approval is required and approved for the demolition of the buildings subject to the conditions and reasons contained within the report.

60 LAND AT LORD HAWKE WAY AND BOWBRIDGE ROAD, NEWARK 21/01831/S73M

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, the application had been submitted as a Section 73 application to amend the wording of condition 11 which related to land contamination.

The application was presented as a late item in order to meet timescales agreed.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager - 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 Newark Town Council.

Members considered the application acceptable.

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

61 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

62 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

Meeting closed at 6.36 pm.

Chairman