

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 18 JANUARY 2022

Application No:	21/02410/FUL
Proposal:	Change of Use of Community Hall to One Dwelling including the erection of an extension and external alterations
Location:	Community Hall, Easthorpe, Southwell, NG25 0HZ
Applicant:	Easthorpe Common Lands Foundation
Registered:	15.11.2021 Target Date: 10.01.2022
Application File:	21/02410/FUL Change of Use of Community Hall to One Dwelling including the erection of an extension and external alterations Community Hall Easthorpe Southwell NG25 0HZ (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)

The application is presented to Planning Committee in accordance with the Council’s Scheme of Delegation as the Applicant has links with a District Councillor and Member of the Planning Committee.

The Site

The application site comprises a community hall which adjoins no. 62 Easthorpe. The site faces onto Bramley Close which is a more modern housing development but the application building and the building to which it adjoins are traditional red brick and pantile buildings that are reflective of the local historic vernacular for Southwell. The community hall is accessed off Bramley Close where there is a parking area laid with hardstanding to the front of the building. There is no land to the rear of the building. To the NE is a public footpath and to the NW lies Easthorpe Road. The area is residential in character, albeit further NE is Southwell’s Industrial area, however the site is still read within the residential context of Easthorpe/Bramley Close.

The application site comprises the historic Easthorpe Old School Hall (the ‘Community Hall’) which adjoins 64 Easthorpe, both of which are identified on the Notts Historic Environment Record (HER) as Local Interest buildings. The Community Hall is outside of Southwell Conservation Area (CA), but is not too far from the north-east boundary of the Easthorpe character area of the CA. The Easthorpe character area has numerous Grade II listed buildings which sit on the main road. Due to its age, architectural appearance and social history, Easthorpe Old School Hall contributes positively to the setting of the CA and is considered to be a heritage asset in-line with the Council’s emerging Criteria for identifying Non-designated Heritage Assets.

Significance of heritage asset(s): Easthorpe Old School Hall is constructed in local red brick with a clay pantile roof and coped gables. Originally a barn, it was converted to a school in the early 19th century, being home to Easthorpe Endowed School from 1827 to the 1940s. Evidence of barn elements can be understood in the masonry, such as the infilled doorway and the first floor hatch. It has a later addition to the east, also brick-built with a pantile roof. There is a modern porch of no significance. Most recently, the building has been used as a community centre. It is attached to 64 Easthorpe, a cottage that appears to predate the barn.

Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history.

The Proposal

Permission is sought for the change of use of the community hall to one residential dwelling.

The building would provide an open plan kitchen/dining/living room with a separate W/C, Bedroom/Snug and ensuite bathroom at ground floor with two bedrooms with ensuites at first floor.

The following external alterations are proposed:

Front (S) Elevation: installation of 2 no. roof lights, retention of existing openings and installation of bi-folding doors at ground floor on the eastern side of the elevation.

Side (E) Elevation: replacement of the existing single storey portion of the building with an extension at two storey with the ridge and eaves height set down slightly from the main body of the building (with architectural detailing to match the building). One window is shown on the gable end at ground floor with a blind window at first floor.

Rear (N) Elevation: retention of existing openings and installation of 3 no. roof lights.

The proposed site plan shows the property would be served by two off-street parking spaces with a garden area to the front, enclosed by a low level brick wall to match the existing walls. Bin storage would also be provided to the side of the dwelling off the proposed terrace. A low height wall with a hedgerow behind is shown enclosing the front garden area and the existing tree at the front of the site is shown to be retained.

Documents submitted with this application:

- Site Location Plan – Ref. 1974 P 00 A
- Ground and Roof Existing – Ref. 1974 P 01
- Elevation South Existing – Ref. 1974 P 02
- Elevation East Existing – Ref. 1974 P 03
- Elevation North Existing – Ref. 1974 P 04
- Site Plan Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 05 A
- Ground Floor Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 06
- First Floor and Roof Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 07
- Elevation North and South Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 08
- Elevation East Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 09
- Justification For Change of Use Statement
- Protected Species Appraisal
- Tree and Hedgerow Appraisal

Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 10 neighbouring properties have been notified by letter.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Southwell Neighbourhood Plan (made Oct 2016)

Policy SD1 - Delivering Sustainable Development

Policy DH1 – Sense of Place

DH3 – Historic Environment

TA3 – Highways Impact

CF1 – Identified Assets

HE1 – Housing Type and Density

NSDC Amended Core Strategy, adopted 2019

Spatial Policy 1 – Settlement Hierarchy

Spatial Policy 2 - Spatial Distribution of Growth

Spatial Policy 7 - Sustainable Transport

Spatial Policy 8: Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities

Core Policy 3 – Housing Mix, Type and Density

Core Policy 9: Sustainable Design

Core Policy 12: Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Core Policy 14: Historic Environment

Newark and Sherwood Allocation and Development Management DPD, adopted 2013

Policy DM5 – Design

Policy DM7 - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Policy DM9 – Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Policy DM11 - Retail and Town Centre Uses

Policy DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other material planning considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance suite, on-line resource, March 2014

NSDC Residential cycle and car parking standards and design guide SPD, 2021

Consultations

Southwell Town Council – No objection.

Southwell Civic Society – Object – “We object to this change of use application which will result in the loss of what has been and potentially could be a well-used community asset. It is the only public meeting place at the Easthorpe end of town and is of a size much better suited than most venues for small informal groups such as committee meetings and amateur dramatic rehearsals. Use has declined because of its current poor state and lack of advertising. It obviously needs modernisation and improvement but grant money for such work is now more readily available for charities than it was some thirty or so years ago when the late Nancy Harrison, a lifetime champion of the Hall, obtained public funding. Presumably the expenditure in 2019 of £24000 on repair and renewals at the Hall and adjoining cottage must have included some exceptional items and is very unlikely to be annually recurring to anything like the same extent. The trust itself could and should be able to make a contribution from the sale proceeds of the cottage and by reviewing

the income stream from its other land holdings.

Parking has never been easy but users should be encouraged to walk or cycle to the venue. Once lost this public asset will never be replaced.”

NSDC, Conservation – No objection subject to conditions relating to brick sample panel, technical details on joinery, rooflights and other external accretions. A basic level one recording of the building is also suggested to be controlled by condition.

NCC Rights of Way – No comments received.

NCC Highways – No objection.

The Ramblers – No comments received.

Comments have been received from ONE interested party that can be summarised as follows:

Object

- This historical importance of the building should be borne in mind when deciding on any proposed development which seeks to significantly alter the appearance of the building.
- The change of use from hall to residential should be refused in principle because it is contrary to Objectives 3 and 5 of the Southwell Neighbourhood Plan (in the following, “Plan”), and in particular because it is contrary to Policy CF1 of the Plan.
- If the Application were permitted, it would have a negative impact on the town’s unique character, and would reduce the quality of life for people living and working in Southwell, and in particular those living in Easthorpe. The grounds for our objection against the change of use are set out in further detail below with regard to policy CF1.
- The Applicant has not clearly demonstrated that there is sufficient provision of Halls in the area, and as such, the change of use should be rejected.
- Concerns raised over:
 - o loss of privacy and overlooking;
 - o overshadowing;
 - o disturbance through noise;
 - o overbearing; and
 - o out of character with the neighbourhood.

Comments of the Business Manager

The NPPG acknowledges that Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area, thus providing a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.

Following public consultation and independent examination, at its council meeting on 11 October 2016 Newark and Sherwood District Council adopted the Southwell Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan now forms part of the development plan for the district and its policies are a material consideration alongside other policies in the development plan and carry weight in the determination of planning applications in Southwell. In this instance the most relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan are listed above and are considered against the relevant aspects of the proposal in the assessment below.

Principle of Development

The site lies within the defined built up area of Southwell, which is identified by SP1 of the Core Strategy as a 'service centre' and therefore the principle of housing is accepted, subject to consideration of the loss of the Community Hall as a community facility, the design of the conversion, impact upon amenity, and highway impacts, amongst other issues. It is fully appreciated that the stance of the Neighbourhood Plan shows an encouragement for the provision of smaller homes for young people and families including through the emphasis of bungalow accommodation. It is equally acknowledged that Policy So/HN/1 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD seeks to ensure that the majority of *new* housing within Southwell will be one or two bedroom units in line with the identified housing need. However, the policy which dictates Housing Type and Density – Policy HE1 of the SNP relates to developments of 11 dwellings or more and therefore is not directly applicable to the current proposal which would represent a conversion scheme creating one additional single dwelling.

Loss of Community Facility

Spatial Policy 8 of the Amended Core Strategy seeks to protect existing community facilities. At a local level, the District Council recognises the important role that new and existing leisure and community facilities play in meeting the community's needs and contributing to improved health and wellbeing. As the building was last in use as a Community Hall this constitutes a community facility, and therefore Spatial Policy 8 is applicable. SP8 states that the loss of existing community facilities will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- Its continued use as a community facility or service is no longer feasible, having had regard to appropriate marketing (over an appropriate period of time and at a price which reflects its use, condition and local market values), the demand for the use of the site or premises, its usability and the identification of a potential future occupier; **or**
- There is sufficient provision of such facilities in the area; **or**
- That sufficient alternative provision has been, or will be, made elsewhere which is equally accessible and of the same quality or better as the facility being lost.

Policy CF1 of the Southwell Neighbourhood Plan would also be relevant which states that Development proposals that would result in the loss of community facilities such as Community Centres and Halls will be resisted unless it can be shown that they are poorly used, not viable or adequate provision is made elsewhere.

It is understood that the site has ceased operating as a Community Hall since Easter 2020 and that in the recent past the use of the community hall has declined given its small size. The supporting statement submitted explains that the cost of repairs to the hall are increasing which are becoming unfeasible. The supporting statement explains that the halls "small size, dated facilities, inadequate parking and the ready availability of better-suited alternatives" has resulted in a decline of bookings with only one regular booking in Feb 2020 (paying £20 per week which is less than the running costs for utilities and insurance (without provision for maintenance or updating of the facility)). The decision was taken to close the Hall in Easter 2020 (taken prior to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic).

The supporting statement explains the application is advanced on the basis of meeting the requirements of the second bullet point of SP8 set out above – that there is sufficient provision of such facilities within the area to justify the loss. The supporting text to SP8 does not expand upon the level of information required to satisfy the requirements of the above bullet points, it is

therefore a case that a judgement needs to be made about the impact the loss this facility would have on the existing community and whether there is adequate alternative provision.

The supporting statement explains that in the immediate vicinity there is a function room within the Hearty Goodfellow (4 minute walk/300m to the west) that has a similar capacity as this community hall and provides modern facilities. It is also understood that previous users of this hall have transferred their bookings to the WI Hall off Queen Street (15 min. walk/1.1km to the west) which is a slightly larger venue with kitchen facilities. Furthermore, rooms of varying sizes are available for hire in Southwell Minster (9 min. walk/800m to the west) – ranging from the State Chamber in the Archbishops' Palace, with a capacity of 110, through two rooms in Trebeck Hall with capacities of 60 and 25, a room in Minster Chambers with a capacity of 70 and three rooms in Sacrista Prebend with advertised capacities of 25, 15 and 12. Southwell Methodist Church also has a number of rooms available (11 min. walk/800 m to the west) as well as Southwell Town Council offering their council chamber and committee room for hire (11 min. walk/800 m to the west). I also understand that a number of pubs in the vicinity offer their rooms for hire.

I have consulted with colleagues in the Planning Policy team to assist with the assessment of the details submitted against the requirements of SP8 and they have advised that in this specific case (for the loss of a community hall) the above facilities cited offer comparable service provision, with similar facilities within an appropriate walking distance for this location. Whilst some of these premises offer different levels of facilities they do nevertheless provide a choice of places for local community groups to gather in close proximity to the site and on this basis it is considered that the requirements of policy SP8 and CF1 have been met to justify the loss of this community facility.

Impact upon the Character of the Area

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and new development should be visually attractive. Core Policy 9 states that new development should achieve a high standard of sustainable design that is of an appropriate form and scale to its context complementing the existing built and landscape environments. Policy DM5 of the DPD states that local distinctiveness should be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design and materials in new development.

Whilst not lying within the Southwell Conservation Area the community hall and adjacent cottage are considered to be local interest buildings and as such Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is relevant which states that Local Interest buildings are non-designated heritage assets. The impact of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset is a material consideration, as stated under paragraph 203 of the NPPF. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance. The NPPF also makes it clear that protecting and enhancing the historic environment is sustainable development (paragraph 8.c).

The proposal would see the addition of a two storey/first floor extension on the eastern elevation of the building. Plans show the extension would be flush with the front and rear elevations but would have a slightly set down ridge and eaves height (using architectural details to match the existing building). This ensures that the extension reads as a subservient addition to the building and respects the building's existing modest proportions and mirroring its existing linear form. Other external alterations are explained within The Proposal section above but mainly relate to retaining the existing features of the building and inserting roof lights. Given the historic interest

of the building the Council's Conservation Officer has provided detailed comments which can be found in full on the online planning file. The CO explains that they have no objection to the development.

The proposed residential use is considered to be compatible with the fabric of the building. The extension is sensitively designed, and not unduly prominent. The approach to fenestration helps sustain the architectural values of the property, and the number of rooflights is suitably restrained.

Conservation has raised no concerns with a residential change of use during pre-application discussions and in response to comments received from local residents they have advised that this building was not designed as a community building, and has served as such only in very recent years. Moreover, the proposal is considered to put forward a sensitive approach to the external treatment of the building which would help preserve its architectural interest.

Paragraph 203 of the NPPF requires a balanced judgement when determining impact on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset. For the reasons set out above, the CO concludes that the proposal would cause no harm to the heritage asset in this case. They also conclude that there would be no harm to the setting of any other heritage asset, including the CA.

Subject to conditions the Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the development and with which I concur. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would comply with the objectives of the abovementioned heritage policies and guidance in this regard.

Neighbour Amenity

Policy DM5 of the DPD states that development proposals should ensure no unacceptable reduction in amenity upon neighbouring development. The NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The Community Hall adjoins no. 64 Easthorpe to the west and no. 1 Bramley Close lies detached to the east. The conversion of this building to a residential dwelling is unlikely to result in any in principle detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity as the site is within a residential area.

The replacement of the existing single storey portion of the building on the eastern side with a two storey extension would bring two-storey built form closer to the common boundary with no. 1 Bramley Close, however the footprint at ground floor level would remain the same. Given there would be no window at first floor in this gable end it is not considered that this extension would result in any adverse overlooking impact on the occupiers of this neighbouring property. In terms of overbearing and overshadowing, given the orientation and relative positioning it is considered unlikely that any unacceptable overshadowing would occur. Similarly, given the separation from the side elevation of the existing dwelling at No 1 there is unlikely to be an overbearing impact on this occupier as a result of the proposal.

In respect to the amenity provision for the proposed occupiers, the Community Hall as an independent dwelling would be afforded a reasonable area of front garden commensurate to serve the dwelling – this space is shown enclosed by the existing low level wall which would have a hedgerow installed behind it to improve privacy for future occupiers. This space would be overlooked by a first floor window on the side elevation on no. 1 Bramley Close and no. 14 across the highway, however any future occupiers would be aware of this situation prior to purchase/occupation and it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable living environment that would be fatal to the scheme.

It is also noted that the two bedrooms at first floor would be solely served by roof lights that would be at a low level internally. Whilst this is not ideal, it is not considered that this would be sufficient in its own right to warrant withholding permission.

Overall it is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policy DM5 of the DPD in this regard.

Highways Safety

Spatial Policy 7 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that there is effective parking provision for new development. Existing parking for the site is available on-site to the front of the building, accessed off Bramley Close. The submitted site plan shows two off street car parking spaces for the dwelling which would be a 2/3-bed property.

The Council has recently adopted a Parking and Design SPD for new residential developments which identifies minimum parking standards (for both car and cycle parking) and expected design standards for parking spaces to support Spatial Policy 7 in the ACS. To accord with Spatial Policy 7 (bullet 5) of the Amended Core Strategy and to implement Paragraph 110 of the NPPF, the SPD explains that the Council will seek to encourage minimum car parking standards for new residential development and that the figures set should be viewed as a recommended minimum as the starting point.

In accordance with this SPD a two bed dwelling should have two off street parking spaces each and a three bed should have three in this location. The SPD does set out that in some circumstances, where appropriate (such as change of use proposals in sustainable locations or with site specific constraints), consideration would be given to car parking provision below the recommended standards set out above and in this case the addition of one residential unit here served by two parking spaces (particularly when compared with the likely traffic that could be generated from the existing community hall) is unlikely to result in such pressure on the local highway network that would be sufficient to warrant the refusal of this application. Furthermore, it is noted that the Highways Authority have commented rising no objection to the proposal in this regard. As such the proposal is considered to accord with SP7 of the Core Strategy.

It is noted that the Highways Authority have however commented about the parking provision for the adjacent property, no 64, which is in the same ownership as the application site. The Highways Authority suggest that the occupiers of this property park on the access to the community hall and therefore that this proposal would result in a loss of parking provision for this dwelling, however it has been confirmed with the applicant that this is not the case. There is no current functional/operational relationship between No 64 and the application site, the former of which is occupied as a separate private residential dwelling with no on-site parking provision, and therefore relies on on-street parking facilities. It is therefore not considered that a lack of parking for no. 64 has any bearing on the application at hand.

Impact on Ecology and Trees

Core Policy 12 and Policy DM7 promote the conservation and enhancement of the District's biodiversity assets. The NPPF also seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible.

A Phase I ecology survey has been submitted to accompany this application which concludes that there was no evidence found of the presence of bats or nesting birds. There were no suitable access points or external features identified on the building that would be suitable to support roosting bats or birds.

An Arboricultural Report has also been submitted which concludes that in order to construct the extension, a short length of privet hedgerow along the SE boundary would require removal. However the report goes on to conclude that this is not considered likely to have any negative ecological effect on the site as a whole and is not considered to pose a constraint to the proposed works. Furthermore, the submitted drawings indicate that there would be no encroachment into the large beech tree's root area (in the SE corner of the site) from any construction works. The survey concludes that the presence of the tree is not considered to pose a material constraint to the proposed works within the site and no mitigation is considered necessary in this instance.

Whilst the removal of the existing hedgerow is not ideal, the hedgerow is not protected and could be removed without prior consent. Furthermore, it is noted that a new boundary wall with a hedgerow behind it would enclose the front boundary which could provide some on site ecological enhancement. Precise details of this can be controlled by condition. Overall it is considered that the proposal complies with CP12 and DM7 in this regard.

Other matters

In terms of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the site is located within Housing Very High Zone 4 of the approved Charging Schedule for the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy. As such residential development in this area is rated at £100m² for CIL purposes. The proposed development would result in 55.01m² additional floor space. A discount of existing floor space for calculating CIL is permitted where the floor space of the building has been 'in use'. An 'In use building' is defined as a building which contains a part of an existing building that has been in lawful use for a continuous period of 6 months within the past three years before the grant of the planning permission. The application building has been in lawful use for 6 continuous months of the 36 previous months and as such this existing floor space can be offset against the CIL charge. CIL is therefore only chargeable on the additional 55.01m² and would be £5,601.94.

Conclusion

Given the above, the application has demonstrated that the proposal meets one of the required points of policy SP8 (and consequently CF1) to adequately justify the loss of the community facility. It is also considered that there would be no impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties as a result of this proposal and it has been concluded that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the area and the building as a NDHA which complies with the advice contained within Section 16 of the NPPF and Core Policy 14 and Policy DM9 of the Council's LDF DPD. There would be no detrimental impact on the highways safety or network in accordance with SP7 and DM5, nor would there be any unacceptable ecological impact as a result of the proposal. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

That full planning permission is approved subject to the following conditions

Conditions

01

The development hereby permitted shall not begin later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

02

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved plan references:

- Site Location Plan – Ref. 1974 P 00 A
- Site Plan Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 05 A
- Ground Floor Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 06
- First Floor and Roof Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 07
- Elevation North and South Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 08
- Elevation East Proposed – Ref. 1974 P 09

Reason: So as to define this permission.

03

Before any construction occurs above damp proof course (DPC) level, details and samples of the materials identified below shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- Bricks (sample panel including details on brick, bond, mortar specification and pointing technique)
- Roof Covering

Reason: In order to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and non-designated heritage asset.

04

No development shall be commenced in respect of the features identified below, until details of the design, specification, fixing and finish in the form of drawings and sections at a scale of not less than 1:10 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be undertaken and retained for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved details.

- External windows including roof windows, doors and their immediate surroundings, including details of glazing and glazing bars.
- Verges and eaves (including fascia)
- Extractor vents
- Flues
- Soil and vent pipes
- Meter Box and any external accretions.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

05

Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and

these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:

- full details of every tree, shrub, hedge to be planted (including its proposed location, species, size and approximate date of planting) and details of tree planting pits including associated irrigation measures, tree staking and guards, and structural cells. The scheme shall be designed so as to enhance the nature conservation value of the site, including the use of locally native plant species;
- means of enclosure;
- car parking layouts and materials; and
- hard surfacing materials.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

06

The approved soft landscaping shall be completed during the first planting season following the first occupation of the development, or such longer period as may be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees/shrubs which, within a period of five years of being planted die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. All tree, shrub and hedge planting shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3936 -1992 Part 1-Nursery Stock-Specifications for Trees and Shrubs and Part 4 1984-Specifications for Forestry Trees ; BS4043-1989 Transplanting Root-balled Trees; BS4428-1989 Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations. The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be completed prior to first occupation.

Reason: To ensure the work is carried out within a reasonable period and thereafter properly maintained, in the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

07

Development shall not commence until a programme of historic building recording and full recording report has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of historical importance associated with the building.

Notes to Applicant

01

The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1st December 2011 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website at www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL IS PAYABLE on the development hereby approved as is detailed below. Full details about the CIL Charge including, amount and process for payment will be set out in the Regulation 65 Liability Notice which will be sent to you as soon as possible after this decision notice has been issued. If the development hereby approved is for a self-build dwelling, residential extension or residential

annex you may be able to apply for relief from CIL. Further details about CIL are available on the Council's website: www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/ or from the Planning Portal: www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

02

This application has been the subject of pre-application discussions and has been approved in accordance with that advice. The District Planning Authority has accordingly worked positively and pro-actively, seeking solutions to problems arising in coming to its decision. This is fully in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Honor Whitfield on ext 5827.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

Lisa Hughes
Business Manager – Planning Development

Committee Plan - 21/02410/FUL

