

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 15 FEBRUARY 2022

Application No:	21/02492/S73
Proposal:	Variation of Condition 1 attached to planning permission 18/01430/FUL to make the temporary permission permanent (Change of use of former abattoir site and paddock to gypsy and traveller caravan site)
Location:	Park View Caravan Park, Tolney Lane, Newark On Trent
Applicant:	Mssrs Bower
Agent:	Dr Angus Murdoch
Registered:	1 December 2021 Target Date: 26 January 2022
Website Link:	https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage

The Site

The application site is located on the northern side of Tolney Lane at its eastern end, just beyond the public car park. The site lies within the Newark Urban Area, as defined within the Allocations and Development Management DPD. The site is closely located to the town and its centre. The site is located within Zone 3b on the Environment Agency Flood Maps and as such forms part of the functional floodplain. The site is also located within Newark's designated Conservation Area.

The north of the site abuts the main railway line linking Nottingham and Lincoln. Open amenity land exists to the south, on the opposite side of Tolney Lane, adjacent to the River Trent. To the east is a local authority operated public car park, while finally to the west an open field/paddock beyond which is another Gypsy and Traveller site.

Comprising just under 0.6ha the site includes the former abattoir building, a single storey structure which remains, oriented gable end on and adjacent to Tolney Lane. The site is relatively flat and is in temporary use as a gypsy and traveller caravan site for up to 15 caravans. Access to the site is taken at two points off Tolney Lane, although previously approved plans show one central access point with one secondary access off the Lane serving a single pitch.

The southern boundary is walled, at a height of approx. 1.6m. Palisade fencing forms the rear boundary with trees situated beyond outside the application site. Other boundaries treatments comprise of vertical timber boarding along the north-east boundary and timber post and rail fencing along the south-west boundary.

Tolney Lane accommodates a large Gypsy and Traveller community providing approx 300 pitches.

Relevant Site History

20/02394/S73 - Variation of condition1 attached to planning permission 18/01430/FUL to

make the temporary permission permanent, refused 29.04.2021 for the following reason:

“The application use falls within a 'highly vulnerable' flood risk vulnerability category that is inappropriate to the Flood Zone in which the application is located (Flood Zone 3b - functional floodplain). Tables 1 and 3 of the PPG make it clear that this type of development is not compatible to this Flood Zone and therefore should 'not be permitted.'

The purpose of granting temporary consent was to cater for the applicants' immediate accommodation needs whilst allowing for the possibility of identifying other sites at lesser risk of flooding. The temporary consent still has seven months to run (up to 30th November 2021) and the Authority is pro-actively pursuing the identification of suitable sites to meet future gypsy and traveller needs within, or adjoining, the Newark Urban Area through the Development Plan process.

Whilst the proposal would assist in the supply of pitches position it is not considered that this is sufficient to outweigh the severe flood risk and warrant the granting of permanent consent. To allow permanent occupation of a site at such high risk of flooding would therefore be contrary to Core Policy 5 and 10 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy 2019 and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD 2013 together with the aims of the NPPF and PPG, which are material planning considerations.”

18/01430/FUL - Change of use of former abattoir site and paddock to gypsy and traveller site – Approved 05.12.2018, subject to a number of conditions including condition 1 which reads:-

“The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following and their resident dependents:

- Mr. Harold William Bower and/or Mrs. Donna Bower – wife of Mr. H.W. Bower*
- Mr. David Bower and/or Mrs. Deborah Bower*
- Mrs. Elizabeth Salmon and/or Mr. Paul Salmon*

And shall be for a limited period being the period up to 30 November 2021, or the period during which the land is occupied by them, whichever is the shorter. When the land ceases to be occupied by those named in this condition 1, or on 30 November 2021, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place in accordance with a scheme approved under condition 5 hereof.

Reason: In the recognition of the current need for gypsy and traveller sites within the district and to allow for further assessment of alternative sites to meet this need including sites at less risk of flooding in accordance with the aims of Core Policy 10.”

17/00949/FUL - Application to remove conditions 1 and 5 of planning consent 15/00354/FUL to make the personal and temporary permission permanent and general (Re-submission of 16/1879/FUL), refused 07.11.2017 for the following reason:

“The application site lies within Flood Zone 3b where the NPPF states that inappropriate development should be avoided by directing it towards areas at lower risk of flooding. When

temporary permission was first granted on this site there were no available Gypsy & Traveller sites in areas at lower risk of flooding. Whilst the Local Planning Authority cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of pitches, the shortfall of 2 pitches is not considered significant or severe. The purpose of granting temporary consent was to cater for the applicants immediate accommodation needs whilst allowing for the possibility of identifying other sites at lesser risk of flooding. The temporary consent still has almost a year to run (up to 30th September 2018) and the Authority is pro-actively pursuing the identification of a suitable site to meet future gypsy and traveller needs within, or adjoining, the Newark Urban Area. Although there would be some social, economic and environmental factors which would weigh in favour of the proposal it is not considered that these, in combination with the supply position, are sufficient to outweigh the severe flood risk and warrant the granting of permanent consent. To allow permanent occupation of a site at such high risk of flooding would therefore be contrary to the aims of the NPPF and put occupiers of the site and members of the emergency services at unnecessary risk.”

- 16/01879/FUL -** Application to remove conditions 1 and 5 of planning consent 15/00354/FUL to make the personal and temporary permission permanent and general – Application refused 04.01.2017 on grounds of flood risk.
- 15/00354/FUL -** Variation of Conditions 6(i) and Condition 5(i) of Planning Permission 14/01106/FUL - Change of use of former abattoir site and paddock to gypsy and traveller caravan site – Approved 15.05.2015 to extend the time scales within which to comply with conditions.
- 14/01106/FUL -** Change of use of former abattoir site and paddock to gypsy and traveller caravan site – Approved 02.09.2014 on a temporary basis until 30 September 2018 and on a personal basis with named occupiers
- 13/01167/FUL -** Change of use of former abattoir site and paddock to gypsy and traveller caravan site – Refused 14.11.2013 Appeal Withdrawn
- 11/01509/FUL -** Change of use of former abattoir site and paddock to form site for touring caravans – Refused 24.01.2012 Appeal Dismissed

The Proposal

This application seeks a variation to the wording of condition 1 attached to the existing planning permission, which currently allows the use on a temporary basis until 30 November 2021, and to remove this restriction and allow the use to be granted on a permanent basis.

In support of the application, the agent has stated: “It is clear that the site is considered to be suitable by your authority given that it has been promoted for allocation. Approving it now would mean that there were 15 pitches provided immediately thereby obviating the need for allocating the site at all.”

No further information has been submitted with this application to vary condition 1, however, the original application approved under 18/01430/FUL was accompanied by the following documents:

- Location Plan Scale 1:1250 received 24 July 2018
- Site Plan (Drawing No: 20/48/2009) dated 28 June 2013
- Topographical Survey dated 11 November 2009

- Flood Risk Assessment dated May 2018

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

No occupiers of properties have been individually notified by letter, but a site notice has been displayed and an advertisement placed in the local press.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019)

Spatial Policy 1 - Settlement Hierarchy

Spatial Policy 2 - Spatial Distribution of Growth

Spatial Policy 7 - Sustainable Transport

Core Policy 4 – Gypsies & Travellers – New Pitch Provision

Core Policy 5 – Criteria for Considering Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Core Policy 9 - Sustainable Design

Core Policy 10 – Climate Change

Core Policy 14 - Historic Environment

NAP1 – Newark Urban Area

Allocations & Development Management DPD (adopted July 2013)

Policy DM1 – Development within Settlements Central to Delivering the Spatial Strategy

Policy DM5 – Design

Policy DM9 – Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Policy DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites – August 2015:

When determining planning applications for traveller sites, this policy states that planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Government's overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates their traditional and nomadic way of life while respecting the interests of the settled community.

Applications should be assessed and determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the application of specific policies within the NPPF and this document (Planning policy for traveller sites).

This document states that the following issues should be considered, amongst other relevant matters:

- o Existing level of local provision and need for sites;

- o The availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants;
- o Other personal circumstances of the applicant;
- o Locally specific criteria used to guide allocation of sites in plans should be used to assess applications that come forward on unallocated sites;
- o Applications should be determined for sites from any travellers and not just those with local connections.

The document goes on to state that local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan and sites in rural areas should respect the scale of, and do not dominate the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure.

When considering applications, weight should be attached to the following matters:

- a) Effective use of previously developed (brown field), untidy or derelict land;
- b) Sites being well planned or soft landscaped in a way as to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness;
- c) Promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles, such as ensuring adequate landscaping and play areas for children and
- d) Not enclosing a site with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fences, that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community.

If a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date 5 year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission.

Annex 1 of this policy provides a definition of “gypsies and travellers” which reads:-

“Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds of their own or their family’s or dependents’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily, but excluding members of an organized group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.”

- Emergency Planning Guidance produced by the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Local Resilience Forum (August 2017)

This document states: “New developments in flood risk areas must not increase the burden on emergency services. The Emergency Services are in heavy demand during flood incidents. The Fire and Safety Regulations state that “people should be able to evacuate by their own means” without support and aid from the emergency services. The emergency services and local authority emergency planners may object to proposals that increase the burden on emergency services.”

“New development must have access and egress routes that allow residents to exit their property during flood conditions. This includes vehicular access to allow emergency services to safely reach the development during flood conditions. It should not be assumed that emergency services will have the resource to carry out air and water resources during significant flooding incidents; therefore safe access and egress routes are essential.....

The emergency services are unlikely to regard developments that increase the scale of any rescue as being safe...”

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
Newark and Sherwood Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, 2020;
The Equality Act 2010;
Human Rights Act 1998.

Consultations

Newark Town Council – Object on the grounds that this application is in a high risk flood area which poses a danger to life, in support of the Environment Agency.

The Environment Agency – Object. The site lies within Flood Zone 3a and 3b (functional floodplain) and has a high probability of flooding. The development is classed as highly vulnerable and Tables 1 and 3 of the PPG make it clear that this type of development is not compatible with this Flood Zone and should not be permitted. Furthermore they object because it fails the second part of the Exception Test, which requires the applicant to demonstrate that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible reduce flood risk overall.

The likely maximum flood depths on this site would be:

- 0.25m during the 5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event. The event used to determine the functional floodplain
- 0.78m during the 1% AEP event
- 1.08m during the 1% AEP event and including a 30% allowance for climate change
- 1.24m during the 1% AEP event and including a 50% allowance for climate change
- 1.32m during the 0.1% AEP event

Flooding to a depth of 0.6m represents DANGER FOR ALL. If the flooding is to a greater depth or involves moving water, the degree of hazard will be even higher. The above noted flood depths constitute a risk to life for any future occupants of the development.

Where there is reliance on flood warning and evacuation, the EA’s preference is for dry access and egress routes to be provided in order to demonstrate the safety of the development and future occupants. In this particular location the access and egress route is the first area of the site to flood, and it floods to extremely significant depths. Absence of safe access and egress from the proposed development coupled with the lack of safe refuge during a flood event makes this an extremely hazardous location in with to locate highly vulnerable development.

The proposals are contrary to NPPF and the flood risk to the site is highly significant. If the Authority is minded to approve the application on a temporary basis the EA request a copy of the decision notice for their records.

If the Authority are minded to approve the application on a permanent basis, the EA stress that they would consider instigating the call in direction as they consider the risks to this site to be too significant to allow permanent ‘highly vulnerable’ development to proceed, without further work to reduce flood risks to the site beforehand.

NSDC, Environmental Health - No objections to the proposed removal of conditions attached to the original planning approval (ref: 18/01430/FUL). Note that despite numerous requests, no application has been submitted for a caravan site license as required by the terms of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960.

NSDC, Emergency Planner – no comments received.

No representations have been received from local residents/interested parties.

Comments of the Business Manager

The main considerations in the assessment of this application relates to the significant unmet need and the absence of a 5 year land supply for gypsy and traveller pitches, and flood risk.

Need

The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) demonstrates a need for 118 pitches to meet the needs of those who were established to meet the planning definition between 2013-33 (this figure rises to 169 to take account of undetermined households and those who do not meet the definition – but who may require a culturally appropriate form of accommodation). Our requirement of 118 pitches forms the basis of the five year land supply test, as required as part of the PPTS. Helpfully the GTAA splits this need across 5 year tranches – with 77 pitches needing to be delivered or available within the first period (2019-24) for a five year supply to be achieved. This reflects a heavy skewing towards that first tranche – due to the need to address unauthorised and temporary development, doubling up (i.e. households lacking their own pitch) and some demographic change within that timespan (i.e. individuals who will be capable of representing a household by the time 2024 is reached).

It is accepted that the Authority has a considerable shortfall in being able to demonstrate a five year land supply, and a sizeable overall requirement which needs to be addressed. Both the extent of the pitch requirement and the lack of a five year land supply represent significant material considerations, which should weigh heavily in the favour of the granting of consent where proposals will contribute towards supply. Importantly, the GTAA assumed a net zero contribution from inward migration into the District - meaning that our pitch requirements are driven by locally identifiable need.

The site forms part of the baseline for the GTAA, which shows a current need for 8 pitches, and a further 5 within the remainder of the plan period – so 13 overall. With 8 pitches to address the needs of those who were demonstrated to meet the planning definition through that process, and 5 who did not. Clearly the proposal would allow for these immediate needs to be addressed as well as the future needs of those not meeting the definition. It is also noted that the temporary consent the site was subject to expired on the 30th November 2021, and so the occupants have an accommodation need which requires addressing.

The case presented is that given the site has been promoted for allocation through the recent Options Report consultation it is considered suitable, and so permission ought to be granted.

It is correct that the Options Report identified the land as ‘currently considered suitable’ for future allocation. However the weight which Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans is determined by the tests at paragraph 48 of the NPPF. In this respect

the stage of preparation of the Amended Allocations & Development Management DPD remains early, and there is also an unresolved objection towards the approach to Tolney Lane from the Environment Agency – received through the consultation. Consequently the amount of weight which could be afforded to the land's future allocation is extremely limited.

Accordingly the granting of permanent consent for this site would allow for the needs suggested by the GTAA to be met. As outlined above, this should weigh heavily in the favour of granting permanent consent, with robust and justifiable reasons needed to depart from that course of action. Officers consider, given the potential risk to people and property, flood risk has the potential to form such a reason.

Flood Risk

The proposed use falls within a 'highly vulnerable' flood risk vulnerability category that is inappropriate to the Flood Zone in which the application is located (Flood Zone 3b – functional floodplain). Tables 1 and 3 of the PPG make it clear that this type of development is not compatible to this Flood Zone and should 'not be permitted.' Paragraph 13 (g) of the PPTS sets out a clear objective not to locate gypsy and traveller sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given particularly vulnerability of caravans. Core Policy 5 requires the completion of a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, applying both the Sequential and Exception Tests, as appropriate, to achieve safety for eventual occupiers.

Park View forms part of a larger collection of sites along Tolney Lane accommodating some 317 individual pitches. The site occupies a location in the highest risk, within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b), with a single point of access/egress (along Tolney Lane to the Great North Road) and which also lays within the functional floodplain. The modelling shows this access to flood before much of the land accommodating the gypsy and traveller pitches.

The Environment Agency objects to the proposal to allow the current temporary permission to be made permanent, advising that according to Table 3 (Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification) of the PPG, the Exception Test should not be applied in this case. The PPG states that highly vulnerable uses should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3, without exception. However paragraph 168 of the NPPF states that for changes of use to a caravan site, the Sequential and Exception Tests should be applied, as appropriate. In the event that these two tests should be applied (which is somewhat debatable), it is considered that the Sequential Test is passed, in that there are no other reasonable available sites with a lower risk of flooding.

In the event that the application of the Exception Test is considered appropriate in this case, this test states that to pass, it should be demonstrated that:

- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and
- b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

It is accepted that the granting of permanent pitches would pass the Sequential Test, as there are no reasonably available sites at lesser risk. No updated Flood Risk Assessment accompanies this application. The applicant is therefore relying on the Assessment submitted in support of the 2018 application. This FRA does not address the Exception Test or the technical ability of the site itself to be safe for its proposed use without increasing flooding elsewhere (and as such is inadequate) but instead relies wholly on the ability to evacuate the site on receipt of a Flood Alert

warning from the EA prior to a flood event occurring. Notwithstanding the absence of mitigation measures on the site, this evacuation process is required as the only access/egress route along Tolney Lane also lays within the functional floodplain. It has already been acknowledged that this places additional pressures on emergency services during a flood event to check that the site has indeed been vacated, but this is still considered to be an acceptable mitigation on the basis that it would be for a finite period of time.

In relation to the first arm of the Test, whilst it is accepted that the development would provide some wider sustainability benefits to the community, in terms of the occupants of the site being able to access schools, hospitals and other services within the Newark Urban Area, this does not outweigh the severity of the harm caused to that same community by the high flood risk at the site.

Furthermore, both officers and the EA are clear that the proposal has not demonstrated compliance with the second arm of the Exception Test.

In support of the application, the agent has referred to the fact that the site is considered to be suitable by the authority given that it has been promoted for allocation. However, the applicant will also be aware that provision of flood resilient access was clearly set out as a condition of the land being acceptable through the consultation process as a potential allocated site. This is something of which the design and delivery is yet to be considered in detail.

Therefore, notwithstanding the passing of the Sequential Test, the use is considered highly vulnerable in flood risk terms and national policy is very clear that it should not be permitted in either Flood Zones 3a or 3b and also fails to demonstrate compliance with the second part of the Exception Test. Clearly this weighs heavily in the balance against the granting of consent.

Other matters

The remaining material planning considerations – impact on Newark Conservation Area, ecology, close to facilities and services within the Newark Urban Area, Gypsy and Traveller status, highway safety, residential amenity and visual amenity, remain unchanged from the previously considered application and as such do not require further consideration in this instance. The Gypsy and Traveller status of the occupants of the site have already been established through past applications. For information, the full officer report from the previous 2018 application can be viewed by clicking on the link attached to the Background Papers listed at the end of this report.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

The land has been identified as a candidate for site allocation through the review of the Allocations and Development Management DPD. However this process is at too early a stage of production to be afforded meaningful weight, and there is an unresolved objection from the Environment Agency towards the approach. It is acknowledged that the proposal would allow for the accommodation needs of the occupants to be met, and would contribute supply towards local pitch requirements and the creation of a five year land supply – with the latter two considerations certainly needing to be afforded significant weight. However the land is located within the functional floodplain (as is the only point of access and egress onto Great North Road), and national policy is very clear that permission should not be granted for this highly vulnerable use in areas at that level of flood risk. The continued policy and technical objection from the Environment Agency, in this regard, is also clear and unambiguous. The potential danger to individuals and property from this context is a considerable material consideration – and one

which, in the view of officers, outweighs the otherwise substantial benefits associated with the scheme.

The Council is working to formulate a sound site allocation strategy, but until such time that this can be afforded meaningful weight there is the reasonable prospect that applicants can seek to bring forward suitable land in alternative locations – through Core Policy 5. The criteria within CP5 were modified as part of the examination of the Amended Core Strategy in order to allow this to take place, and provide the reasonable prospect of applicants being able to identify suitable land – including in areas at least flood risk.

In allowing the appeal decision at Green Park on Tolney Lane (for touring caravans that would evacuate the site at the Environment Agency's flood warning as is set out within this proposal), the Inspector considered that that whilst Gypsy and Traveller development would usually be inappropriate in a high risk Flood Zone, balanced against all the other considerations that weighed positively including significant unmet need, a temporary permission was appropriate in that instance. Indeed, the reasoning behind the Inspector's granting of a temporary consent continue to remain valid at this time. This decision was reflected in the previous granting of a temporary permission for 3 years on the previous approval granted on this site, with flood evacuation plans put in place to mitigate flood risk to the occupiers of the site on a short term basis. There has been little material change to planning considerations since that decision was reached. The Environment Agency has requested that they be notified in the event that the application is granted a temporary or permanent consent.

Whilst it is acknowledged that this site has already benefited from two consecutive temporary permissions, as it stands officers are unable to provide support for the granting of permanent consent.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is refused for the following reason

01

The application use falls within a 'highly vulnerable' flood risk vulnerability category that is inappropriate to the Flood Zone in which the application is located (Flood Zone 3b – functional floodplain). Tables 1 and 3 of the PPG make it clear that this type of development is not compatible to this Flood Zone and therefore should 'not be permitted.'

The purpose of granting temporary consent was to cater for the applicants' immediate accommodation needs whilst allowing for the possibility of identifying other sites at lesser risk of flooding. The Authority is pro-actively pursuing the identification of suitable sites to meet future gypsy and traveller needs within, or adjoining, the Newark Urban Area through the Development Plan process. Although there would be some social factors which would weigh in favour of the proposal, it is not considered that these, in combination with the supply position, are sufficient to outweigh the severe flood risk and warrant the granting of permanent consent. To allow permanent occupation of a site at such high risk of flooding would put occupiers of the site and members of the emergency services at unnecessary risk.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to Core Policy 5 and 10 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD (2013) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Planning Practice Guidance and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015), which are material planning considerations.

Notes to Applicant

01

You are advised that as of 1st December 2011, the Newark and Sherwood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule came into effect. Whilst the above application has been refused by the Local Planning Authority you are advised that CIL applies to all planning permissions granted on or after this date. Thus any successful appeal against this decision may therefore be subject to CIL (depending on the location and type of development proposed). Full details are available on the Council's website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/

02

The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. Working positively and proactively with the applicants would not have afforded the opportunity to overcome these problems, giving a false sense of hope and potentially incurring the applicants further unnecessary time and/or expense.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

Link to Committee Report for application 18/01430/FUL – https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/files/72EDBB9F2DE47A3326616583B2CC84FC/pdf/18_01430_FUL-COMMITTEE_REPORT-927289.pdf

For further information, please contact **Julia Lockwood** on ext **5902**.

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 - 21/02492/S73

