

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Correspondent</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Points Raised (Summary)</b>	<b>Officer's Response</b>
5 Land off Nottingham Road	Case Officer	N/A	Committee Plan usually attached to end of report was inadvertently omitted from the agenda – this is included as an Appendix to this schedule.	N/A
5 Land off Nottingham Road	Patrick Dunne, Director of Group Property, FM & Procurement (Sainsburys)	10.03.2023	Letter received by local members directly, expressing extreme disappointment in the officer recommendation. They point to all the issues that have been resolved during the 18-month application lifespan, including they say agreeing a suite of conditions. Sainsbury's disagree with the balance which they say should be tilted heavily in favour of granting permission particularly in a time when investment and job creation is vital to support the economy. If refused residents will continue to have to travel significant distances to complete their main food shop.	Noted. Members should note that in the event of an approval, conditions have not been agreed as suggested and would need to be alongside a s106 agreement to secure the obligations set out in the report.
5 Land off Nottingham Road	Agent letter (WSP)	15.03.2023	Formal request for deferral to allow the applicant to address the issues. The letter forms Appendix B.	<p>Regardless of the whether the trees are or are not 'ancient woodland' doesn't change the impact that the scheme would have on the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Regarding the applicant's comments on the ecological reason for refusal, it should be noted that the paragraph quoted at the bottom on page 66 of the agenda was quoted from the incorrect (submission) version of the SNP. This wording was deleted and changed to the following wording within the adopted SNP:</p>

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

				<p><i>“...Where it is apparent or becomes apparent during the course of a planning application that a site has significant ecological value, development proposals must include a base line assessment of the habitats, species and overall biodiversity value for the site, where appropriate, expressed in terms of the biodiversity accounting offsetting metric, advocated by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), proportionate to the size of the development. The assessment must demonstrate how biodiversity will be conserved and enhanced by the development.”</i></p> <p>This does not change the conclusions that I have drawn in my paragraph at the top of page 67 as there is no baseline assessment.</p> <p>Officers are currently considering the request for deferral and advice will follow.</p>
5 Land off Nottingham Road	Members of the public (addresses haven't been provided in all of the comments to verify that they are from local residents)	10.03.2023 to 15.03.2023	<p>Since the agenda has been printed, additional comments have been received either directly or have been forwarded on from local ward members who have been contacted. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Numbers correct as of 17.30 on 15.03.2023.</p> <p><b><u>Emails of support</u> – 115 have been received of which 99 are from persons who have not previously commented.</b></p>	Noted. Most points raised have been considered in the officer committee report.

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

			<p>These comments highlight the benefits of the scheme as set out in the comments of support on pages 25 &amp; 26 of the committee report.</p> <p>Many comments express disappointment in the recommendation and express dissatisfaction with the current retail offer in Southwell. The benefits to being able to shop locally in Southwell (especially for the elderly who cannot get out of town) have also been cited along with the view that it will encourage people to the town. New comments not previously raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Issue raised with floodlighting is nonsensical when it lies next to a rugby pitch with extensive floodlights;</li><li>• Will be disappointed if views of the community aren't taken on board by out of touch councillors who are supposed to voice our views not their own;</li><li>• Retail offer is now worse since Gonalston Farm Shop has closed;</li><li>• If this site isn't suitable I would urge you to find a site that is.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Emails of objection</u> – 11 received of which 9 are from persons who have not previously commented.</b></p> <p>Comments are broadly similar to those set out to those objections summarised on pages 26-33 and include that</p>	<p>The comment regarding the floodlighting is noted. However this site is at the gateway to the town and in a more prominent location than the long established rugby club.</p> <p>Whilst the support is noted these comments do not change the officer recommendation.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

			the location isn't suitable, the signage would be intrusive and not suitable for such an attractive entry to the town and road changes will cause challenges to the character of the town. A comment has been made that there will be a duty on the Council to consider the unmet retail need in the Plan Review. Others have commented that it would be a tuck shop for Brackenhurst and the Minister School, that it is too small for a weekly shop and that the jobs provided would be similar to those employers are already finding hard to fill.	
7 Land Off A17, Coddington	Local Resident	08.03.2023	Support	Noted.
7 Land Off A17, Coddington	Local Resident	08.03.2023	There remain brownfield sites in Newark and the locality better suited for building than farmland. Adverse impact on wildlife and Coddington Wood, adverse lighting and noise impacts, substantial traffic load through an area, joining the village up to Newark itself, and losing yet more Agricultural land.	These matters largely relate to issues of principle considered at outline planning application stage. Other issues are already covered in the Agenda report.
7 Land Off A17, Coddington	Local Resident	09.03.2023	Support	Noted.
7 Land Off A17, Coddington	Local Resident	09.03.2023	Support	Noted.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

9 Manor Lodge, Manor Walk, Epperstone	Applicant	14.03.2023	<p>Working with NSDC sept/oct 2022 all 9 large cabins and several thousand tonnes of reclaimed materials had been removed and the larger site had been reprofiled using approx. 4,500 tonnes of subsoil and topsoil.</p> <p>The boat will be removed summer 2023.</p> <p>Once the new shed is built, all the reclaimed materials will be used in the garden.</p> <p>He has agreed to give 3 weeks notice to the Parish and West Manor Park residents to ensure access for the crane and boat transporter.</p> <p>He does not own 6 garages.</p> <p>The agenda papers still show the incorrect plan.</p> <p>Photos showing 3 bay dormer windows have existed for the past 10 years.</p> <p>New gates were promised in 2018 but residents insisted they were not wanted.</p> <p>New gates and fences will be fitted when building and landscaping work completed. The metal estate fences already on site since September 2022.</p>	All matters are noted. The Site location plan has been corrected and a new plan will be produced and presented to Members.
11 4 The Orchards, Oxton	Agent	14.03.2023	<p>Plans received to remove the vehicular gate from the proposal and suggestion to amend the description of development to the following:</p> <p>“Demolition of existing garage, front conservatory/utility and rear porch. Proposed erection of 2-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension”.</p>	<p>This is welcomed by the Council and the sliding gate is removed from consideration by Members and Refusal reason no.2 should be amended to state the following:</p> <p>In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its inappropriate scale and massing, result in an unacceptable, dominating addition to the existing dwelling. The proposal would thereby result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of Oxton Conservation</p>

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

				<p>Area, which cannot be outweighed by any public benefit.</p> <p>The proposal is therefore contrary to the duty contained within Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the provisions of Core Policy 9 and 14 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) and Policy DM5, DM6 and DM9 of the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD (2013) as well as the NPPF (2021) which forms a material planning consideration.</p> <p><u>Informative</u></p> <p>1. Deletes the following drawings from its list.</p> <p>DRWG no. AM2-PLA-016 Proposed sliding gate; DRWG no. AM2-PLA-017 Proposed sliding gate precedents.</p>
13 The Dutch Barn Lowdham	Agent	15.03.2023	Letter from agent expressing disappointment at recommendation. Letter attached in Appendix C.	Letter to be reviewed and response to follow if required.
	Agent	15.03.2023	<p>Agent argues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Both barn &amp; stables “previously developed land”, so falls under NPPF para 149 g).</li> <li>2. Structural survey sufficient to establish whether conversion or rebuilding.</li> <li>3. Residential paraphernalia would be no worse than existing paraphernalia on the site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Farm shop not accepted to be “previously developed land”.</li> <li>2. Structural engineer assesses existing engineering not planning policy compliance.</li> <li>3. Disagree, furthermore this is not put forward as a reason for refusal.</li> </ol>

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

**Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda**

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Retention of frame intentional part of design</li><li>5. Council inconsistent on large windows/balconies</li><li>6. Replacement farm shop building will incorporate adequate storage, so existing use redundant.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Design objection is to frame in front of windows, not retention of frame per se.</li><li>5. Specific objections here to balcony location at front and large window at front not related to previous agricultural use.</li><li>6. Evidence not in front of us, and this is not put forward as a reason for refusal.</li></ol>
14 The Mistal, Epperstone	Agent	13.03.2023	<p>The agent explains the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal is for the son of the applicant whom works on the farm and enables all family members to live and work together;</li><li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> bedroom is required to make it a viable property;</li><li>• Evidence of a previous building on the site (see historical photo);</li><li>• Logical to consider an extension as opposed to a new build which would have greater impact on the GB.</li></ul>	<p>The comments are noted however, the building is still 'viable' as a dwelling and it is personal preference to have 2 bedrooms. The historic photo shows a substantial metal agricultural shed type building which is built up from the boundary walls and encloses the entire space. This is not considered reasonable justification for an extension.</p>