



Report to Planning Committee 9th November 2023

Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development

Lead Officer: Amy Davies, Planner, Ex 5851

Report Summary			
Application No.	23/01186/FUL		
Proposal	Demolition of existing detached garage and outbuildings. Erection of single storey dwelling		
Location	The Coach House, Church Hill, Bilsthorpe, NG22 8RU		
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Julie & Adam Brisendon	Agent	Mrs Claire Pendle - Claire Pendle Planning
Web Link	23/01186/FUL Demolition of existing detached garage and outbuildings. Erection of single storey dwelling, new boundary wall and carport for The Coach House The Coach House Church Hill Bilsthorpe NG22 8RU (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)		
Registered	17 July 2023	Target Date	11 September 2023
		Extension of Time	10 November 2023
Recommendation	That planning permission be REFUSED for the reason(s) set out in Section 10.0 of this report		

This application is being referred to the Planning Committee for determination by the Local Ward Member, Councillor R Holloway, who considers the proposal represents sustainable development in accordance with the development plan as it would replace an existing building with a more energy efficient and better designed building that would sit comfortably in the surroundings and have less impact on heritage assets. In addition, Bilsthorpe Parish Council Support the application, which is contrary to the Officer’s Recommendation to Refuse.

1.0 The Site

The application site lies within the built-up part of Bilsthorpe (as defined by the Development Plan policies map) and within the designated Conservation Area. Located at the top of Church

Hill to the east of the settlement, The Coach House is an attractive dwelling formerly associated with The Old Rectory which lies to the west with Keepers Quarters intervening them.

The host property benefits from a large detached three bay garage with accommodation above accessed via external steps. The land associated with the dwelling is largely laid to lawn and there are some other modest outbuildings present. There are a number of trees within the site, mainly around the boundary hedgerow. Access to the site is via Church Hill with parking and turning available within the site.

Dwellings known as Church Close, Oak Barn and Church Barn lie to the north of the site with the latter two units being located closest to the existing garage. The Grade I listed Church of St Margaret lies to the north-west of the site.

The site lies in Flood Zone 1 according to Environment Agency mapping and within the Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Policy Zone PZ 27: Kirklington Village Farmlands.

The site has the following constraints:

- Conservation Area
- Nearby Listed Buildings
- Adjacent to Non-Designated Heritage Asset

2.0 Relevant Planning History

10/00179/FUL – Erection of two storey pitched roof extension and detached two storey garage block. Approved 21.04.2010.

06/00417/FUL – Proposed dwelling and garage (on land immediately east of The Coach House). Withdrawn 18.04.2006.

97/50183/FUL – Installation of dormer windows to rear elevation. Approved 23.04.1997.

95/50145/FUL – Installation of dormer windows. Refused 08.08.1995.

62860104 – First floor extension to Coach House. Approved 27.03.1986.

6281199 – One bungalow, (on land immediately east of the Coach House). Refused 20.08.1981

6280994 – Erection single bungalow (on land immediately east of the Coach House). Refused 16.12.1980.

628053 – Alterations and extensions. Approved 14.02.1980.

This list excludes applications to undertake tree works at the property.

3.0 The Proposal

The application seeks permission to demolish the existing detached garage with

accommodation above and other outbuildings and erect a new 'pavilion style' single storey 3-bedroom dwelling with garden and driveway to the east side of the existing dwelling known as 'The Coach House'. The proposed new dwelling would measure approximately 18.5-metres by 7.5-metres (approx. 139 square metres) and include a flat overhanging roof covering an area of 260 square metres. Concept visuals have been provided to illustrate the form and scale of the proposed new dwelling, and a precedents and materials sheet shows examples of the contemporary style of dwelling proposed.

The proposed site plan indicates the proposed new dwelling would be accessed via the existing driveway to the north/front of The Coach House and include a turning/parking area to the west side and private garden to the south.

An alternative driveway/turning/parking area would be sited to the west side and rear of The Coach House to serve the host dwelling.

The application has been revised to omit a proposed two-bay garage to the rear of The Coach House. For the avoidance of doubt, the assessment outlined below is based on the following plans and supporting information:

- 03A Revised Proposed Site Plan
- 04 Ground Floor
- 05 Site View & Location Plan
- 06 Concept Visual South East and West
- 07A Precedents and Materials
- 08 Proposed South & East Elevations
- 09 Proposed North & West Elevations
- Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Jane Catterall dated June 2023
- Planning Statement prepared by Claire Pendle Planning dated July 2023
- Tree Survey prepared by AT2 Tree Surveys dated 22 May 2023 Revised 14th September 2023
- Photos of 'Stable' and Greenhouse proposed to be demolished.

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 7 properties have been individually notified by letter. A site notice has also been displayed near to the site and an advert has been placed in the local press.

Site visit undertaken on 31 July 2023.

5.0 Planning Policy Framework

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 3 – Housing Mix, Type and Density
Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design
Core Policy 12 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Core Policy 14 – Historic Environment

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM1 – Development within Settlements Central to Delivering the Spatial Strategy

DM5 – Design

DM7 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

DM9 – Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Planning Practice Guidance (online resource)

National Design Guide – Planning practice guidance for beautiful, enduring and successful places September 2019

Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD June 2021

6.0 Consultations and Representations

NB: Comments below are provided in summary - for comments in full please see the online planning file.

(a) Statutory Consultations

Historic England – Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.

NCC Highways – This application can be considered under Standing Advice

(b) Town/Parish Council

Bilsthorpe Parish Council - Support

(c) Representations/Non-Statutory Consultation

Conservation – The proposal would cause a moderate level of harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and a negligible impact on the wider setting of the Listed Buildings. This would be contrary to s.72 of the Act. With reference to planning policies, this would be ‘less than substantial harm’ to the designated heritage asset (par.202 of NPPF and policy DM9 of the local development framework). There is no clear and convincing justification for this level of harm (par.200 of NPPF) and there would be no heritage-related benefits which would balance or outweigh this level of harm (par.202 of NPPF). We, therefore, object to the proposal from a conservation perspective.

NSDC Tree Officer – The development of the grounds dividing them into two separate residential units, the removal of trees over time, the development prejudicing future planting due to changes in use, would fundamentally change the character of the conservation area.

No other third party/local resident comments received.

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development

The key issues are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact on Character and Heritage Assets
3. Impact on Residential Amenity
4. Highway Safety and Parking
5. Trees and Biodiversity
6. Other Matters

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and recognises the duty under the Planning Acts for planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The NPPF refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development being at the heart of development and sees sustainable development as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. This is confirmed at the development plan level under Policy DM12 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

As the application concerns designated heritage assets of listed buildings and the conservation area, sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') are particularly relevant. Section 66 outlines the general duty in exercise of planning functions in respect to listed buildings stating that the decision maker "*shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.*" Section 72(1) also requires the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of conservation areas.

The duties in s.66 and s.72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a local planning authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight.

Principle of Development

The Adopted Core Strategy details the settlement hierarchy that will help deliver sustainable growth and development in the District (Spatial Policy 1). The intentions of this hierarchy are to direct new development to the Sub-regional Centre, Service Centres and Principal Villages, which are well served in terms of infrastructure and services, which is reinforced by Policy

DM1 'Development within Settlements Central to Delivering the Spatial Strategy' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD.

The village of Bilsthorpe is identified as a Principal Village within the settlement hierarchy and has a defined village envelope. It is a location where provision will be made for new housing to meet local housing need and there is support for employment to provide local jobs in order to secure the village's role as a sustainable community.

The Council's latest District Wide Housing Needs Assessment 2020 outlines the housing needs for the Sherwood sub-area including Bilsthorpe. In terms of the need for additional housing, the 2020 HNA outlines that the Sherwood sub-area has a need for 4 or more-bedroom family housing than the District as a whole, followed by more 3-bedroom houses, which form approximately 20% of the overall housing mix needed for the area. The proposed new dwelling, by virtue of being a 3-bedroom house, could therefore contribute positively towards meeting this identified need, as outlined in Spatial Policy 2 'Spatial Distribution of Growth' and Core Policy 3 'Housing Mix, Type and Density' of the Amended Core Strategy DPD. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the Council has an up-to-date plan and can demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply.

Overall, the proposed new dwelling is considered acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the site-specific issues outlined below.

Impact on Character and Heritage Assets

Core Policy 9 'Sustainable Design' of the Amended Core Strategy (Adopted March 2019) requires new development proposals to, amongst other things, "*achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is capable of being accessible to all and of an appropriate form and scale to its context complementing the existing built and landscape environments*". In accordance with Core Policy 9, all proposals for new development are assessed with reference to the design criteria outlined in Policy DM5 'Design' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD, which confirms the requirement for new development to reflect the rich local distinctiveness of the District's landscape and character through scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials, and detailing.

Core Policy 14 'Historic Environment' of the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019) requires the continued conservation and enhancement of the character, appearance and setting of the District's heritage assets and historic environment, in line with their identified significance, and the preservation and enhancement of the special character of Conservation Areas. In accordance with Core Policy 14, development proposals should take account of the distinctive character and setting of individual conservation areas including open space and natural features and reflect this in their layout, design, form, scale, mass, use of materials and detailing (Policy DM9 'Protecting of the Historic Environment' of the Allocations & Development Management DPD).

The site lies within the Bilsthorpe Conservation Area and within the wider setting of St Margaret's Church (Grade I Listed) and its boundary walls and steps (Grade II Listed). Consequently, special regard should be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area in accordance with the duty contained within Section

72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (hereafter referred to as 'the 1990 Act') and, for development which affects a listed building, preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses in accordance with the duty contained within Section 66(1) of the 1990 Act.

The Council's Conservation Officer has described the significance of the heritage assets and context of the application site as follows:

"Bilsthorpe Conservation Area ... encompasses the historic core of the settlement along Kirklington Road and Church Hill. The land within the Conservation Area boundary rise steeply to the east towards the church (Grade I) and the surrounding 17th -19th century houses. The Conservation Area is characterised by the irregular arrangement of detached buildings, which are predominantly situated along the highway or clustered around the church. The buildings are a mixture of traditional cottages, farmhouses or former barns and larger houses which are constructed in brick walling, some rendered or stone, with a pantile or tile roof. The Coach House was likely associated with the Rectory and dates from the mid-19th century. Whilst there have been some modern alterations to facilitate the conversion, the building still makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The garage does not make a positive contribution to the setting of the Coach House and diminishes the ancillary nature of the converted building."

It has been confirmed the proposal would have a no impact on the wider setting of the abovementioned Listed Buildings. Indeed, Historic England has considered the application and chosen not to offer advice. Notwithstanding this, the Conservation Officer has identified there would be harmful impacts to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as outlined in *italics* below:

"The proposed new dwelling would be a single storey flat roof building with a sedum roof, projecting canopy, brick panels for the walling and large expanses of glazing. The design would be overtly contemporary and starkly contrast with the overriding vernacular character and appearance of surrounding buildings (including the modern pastiche houses). It is recognised that the proposal seeks to minimise the visual impact of the new dwelling through the 1-storey height and sedum roof. However, the contrasting form and design as well as contemporary glazing would distract from the surrounding character and appearance and diminish the architectural interest of the Conservation Area."

The siting of a dwelling in this location would be located behind the historic building line and erode the traditional plan form of the Church Hill part of Bilsthorpe Conservation Area. As noted in section 3.3 of the Heritage Impact Assessment, there are a number of late-20th and early-21st century houses around this part of the Conservation Area. Some of these new dwellings have a neutral impact on the significance of the Conservation Area and some detract from the character and appearance. These modern dwellings do not provide justification for further harm to the plan form and layout of the Conservation Area."

I agree that the proposed development would constitute inappropriate backland development that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the overtly contemporary design would be discordant with the traditional character of buildings in this part of the Conservation Area and diminish its architectural

interest, contrary to the duty to preserve or enhance required under s.72 of the 1990 Act. It is also noted that demolition of the existing detached garage and outbuildings is not proposed to be compensated as part of the development, which leaves some uncertainty over how both plots would develop in future. It would not seem practical for two family sized homes to have nowhere to store garden furniture or equipment for example. The possible addition of sheds and outbuildings within each plot, potentially under permitted development rights, could lead to over development that would cumulatively harm the character and appearance of the area over time.

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Also, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use (Paragraph 202). In the opinion of officers, there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm that would be caused to the significance of the conservation area. There would also be no public benefits, nor any other material consideration, that would outweigh the harm identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to the objective of preservation required under Section 72 of the 1990 Act as well as relevant provisions of the abovementioned planning policy framework.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 of the DPD states that development proposals should ensure no unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts and loss of privacy upon neighbouring development.

The proposed new dwelling would be sited approximately 20-metres to the west of The Coach House with a new 1.8-metre-high brick garden wall and mixed species hedge proposed to separate the two sites. The proposed access arrangements would present an awkward relationship between the two sites, with vehicles driving past the front of The Coach House to reach the gated entrance to the proposed new dwelling. There are several windows and a main door overlooking this existing driveway, which would no longer serve The Coach House despite its close relationship to it. That said, it is clear that occupants of both the existing and proposed dwellings would enjoy adequate amenity with no unacceptable overbearing or overlooking impacts. So, whilst the proposed access arrangements would not be ideal, it is not considered this matter in itself would warrant refusal of planning permission.

Historic barns to the north of the existing garage have been converted to residential use and are one and a half storey. There appears to be four first floor bedroom windows facing the site (three within the central part) with ground floor openings serving the sitting rooms and kitchen. The northern elevation of the proposed new dwelling has been designed with high level obscure glazed windows, presumably to avoid direct overlooking. Although the proposed new dwelling would be sited close to the boundary, the distance between dwellings would appear to be approximately 18m-20m, which is likely to be sufficient to avoid oppressive and overbearing impacts on the living conditions of these neighbours.

Overall, it is considered there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residents nor existing or future occupants of The Coach House in accordance with the relevant provisions of Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD.

Highway Safety and Parking

Spatial Policy 7 and DM5 expect development proposals to provide appropriate and effective parking provision as well as appropriate means of access. The Council's Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD sets out residential parking expectations in terms of design and quantum. Nottinghamshire County Council (as Highways Authority) also offers design guidance for residential developments.

The Coach House is sited at the end of Church Hill on the east side of the village. There is an existing gated access and driveway that runs past the front of the property, terminating in front of the existing detached garage. There is a separate driveway to the west side of the property that runs parallel with the boundary. Nottinghamshire County Council (as Highways Authority) advises that a single private drive should measure 3.6-metres wide if bound on both sides, which both driveways are. This width increases to 5.8-metres for driveways shared by two to five dwellings.

The Proposed Site Plan indicates the driveway to the front of The Coach House would be shared and, as such, should technically measure the greater distance of 5.8-metres. However, the Proposed Site Plan also shows an alternative driveway for The Coach House to the west side/rear of the property, suggesting that the 'shared' element would be more in terms of pedestrian access, especially as the main front door to The Coach House is positioned facing that driveway. Whilst it would be reasonable to expect occupiers of both properties to be aware of this arrangement, it is unclear whether there may be instances of delivery or other visiting vehicles blocking the driveway to the proposed new dwelling, which annotations indicate would fall about a metre below the recommended width for a shared driveway. Although comparatively narrower than the driveway to the front, the driveway to the side of The Coach House measures just over the recommended width of 3.6-metres for a single private drive.

Notwithstanding concerns regarding driveway widths, the Proposed Site Plan illustrates both dwellings would be afforded adequate space for turning and parking vehicles, although there would be no sheltered parking for either dwelling nor any domestic storage sheds for typical items such as bicycles, gardening equipment and lawn mowers. Details of driveway surfaces, and drainage arrangements are unclear but could be conditioned if the LPA was minded to approve the application.

Finally, the Proposed Site Plan indicates bins for the proposed new dwelling would be sited approximately 45-metres from the site entrance off Church Hill, which is significantly over the maximum distance Building Regulations suggest is appropriate for domestic developments (25-metres from the waste collection point).

In summary, adequate parking and turning areas would be provided in accordance with the abovementioned policy framework, and further details could be secured by condition if

needed. Whilst the proposed access arrangements are considered awkward, it is not considered this would result in issues of highway safety that would warrant refusal of the application.

Trees and Biodiversity

Core Policy 12 of the Amended Core Strategy DPD seeks to secure development that maximises the opportunities to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity. Policy DM7 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD states that natural features of importance within or adjacent to development sites should, wherever possible, be protected and enhanced.

The application is supported by a Tree Survey prepared by AT2 Tree Surveys which identifies an existing mixed hedge (H2) to the north of the proposed new dwelling as Category U and unsuitable for retention. A pollarded trunk of a Norway Maple (T12 - currently used to hang a child's swing from) is also identified as Category U and unsuitable for retention. A Category A High Quality Oak Tree (T13) is identified close to the southwest boundary of the site, some distance from areas that are proposed to be developed. With the exception of other hedges (H3 and H11) that border the site to the east, south, and west, and identified as Category B 'Moderate Quality', remaining trees within the site are considered Category C Low Quality. That said, no trees are proposed to be removed in order to build the proposed new dwelling, although it is expected that mixed hedge H2 would be removed and replaced. Unfortunately, the application does not detail how trees and hedges proposed for retention would be protected from construction works. However, such details could be secured by condition if the LPA were minded to approve the application.

The Council's Tree Officer has considered the application and submitted Tree Survey and raised concerns about potential impacts on the High Quality Oak Tree (T13). They have also suggested that the development would significantly alter the character of the site, which was historically orchard land surrounding The Old Rectory. Whilst the historic maps dating back to 1875-85 clearly show the site was covered in trees, the existing character is rather more domesticated with extensive areas of managed lawn, the presence of domestic outbuildings, a green house, and children's play equipment. That said, there are concerns regarding the impacts of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, which have been outlined under 'Impact on Character and Heritage Assets'.

The application is also supported by a Protected Species (Bats) Survey prepared by BJ Collins. This details a preliminary bat roost assessment undertaken to the existing detached garage proposed for demolition on 31st May 2023. The assessment found no evidence of use by bats, nor any obvious entry points into the building, although a raised tile was noted as a feature that might support crevice dwelling roosting bats. Overall, the existing detached garage was assessed as being of Low/Negligible potential for bats, with other buildings categorised as being of Negligible potential for roosting bats. Consequently, no further surveys were recommended to be undertaken. The report recommends precautionary procedures to mitigate the very low risk of a transient bat being present during the demolition phase i.e., an ecological construction method statement, which could be secured by condition if the LPA was minded to approve the application.

Other Matters

The Planning Statement submitted in support of the application suggests the design incorporates a number of sustainability features including air source heating, solar panels, and superinsulation. However, the proposed plans do not include details of such features so it is difficult to envisage how they would be incorporated into the design. For example, given the flat roofed pavilion style design of the proposed new dwelling, it is presumed solar panels would either be affixed to an angled mounting frame on the roof or within the garden area, which would further develop the site and potentially reduce the amount of amenity space for future occupants to enjoy. Whilst the planning system supports the use of renewable and low carbon energy and heat measures in all types of development, such measures can often be achieved through permitted development rights and/or compliance with building regulations, giving it relatively limited weight in the planning balance on an application such as this. Consequently, it is not considered that any benefits associated with incorporating sustainability features would outweigh the harmful impacts identified.

8.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

9.0 Conclusion

The site falls within the village of Bilsthorpe which is a Principal Village where the principle of new residential development is supported. However, the proposed development would constitute inappropriate backland development that would be uncharacteristic and harmful to the character and appearance of the designated conservation area. No clear and convincing justification has been provided or heritage/public benefits identified that outweighs the harm identified. Whilst there is no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing detached garage any benefits associated with this element of the proposal do not outweigh the harmful impacts of the wider development. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

10.0 Reason for Refusal

01

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed new dwelling, by virtue of its siting, scale, and contemporary design, would constitute inappropriate backland development that would be uncharacteristic and harmful to the character and appearance of the Bilsthorpe Conservation Area. No clear and convincing justification has been provided for this harm nor are there any heritage, public, or sustainability benefits that would outweigh the harm identified.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the objective of preservation required under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the provisions

of Core Policy 9 'Sustainable Design' and Core Policy 14 'Historic Environment' of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted March 2019) and Policy DM5 'Design' and DM9 'Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the Allocations & Development Management Development Plan Document (adopted July 2013); as well as guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance, which form material planning considerations.

Informatives

01

The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. Whilst the applicant has engaged with the District Planning Authority at pre-application stage our advice has been consistent from the outset. 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.

02

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/

03

Refused drawings:

- 03A Revised Proposed Site Plan
- 04 Ground Floor
- 05 Site View & Location Plan
- 06 Concept Visual South East and West
- 07A Precedents and Materials
- 08 Proposed South & East Elevations
- 09 Proposed North & West Elevations

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Application case file.

Committee Plan - 23/01186/FUL



