



Report to Planning Committee 18 January 2024
 Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development
 Lead Officer: Laura Gardner, Senior Planner, Ext. 5907

Report Summary			
Application Number	22/02321/FULM (Major)		
Proposal	Demolition of existing store building, creation of car parking and removal of trees.		
Location	Newark Day Service, Woods Court, Walker Close, Newark On Trent NG24 4BP		
Applicant	Assura Aspire Limited	Agent	Mr Steve Buckley - Peacock + Smith
Web Link	22/02321/FULM Demolition of existing store building, creation of car parking and removal of trees. Newark Day Service Woods Court Walker Close Newark On Trent NG24 4BP (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)		
Registered	19.12.2022	Target Date / Extension of Time	20.03.2023 / 26.01.2024
Recommendation	Refuse, for the reason outlined in Section 10.0		

The application is being referred to Planning Committee by the Business Manager as the Authorised Officer due to the potential impacts on the provision of a community facility through the recommendation to refuse the application.

1.0 The Site

The site relates to the former Newark Day Centre, a purpose-built building erected in the 1980s originally as a County Council-run residential care home and day care unit for elderly people. From 2018 the building was used solely as an adult day centre by the County Council but it is now vacant.

The site is located to the south of London Road and to the east of Bowbridge Road in the Newark Urban Area and Conservation Area and is accessed via Walker Close, a residential street. The building is well screened by mature trees and shrubs and has off-street parking for approximately 6-7 vehicles adjacent to the vehicle access. The building is currently secured behind high security fencing. Boundaries to the north and west with Bowbridge Road and

London Road respectively are formed by brick walls, timber fences and mature trees and shrubs. The boundaries to the south and west are formed by the rear garden walls/fences/hedges of residential properties on Walker Close and London Road.

The site is within Flood Zone 1 and at low risk of surface water flooding according to the Environment Agency maps.

The site has the following constraints:

- Newark Conservation Area.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

18/01579/CMA - Change of use of an Elderly Persons Home to an Adult Day Centre (Use Class C2 to D1) including erection of secure 2m timber fencing. 2.4m high secure Herras fencing. Erection of building entrance canopy and polytunnel. *Application approved by Nottinghamshire County Council 17th September 2018.*

01850810 - Erection of elderly persons home with day centre. *Application approved 29th November 1985.*

3.0 The Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for the creation of car parking to facilitate the use of the building as a medical centre and ancillary pharmacy for the re-location of the existing Barnby Gate GP Surgery.

The change of use in itself does not require planning permission but the creation of car parking, the demolition of the existing store building and associated removal of trees does require permission.

Car parking is proposed for 59 spaces in total, including 13 staff parking spaces. Cycle parking areas are also proposed totalling space for 56 bikes.

The scheme has been revised during the application given there is no longer an intention for Fountain Medical Practice to also occupy the building. Previously proposed extensions to the building have also been removed from the application.

A number of trees would be removed (total of 30) on site to provide space for the construction the car park to the south and west of the building. Replacement planting is proposed as part of the application (total of 37).

An existing detached store building next to the entrance is proposed to be demolished.

The application has been considered based on the following plans and documents:

- Planning Statement by Peacock + Smith/Assura dated November 2023;
- Design and Access Statement – 2202-03 dated November 2023;

- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Compensation Plan by via V3 dated 09/11/23;
- Framework Travel Plan by Civic Engineers dated 18th November 2022;
- Transport Statement by Civic Engineers dated 18th November 2022;
- Phase 1 Ecology Survey prepared by Betts Ecology;
- Supplementary Ecological Report dated December 2023;
- Statement of Community Involvement by Peacock + Smith/Assura;
- Location Plan– drawing no. 2202-0200, rev P00;
- Existing Site Plan– drawing no. 2202-0201, rev P00;
- Existing Ground Floor Plan– drawing no. 2202-0210, rev P00;
- Existing First Floor Plan– drawing no. 2202-0211, rev P00;
- Existing Roof Plan– drawing no. 2202-0212, rev P00;
- Existing Elevations Sheet 1– drawing no. 2202-0220, rev P01;
- Existing Elevations & Sections Sheet 2– drawing no. 2202-0221, rev P01;
- Proposed Site Plan– drawing no. 2202-0101, rev P06;
- Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans– drawing no. 2202- 0110, rev P00;
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 1– drawing no. 2202-0320, rev P02;
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 2– drawing no. 2202-0321, rev P02.

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 60 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 12th January 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

Spatial Policy 8 – Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities

Core Policy 6 – Shaping our Employment Profile

Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design

Core Policy 12 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

Core Policy 13 – Landscape Character

Core Policy 14 – Historic Environment

NAP1 - Newark Urban Area

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

6.0 Consultations

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

(a) Statutory Consultations

NCC Flood – No objection and no further comments.

(b) Town/Parish Council

Newark Town Council – *Comments on the revised scheme:*

Newark Town Council repeats its previous comments made in relation to this application but would further wish to offer Fountain Gardens as a potential location for tree planting to mitigate the loss of trees on this site. The improved local medical facilities are required and repurposing an existing building rather than building new, is advantageous.

Comments on the original scheme:

No Objection was raised to the principal of this development and Members recognise the need for the medical services this development will generate.

Newark Town Council does however, have serious concerns about the impact of traffic on adjoining residential streets and would ask that the applicant and Highways have due regard to these concerns and ensure where practical, that mitigation measures are applied.

Newark Town Council would also recommend bat surveys are undertaken on all trees due to be felled and relevant conditions applied in response thereto. There is evidence of a bat population in and around the site.

Councillors welcomed the green roof on the extension and other climate friendly measures within the development, including the replacement of trees being felled to make way for the car park.

(c) Representations/Non-Statutory Consultation

NCC Highways – No objections subject to conditions.

NSDC Conservation – No objections from a heritage and conservation perspective.

NSDC Lead Biodiversity and Ecology Officer – No objections subject to conditions.

NSDC Tree Officer – It is suggested the revisions:

1. Will have a strong negative impact on the character of the conservation area.
2. Proposed mitigation is inappropriate, ineffectual, and not reasonable due to the level of built structures.
3. Represents significant loss of canopy coverage within the urban area.
4. At a basic level simple measures such of tree growth, species, environmental impacts have not been included in the submitted assessment.

Cadent Gas – No objection subject to informative.

NHS – No S106 contributions requested.

7 letters of representations have been received relating to the revised proposals:

- Concerns remain as previous objection, the increased traffic will make an already difficult access much worse;
- There is a fox family living on site;
- Parking will spill out onto neighbouring streets;
- The previous use of the building produced very little traffic so they should not be seen as comparable;
- Not enough trees being removed to provide adequate parking but trees should be planted elsewhere to mitigate;
- Concern regarding noise nuisance from late opening of the pharmacy or GP appointments;
- Concerned about the lack of parking spaces;
- Parking was inadequate when it was a nursing home;
- Will the surgery be policing the car park for non patient visitors;
- Concern regarding removal of trees;
- There is no vehicular barrier making it at risk of antisocial behaviour;
- No lighting is shown on the plans;
- Without hours of opening it is difficult for residents to assess the application;
- Has any action to extend permit parking zone been considered;
- Construction impacts will need consideration in relation to neighbouring properties;

5 letters of representation were received in respect to the original scheme, details of which can be summarised as follows:

- The combining of surgeries would provide a very busy centre;
- Hatton Gardens and Walkers Close are at best only capable of one-way traffic due to the width of Walkers Close;
- There is already parking on both sides of the street;
- The proposed car park will not be big enough causing overflow into residential areas;
- Construction lorries will not be able to access the site;
- Not the right place for a doctors surgery;

- There should be a stop sign for people exiting the site as its on a bend;
- Expect the traffic to be much higher than the figures generated;
- If vehicles are parked on the entry into Walker Close on the double yellow lines it could stop access by larger delivery vehicles, ambulances and refuse collection vehicles as the road isn't wide enough;
- There are hedges and foxes living on the site;
- When the site was in use as a Care Home large vehicles had difficulty turning out of Walker Close due to parked cars on both side of Hatton Gardens;
- People park in the area who work in Newark to avoid parking charges;
- The church provides facilities for MIND most of the week and the building is also booked Friday and Saturday mornings;
- The only time residents can park close to their house at the weekend;

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development

The key issues are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact upon the Character of the Area and Heritage Implications
3. Impact upon Trees and Ecology
4. Impact upon Residential Amenity
5. Impact upon Highway Safety

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 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

As the application concerns designated heritage assets of the conservation area, section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') is particularly relevant. Section 72(1) 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

Spatial Policy 1 states that the Newark Urban Area is the main location for investment for new services and facilities within the District. The proposal relates to external works to the site to

facilitate the change of use of the building to a medical practice and ancillary pharmacy. Given the previous use of the site as an adult day care centre, the use as a medical practice would be permitted development not requiring express planning permission. The change of use element is therefore not assessed further other than to acknowledge that the proposal relates to works which are intended to support a community facility. Spatial Policy 8 states that new community facilities will be encouraged particularly where they address a deficiency in current provision.

The impact of the proposal, namely the construction of car parking areas and subsequent loss of trees are assessed below.

Impact upon the Character of the Area and Heritage Implications

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Core Policy 9 and Policy DM5 of the DPD require new development to achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is of an appropriate form and scale to its context, complementing the existing built and landscape environments.

In addition to the above, the site is located within the Newark Conservation Area. Proposals should therefore be sensitively designed so as to not harm the setting of these heritage assets in accordance with Section 16 of the NPPF along with Core Policy 14 of the Core Strategy and DM9 of the DPD.

The existing building is set across a sprawling footprint with varying single storey and two storey elements. The detached store building to be demolished is of no particular architectural merit and therefore there is no objection to its loss in character terms. There are no longer any extensions proposed to the building and therefore the main impact on character would be the creation / formalisation of a car parking area and related loss of trees.

Car parking is proposed to the east; west and south of the building. However, given the size of the site, there would remain some form of landscaped buffer between the areas of car parking and the site boundaries with the exception of the eastern boundary. The spaces along the eastern boundary are discretely positioned away from a public vantage point of view given their proximity to neighbouring dwellings. The car parking spaces by their very nature are low lying. The creation of hardstanding in itself would not impose harm to the setting and appearance of the Conservation Area as reflected by the lack of objection from Conservation colleagues. The character impacts arising from the loss of trees is discussed further below.

Impact upon Trees and Ecology

Core Policy 12 states that the District Council will seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the District and seek to secure development that maximises the opportunities to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity.

The application has been supported by a Tree Survey which inspected 49 individual trees and 2 groups of trees containing over 60 stems. Of these, one tree was deemed to be of Category A quality (a tree in separate ownership overhanging the building); 34 of Category B; 12 of Category C and 4 Category U.

A total of 30 trees are proposed for removal to facilitate the proposed parking areas. These include 17 Category B specimens and 13 Category C specimens. To compensate for the loss of tree cover, it is proposed to undertake replacement planting at a minimum 1:1 ratio as shown on a tree compensation plan. The comments of the Town Council are noted in terms of offering the Fountain Gardens as an alternative location for tree planting, but the aim should be for adequate replacement planting to be provided on site to compensate for the site specific impacts.

The proposals have been assessed by the Councils Tree Officer who has raised significant concerns in relation both to the proposed level of tree loss but also the inadequacy of replacement planting.

It is stated that the proposed planting does not take account of the current location, site conditions, soil conditions or the character of the area. Some of the trees to be removed are of a significant scale (for example 20m high and above) but would be replaced by specimens of just 5m high. Visually and biologically the replacement trees are not comparable to those which would be lost.

In addition to the above, the Tree Officer has raised some doubt to the categorisation of the trees suggesting that their quality has been under-estimated.

Based on the level of car parking proposed, there would not be adequate space for the viable replacement of tree cover but there is also the potential that trees shown as being retained would be subsequently lost through construction damage. The tree loss proposed would have significant character impacts to the site and the surrounding area exposing a large building which is currently heavily screened. The impact on the character of the area could potentially be further exacerbated by the potential further loss of trees intended for retention through construction damage in the creation of the car parking areas.

Given that the building as existing is vacant, and noting the aforementioned tree cover within the site, there is potential for the site to hold ecological value. The development involves an element of demolition in the form of the detached building towards the south of the site. On this basis, a preliminary ecological survey has been undertaken and submitted with the application.

This has subsequently been updated during the application noting the delay since the initial survey and in response to the revised design proposals. The updated report concludes the following text:

“The habitats present within the Site were not found to have changed significantly since the initial ecology site visit. The preliminary bat roost assessment of the buildings concluded that the main former care home building (Building 1) provides moderate suitability for roosting bats, whilst the boiler building (Building 2) provides negligible suitability for roosting bats. All trees within the Site were assessed to be of negligible suitability for roosting bats. This is consistent with the results and conclusions of the 2022 PEA report. The potential roost features on Building 1 are typically gaps within the soffits, and occasionally around window frames and adjacent hanging tiles. It is understood that the works to the building will comprise internal

refurbishment only and will not impact loft spaces, or any areas of potential roost features. No further survey for roosting bats is considered necessary as the development is not anticipated to result in any direct impacts to potential roosting features within Building 1. Demolition of Building 2 and tree felling operations will also pose negligible risk to roosting bats given the lack of potential roosting features present.”

The report goes on to make recommendations for mitigation, compensation and enhancement which could be secured by suitably worded conditions.

It is noted that the original survey did recommend further emergence surveys which do not appear to have been undertaken. Given the discrepancy between the two documents, the Councils ecologist has reviewed the updated ecological report. It has been confirmed that the change in the development proposals (i.e. no longer proposing any extensions) and confirmation that the proposed internal works would not involve any disturbance of the roof space would be sufficient to conclude that there are no potential constraints regarding roosting bats. As such it is agreed that no additional survey work would be required. It is suggested that if permission were to be otherwise forthcoming then a planning condition could be attached requiring a Biodiversity Management Plan.

Notwithstanding that the development would have an acceptable impact on protected species, overall, the impact to trees is considered unacceptable and contrary to the aims of Core Policy 12 and Policy DM7.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 states that the layout of development within sites and separation distances from neighbouring development should be sufficient to ensure that neither suffers from an unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy.

Residential dwellings are located on Walker Close to the south of the site and Bowbridge Road to the west. There is also a pair of semi-detached dwellings accessed from London Road immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The additional parking areas have the potential to cause nuisance from comings and goings. However, an existing line of trees on a raised bund would separate the parking from the majority of the neighbouring dwellings and provide some screening and separation (even with the proposed tree removal works). Whilst there may still be some nuisance from increased activity within the site it is unlikely to occur at unsociable hours and given that the site has been a day centre in the past, which would have resulted in a degree of activity, I consider that this would be acceptable.

Impact upon Highway Safety

Spatial Policy 7 states that development proposals should contribute to the implementation of the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan and should minimise the need for travel, through measures such as travel plans for all development which generates significant amounts of movement. In addition, development should provide safe, convenient and attractive accesses for all, including the elderly and disabled, and others with restricted mobility, and provide links to the existing network of footways, bridleways and cycleways, so as to maximise opportunities for their use. The policy goes on to state that proposals should provide

appropriate and effective parking provision, both on and off-site, and vehicular servicing arrangements in line with Highways Authority best practice and ensure that vehicular traffic generated does not create new or exacerbate existing on street parking problems.

It is recognised that the location is close to public transport links and it is likely that some patients would be able to attend the health centre by non-car modes of transport including walking and cycling (for which secure storage would be provided). However, it is equally acknowledged that there are local concerns that the local road network cannot facilitate the traffic from the development and that there may be increased parking on residential streets close by should the car park reach capacity.

The proposal would be served by the existing vehicular access from Walker Close albeit it is proposed to create an additional pedestrian access from London Road at the north eastern corner of the site. The proposals include a car park for 59 vehicles (including 13 staff parking spaces) and cycle stores for both visitors and staff. It is worth noting that the existing Barnby Gate Surgery operates with approximately 20 spaces.

The application has been accompanied by a Transport Statement and Travel Plan which have been reviewed by NCC as the Highways Authority. Initially concerns were raised in relation to the level of car parking proposed but NCC have since accepted that given the extant use of the site (and acknowledging that the change of use in itself does not require permission) there would be no justifiable highways grounds to resist the application. The additional parking through the revised plans is welcomed by NCC but there is still concern that the level of parking does not meet standards. Conditions have therefore been suggested to mitigate this which could be imposed if permission were to be otherwise forthcoming.

Neighbouring comments have queried whether there has been consideration to extending the parking permits in the area. One of the conditions suggested by NCC Highways is for parking surveys to be undertaken following the development being brought into use which could in theory lead to the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order.

Although parking and matters of access are clearly a concern locally, material weight must be given to the potential of the site being brought back into use without the level of car parking proposed. The revised scheme does at least demonstrate an increased provision of parking for both staff and patients and with the ability to impose conditions were the application to be otherwise acceptable, there is therefore no demonstrable conflict with Spatial Policy 7 or the relevant elements of Policy DM5.

Other Matters

A neighbouring party has made representations in relation to a tree close to their shared boundary which in their opinion should be coppiced. However, having identified this specimen within the submitted tree survey it appears to be in good condition with no recommended works. I therefore do not consider it would be reasonable or necessary to require further works to this tree through this application process.

Neighbours have also made comments in relation to a lack of detail in relation to lighting. No lighting is proposed as part of this application, if permission were to be granted and lighting

were deemed necessary, it would need to be subject to a separate application which would then be assessed on its own merits.

Reference is made to opening hours not being known and therefore it not being possible to fully assess the impacts of the proposal. However, as above, the change of use is not subject to assessment noting that it does not require planning permission. There are no controls on the hours of opening on the extant permission and therefore it would be unreasonable to impose them through this application (if permission were to be otherwise forthcoming).

If the application were to be improved, impacts of construction could be controlled through condition (e.g. hours of construction noting the close proximity to residential properties). A neighbouring property has raised concern that there is no barrier indicated on the car park to prevent antisocial behaviour. It is not deemed necessary to insist on this from a planning perspective, there would be other reasonable means of security (such as cameras) and there is no substantive evidence to suggest antisocial behaviour would be an issue.

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 principle of the development is acceptable noting that the site is within a sustainable location and the proposed end use will bring community benefits. The level of car parking proposed is substantial albeit there are still concerns from NCC Highways that it may not be sufficient to serve the end use. However, noting that the building could be brought into use as a medical centre without planning permission (and therefore without any additional car parking to what is already on site) there are no substantive grounds to resist the application on parking and highways impacts. NCC Highways have confirmed this through a lack of objection to the revised proposal.

The creation of the car parking has considerable impacts in respect to the existing tree cover within the site. A total of 30 trees are proposed for removal to facilitate the proposed parking areas. These include 17 Category B specimens and 13 Category C specimens albeit it is considered that the quality of the specimens on site overall has been underestimated. Despite replacement planting being proposed to compensate for the loss of trees, visually and biologically the replacement trees are not comparable to those which would be lost.

The tree loss proposed would have significant character impacts to the site and the surrounding area exposing a large building which is currently heavily screened. The impact on the character of the area could potentially be further exacerbated by the further loss of trees shown as being retained through construction damage in the creation of the car parking areas.

Overall, the impacts to trees and subsequent adverse impact on the character of the area is unacceptable and contrary to the aims of Core Policies 9 (Sustainable Design), 12 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) and 13 (Landscape Character) of the Amended Core Strategy and Policies DM5 (Design) and DM7 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) of the Allocations and Development Management DPD. The benefits of the proposal, namely facilitating the building being brought into a community use are not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm associated with tree loss.

In reaching the above conclusion, weight has been attached to the fall-back position of bringing the building into use as a medical centre and pharmacy without planning permission (which would potentially have adverse impacts on the highway network through increased parking in the area). However, it is considered that without associated car park the risk of the applicant choosing to implement a change of use would be low. The applicant (through discussions with their agent) was offered the option to withdraw the application and pursue the change of use through permitted development without any associated external works or indeed to reduce the level of car parking in an attempt to lessen the adverse impact on trees. However, it was confirmed that the level of car parking proposed has been tested with the operators at significant length. It is therefore not considered to be a reasonable fall back position that the change of use would occur without the associated car parking so the weight attached to this is limited in the overall planning balance.

10.0 Reason for refusal

01

The creation of the proposed car parking areas has considerable impacts in respect to the existing tree cover within the site. A total of 30 trees are proposed for removal to facilitate the proposed parking areas. These include 17 Category B specimens and 13 Category C specimens albeit it is considered that the quality of the specimens on site overall has been underestimated. Despite replacement planting being proposed to compensate for the loss of trees, visually and biologically the replacement trees are not comparable to those which would be lost.

The tree loss proposed would have significant character impacts to the site and the surrounding area exposing a large building which is currently heavily screened. The impact on the character of the area could potentially be further exacerbated by the further loss of trees shown as being retained through construction damage in the creation of the car parking areas.

Overall, the impacts to trees and subsequent adverse impact on the character of the area is unacceptable and contrary to the aims of Core Policies 9 (Sustainable Design), 12 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) and 13 (Landscape Character) of the Amended Core Strategy and Policies DM5 (Design) and DM7 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) of the Allocations and Development Management DPD. The benefits of the proposal, namely facilitating the building being brought into a community use are not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm associated with tree loss.

Informatives

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 has been refused based on the following plans and documents:

- Planning Statement by Peacock + Smith/Assura dated November 2023;
- Design and Access Statement – 2202-03 dated November 2023;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Compensation Plan by via V3 dated 09/11/23;
- Framework Travel Plan by Civic Engineers dated 18th November 2022;
- Transport Statement by Civic Engineers dated 18th November 2022;
- Phase 1 Ecology Survey prepared by Betts Ecology;
- Supplementary Ecological Report dated December 2023;
- Statement of Community Involvement by Peacock + Smith/Assura;
- Location Plan– drawing no. 2202-0200, rev P00;
- Existing Site Plan– drawing no. 2202-0201, rev P00;
- Existing Ground Floor Plan– drawing no. 2202-0210, rev P00;
- Existing First Floor Plan– drawing no. 2202-0211, rev P00;
- Existing Roof Plan– drawing no. 2202-0212, rev P00;
- Existing Elevations Sheet 1– drawing no. 2202-0220, rev P01;
- Existing Elevations & Sections Sheet 2– drawing no. 2202-0221, rev P01;
- Proposed Site Plan– drawing no. 2202-0101, rev P06;
- Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans– drawing no. 2202- 0110, rev P00;
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 1– drawing no. 2202-0320, rev P02;
- Proposed Elevations Sheet 2– drawing no. 2202-0321, rev P02.

03

The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. However the District Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to make some revisions to the proposal. Whilst not all problems arising can be overcome, several potential reasons for refusal have been negated.

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.

