

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 3 DECEMBER 2019

Application No: 19/01489/FUL

No:

Proposal: Single storey extension to main building to form Sauna and steam room.

Location: Blidworth Community Leisure Centre, Blidworth.

Applicant: Mr Andy Carolan

Agent: Mr John Gaddass Newark & Sherwood District Council

Registered: 19.08.2019 **Target Date:** 14.10.2019

Link: <https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=PVXB88LBKSQ00>

This application is being presented to the Planning Committee in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation as this Council is the applicant/agent.

The Site

The application site comprises a substantial rectangular plot occupied by Blidworth Community Leisure Centre at the junction of Mansfield Road and Belle Vue Lane. The site is within the main built up area of Blidworth, a principal village as identified by the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy. Neighbouring development includes both residential and commercial uses as well Blidworth fire station immediately to the northern boundary of the site. A number of large mature trees are located close to the boundary with the Mansfield Road. To the rear of the application building is a hard surfaced car park and children's playground.

Relevant Planning History

13/01526/ADV - 1 Steel Frame Sign and 1 Internally Illuminated LED Screen Enclosure. Approved 20.12.2013

08/00011/FULR3 - Change of use and extension of existing community centre to form leisure centre – Approved 28.02.2008.

07/00470/FULR3 - Erection of 2.4 Meter high green "Heras" style mesh fence. Approved 12.10.2007.

The Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey extension in order to create a steam room and sauna facility in connection with the existing leisure centre.

The proposed extension would be located on the south-west facing elevation and measure 5.3m in depth and 6.13m in width. The roof design would be dual pitched with an eaves level of 2.3m and a maximum ridge height of 3.4m. The external finish would be facing brickwork on the elevations and tiles on the roof, both to match the existing building.

Submitted Documents

For the avoidance of doubt, the following assessment has been based on the plans and details listed below

RR-97-03 – Existing Plans and Elevations

RR-97-02 – Block Plan

RR-97-04 – Proposed Plans

RR-97-05 – Proposed Elevations

Tree Survey by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd dated October 2019

Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of twenty two properties have been individually notified by letter.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2011)

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 8 – Retail Hierarchy

Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design

Core Policy 10 – Climate Change

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM1 – Development within Settlements Central to Delivering the Spatial Strategy

DM5 – Design

DM11 – Retail and Town Centre Uses

DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2019
- Planning Practice Guidance
- National Design Guide – Planning practice guidance for beautiful, enduring and successful places September 2019

Consultations

Blidworth Parish Council – ‘We object to this application as it is an illegal application due to the wrong name being used on the Property Name on the application form.’

‘Further to our comment submitted yesterday we would like to clarify by adding the following: The Planning application states that the proposal is for Blidworth Community Leisure Centre. There is no where stated on the building that this is a community building. We therefore feel that this application does not benefit the community but only those that pay a membership.’

Tree Officer –

Further comments on the submitted Tree Protection Plan received 13/11/19

‘The proposed ground protection noting ply over polythene is not acceptable. It needs to be ply (thickness needs specifying) on top of compressible layer i.e.150mm depth of wood chip laid over a geotextile.’

Original comments received 01/11/19

The amended plan indicates a new footway to be installed within the RPA of trees on the north/west boundary that has not been addressed within the submitted tree report. The report implies any excavations to be carried out under supervision which is unlikely to be monitored. I would suggest a site specific method statement is required. Fencing and ground protection measures are recommended by no site specific details are noted.

Site specific details for the proposed footway should be submitted. Soft landscape options are noted in the tree report but none have been submitted. Recommend any approval has attached conditions relating to an arboricultural method statement and scheme for tree protection, prohibited activities, details on new tree planting and implementation of eh landscaping scheme.

NSDC Environmental Health - There are no environmental health observations to make about this application.

No other representations have been received

Comments of the Business Manager

Principle of Development

The application site is located within Blidworth which is defined as a ‘Principal village’ in the settlement hierarchy contained within Spatial Policy 1 of the Amended Core Strategy which has a defined function as a secondary focus for service provision. Spatial Policy 2 outlines that the overall strategy for Blidworth is regeneration where the District Council will amongst other things seek to secure new employment opportunities and the regeneration of vacant land.

Furthermore Spatial Policy 8 of the Amended Core Strategy advises that the provision of new and enhanced community and leisure facilities will be encouraged, particularly where they address a deficiency in current provision, and where they meet the identified needs of the communities. Given the above, it is considered that the principle of the development at the site is acceptable.

Impact on visual amenity and local distinctiveness

Core Policy 9 states that new development should 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. Policy DM5 requires the local distinctiveness of the District's landscape and character of built form to be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials and detailing of proposals for new development. The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and new development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

The application building is a large detached building located within a prominent position on a corner plot, and while I am mindful that the proposed extension is located on an elevation facing Mansfield Road, I am also aware that this section of the application building is heavily screened by the large mature trees that run close to the boundary with this highway.

Furthermore, I am of the view that the large host building would form a backdrop to the proposed extension, which is small-scale in context and as such the proposed development is considered to appear visually acceptable within the street scene and would not result in an unduly prominent feature. The single storey design and external finish of the proposed extension is also considered to be in keeping with the host building.

Impact on Trees

The application is supported by a tree survey which has identified 3 small Hawthorn trees (labelled G4 within the tree survey plan) would be required to be removed in order to accommodate the proposed development. These trees have been classified as being of low quality. The survey has also identified that pruning works would be required to the closest larger mature Ash trees, (labelled G5) consisting of a crown lift and reduction.

It is considered that while the loss of the young hawthorn trees at the site is regrettable, taking into account the size and quality of these trees, as well as the lack of prominence within the area, the loss of these trees would not result in such an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the site and wider area that it should be refused. In coming to this conclusion I have taken into account that the tree survey has confirmed that the large mature trees along the frontage would be unaffected by the proposal, albeit with some pruning works required to the closest trees within group G5.

Following negotiations with the agent, confirmation has been received that the new footpath indicated along the frontage of the site and in close proximity to the root protection area of the trees no longer forms part of the proposal. I note that the Tree Officer raises no objection to the scheme, and while mindful of the recommended conditions, I consider the replacement landscaping scheme to not be appropriate in this instance given the intended retention of the mature trees along the frontage. Instead, a more bespoke condition securing the recommendations of the submitted tree survey results to be more appropriate. A condition securing the agreed protection measures during construction is also considered appropriate.

Impact on 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. Furthermore, the NPPF seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The closest neighbouring residential properties are located along Mansfield Road, approx. 30m to the west and properties along Belle Vue Road, approx. 48m to the south-east. Given the level of separation to the closest neighbouring residential properties and limited dimensions of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any material impact on neighbouring amenity.

Highway safety

Spatial Policy 7 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that vehicular traffic generated does not create parking or traffic problems. Policy DM5 of the DPD requires the provision of safe access to new development and appropriate parking provision.

The site is served by a large hard surfaced car park to the rear of the application building and accessed via Belle Vue Lane. There is no change to vehicular access into the site or the layout of car park as part of this application and it is also not envisioned that the proposed development would alter the demand for parking at the site significantly. As such, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to result in material impact on highway safety at the site.

Other matters

I note the comments of the Parish Council in relation to the use of the word community within the application buildings name, and while I am mindful that the leisure use may require a paid membership fee, it is understood that this leisure facility is open to the general public. I therefore consider the use of the word community in the title of the application building to not be misleading. In any case, I do not consider the title of the application building to be central to the assessment of the proposed development. Regardless, it is still capable of being a community facility in accordance with SP8 which would offer an improved service.

Conclusion

The proposal relates to the extension and improvement of an existing leisure facility within the Principle Village of Blidworth and is acceptable in principle. I have identified no adverse impacts on the visual amenity of the site or wider area or the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Impacts to trees is acceptable and harm can be mitigated by condition. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in any material impact on highway safety. Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is approved subject to the conditions and reasons shown below

Conditions

01

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

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

02

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

RR-97-02 – Block Plan

RR-97-04 – Proposed Plans

RR-97-05 – Proposed Elevations

Tree Survey by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd dated October 2019

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority through the approval of a non-material amendment to the permission.

Reason: So as to define this permission.

03

The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials details submitted as part of the planning application unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

04

Prior to the commencement of development at the site, the landscaping works as shown within the submitted Tree Survey Plan Ref. 9277-T-02 which includes the removal of Hawthorn trees labelled G4 and the recommended pruning works to trees labelled G5 shall be carried out at the site.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory provision is made for the continued health and retention of the remaining trees in the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

05

Prior to the commencement of development at the site, the tree protection measures shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Tree Protection Method Statement dated 11/12/19 details, with the exception of stated ground protection, which shall be 200mm thick ply on top of a compressible layer consisting of 150mm depth wood chip laid over a geotextile. These measures shall be in place for the entire construction period.

Reason: To ensure that existing trees and hedges to be retained are protected, in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation.

06

Notwithstanding the approved layout plan Ref; RR-97-02 Block Plan, the indicated new footpath along the frontage is not approved.

Reason: As agreed by the applicant who has withdrawn this element of the proposal to ensure that existing trees and hedges to be retained are protected, in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation.

07

The following activities must not be carried out under any circumstances.

- a. No fires to be lit on site within 10 metres of the nearest point of the canopy of any retained tree/hedgerow on or adjacent to the proposal site.
- b. No equipment, signage, fencing etc shall be attached to or be supported by any retained tree on or adjacent to the application site,
- c. No temporary access within designated root protection areas without the prior written approval of the District Planning Authority.
- d. No mixing of cement, dispensing of fuels or chemicals within 10 metres of any retained tree/hedgerow on or adjacent to the application site.
- e. No soak- aways to be routed within the root protection areas of any retained tree/hedgerow on or adjacent to the application site.
- f. No stripping of top soils, excavations or changing of levels to occur within the root protection areas of any retained tree/hedgerow on or adjacent to the application site.
- g. No topsoil, building materials or other to be stored within the root protection areas of any retained tree/hedgerow on or adjacent to the application site.
- h. No alterations or variations of the approved works or protection schemes shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the District Planning Authority.

Reason: Reason: To ensure that existing trees and hedges to be retained are protected, in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation.

Notes to Applicant

01

The application as submitted is acceptable. In granting permission without unnecessary delay the District Planning Authority is implicitly working positively and proactively with the applicant. This is fully in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 (as amended).

02

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

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is not payable on the development hereby approved as the gross internal area of new build is less than 100 square metres.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Gareth Elliott on ext 5836.

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

Lisa Hughes
Business Manager – Growth and Regeneration

Committee Plan - 19/01489/FUL



