

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 2 JUNE 2020

Application No:	19/01865/RMAM
Proposal:	Reserved Matters submission for 219 no dwellings with access gained from the primary, central spine road (permitted under 19/00674/RMAM) including open space, landscaping (soft and hard) and associated internal road infrastructure.
Location:	Former Thoresby Colliery, Ollerton Road, Edwinstowe
Applicant:	Barratt Homes
Registered:	21.10.2019 Target Date: 16.01.2020
	Extension of Time Agreed Until 04.06.2020
Website Link:	https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage

This application is being referred to the Planning Committee for determination by all three local ward members (Cllrs Brown, Carlton and Peacock) for a number of reasons including the scale and importance of the proposal. Further comments have been included in this report.

The Site

Thoresby Colliery closed in July 2015 and the wider site extends to approximately 150.3ha, comprising the former pit yard area, spoil heaps and some arable fields fronting the A6075 Ollerton Road to the south. The colliery site lies to the north east of the settlement of Edwinstowe and is primarily accessed from the A6075 Ollerton Road via the existing colliery access road.

This application site forms a residential phase and extends to some 8.2 hectares of land located on the western frontage of the site (nearest Edwinstowe). The site is set lower than the adjacent highway to the south and gradually declines from west to east by several metres. The site is bare soil currently being levelled in accordance with a previous reserved matters application that approved a pre-development stage. There is existing vegetation adjacent to the highway that remains and screens the site. Land immediately to the north and east will form later phases of residential development which also benefit from outline permission.

To the north and east of the wider site is the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation and Special Sites of Scientific Interest that lie within the adjacent Special Area of Conservation (Birklands and Bilhaugh; Birklands West and Ollerton Corner). The Sherwood Forest National Nature Reserve (NNR) and Country Park lies to the west. The site also lies within the 5km buffer zone of the Sherwood Important Bird Area, and parts of the site are within 500m of an Indicative Core Area identified by Natural England for a potential prospective Special Protection Area (pSPA). The site lies within the parish of Edwinstowe and within the Edwinstowe and Clipstone Ward.

Relevant Planning History

16/02173/OUTM – ‘Residential Development up to 800 dwellings (Class C3), Strategic Employment Site comprising up to 4,855 sqm Class B1a, up to 13,760 sqm Class B1c, and up to 13,760 sqm Class B2, a new Country Park, a Local Centre, "The Heart of the New Community" containing a mix of leisure (to include zip wire), commercial, employment, community, retail (up to 500 sqm), health, and residential uses, a Primary School, Open Space and Green Infrastructure (including SUDS), and associated access works including the details of the primary access junctions into the site from Ollerton Road.’ Approved 12th March 2019, subject to 51 conditions and a section 106 Agreement which secured the following:

- Affordable Housing of 7.5% of total number of dwellings
 - Primary Education contribution, 1.3ha of land and £3,600,000 for new school
 - Healthcare contribution of £786,096
 - Sports Pitch contribution £590,176
 - Ollerton Roundabout contribution of £1,198,000
 - Library contribution of £35,130
 - Community Facility contribution of £607,256
 - Open Space of 11.89 ha of land comprising;
 - Sustainable urban drainage;
 - Multi-use games area;
 - Public open space;
 - Children’s and young people’s space comprising 2 x locally equipped area for play and 1 x neighbourhood play area;
 - Maintenance of the open space/country park and monies to do so.
 - Review of viability prior to occupation of 400th dwelling
-
- 19/01116/DISCON – Condition 18 in relation to Habitat Creation and Management plan was discharged on the 30th August 2019 for the for enabling infrastructure works only
 - 19/01117/DISCON - Conditions 9 and 10 (Oil and petrol separators and removal of suspended solids from surface water run off) for the whole site were discharged on 30th August 2019.
 - The following conditions were also discharged purely in relation to the enabling infrastructure phase of the development:-
 - 11 (CEMP)
 - 12 (SWMP)
 - 16 (Arboricultural works)
 - 19 (External Lighting)Condition 31 (retained building strategy) was also discharged as part of this application.

19/00674/RMAM - Reserved Matters were granted under delegated powers in July 2019 for the enabling infrastructure phase of the comprehensive development. The approved works included the provision of a new ghost island at the junction of the existing colliery access with Ollerton Road, a new main spine road to serve the first two phases of the residential development which utilises the existing colliery access drive together with its associated highway drainage, surface water and foul infrastructure drainage systems, landscaping and earthworks. It also included the approval of an air quality assessment which covered the whole of the site and all phases of development.

19/01016/RMAM - Reserved matters application for Phase 1 (by Harron Homes Ltd) residential development comprising 143 no. dwellings with access gained from the primary, central spine road (outline permission ref. 16/02173/OUTM) was approved by committee as recommended in December 2019.

19/02159/FUL – Development of one (temporary) construction access point to serve this Phase was recently refused by the planning committee on the grounds that the need for the access hadn't been demonstrated and the resulting perceived highway harm.

The Proposal

Reserved matters (scale, appearance, layout and landscape) approval is sought for 219 dwellings, known as Phase 2 of the Thoresby Colliery re-development. As originally submitted the scheme was for 220 dwelling but various amendments made during the life of application have reduced the quantum of units by 1.

The scheme comprises 15 different house types mainly two and some two-and-a half storey dwellings made up of a mix of detached, semi-detached and terrace dwelling plus 2 flats. The number of market dwellings proposed is 203 whilst the remaining 16 would be for affordable homes. Materials proposed are predominantly red brick with a limited number being in buff brick with grey or brown roof tiles.

The layout comprises a central area of public open space including a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) as well as two linear areas of space totaling c2,887m².

It is proposed that this site is delivered in sub phases, with the site being developed generally in an east to west direction, albeit the dwellings along the northern spine road and the road itself would be within Phase 1.

The Submission

House Name	Drawing No	House Type	Bedrooms	Plots	No.
SF58/SF59	SF58-E-7/SF59-EH7 01	Affordable Apartment	1 (double)	64, 65	2
SH50	SH50-EH7 50 SH50-I-TYPE 50 Rev C	Affordable end terrace/semi Affordable mid-terrace	2 (doubles)	61, 62, 63, 87, 88, 178, 179, 180	8
SH52	SH52-EH7 TYPE 52 SH52-I-7 52 Rev D	End 2 storey semi/terrace Mid terrace	3 (2 doubles)	52, 53, 54, 55, 176, 177	6
Ingleby	H403-F7	Detached 2 storey	4 (2 double/2 single)	90, 117, 119	3
Wilford	P204-EH7 Rev C	Two storey semi-	2	57, 58, 66, 67, 70, 71,	20

	P204-I-7 Rev A	detached/terrace	(doubles)	94, 95, 96, 108, 109, 157, 158, 160, 161, 170, 171, 181, 182, 183,	
Archford	P382-EG7 P382-EH7 Rev B P382-EG7 Con	Two storey semi-detached 2	3 (1 single)	3, 12, 13, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 68, 69, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 101, 102, 106, 107, 131, 143, 144, 149, 120, 163, 184, 197, 198, 200,	31
Abbeydale	H349-7 Rev A	Two storey detached integral garage	3 (doubles)	31, 38, 98, 99, 100, 159, 162, 167, 168, 172, 195, 196, 188, 192, 199, 204, 206	17
Hadley	P341-D7 Rev B P341-E-7 Rev A	Two storey detached	3 (1 single)	40, 11, 56, 97, 121, 126, 130, 150, 155, 156, 164, 165, 169, 185, 189, 208, 201	17
Hollingwood	H486-7 H486-H7 Con	Two storey detached	4 (1 single)	4, 41, 45, 81, 105	5
Greenwood	T322-I-7 Rev A T322-E-7 Rev A T322-E-7 Con	Two-and-a-half storey end semi/terrace	3 (doubles)	2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 23, 24, 32, 33, 59, 60, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 103, 104, 122, 123, 124, 125, 145, 146, 147, 148, 174, 175, 186, 187, 190, 191, 193, 194, 217, 218	41
Holden	H469-H7 Rev C H469-H7 Con	Two storey detached	4 (doubles)	15, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 46, 47, 49, 50, 89, 91, 92, 111, 114, 115, 116, 132, 136, 141, 142, 152, 153, 154, 209, 210, 212	27
Avondale	H456-X7 H456-X7 Render			1, 14, 19, 20, 27, 28, 51, 48, 76, 92, 110, 118, 129, 139, 140, 151, 211, 219	18
Meriden	H429-7 Rev A			17, 42, 43, 133, 166, 173, 202, 203, 205, 207	10
Exeter	H418-7 Rev A H418-H7 Con Rev B			16, 44, 112, 113, 127, 128, 134, 135, 137, 138, 213, 214, 215, 216,	14
Total					219

- H8066/101 Rev P – Planning Layout
- H8066/13 Rev C- Phasing Plan
- GL1221 01J Landscape Masterplan

- H8066/02 Rev A - Site Location Plan
- 2010/DET/214 – 900mm Post and Rail Fence
- 2010/DET/216 – 450mm Timber Knee Rail
- 2010/DET/229 – 1200mm Vertical metal railings
- DB-SD13-006 B– Closed Boarded Fence
- DB-SD13-004 C– Boundary Wall Type 1
- H8066/06 Rev D – Materials and Enclosures Layout
- H8066/05 Rev C, Street-scene AA
- H8066/05 Rev B, Street-scene CC

Garages

- Single semi side gable garage – C160
- Single Garage – Ref:- SSG1H8 Rev 1
- Single Garage – Ref:- LSG1H8
- Single Garage - Ref:- LDG2H8
- Double Garage Ref:- SDG1H8 Rev 1
- Double Garage Ref:- LDG1H8

Engineering:

- Lighting and Ecology Assessment Rev B – this plan responds to the requirement contained within condition 19 of the Outline Planning Permission.
- Proposed Highway Lighting Lux Contour Levels, H09630/3499/LUC Rev C
- Preliminary FFL's and Drainage Strategy Ref: 101 Rev L
- Swept Path Analysis Estate Car Ref: PJS19-07-105 Rev D
- Swept Path Analysis Refuse Vehicle Ref: PJS19-07-106 Rev D
- Swept Path Analysis Fire Tender Vehicle Ref: PJS19-07-107 Rev C
- Horizontal Geometry Ref: PJS19-07-108 Rev C
- Street Lighting, Ref: H08630-3499 Rev C
- Soft Landscaping Proposals, GL1221 03C, GL 1221 04B and GL 1221 02B
- Play Area Proposals, GL 1221 05

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 7 properties have been individually notified by letter. Several site notices have also been displayed near to the site and an advert has been placed in the local press. Further public consultation has taken place on the amended plans.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

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

Spatial Policy 1 - Settlement Hierarchy

Spatial Policy 2 - Spatial Distribution of Growth

Spatial Policy 5 – Delivering Strategic Sites

Spatial Policy 6 – Infrastructure for Growth

Spatial Policy 7 - Sustainable Transport

Spatial Policy 8 – Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities

Core Policy 1 – Affordable Housing Provision

Core Policy 3 – Housing Mix, Type and Density

Core Policy 6 – Shaping our Employment Profile
Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design
Core Policy 10 – Climate Change
Core Policy 12 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
Core Policy 13 – Landscape Character
Core Policy 14 – Historic Environment
ShAP 3 – Role of Edwinstowe
ShAP 4 – Land at Thoresby Colliery

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM1 – Development within Settlements Central to Delivering the Spatial Strategy
DM2 – Development on Allocated Sites
DM4 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation
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 2019
Planning Practice Guidance

Consultations

CLRs Brown, Carlton and Peacock – (11 May 2020) - A joint letter was received requesting that the application be considered at the Planning Committee and setting out concerns as follows:

- Have the appropriate contamination surveys been undertaken and is the Planning Authority confident that no part of the site will give rise to public health issues?
- Can the Planning Authority confirm that a condition will be imposed that any areas at risk of contamination are clean capped to at least 600mm?
- Is the Planning Authority happy to determine this application without the Habitat Creation Management Plan which the RSPB has requested?
- The proposed site is nestled between Sherwood Forest Country Park, Ollerton Heath and the proposed country park, created on the former spoil heaps. Is the Planning Authority happy that the proposals from the developer provides enough tree planting and other landscaping in communal areas to at least shield the site from the areas of natural beauty that surrounds it?
- Recently the B6075 flooded due to, in part, to the ongoing infrastructure works on site and the excessive amounts of rain we currently suffer. Is the Planning Authority confident that the drainage and flood mitigation measures on this site will prevent such flooding both on the site and on to the adjacent highways?
- Edwinstowe has suffered recently from localised flooding in various parts of the village, seemingly the existing drainage system cannot cope with the current capacity. Is the Planning Authority confident that the additional drainage needs of this development and others proposed on this site will not add to the drainage burden of the rest of the village, causing more localised flooding in the village?

- We are concerned that car parking on site will not be sufficient as we have seen on new sites all over the district. We need to build houses that reflect the actual situation regarding cars and roads. Pavements are not wide enough and car parking spaces are a precious resource, this causes inconvenience for other drivers and pedestrians.
- Harworth Estates have promised that they will produce a Construction Management Plan for the whole of their site which will set out how they will minimise dust, noise and other such environmental emissions. Has this plan been approved?
- There is provision of green space on the site which is positive, however we would have liked for the green space to be linked up which would create a clear pedestrian/cycleway to the village.
- The new development will greatly increase traffic around the village. Though a financial contribution to Ollerton Roundabout is welcome it provides no help to the pinchpoints within the village. Worryingly a proposed link road between the former pit lane and the B6034 is not part of this application, this link road would alleviate traffic at the traffic lights where the B6034/B6075 roads cross, in the heart of the village. We would like to see a proper commitment that this link road will be put in place as part of the wider development before further development is allowed.
- The B6075 which runs adjacent to the site has, over the years seen many accidents and, sadly fatalities. It is a dangerous road for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. The development of this site and the wider site will increase the number of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using the B6075. Can the committee place a condition of this application that the B6075 be reduced to a 30mph road and the pedestrian pathway along the road be widened?
- We are concerned that contrary to the advice from NSDC Strategic Housing that there are no bungalows on this development when there is a clear demand for bungalows in the area. A suggestion that bungalows will be built as part of future development, however there is no commitment at this stage. This is the closest part of the development site to the village, it is important that older people can access the village and therefore it makes sense that bungalows should be built on this site.
- We have been concerned from the outset about the percentage of affordable housing on this whole site. NSDC has a target of 30% affordable housing yet this site has a desultory 7.5%. At the halfway point of the whole development (400 houses) we have an opportunity to look at how profitable the site has been and to readjust the numbers of affordable houses for the remainder of the site. We are now concerned that the model being used by Harworth Estates to deliver the homes will obfuscate the financial position of each stage and that in terms of business viability targets, these will be very difficult to measure. Is the Planning Authority happy that it can properly monitor the profitability of the ongoing site and therefore properly review the amount of affordable housing that is viable at the halfway stage?

Edwinstowe Parish Council – (November 2019) ‘Support Proposal – Unanimous - There is no problem with phase 2 but it was noted that due to recent rainfall that the land consistent with phase 2 appears to be much lower than the other phases and to ask Newark and Sherwood Planning Authority to consider if this will make it susceptible to flooding. There was concern that this development could be doing more regarding solar panels and it was agreed that Cllr Brooks can go to the Committee and speak to the Council regarding our concerns in this area. The transportation of materials should come from A614 and not through the village.’

Bilsthorpe Parish Council – on 11th December confirmed they had no comments.

Perlethorpe-cum-Budby Parish Meeting – No objections

Ollerton Town Council – (24.03.20) No objections

OBTC had previously objected as they were concerned the requested surveys not yet being received albeit this matter was since clarified.

NCC Highways Authority – (07.04.2020) Further to comments dated 11 November 2019, the proposed layout as shown on drawing H8066/101/N is now generally acceptable in highway terms.

In order to promote sustainable travel, the only amendment I would wish to see is the provision of the shown footpath link to Ollerton Road upgraded to a 3m wide shared pedestrian/cycle access.

Also, I would wish it to be confirmed that the bend adjacent to plots 122 & 123 has been widened to 6.1m (at its apex) to cater for swept path of large vehicles. If it hasn't, then further amendment is required.

On the assumption that the above matters can be easily resolved by the time Planning Committee meets, no objections are raised subject to the following conditions..”

NCC HWA then go on to list 3 conditions to ensure that the driveways are constructed in a bound material, that the garage doors have adequate set back from the road and to ensure there is adequate drainage to prevent it running onto the highway. The conditions are repeated in the conditions section verbatim so are not set out here.

11 November 2019 – A number (9) of amendments were requested in order for the Highway Authority to raise no objections

NCC Policy (10.01.20) – No strategic comments to make.

NCC - Rights of Way – 05.03.20 and 15.01.20: ‘I have checked the definitive map and no public rights of way are recorded over the proposed development site. This does not preclude unrecorded rights being proved to exist at a later date.’

Lead Local Flood Authority – (17.03.20) Please refer to previous comments dated 04.11.2019. Should the applicants wish to proceed without a surface water condition they should submit a detailed surface water strategy for consideration.

“Nottinghamshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the application which was received on the 21 Oct 2019. Based on the submitted information we have no objection to the proposals and can recommend approval of planning subject to the following conditions...”

They then go on to recommend the imposition of a condition to control surface water drainage and an informative to the applicant.

NSDC, Environmental Health (Contamination) – ‘This application refers to phase 2 only as far as I can tell. If that is the case then I have no comments as the land was all greenfield and no elevated contamination was identified. There remain outstanding matters in relation to phase 1 where

there was an area of that phase which was used for coal stocking and an agreement relating to the level of clean capping is yet to be met.'

NSDC, Environmental Health - I have no further observations to those made in relation to the application 16/02173/OUTM with regards to the CEMP being adopted across the site and recommendations made by the noise consultants with reference to the properties facing Ollerton Road, commented on by my colleague Mr Phillip Doughty.

NSDC (Strategic Housing) – (16.03.20) Strategic Housing supports the proposal to improve the aspect from the affordable housing. The Council’s policy requires affordable housing to be ‘pepper potted’ across the scheme and tenure blind. The limited provision of affordable housing in the proposal has a lax application to the policy and I would have liked to have seen the provision more widely dispersed across the scheme.

With reference to our previous consultation regarding the above application, we have received amended information as described above.

(11.11.19) - The following is agreed as suitable:

	Type	Tenure	Total Affordable Rent	Total Shared Ownership
2	Flats	Rent	2	-
8	2 Bed Houses	Rent	6	2
6	3 Bed Houses	Rent	2	4
16			10	6

Historic England (11.03.20 & 15.01.20) - Do not wish to offer any comments.

Ramblers (23.01.20) - This development does not involve any recorded rights of way and we have no objection.

Representations have been received from 3 local residents/interested parties raising objections which are summarised follows in respect of the original plans comprising 220 dwellings. No comments on the amended plans have been received to date.

- Unable to locate documentation on the proposed make-up of the proposed housing in terms of how many 2 bed, 3 bed, etc and how many affordable; a lot more than phase 1;
- The lay-out is very cramped, once again it seems to be an exercise in shoehorning as many properties as possible in to the space, rather than creating an attractive and welcoming environment that will promote a sense of community;
- The proposed green area is far too small for the number of properties and should be extended to take up all of that central block, replacing the adjacent properties with good outdoor leisure facilities;
- Watched the community village feeling in Edwinstowe dwindle over the years with every new phase of housing development and truly believe that this 800 dwelling plan will destroy the village and drive life-long residents out;
- Concerned that large development appears to have been split into smaller phases;
- Development has been steamrolled through by developers
- Failure to adhere to requests for surveys;

- This particular site was once a feeding ground for the Sherwood Forest Nature Reserve now it is to be developed. Where are the green corridors and hedgerows through the site for the wildlife?
- Concerned that it will have an impact on the countryside in the middle of England's most iconic forest landscape. The RSPB state that the planting scheme should reflect that;
- This is not just another site of industrial wasteland for Harworth Estates to exploit, it is in Sherwood Forest;
- This site has been waterlogged for many weeks, all work on this site should stop until all of the concerns and conditions of the Flood Authority has been addressed or is it more important that Newark & Sherwood District Councils five year housing supply is not delayed;
- The road at Cockglode corner has recently been flooded making it very dangerous for motorists, this is before this whole site is covered in concrete;
- Permission should never have been given for this site to be developed.
- There are five housing developments taking place at the moment in Edwinstowe we were once known as the village of Robin Hood, not any more we are a town;
- Perhaps Newark & Sherwood District Councils new Tree Planting Initiative may include Sherwood Forest to replace the thousands of trees that were lost over the last 100 years.

Comments of the Business Manager

Background and Context

Members resolved to approve outline permission for a mixed use development on this allocated site at Planning Committee in October 2017 and in February 2019 (when an update report was presented taking account of the updated NPPF) in accordance with the officer recommendation. Lengthy delays followed relating to the signing and sealing of the Section 106 Agreement which was eventually executed in March 2019.

The principle of this phased development has therefore been established through the granting of the outline consent with the means of access being the only matter that was considered and ultimately approved. The principle of the uses, the parameters and general disposition of uses are therefore established and need not be considered further in any detail. The scheme secured a range of developer contributions as set out in the site history section earlier in the report.

The way the former colliery site is being delivered is similar to that at Land South of Newark (the strategic urban extension) in that the site is owned by Harworth Estates, who are essentially the master developer who will be responsible for delivering the majority of the infrastructure. They have already secured reserved matters approval for the enabling phase which included the development of the access road in to the site as well as meeting the overarching pre-commencement conditions such as the dealing with any air quality, ground water pollution, construction environmental management plans etc. They then offer each phase which is 'ready to go' to different house builders. Thoresby Estates therefore retain a role of coordinating the overall mix, design ethos and provision of infrastructure moving forward.

Phase 1 has already been approved to Harron Homes for reserved matters for 143 dwellings by the Planning Committee in December 2019.

Phase 2 now relates to 219 dwellings advanced by Barratt Homes. The merits of this scheme are assessed in detail below.

Housing Mix, Type and Density

Density

The quantum of overall housing was set at outline stage and to a degree the density was also indicated. It is noted that this parcel of residential development was indicatively shown to provide for around 194 dwellings. The scheme as advanced is for 219 dwellings but I consider that this is broadly in line with the Master Plan and Design and Access Statement.

Core Policy 3 (Housing Mix & Density) expects average densities to be no lower than 30 dwellings per hectare. This phase will be one of the lower density parts of the site at around 26.7 dwellings per hectare but it is anticipated that higher densities will be focused towards the local centre. I am satisfied that the proposal meets with the expectations of the outline permission, CP3 and ShAP4 in striking an appropriate balance for density levels.

Mix

Core Policy 3 (Housing Mix & Density) also seeks to secure housing that meets the needs of the district, namely family housing of 3 bedrooms or more, smaller housing of 2 bedrooms or less and housing for the disabled and elderly population, but to reflect local need. It also states that such a mix will be dependent on the local circumstances of the site and any localised housing needs information.

Policy ShAP4 (Land at Thoresby Colliery) states that housing development should achieve density levels that strike a balance between efficient use of land and the green infrastructure and nature conservation requirements of the site.

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment of 2015 (SHMA) is, as the name suggests, a high level market assessment of houses required in the Nottingham area. I am not convinced that this is the most appropriate way of assessing localised housing need. However if regard is to be had to this document the need is as follows; 52% identified need for 3 beds , 28.8% need for 2 beds, 14.5% identified need for 4+ beds and 4.7% identified need for 1 bed units.

The Sub Area Report of the DCA Housing Needs Survey from 2014 indicates that the most needed type of housing is 2 bedroom dwellings (51.8%) followed by 3 bedrooms (38.2%) followed by 4 bedroom dwellings (10%) with no requirement identified for 1 bedroom units. The report also identified that the main property type in the sub area as existing are semi-detached dwellings with Edwinstowe being the most popular choice for future housing requirements.

Market Mix

Notwithstanding the above policy requirements, Members will be aware that at outline stage a viability case was advanced which adopted an 'assumed mix' for the site which then influenced the level of developer contributions that were secured. This assumed mix was not strictly in line with the policy objectives but struck a balance between getting an acceptable mix whilst obtaining a range of developer contributions in order to mitigate the impacts of the scheme upon infrastructure. This assumed mix was implicitly accepted when outline permission was granted.

Whilst this assumed mix is not set in stone, there is little scope in terms of amending this mix without it affecting the scheme's viability and necessitating the re-opening of a viability discussion and the reconsideration of matters considered and fixed at outline stage (most notably the quantum of affordable housing which was set at 7.5%).

In terms of the overall market mix the table below summarises the position:

Unit Type	Originally submitted Barratt Homes Scheme - No. of units (%)	Revised Scheme Barratt Homes Scheme - No. of units (%)	Viability - Assumed Mix for whole site
1 bed	0	0	18 (2.43%)
2 bed	14 (6.86%)	20 (9.85%)	82 (11.07%)
3 bed	109 (53.43%)	106 (52.2%)	327 (44.18%)
4 bed	81 (39.7%)	77 (37.93%)	261 (35.25%)
5 bed	0	0	52 (7.02%)
Total	204	203	740 (100%)

You will note that in terms of its proportionate share of the entire site when compared to the assumed mix, the Barratt market mix offers more 3 and 4 bedroom units, less (none) 5 bedroom units and slightly less 2 bed units. However the proposed mix is well within a 10% tolerance of the assumed mix.

It is worth noting that taken in context with Phase 1 approved by Members in December, the scheme currently being considered does offer a better mix in terms of the family housing of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings as the table below shows.

Unit Type	Phase 1: Harron Homes Market Mix as approved	Phase 2: Barratt Homes Scheme – Market Mix, No. of units (%)	Phases 1 & 2 Combined - No. of units (%)	Viability - Assumed Mix for whole site
1 bed	0	0	0	18 (2.43%)
2 bed	0	20 (9.85%)	20 (6.15%)	82 (11.07%)
3 bed	40 (30%)	106 (52.2%)	146 (44.92%)	327 (44.18%)
4 bed	75 (57%)	77 (37.93%)	152 (46.76%)	261 (35.25%)
5 bed	8 (6%)	0	8 (2.46%)	52 (7.02%)
6 bed	9 (7%)	0	9 (2.76%)	
Total	122 (100%)	203 (100%)	325 (100%)	740 (100%)

Furthermore I am aware that the master developer supports the mix and has stated that they expect more, smaller units to come forward in later more dense phases around the local centre and that they expect the frontage phases to offer a larger proportion of the larger units. They also went on record in December 2019 (as part of the Harron Homes proposals) stating that they expect other phases to accommodate some bungalows on the site. Taking all of this into account I consider that the mix broadly reflects that which was tested with the viability and is acceptable.

Affordable Mix

It should be noted that the quantum of affordable housing (7.5% equating to 60 units overall on the wider site) has been set firmly at outline stage and embedded into the S106 Agreement. The s106 requires the owners to submit a scheme detailing the tenure split, design and location prior to construction begins on each phase. However it is timely to consider part of this now as by first construction the mix would have been approved.

Barratt Homes advance a proportionate share of 7.3% (rounded down) of affordable housing, equating to 16 dwellings. The proposed tenure split will be 60% rent and 40% shared ownership as agreed with the Council's Strategic Housing Officer. Details of the plot numbers has not been provided but would need to be as part of the obligation of the s106 Agreement.

Again in terms of assessing this in context, when considered alongside the approved Phase 1 scheme the scheme offers a decent mix and this table also shows what is left to be provided moving forward which Members may find useful.

Affordable Type	Secured at outline stage	Phase 1 Quantum as Approved	Phase 2 as Submitted	Combination	Remaining types left to be provided elsewhere
1 beds	26 (of which 16 x affordable rent, 2 x intermediate/shared ownership and 8 x discounted open market unit)	0	2	2	24
2 beds	51 (of which 24 x affordable rent, 9 x intermediate/shared ownership and 18 x discounted open market unit)	3	8	11	40
3 beds	43 (of which 22 x affordable rent, 4 x intermediate/shared ownership and 17 x discounted open market unit)	8	6	14	29
	120 units equating to 7.5% affordable housing	11 (8% rounded)	16 (7.3% rounded)	27 (7.67%)	93

	overall	up)	down)		
--	---------	-----	-------	--	--

Whilst not pepper potted in the true sense, the affordable housing is broken into three clusters and is indistinguishable from the market housing in terms of its appearance. As such I am satisfied that this would not cause harm to social cohesion and also allow for effective management of the homes as I understand clusters of housing are preferred by registered providers.

Design, Character and Appearance

Given the extant approval for outline planning permission, it has already been accepted in principal that the character of the site will fundamentally change. However, with the benefit of full layout and elevational details, the LPA are now in a position to fully assess the magnitude and ultimately appropriateness of this against the policy context set out in policies CP9, CP13, ShAP4 and DM5.

The Master Developers have set a Design Code but this has no planning status having never been formally advanced as part of an application. However its objective is to create a sustainable development that respects the positive features of the site, creates a legible and attractive place with a sense of identity of a high quality and provide a well-planned layout with pleasant well designed streets and spaces. These elements are what are expected for good design in any event.

The house types proposed for this phase are generally the Barratt standard products which are found on many other development sites albeit some of the more prominent plots have been adapted so they are bespoke to the site. In any event the proposed dwellings are attractive and well laid out to provide an attractive living environment. Generally the larger units are arranged to form the periphery of the site with the smaller units arranged in the more central areas. Certain house types are arranged to frame focal points around the site and create an attractive street-scene. Given the land levels of the site which is considerably lower than Ollerton Road to the south, the dwellings will not be prominent and will be set behind the existing retained tree belt. The material pallet proposed reflects the built form of Edwinstowe and Ollerton, being predominantly red brick, with some interspersed buff brick and render. These buff brick dwellings are located at prominent/key plots throughout the site, mainly on corners and to define a visual end stop to views. This use of materials will help to create a sense of place and add interest to the street scene. Details of the boundary treatments have also been provided which include the use of screen walls to the gardens of prominently located plots (rather than fencing) which will help with longevity and metal fencing surrounding the main public open area. Along the main northern spine road, trees and hedgerows form the frontage boundaries in an attempt to soften this and give it more of an 'avenue' feel.

As the land rises gradually across the site, details of the finished floor levels in relation to ground levels is considered important in ensuring that the dwellings interrelate well and that adjacent phases sit well with one another. Details have been provided and are acceptable as evidenced by the by the street-scenes which show level changes, as well as the detailed annotated layout plan providing spot levels.

The development would be well screened and be set behind mature belts of existing landscaping that front Ollerton Road and the main entrance into the wider site known as The Avenue. Access into this Phase is from the east with the highway looping around with cul-de-sacs and private driveways off it. Dwellings are designed to front both Ollerton Road and The Avenue accessed by

private drives to their frontages. Having dwellings addressing the road frontages is welcomed so as to avoid views of gardens and the inevitable domestic paraphernalia which can result in clutter.

Overall I find that the house types and associated boundary treatments are an interesting mix of styles that have some features that reflect the local vernacular.

Public Open Space

The timing of delivery and the quantum of public open space (POS) to be provided on site is controlled by the s106 Agreement. At outline stage a Masterplan was advanced showing how the scheme might look and condition 5 of the outline permission requires the development to be 'substantially in accordance with' it unless otherwise agreed. This indicated that some open public space would be provided to the north of this phase as indicated by the half ellipse shape on the extract below.

Extract of approved Masterplan submitted at outline stage:



The scheme as advanced by Barratt Homes has three parcels of public open space (POS). The quantum of POS has also increased from its original submitted plan from 1946m² to 2887m² which is welcomed. Whilst not located in the same place as indicated on the masterplan, the main area is nevertheless located centrally to the phase such that it acts as a focal point for residents and would include a locally equipped area of plan (LEAP). It is also worth noting that the Barratt scheme indicates the central POS/LEAP would be delivered in their sub-phase 2 (their projected year 3/ 4 on site out of their expected 5 year presence on-site). This is unlikely to conflict with the timings set out in the section 106 agreement and is acceptable.

In respect of the LEAP, a play area proposals plan has been deposited with the Authority during the lifetime of the application which shows the provision of equipment. This comprises swings, a

see-saw, a roundabout, a climbing structure with slide and balancing apparatus. This specification is considered appropriate.

The s106 agreement obligates the provision for 2 LEAPs and 1 NEAP as part of the wider development and prevents the occupation of more than 60% of each phase until the associated POS is provided and in a good order. No development can commence until a specification and management plan has been agreed with the LPA. Consequently I do not consider that there is a need to impose any conditions in respect of this as it is already dealt with by the obligation.

Extract of layout showing locations of POS



Two other linear areas are also provided; one to the south-west adjacent to the main road and the other leads from the central area north towards what will be Phase 3. These linear parcels of land are welcomed as it is hoped that these pleasant green areas will encourage pedestrian activity through the site towards the proposed local centre and to provide a pleasant walk towards the proposed new school that will be delivered to the north-west in due course.

It should also be noted that the master developer will deliver the country park to the north of the phasing shown below which residents will be able to enjoy.

Extract of up to date phasing plan



Overall the provision of POS within this phase is well placed, enabling permeability throughout the site and in my view accords with the policy provisions set out in SP8, ShAP4, CP9 and DM5.

Landscaping and Ecological Matters

ShAP4 sets out that green infrastructure is to be provided to include landscaping and structural planting throughout the development, links to the countryside beyond, enhancements to the existing habitats and local landscape to name some of the objectives.

This application is accompanied by detailed specifications for both strategic and in-plot landscaping. This generally shows native species have been utilized on areas that are within the public realm and ornamental species where these fall within garden curtilages in order to avoid large roots that could harm foundations. Native trees would be planted adjacent to the LEAP and where these fall within the POS.

Extract from landscape masterplan



I note that the ward members have made comments that the northern spine road should be tree lined to create an avenue approach. My understanding is that the current layout doesn't have room for street trees and for which the commuted sums are substantial. Instead efforts have been made by the developer to soften the northern spine road with the provision of trees and hedgerows along the frontages of dwellings where possible in order to give this a leafy, green edge. I consider this to be an acceptable approach. The developer has also pointed to a hedgerow on the northern side of this spine road, outside of their boundary which they say is shown to be retained on a plan shared by the master developers with them. This was not previously shown on the masterplan submitted at outline stage. However Harworth Estate have clarified that the hedgerow in question has been placed into the management plan to ensure it is protected and retained, with the intention of incorporating it into the development as a direct response to the ward members' concerns. The northern spine (which is to be delivered by Barratt rather than Harworth) will ultimately have a green edge on both sides that is attractive and conducive to its context.

Turning now to matters of ecology. Condition 18 of the outline permission states that no development can commence unless a detailed Habitat Creation and Management Plan ("HCMP") associated with that phase or sub phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

I note that the layout plan details that 7 of the plots along the western boundary (adjacent to the strategic landscape buffer outside of this application site) would be fitted with bat boxes and 62 plots would be fitted with bird nest boxes throughout the site. I consider that the number and siting of these would be appropriate. The implementation of these is for Condition 18 of the outline permission albeit I expect that these would be installed when the dwellings are built. I consider that installation of these artificial nest boxes is sufficient to partly discharge C18 of the outline consent for this phase of the development in line with the requirements of CP12, DM7 and

DM5 albeit further creation and management could be extended within the POS in order to fully discharge this condition.

In support of the application, a Lighting and Ecology Assessment has also been submitted for this phase in order to comply with Condition 19 of the outline permission. This appraises the lighting impacts upon ecology, particularly bats and concludes that there would be a negligible impact on bats arising from the scheme subject to some caveats. This appraisal has been undertaken by reputable consultants and I have no reason to dispute their findings albeit it is important therefore that the lighting scheme as advanced is secured in the form appraised and this will feature in a condition.

It should be noted that a Habitat Regulation Assessment has been undertaken for this project and is available to view on file.

Impact on Amenity (upon existing and proposed occupiers and Noise Impacts)

Policy context in respect of the impact on living conditions is set out in policies DM5 and CP9 of the Development Plan as well as the NPPF.

Relationships between proposed dwellings are considered to be satisfactory in order to meet the needs of privacy and avoid adverse impacts. In any event buyers would be aware of these relationships at the outset.

This phase of the development is nearest to Edwinstowe village and there are dwellings located to the west and south-west in the village and there are a small number of dwellings beyond it to the south side of A6075 Ollerton Road. The distances between the edge of the phase and these properties however is over 110m away and as such there would be no adverse impacts in terms of loss of privacy overlooking, overshadowing etc. The impact from the construction phase of the development was considered at outline stage and conditions were imposed in order to deal with these impacts. These conditions have been discharged and the matter need not be considered any further as part of this scheme.

Condition 32 of the outline consent required with the submission of reserved matters for each phase, an up-to-date noise assessment and mitigation strategy, where appropriate.

The Noise Assessment submitted appears to be the same one that accompanied the outline permission dated 2016. However it is clear to me that the A6075 road is the sole source of noise and I do not believe there to have been any change in circumstances since the outline scheme was considered. On Phase 1 which has a similar relationship to this phase with the road, mitigation was considered necessary in the form of standard double glazing and standard trickle vents for the dwellings themselves which would reduce noise levels to well within acceptable guidelines. It is noted that for the plots adjacent to the A6075, gardens are positioned to the rear and are therefore screened by the dwellings themselves. There is one plot (plot 1) where this is not the case but the boundary treatment comprises a solid brick wall which would likely reduce noise levels to below 50dB L satisfying the desirable guideline as recommended by British standard noise guidance.

Subject to conditions being imposed to ensure that these mitigation measures are installed on site, I am satisfied that the noise levels will be satisfactory and comply with relevant guidance as well as Policies DM5 and CP9 of the Development Plan.

Highway and Parking Matters (including legibility and appearance of parking)

During the lifetime of this application, the layout has been amended to address matters raised by both planning officers and NCC Highways Authority. The northern spine road was initially considered by officers to be overly dominated by frontage parking to the detriment of the scheme. Changes have been made to reduce this impact.

With regards to the quantum of parking, generally the two bedroom dwellings have been provided with 2 spaces per plot, the 3 bedroom affordable units with 2 spaces, 3 bedroom market homes with 3 spaces (including integral garage) and the larger units of 4 bedrooms have a minimum of 3 spaces (some have 4) plus garages (both integral and detached) which increases the number of available spaces. I note there is no provision for visitor parking, however the roads are 5.5m wide in the main so there could be some limited visitor parking on the roads without causing a highway safety concern. NCC Highways have not raised objection to this and overall the number of spaces would appear to be adequate.

One of the matters raised was to request the inclusion of pedestrian and cycle access directly with the main spine road and to the south. The applicant has shown links would be made, an arrangement that both the Master Developer and NCC Highways Authority are satisfied with and I am satisfied that the scheme now incorporates more sustainable access points as required by SP7, ShAP4 and DM5. The revision P of the planning layout has now addressed the previously outstanding matters raised By NCC Highways Authority.

Heritage Considerations

At outline stage it was noted in the committee report and in decision taking terms that the wider (whole) site was located 300m from Edwinstowe Conservation Area and that there are a number of listed buildings and a registered park in the area which could be affected by the scheme. Having regard to the policy context and all relevant considerations I consider that this scheme is acceptable particularly given that heights of buildings are restricted to two and a half storey on land that is set lower than the adjacent highway in places and given the existence of structural landscaping to the south and west. It is noted that since the outline permission was granted, Edwinstowe Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan has been adopted. However this does not change my view the impact upon setting.

Upon investigation, archaeological potential was established to be very low at outline stage with very little surviving archaeology and no mitigation was therefore required. I am satisfied therefore that heritage matters have been adequately addressed and that the scheme preserves the historic significance of assets in the vicinity in line with DM7 and CP14.

Other Matters raised by Ward Members

I now turn to the concerns raised directly by the three local Members which have not been addressed elsewhere in this report.

Land contamination and remediation has been raised as a concern and it has been questioned as to whether appropriate contamination surveys have been carried out. The answer is that they have; it was a matter conditioned as part of the outline consent and this deals with the requirement to clean cap materials.

Habitat Creation and Management Plans is a requirement of the outline consent and section 106 agreement.

Drainage is a matter that has been dealt with via the outline application and the enabling application 19/00674/RMAM and do not form of this reserved matters stage.

The Construction Management Plan is a requirement set out outline stage and has been provided for the development that has already taken place.

The mentioned link road between the former pit lane and the B6034 falls outside of this application site and would be for the master developer to take forward.

Reducing the speed limit of the adjacent Ollerton Road is not within the remit of a reserved matters application and has not been recommended by the Highways Authority advice at outline stage.

Regarding the percentage of affordable housing, this was set out outline stage and cannot be re-examined as part of a reserved matters application. There is a mechanism to review the viability and we will be able to properly review this at the appropriate stage.

Conditions of the outline permission

The majority of the pre-commencement conditions imposed at outline stage require that no development is commenced until such time as outstanding details (such as detailed drainage plans, land contamination mitigation etc.) have been agreed with the Authority. Some of this information has been provided as part of this reserved matters or as part of the current Discharge of Condition applications noted within the planning history section of this report, whilst others have not yet been provided and will require the submission of a formal Discharge of Condition application, whereby statutory consultees will be given the opportunity to make representations. It is likely that some of these conditions will be discharged on a phase by phase basis. For the avoidance of doubt it should be noted that conditions imposed at outline stage will still apply unless they are not applicable to the development in question, have been discharged or have been dealt with as part of the reserved matters process.

For example, this is the case in respect of surface water drainage whereby the Lead Local Flood Authority have requested a condition be imposed to control this. However no further condition is required as it is already controlled by Condition 22 of the outline consent and need not be imposed again.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

The principle of development for 800 homes and the delivery of an appropriate quantum of associated infrastructure to serve the development was secured at outline stage. It is noted that the majority of the concerns by local residents relate to such matters.

Phase 2 was shown on the outline masterplan as providing approximately 194 dwellings whereas this reserved matters application is now for 219 dwellings. However I consider that the amount and disposition of dwellings is appropriate when taken in context of the wider development.

I have found no harm arising from the scheme in terms of highway safety or parking and the amenity of both existing and future residents is considered to be acceptable. Noise issues arising during the construction and operational phases have been/can be mitigated by conditions imposed already at outline and more specifically in relation to plots as set out below.

The mix of houses on this phase does not exactly meet the 'assumed market mix' advanced as part of the viability submission at outline stage, albeit this is not vastly different. The number of market 2 bed units is -1.22% compared with the assumed viability mix whereas the number of market 3 and 4 beds would increase by +8.02% and +2.68% respectively. No bungalows, 5 bed units nor 1 bed units are provided for market as part of this scheme. I understand that the master developers are looking to provide a proportion of the affordable housing on the wider site (later phases) as bungalows and I understand that the central areas will incorporate a number of smaller units. Indeed a number of the larger 5+ bed units have already been approved on Phase 1. As such when viewed holistically I am satisfied there is a decent mix of housing, including the provision of appropriate sized affordable housing that would be socially cohesive.

I consider that the design and layout is acceptable and note that the site is served by a focal point of public open space with other areas incorporated to create decent permeability through the site and encourage pedestrian activity. The indicative landscaping provision of soft and hard landscaping is acceptable and the specific details can adequately be reserved for condition. Habitat creation is a matter that has been considered in part albeit there is scope for increasing this as part of the detailed specification for the public open space which will be considered as part of the discharge of the planning obligation.

Overall, I consider that the scheme advanced is acceptable, when taken in context and a recommendation of approval is offered.

RECOMMENDATION

That reserved matters approval is granted subject to the conditions and reasons shown below

Conditions

01 (Internal Noise Mitigation)

All dwellings shall be fitted with a minimum of standard double glazing and standard trickle vents (or better) prior to first occupation of each dwelling.

Reason: In order to protect the occupiers from an unacceptable noise impacts in line with the necessary mitigation identified in the Noise Impact Assessment which accompanies this application.

02 (External Noise Mitigation)

Prior to the first occupation of Plot 1, a 1.8m high solid brick wall shall be installed on its southern boundary in the position shown on drawing number H8066/O6 Rev C (Materials and Enclosure Layout). This boundary treatment shall be retained on site for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the occupiers of this plot from unacceptable noise impacts from the adjacent road.

03 (Driveways to be bound in perpetuity)

No dwelling forming part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until its associated drive/parking area is surfaced in a hard bound material (not loose gravel) for a minimum of 5 metres behind the Highway boundary. The surfaced drive/parking area shall then be maintained in such hard bound material for the life of the development.

Reason: To reduce the possibility of deleterious material being deposited on the public highway (loose stones etc.).

04 (Garage Doors types)

Any garage doors shall be set back from the highway boundary a minimum distance of 5 metres for sliding or roller shutter doors, 5.5 metres for up and over doors or 6 metres for doors opening outwards.

Reason: To enable a vehicle to stand clear of the highway whilst the garage doors are opened/closed and to protect the free and safe passage of traffic, including pedestrians, in the public highway.

05 (Control of surface water onto highway)

No dwelling forming part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a drainage scheme to prevent surface water from entering the public highway from the access drives, driveways and/or parking areas of each plot has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented on site prior to first occupation and shall then be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure surface water from the site is not deposited on the public highway causing dangers to road users.

06 (Implementation of Landscaping and boundary treatments)

The approved soft landscaping scheme (as shown on drawing numbers GL 1221 02B, 03C and 04B and GL 1221 01J Landscape Masterplan) shall be completed during the first planting season following the first occupation of each associated dwelling, or such longer period as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any soft landscaping that falls in the public domain (outside of any dwelling curtilage) shall be completed prior to occupation of the 150th dwelling unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees/shrubs which, within a period of seven years of being planted die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and same species unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All tree, shrub and hedge planting shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3936 -1992 Part 1-Nursery Stock-Specifications for Trees and Shrubs and Part 4 1984-Specifications for Forestry Trees ; BS4043-1989 Transplanting Root-balled Trees; BS4428-1989 Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations. The approved hard landscaping scheme including the provision of boundary treatments shall be completed prior to first occupation of each associated dwelling or in the case of land falling in the public domain, prior to occupation of the 150th dwelling hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure the work is carried out within a reasonable period and thereafter properly maintained, in the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity.

07 (Bird and Bat Boxes)

The bird and bat boxes as identified on drawing number H8066/101 Rev P (Planning Layout) shall be installed on site prior to first occupation of each dwelling upon which they are to be sited and shall be installed at eaves level of that dwelling. These bird and bat boxes shall be retained on site for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In order to create habitat and to ensure these features are retained on site in line with the requirements of the policies CP12, DM7 and DM5 of the Development Plan.

08 (Ecological Mitigation for street lighting)

Notwithstanding the external lighting shown on drawing number H08630/3499/LUX Rev C, during operation phase the proposed LED lanterns shall have dimmed drivers pre-programmed to reduce light output by 50% between the hours of 22:00 to 07:00. Proposed photocells will be the Lucy Zodian ZCell 20:20 lux NEMA type. All new LED lanterns for installation on 6m lighting columns will be set at 0° and will have a G3 Intensity Classification to alleviate upward light pollution and all LED lanterns at the peripheries of the development and around areas of green space will have rear shields fitted up to a 100m.

Reason: In order to protect the nocturnal ecology of the site and in accordance with the recommendations contained within the Lighting and Ecology Assessment by FPCR dated April 2020.

09 (Approved Plans)

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

SF58-E-7/SF59-EH7 01, SH50-EH7 50, SH50-I-TYPE 50 Rev C, SH52-EH7 TYPE 52, SH52-I-7 52 Rev D, H403-F7, P204-EH7 Rev C, P204-I-7 Rev A, P382-EG7, P382-EH7 Rev B P382-EG7 Con, H349-7 Rev A, P341-D7 Rev B, P341-E-7 Rev A, H486-7, H486-H7 Con T322-I-7 Rev A, T322-E-7 Rev A, T322-E-7 Con, H469-H7 Rev C, H469-H7 Con, H456-X7 H456-X7 Render, H429-7 Rev A, H418-7 Rev A, H418-H7 Con Rev B, H8066/101 Rev P – Planning Layout, H8066/13 Rev C- Phasing Plan, GL1221 01 Landscape Masterplan, H8066/02 Rev A - Site Location Plan, 2010/DET/214 – 900mm Post and Rail Fence, 2010/DET/216 – 450mm Timber Knee Rail, 2010/DET/229 – 1200mm Vertical metal railings, DB-SD13-006 B– Closed Boarded Fence, DB-SD13-004 C– Boundary Wall Type 1, H8066/06 Rev D – Materials and Enclosures Layout, H8066/05 Rev C Street-scene AA, H8066/05 Rev B Street-scene CC, Single semi side gable garage – C160, Single Garage – Ref:- SSG1H8 Rev 1, Single Garage – Ref:- LSG1H8, Single Garage - Ref:- LDG2H8, Double Garage Ref:- SDG1H8 Rev 1, Double Garage Ref:- LDG1H8, Preliminary FFL's and Drainage Strategy Ref: 101 Rev L and Play Area Proposals, GL 1221 05.

Reason: So as to define this approval.

Notes to Applicant:

01

The applicant should note that notwithstanding any planning permission that if any highway forming part of the development is to be adopted by the Highways Authority, the new roads and any highway drainage will be required to comply with the Nottinghamshire County Council's current highway design guidance and specification for roadworks. A Section 38 Highway Adoption Agreement is likely to be required and further details can be provided - Contact: david.albans@nottscc.gov.uk

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 development type proposed is zero rated in this location.

03

The applicant's attention is drawn to those conditions on the decision notice AND those contained on the outline permission which are also relevant, which should be discharged before the development is commenced. It should be noted that if they are not appropriately dealt with the development may be unauthorised. The applicant is advised that the decision notice should ALSO be read in association with the legal agreement made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

04

This application has been the subject of discussions during the application process to ensure that the proposal is acceptable. The District Planning Authority has accordingly worked positively and pro-actively, seeking solutions to problems arising in coming to its decision. This is fully in accord Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Clare Walker on ext 5834.

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

Lisa Hughes
Business Manager – Planning Development

Committee Plan - 19/01865/RMAM

