

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 4 AUGUST 2020

Application No:	20/00556/FUL
Proposal:	Erection of 1 no. shed and 1 no. greenhouse
Location:	Field Reference 0683 Off Low Street, Collingham, Nottinghamshire
Applicant:	Miss Zoe Davies
Registered:	21.05.2020 Target Date: 16.07.2020
	Extension of Time Agreed Until 07.08.2020
Link to Planning File:	https://publicaccess.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=Q8AWPPLBGPE00

This application is being referred to the Planning Committee for determination by the local ward member Cllr Linda Dales on the grounds that the application will result in an unacceptable impact on the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade I Listed Church, presents a flood risk, will attract crime and disorder and has not been designed in keeping with the intended use.

The Site

The application site comprises a c.0.23 Ha parcel of land on the western side of Low Street in the village of Collingham. The land is a corner plot at the junction of Low Street with Carlton Ferry Lane. All Saints Church (Grade I) and its boundary wall (Grade II) lie to the NE of the application site across the highway set on higher ground. The application site is currently over grown and unkempt. The Boundary to the west has been identified as an important group of trees and hedgerow and there is a TPO tree at the NE corner of this boundary. To the west lies The Fleet, an open watercourse, and beyond this boundary the land to west has been identified as important open space contributing to the setting of the village. The site to the south has also been identified as an important open space.

The application site has been previously used as a market garden and allotments however in the recent past has been subject to ongoing planning enforcement action and there is currently a burnt out caravan sited adjacent to the eastern boundary. Access to the site is taken from the eastern boundary through large timber gates. There is no planning history relating to these access gates however Planning Enforcement colleagues have investigated these in the past, concluding that given the passage of time they have been in situ, they are now immune from enforcement action. The site sits on 2 levels as it slopes down towards the Fleet. The lower level is planted as an orchard and the upper level comprises more flat land, albeit the entire site is very overgrown, particularly the eastern boundary which prevents views into the site.

The site lies within the Collingham Conservation Area and is in Flood Zone 3 as defined by the Environment Agencies Flood Mapping.

Relevant Planning History

EXP/00066/20 – Cut back and fill in gaps in hedges. Clearance of former allotment and market garden site and introduction of vegetable plot, sheds, grazing for alpaca and poultry. Clearance of orchard and replanting. Erection of temporary fencing. – Split Decision 23.03.2020

- *Trimming of Hedges and replanting hedge - does not require permission/consent as this is not 'development' and does not require conservation area consent*
- *Removal of Caravan and any structures currently on the land – planning permission is not required for this.*
- *To keep an alpaca for purposes other than simply grazing it on the land (i.e. if you are bring feed onto the land and you would take the alpaca walking etc.) would require a planning application for a change of use of the land. To use part of the land as a vegetable garden (with no associated structures) would also not require a change of use as both would fall under the above definition of 'agriculture'.*
- *If the Alpaca would be brought hay and feed (thus not solely living off grazing the land) then planning permission is required for a change of use from agriculture to paddock/alpaca grazing land. Similarly for Chickens, if they are for domestic purposes this will require planning permission. Any chicken coop will require planning permission.*
- *Erection of any sheds/structures on the land for any purpose will need planning permission as the land does not have any permitted development associated with it for the erection of structures.*
- *Removal of any trees - will require an application for conservation area consent*
- *Planting of trees will not require any permission/consent*
- *Any gate, fence, wall or means of enclosure erected or constructed adjacent to a highway will need planning permission if it exceeds 1 m in height, irrespective of whether it is temporary or permanent.*

The Proposal

For the avoidance of doubt amended plans have been submitted throughout the course of this application.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of one greenhouse and one shed adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The sheds are intended to serve the agricultural use of the site as a market garden.

Greenhouse: 5.5 m long x 2.4 m deep, 1.7 m to eaves, 2.4 m to ridge – timber framed with glass panels to be used as a greenhouse for growing tropical fruits.

Shed 2: 6.03 m long x 1.9 m deep, 1.8 m to eaves, 2.2 m to ridge - traditional timber shed design to house equipment required to maintain the land.

The structures are to be positioned on the upper level of the site on an Eco base Fast fit honey cone base made from recycled plastic – this membrane will be set into the ground and filled with pea gravel to allow water to pass in potential flood events. On top of this base would be a Billyoh Eze Base made from timber the same size as the shed bases.

Details included within the applicants submission that do not require planning permission:

The supporting statement details that as part of the proposal the existing lower level of the site will be retained as an orchard and half of the upper level will be used to plant vegetables, the remained will be grassed/landscaped. The applicant intends to remove the burnt out caravan on the site, clear rubbish, cut back the hedgerows, tidy the orchard and brambles so they can be harvested, plant more fruit trees and in-fill the hedgerow where there are gaps.

Documents submitted with this application:

- Site Location Plan (22.5.20)
- Proposed Greenhouse Elevations (22.07.20)
- Proposed Sheds 2 Elevations
- Revised Block Plan (22.7.20)
- Greenhouse Floor Plan
- Shed 2 Floor Plan
- Shed Base Specification
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Heritage Impact Statement (includes a statement describing the proposal)

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of one property 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.

Earliest Decision Date: 25.06.2020

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019)

Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design

Core Policy 10 – Climate Change

Core Policy 14 – Historic Environment

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM5 – Design

DM8 – Development in the Open Countryside

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

Collingham Parish Council – “The Parish Council considered this application at the meeting of 28 May 2020. The Parish Council resolved unanimously to **object** to this proposal due to the following material planning considerations:

➤ Design and Visual impact

This site lies within the heart of the conservation area and has over recent years become a waste land and far from its agricultural past. The boundary planting is overgrown and poorly maintained with branches regularly falling onto the adjacent verges and highway as a result. Whilst the trees and hedges need urgently to be maintained to be in keeping with other hedges on this west side of Low Street, which would make the site more visible to passing motorists and pedestrians but which would then result in these proposed buildings having a significant visual impact on the area. The proposed design of shed 2 is traditional for such a building as to house tools and equipment on an allotment site, although the proposed size appears to be far beyond that required for housing tools to maintain the plot. The proposed design of shed 1 is described as a “summer house” on the elevations, this is not in keeping with the agricultural designation of the land, nor a market garden. The proposal includes a lawn area on the upper level, this is not in keeping with the agricultural designation of the land, nor market garden. There is no evidence of any shed of this size currently on Low Street.

➤ Crime (and fear of)

The site has in the past been subject to much antisocial behaviour. The installation of the large wooden gates by the previous owner to secure the site has done little to achieve this as was evidenced by the arson attack on the caravan parked on the site (without planning permission and subject to enforcement action). Whilst the caravan was of more substantial construction than a timber shed, this clearly was still subject to vandals. Whilst the current owner has placed significant obstructions around the gate in an attempt to make the site more secure, it is clear that they have had issues with crime on the site and the obstructions being used are not in keeping with the nature of the conservation area in this location. Shed 1 with so many large windows will enable all the contents to be clearly visible and therefore potentially subject to break ins.

➤ Planning History

Whilst the applicant states that the site is not “within an area at risk of flooding”, the site sits within flood zone 3 and the applicant has submitted some information about the site with regard to this, unfortunately the more recent flood events of 2012 and 2019/20 have not been included. In 2012 the site was completely underwater, whilst the recent flood only affected the lower level of the site. It would appear that the applicant has little or no experience of flood events as the application states that “all can be removed should flooding happen”. For a more traditional size shed, this may be feasible, however for the size of sheds proposed this would appear to be unfeasible, without a small fleet of vehicles to facilitate this as those affected by flooding know only too well that the water level can rise very quickly with little or no warning. The two sheds are proposed to be of timber to “allow water to flow should the plot flood” – evidence would suggest that the shed (and possibly its foundations) are likely to be displaced in the event of a flood as both plastic and timber float. Whilst there appears to be no previous planning applications for this site listed on the planning portal, the Parish Council is aware that many previous owners have received planning advice, to the effect that this site is not suitable for any type of development given the flood history of the site and the agricultural classification given to the land.

➤ Health and Safety

The Applicant states that “As Low street is a busy street for cars, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders cutting back the hedgerows away from the road will also make it safer. The land owner is legally obliged to undertake this work and the County Council had asked the previous owner to undertake the necessary work to make the highway safe, which it is hoped will soon take place, although as yet no planning permission for this work has been submitted as far as the Parish Council are aware.”

Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board – “The site is within the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board district. The Board maintained Collingham Fleet, an open watercourse, exists along the boundary of the site and to which BYELAWS and the LAND DRAINAGE ACT 1991 applies.

The Board’s consent is required to erect any building or structure (including walls and fences), whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within 9 metres of the top edge of any Board maintained watercourse or the edge of any Board maintained culvert.

The Board’s consent is required irrespective of any permission gained under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Board’s consent will only be granted where proposals are not detrimental to the flow or stability of the watercourse/culvert or the Board’s machinery access to the watercourse/culvert which is required for annual maintenance, periodic improvement and emergency works. The applicant should therefore note that the proposals described within this planning application may need to be altered to comply with the Board’s requirements if the Board’s consent is refused.”

Additional comments 23.7.20 – “The Parish Council opinion has not changed on this application.”

NSDC Conservation Officer – “Site Analysis

Collingham is predominantly a residential village, with several commercial buildings along the High Street, and a developing range of retail and service sector facilities in a small shopping centre close to the centre of the village off the High Street. Like most Nottinghamshire villages Collingham is predominantly a red brick and pantile village. The conservation area was originally designated in 1973. The designation was reviewed in 1989 and 2006. The application is located on Low Street, which historically was the main street. Today Low Street is a very quiet street with a more rural character to Collingham High Street.

The application site is currently over grown and unkempt. The Boundary to the west has been identified as an important group of trees and hedgerow. The land beyond the west boundary is identified as important open space contributing to the setting of the village. The site to the south has been identified as an important open space. Opposite the site is the Church of All Saints. The Church is Grade I listed (LEN 1156985) and the boundary wall is Grade II (LEN 1046044)

Legal and policy considerations

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the ‘Act’) requires the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and any architectural features that they possess. In addition, section 72 of the Act requires the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. In this context, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm, and is a matter of paramount concern in the planning process.

Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance. Key issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, land-use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting.

The importance of considering the impact of new development on the significance of designated heritage assets, furthermore, is expressed in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Section 16 advises that the significance of designated heritage assets can be harmed or lost through alterations or development within their setting. Such harm or loss to significance requires clear and convincing justification. The NPPF also makes it clear that protecting and enhancing the historic environment is sustainable development. LPAs should also look for opportunities to better reveal the significance of heritage assets when considering development in conservation areas.

The setting of heritage assets is defined in the Glossary of the NPPF which advises that setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. Paragraph 13 of the Conservation section within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

Additional advice on considering development within the historic environment is contained within the Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes (notably GPA2 and GPA3). In addition, 'Historic England Advice Note 2: making changes to heritage assets' advises that the main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, aside from NPPF requirements such as social and economic activity and sustainability, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, durability and adaptability, use, enclosure, relationship with adjacent assets and definition of spaces and streets, alignment, active frontages, permeability and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate.

It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting (paragraph 41).

Assessment of proposal

The application is for the construction of two sheds on site. These sheds are sizable, however are still domestic in scale.

Supporting statement outlines that the site will be cleared and the site used for growing fruit and vegetables. The existing hedgerows will be properly managed and planted. The site is already well screened and the additional planting will further improve this. With the sheds being domestic in scale it is considered that the proposal will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal therefore reflects the objectives of preservation required under section 72 of the Act. In addition the proposal follows the heritage objectives contained within the Council's LDF DPDs and section 16 of the NPPF."

The Conservation Officer has reviewed the amended design for Shed 1 to a greenhouse and has advised that they would reiterate their previous comments given the similarities. In addition as a greenhouse is more transparent in design there would be less of an impact than the originally proposed shed.

Historic England – pending receipt.

Representations have been received from 1 local residents/interested parties which can be summarised as follows:

- Concern over proposed use and domesticated design of shed 1
- Inappropriate size/scale
- Will be imposing from the church ground
- The land is agricultural and the buildings do not fit with this designation
- Proximity to the Church
- Concern over antisocial misuse
- Glass proposed in sheds will add to the interest of criminal vandals
- Flooding concerns over the field being submerged in flood events

Comments of the Business Manager

Principle of Development

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes the principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and recognises that it is a duty under the Planning Acts for planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan. Where proposals accord with the Development Plan they will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF also refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development being at the heart of the NPPF. This is confirmed at the development plan level under Policy DM12 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

The supporting statement details that as part of the proposal the existing lower level of the site will be retained as an orchard and half of the upper level would be used to plant vegetables, the remainder would be grassed/landscaped. The applicant intends to remove the burnt out caravan on the site, clear rubbish, cut back the hedgerows, tidy the orchard and brambles so they can be harvested, plant more fruit trees and in-fill the hedgerow where there are gaps. Neither of these operations require planning permission and as such will not be discussed further within this appraisal. The only part of the application that requires planning permission is the erection of the greenhouse and shed on the land.

The site lies within Collingham which is defined as a principle village by SP1 which sets the settlement hierarchy for the district. The extent of the main built-up area of Principle Village's is defined by a village envelope. The application site falls outside of this village envelope and therefore falls to be considered under policy DM8 as development within the open countryside. DM8 states that development away from the main built up areas of villages, in the open countryside, will be strictly controlled and limited to certain types of development, one of which is agricultural and forestry development requiring planning permission. Proposals within this category needs to explain the need for the development, its siting and scale in relation to the use it is intended to serve.

The applicant has explained that they require these two structures in association with the agricultural use of the land. The land has previously been used as a market garden/agricultural use. Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 defines 'agriculture' as including:

- 'horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming;
- the breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food, wool, skins or fur, or for the purpose of its use in the farming of land);
- the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, osier land, market gardens or nursery

- grounds; and
- the use of land for woodlands where that use is ancillary to the farming of land for other agricultural purposes.'

The applicant proposes to use the land as a market garden/allotment planting and requires the two structures in association with this use for their own personal vegetable/fruit growing. Use of the land as a market garden for growing vegetables/fruit is considered to fall within the definition of agriculture and as such consent is not required for any change of use of the land. Throughout the course of the application 'Shed 1' now 'Greenhouse' has been amended from a timber and glazed summerhouse design to a timber and glazed greenhouse and is proposed to be used as a greenhouse for growing tropical fruits. 'Shed 2' is of a traditional timber shed design to house equipment/tools required to maintain the land as the applicant does not live locally to the site.

I note concerns have been raised by the Parish Council and interested parties as to the proposed use of the land and the structures (noting that reference has been made to the initial image used by the applicant in their submission to illustrate one of the sheds depicts a 'summerhouse' that is domestically furnished). Throughout the course of the application Officers have queried the design of Shed 1 which as originally submitted did look more domesticated than normal sheds found on allotments and asked whether a greenhouse would be more appropriate for its intended purpose for growing tropical fruits. Following discussions the applicant has agreed to amend the proposal to change shed 1 to a timber framed greenhouse which still suits the intended purpose of this structure which is to grow tropical fruits but visually would be a structure more typically seen in an allotment style setting.

I am satisfied that the applicants intention is to use both the greenhouse, the shed and the land for agricultural purposes and that the application therefore does not relate to a change of use of the land. In principle the erection of two structures to serve the use of the land as a market garden/allotment is considered to be appropriate and falls within the definition of agriculture. The scale of the structures are also not considered to be excessive for the size of the land and the applicant has adequately justified why two are required. The use of these structures or the land for any other purpose other than agriculture would require planning permission for a change of use, however for clarity, in the event that planning permission is granted a condition could be attached to the consent to state that the land and structures should only be used for this purpose.

Impact on the Character of the Area/Conservation Area Impact

Core Policy 9 states that new development should achieve a high standard of sustainable design that is of an appropriate form and scale to its context complementing the existing built and landscape environments. Policy DM5 of the DPD states that local distinctiveness should be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design and materials in new development. The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and new development should be visually attractive.

The application site lies within the conservation area and is therefore considered with awareness of the implications the development could have on the setting of the Collingham Conservation Area. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. In this context, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm. The courts have said that these statutory requirements operate as a paramount consideration, 'the first consideration for a decision maker'. Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst

other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance. The importance of considering the impact of new development on the significance of designated heritage assets, furthermore, is expressed in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Paragraph 194 of the NPPF, for example, advises that the significance of designated heritage assets can be harmed or lost through alterations or development within their setting. Such harm or loss to significance requires clear and convincing justification. The NPPF also makes it clear that protecting and enhancing the historic environment is sustainable development (paragraph 8.c).

The application is for the construction of one greenhouse and one timber shed on site. These structures are of a reasonable size, however are still small scale in terms of their height and footprint, particularly in relation to the size of the land upon which they would be sited. The structures would be positioned adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site which is well established and prevents views into the site. The supporting statement details how the site is proposed to be cleared and used formally for allotment planting and the existing hedgerow is proposed to be managed and planted. The site is already well screened and the additional planting will further improve this. Given the separation and substantial boundary screening the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the setting of the Grade I listed church to the NE or its Grade II listed boundary wall despite the church being set on higher ground than the application site. I am mindful of comments received from interested parties that raise concerns in this regard however the Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the scheme or concerns regarding the impact of the Church's setting.

Whilst the structures will be well screened by the boundary to the site I am mindful that good design should not just exist in visible locations and indeed Conservation Areas are designated for both their character and appearance. In this respect the naturalistic timber materials proposed are considered to be appropriate, the scale of the structures are not considered to be excessive in relation to the size or use of the land and the Conservation Officer has confirmed in their comments that given the structures are relatively small scale it is considered that the proposal will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal therefore reflects the objectives of preservation required under section 72 of the Act. In addition the proposal follows the heritage objectives contained within the Council's LDF DPDs and section 16 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

The NPPF seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM5 of the DPD states planning permission will be granted provided it would not adversely affect the amenities of the adjoining premises in terms of overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy.

Given the nature of the development and physical separation of the site from any neighbouring occupier the application is not considered to result in any neighbouring amenity impacts in accordance with policy DM5 and the NPPF.

Impact on Flood Risk

The site lies within FZ3 as defined by the Environment Agencies Flood Mapping. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides guidance on dealing with development where all or

part of the application site is at high risk of flooding. Chapter 14 of the NPPF outlines that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere – themes which are reflected within policies DM5, CP9 and 10 of the Council’s development plan. The application at hand is for minor development, paragraph 164 of the NPPF advises that applications for minor development should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments.

To accompany the application the applicant has submit a Flood Risk Assessment which considers the risk to users of the site and third parties. It is not considered that the proposal would result in an increased flood risk to third parties given the level of development, site context and less vulnerable use, in addition there would remain ample amounts of permeable surfacing on the wider site for water to permeate. It is not therefore considered that the proposed development is unlikely to result in any increased levels of flood risk for users of the site or elsewhere in accordance with Policy DM5, Core Policies 9 and 10 and the aims of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Comments have been received from the Parish Council and interested parties which have been duly taken on board throughout this appraisal. Comments have been received in relation to past antisocial behavior/crime events at the site however I am mindful that past events when the land was not in the ownership of the current applicant are not material to the determination of this planning application. Whilst I appreciate that the site may have been subject to vandalism in the past this is not a reason to withhold planning permission for a proposal which seeks to utilise this agricultural land for its intended purpose.

Conclusion

Overall the principle of two structures to serve this agricultural field is considered to be acceptable in accordance with point one of policy DM8. The applicant has adequately justified why these two structures of such a design and scale are required to serve the agricultural use of the land and the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings/structures. The proposal therefore reflects the objectives of preservation required under section 72 of the Act. In addition the proposal follows the heritage objectives contained within the Council’s LDF DPDs and section 16 of the NPPF. There are no neighbouring amenity or flood risk impacts that have been identified and as such there are no material planning considerations why this application should not be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

That full 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 accordance with the following approved plans/documents:

- Site Location Plan (22.5.20)
- Proposed Greenhouse Elevations (deposited 22.07.20)
- Proposed Sheds 2 Elevations
- Revised Block Plan (deposited 22.07.20)
- Greenhouse Floor Plan (deposited 22.07.20)
- Shed 2 Floor Plan

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 through an application seeking a non-material amendment.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

04

The structures hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for the purposes of agriculture ancillary to the land upon which they are sited.

Reason: To ensure that the use of the site remains agricultural as it is located in the open countryside.

Notes to Applicant

01

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 Honor Whitfield on ext 5827.

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 - 20/00556/FUL

