

NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the **Planning Committee** broadcast from the Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark, NG24 1BY on Tuesday, 12 January 2021 at 2.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor R Blaney (Chairman)
Councillor I Walker (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor L Brazier, Councillor M Brock, Councillor R Crowe, Councillor Mrs L Dales, Councillor Mrs M Dobson, Councillor L Goff, Councillor Mrs R Holloway, Councillor Mrs P Rainbow, Councillor Mrs S Saddington, Councillor M Skinner, Councillor T Smith, Councillor K Walker and Councillor Mrs Y Woodhead

290 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillor Mrs L Dales declared a personal interest as she was the Council's appointed representative on the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and Upper Witham Valley Drainage Board.

291 DECLARATION OF ANY INTENTIONS TO RECORD THE MEETING

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Council was undertaking an audio recording of the meeting, which would be webcast.

292 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1 DECEMBER 2020

AGREED that the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2020 were approved as a correct record of the meeting, to be signed by the Chairman.

293 LINEAGE LOGISTICS, BELLE EAU PARK, BILSTHORPE, NEWARK - 20/00636/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the erection of an extension to the existing warehouse/distribution centre to create additional floor space for B8 use (storage and distribution), parking and associated works.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from a Neighbouring Party; the Agent; Nottinghamshire County Council Highways; and the Planning Case Officer.

The Senior Planning Officer informed Members of a proposed amendment to Condition 7 and 13 if the Committee were minded to approve the application, as follows. The Officer recommendation was amended to approval subject to the conditions outlined and also a legal agreement securing monitoring fees for the Travel Plan and compliance with the Traffic Management Plan.

Condition 7

The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the mitigation measures included within the Noise Assessment by wsp – 70069516-001/R01 dated May 2020, have been fully installed on site. For the avoidance of doubt this includes:

- A 20 metre length of 2.5m high acoustic fence/barrier along the Western site boundary joining the existing barrier at its Northern extent
- A 50 metre length of 2.5m high acoustic fence/barrier along the Western site boundary adjacent to the site access road ~~effectively~~ extending the existing screening to the South.

The measures shall thereafter be retained for the operational lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect neighbouring amenity.

Condition 13

Notwithstanding the submitted details within Initial Travel Plan by TTHC – M19136-03C TP dated October 2020, no part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall set out proposals (including targets, a timetable and enforcement mechanism) to promote travel by sustainable modes and shall include arrangements for monitoring of progress of the proposals. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable set out in that plan.

Reason: To promote sustainable travel.

Members considered the application and it was commented that the structure currently dominated the area off the A617 and the proposed development would result in added visual harm by virtue of its sheer scale and massing. Policy DM8 was quoted and it was felt that the development was not proportionate in the countryside, was unsuitable as this area was not an industrial site. The A617 was already heavily used with the narrow congested Kelham Bridge. The impact from this development on the surrounding local residents should be taken into account, including overshadowing from this business. HGV's were currently parking outside residential properties waiting for delivery/collection times and residents were also experiencing noise nuisance and littering from the HGV's. It was commented that the development should be on an industrial estate with better road networks. Members also felt that as the application was for chilled goods this application was for a new business, which conflicted with Policy DM8, as it was not a proportionate expansion of a business, as Members considered this a new business. The Transport Management Plan was also questioned regarding why the business was not already adhering to a Transport Management Plan. A Member commented that contact had previously been made with the business regarding complaints about HGV's using unsuitable roads and the company had confirmed that they were unable to influence the drivers. Some Members considered the 170 jobs given the economic crisis the country was experiencing and felt that employment was a primary factor. Other Members did not consider job creation to outweigh the harm identified in the Officers report.

Councillor I Walker took no part in the vote as he was not present for the entire

Officer presentation.

A vote was taken and lost to approve planning permission with 5 votes For and 8 votes Against.

AGREED (with 8 votes For and 5 votes Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation planning permission be refused due to principle/disproportionate extension in the open countryside, adverse visual impact and associated impact on neighbour amenity, less than substantial heritage harm. Development is therefore contrary to policies CP3 and SP3 of the Core Strategy and DM5 and DM8 of the Allocations & Development Management Plan Document.

In accordance with paragraph 12.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

Councillor	Vote
R. Blaney	For
L. Brazier	For
M. Brock	For
R. Crowe	Against
Mrs L. Dales	For
Mrs M. Dobson	For
L. Goff	Against
Mrs R. Holloway	For
Mrs P. Rainbow	For
Mrs S. Saddington	Absent
M. Skinner	Against
T. Smith	For
I.Walker	Took no part in the vote
K. Walker	Against
Mrs Y. Woodhead	Against

294 14 CHATHAM COURT, NEWARK - 20/02000/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the proposed conversion of an existing ground floor flat into a Community Hub, including change of use from residential to Community use.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Members considered the application and they welcomed the investment of the hub for residents and the area. It was commented that if the community hub was not successful the room be converted back into a one bedroom flat.

AGREED (unanimously) that planning permission be approved subject to the conditions and reasons contained within the report.

Councillor Mrs S Saddington joined the meeting at this point.

295 1 BARREL HILL ROAD, SUTTON-ON-TRENT - 20/02132/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for the change of use of a (C3a) Dwelling to a Children's Care Home (C2) for three children, demolition of garage and associated external alterations to create on-site parking and turning areas.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Members considered the application and it was commented that there was very little difference in terms of numbers of children and carers to that of a residential property. It was suggested that the car parking area could be grassed with a membrane in order for it to be used as a play area when not being used for car parking.

AGREED (unanimous) that planning permission be approved subject to the conditions and reasons contained within the report.

296 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

297 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

298 ENFORCEMENT REPORT - 20/00473/ENFB

The exempt report was withdrawn from the agenda as the land owner had submitted a planning application for the change of use. Given the change in circumstances it would be inappropriate to take enforcement action and the application would be considered and determined through the usual planning process.

Meeting closed at 3.20 pm.

Chairman