

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield,

on Wednesday, 25th August, 2021 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor Sarah Madigan in the Chair;

Councillors Samantha Deakin, Rachel Madden,
Andy Meakin, Lauren Mitchell, Phil Rostance,
John Smallridge (as substitute for Arnie Hankin),
Helen-Ann Smith and Jason Zadrozny.

Apology for Absence: Councillor Arnie Hankin.

Officers Present: Lynn Cain, Louise Ellis, Mick Morley,
Ashley Patel, Christine Sarris and Robbie Steel.

In Attendance: Councillor John Wilmott.

P.9 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Personal Interests and Non-Registrable Interests

Councillors Lauren Mitchell, Phil Rostance and Jason Zadrozny all declared Non-Registrable Interests in respect of Application V/2021/0354, Thackeray Associates, Goal Storage Enclosure, Kenbrook Road Playing Field, Kenbrook Road, Hucknall. Their interests arose from the fact that they had previously spoken with the applicant and some objectors, but in doing so had not expressed any opinions at any point.

P.10 Minutes

RESOLVED
that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 21 July 2021, be received and approved as a correct record.

P.11 Town and Country Planning Act 1990: Town Planning Applications Requiring Decisions

Prior to consideration of the applications and in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4 (Order of Business), the Chairman advised that she would be considering the second application, V/2021/0354 Goal Storage Enclosure, Kenbrook Road Playing Field, Kenbrook Road, Hucknall, as the first item. Committee Members concurred with this course of action.

1. Application V/2021/0354, Thackeray Associates, Goal Storage Enclosure, Kenbrook Road Playing Field, Kenbrook Road, Hucknall

(In accordance with the Council's Constitution and the Members' Code of Conduct, Councillors Lauren Mitchell, Phil Rostance and Jason Zadrozny had previously declared Non-Registrable interests in respect of this application. Their interests were such that they stayed in the meeting and took part in the discussion and voting thereon.)

In accordance with the Council's Policy for dealing with late matters in relation to planning applications, (Minute No. D4.17, 1993/94 refers), officers proceeded to give a verbal report as to additional comments received in relation to the application as follows:-

One additional objection had been submitted from a resident who had already objected on previous occasions, and no new issues were raised in this latest set of comments.

This changed the total representations received throughout the consideration of this application and across all 4 consultations as follows:

752 representations received from 549 residents
678 objected to the proposal
72 supported the proposal
2 neither objected to or were in support of it.

Pete Davies, as an objector, the applicant Jamie Brough, and Councillor John Wilmott who called-in the application, took the opportunity to address the Committee in respect of this matter. As per the agreed process, Members were then offered the opportunity to clarify any points raised during the submission as required.

It was moved and seconded that conditional consent be granted as per officer's recommendation subject to an additional condition as follows:

Condition

Prior to the goal storage enclosure being brought onto site, a hedgerow shall be planted on the east side of the enclosure, in accordance with the details to first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following the completion of the development and for a period of five years, if any section of the hedgerow dies, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To help the development assimilate into the surroundings.

2. Application V/2020/0832, Platform Housing Ltd, Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval V/2018/0213 - Proposed Residential Development of 47 Dwellings Including the Demolition of Existing Buildings, The Quarry, 57 Stoneyford Road, Sutton in Ashfield

In accordance with the Council's Policy for dealing with late matters in relation to planning applications, (Minute No. D4.17, 1993/94 refers), officers proceeded to give a verbal report as to additional comments received in relation to the application as follows:-

An additional two objections had been received from neighbouring residents. The issues raised were covered within the report. However, one of the issues had disagreed with the committee report stating there would be an adverse impact to No. 22 Mount Pleasant from a loss of privacy overshadowing and loss of daylight (especially in the evening). It had been further stated that it did not meet the separation distance of 21m in the Council's SPD and that there was no guarantee that existing vegetation would remain. It was stated that bungalows would be more preferable.

Officer Response

It was considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of light, overshadowing or loss of privacy to No.22 Mount Pleasant. This was due to the substantial land level difference and separation distance. The acceptability of this relationship would be discussed in greater detail and demonstrated during the presentation.

Pete Davies, as an objector, took the opportunity to address the Committee in respect of this matter. As per the agreed process, Members were then offered the opportunity to clarify any points raised during the submission as required.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to enable officers to discuss matters further with the applicant and surrounding residents, in relation to plots 28-30, and be brought back to committee at the earliest opportunity.

The meeting was adjourned at 11.20am and reconvened at 11.30am.

3. Application V/2021/0445, Mr I Glen, Outline Application with all Matters Reserved for a Maximum of 2 Dwellings, Land at Linby Boarding Kennels, Church Lane, Hucknall

In accordance with the Council's Policy for dealing with late matters in relation to planning applications, (Minute No. D4.17, 1993/94 refers), officers proceeded to give a verbal report as to additional comments received in relation to the application as follows:-

The applicant had agreed to pay reasonable contributions towards public open space, education and health, as part of a Section 106 Agreement which took account of the 9 dwellings previously approved at the wider site. The amount payable had not yet been agreed and would be subject to further discussions to reach appropriate contributions.

The applicant had not agreed as yet in relation to the provision of affordable housing, as they were in discussions with the Council's Housing Team as to the expected likely requirements for affordable housing.

It was moved by Councillor Jason Zadrozny and seconded by Andy Meakin that:

- a) officer's recommendation contained within the report be rejected and planning consent be granted subject to a satisfactory S106, appropriate conditions and referral to the secretary of state.
- b) delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director, Planning and Regulatory Services, in consultation the Planning Committee Chairman, to negotiate and agree the most appropriate S106 contributions and conditions for the site.

Reasons for rejecting officers' recommendation:

The wider assessment of the site and it's viability as a whole would lead to securing appropriate infrastructure through S106 contributions. This would result in a development site that would be more sustainable.

For the motion:

Councillors Samantha Deakin, Sarah Madigan, Lauren Mitchell, Andy Meakin, Phil Rostance, John Smallridge, Helen-Ann Smith and Jason Zadrozny.

Against the motion:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

4. Application V/2021/0497, Mr C Chambers, Full Planning Consent for Two Detached Dwellings with Associated Access and Car Parking, 344-348 Land Rear of Watnall Road, Hucknall

In accordance with the Council's Policy for dealing with late matters in relation to planning applications, (Minute No. D4.17, 1993/94 refers), officers proceeded to give a verbal report as to additional comments received in relation to the application as follows:-

The applicant had submitted information in respect of 4 other sites within the District suggested to be similar to the application site and these have been considered by officers. However, it was considered that these sites were not similar to the application site and every application should be determined on its individual planning merits.

Max Cully, for the applicant, took the opportunity to address the Committee in respect of this matter. As per the agreed process, Members were then offered the opportunity to clarify any points raised during the submission as required.

It was moved by Councillor Phil Rostance and seconded by Councillor Jason Zadrozny that the officer's recommendation contained within the report be rejected and planning consent be granted, subject to the following standard conditions and removal of any permitted development rights;

Conditions

1. The development hereby approved shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015, as amended, relating to Classes A-E of Part 1 of Schedule 2, the dwellings shall not be enlarged, improved, altered nor shall any building be erected incidental to the enlargement of the dwelling house. No development shall be undertaken without permission of the Local planning authority.

Reasons for rejecting officers' recommendation:

It is considered by the planning committee that the application does not negatively affect the surrounding area and the condition will prevent any further issues.

For the motion:

Councillors Samantha Deakin, Lauren Mitchell, Andy Meakin, Phil Rostance, John Smallridge, Helen-Ann Smith and Jason Zadrozny.

Against the motion:

None.

Abstentions:

Councillor Sarah Madigan.

P.12 Planning Appeal Decisions

Members were asked to note the recent Planning Appeal decisions as outlined in the report.

RESOLVED

that the report be received and noted.

The meeting closed at 12.05 pm

Chairman.