

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, 17 MARCH 2021**

Present: Councillor D K Watts, Chair

Councillors: D Bagshaw  
L A Ball BEM  
T A Cullen  
D Grindell  
M Handley  
R I Jackson  
G Marshall  
J W McGrath (Vice-Chair)  
D D Pringle  
R D Willimott  
M Radulovic MBE (Substitute)  
P D Simpson (Substitute)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R D MacRae and P J Owen.

### 64 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor M Radulovic MBE declared a non – pecuniary interest in item 4.6 as he was acquainted with the Managing Director of the development company. Minute number 67.6 refers.

Councillor D Bagshaw declared a non – pecuniary interest in item 4.5 as he was acquainted with the landowner. Minute. number 67.5 refers.

### 65 **NOTIFICATION OF LOBBYING**

The Committees received notifications of lobbying in respect of the planning applications subject to consideration at the meeting.

### 66 **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

#### 66.1 **Items Deferred from the Previous Meeting**

There were no items to consider from the meeting of the Planning Committee on 10 March 2021.

66.2 APPLICATION NO 20/00541/FUL (IF NOT DETERMINED AT THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING ON 10 MARCH 2021)

Construct 28 dwellings  
42 – 44 Brookhill Leys Road, Eastwood, Nottingham, NG16 3H

This item was determined at the Planning Committee meeting of 10 March 2021.

66.3 APPLICATION NO 20/00714/FUL (IF NOT DETERMINED AT THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING ON 10 MARCH 2021)

Construct link extension and change use from residential (Class C3) to residential care home (Class C2)  
259 High Road, Chilwell, NG9 5DD

**RESOLVED that the item be deferred to allow further discussions with the applicant.**

66.4 APPLICATION NO 21/00023/FUL

Construct stable extension, lion's den and erect 3m high internal fencing to extend wildcat enclosure.  
Land North of Home Farm Cottage and Park View Cottage, Main Street, Strelley, Nottinghamshire

The application had been brought before Committee by Councillor D K Watts.

There was a late item comprised of a letter of support for the application.

Reece Oliver, applicant, Anthony Durken, objecting, and Councillor P J Owen, Ward Member, made representation to the Committee prior to the general debate.

There was concern that the proposed fencing was industrial in appearance, which would negatively impact on the openness of the Green Belt and that members of the public trying to view the animals were causing a nuisance and affecting neighbour amenity.

There was debate about whether the enclosure would be visible from the road and whether the bridleway would be affected, in particular, horses being worried by the lions. Consideration was given to whether the impact of the current enclosure would be similar to the proposed enclosure. It was noted that the Very Special Circumstances for the proposed development in the Green Belt were that the proposed enclosure would be of benefit to the health and safety of the lions without increasing the impact on the Green Belt.

As Ward Member, Councillor P J Owen exercised his right to sum up after the debate.

**RESOLVED that the planning application be granted, with the precise wording and conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.**

66.5 APPLICATION NUMBER 20/00641/FUL

Construct 115 dwellings, associated infrastructure, attenuation pond and vehicular access from Cordy Lane.

Land to the rear of Brinsley Recreation Ground, Church Lane, Brinsley

This application was brought to Committee as it was an Allocated Housing Site within the Part 2 Local Plan.

There were a number of late items including a submission from the Coal Authority withdrawing their objections to the scheme and changes to conditions.

Robert Galij, applicant, Peter Housley, objecting, and Councillor Elizabeth Williamson, Ward Member made representation to the Committee prior to the general debate.

There was concern about the level of Section 106 contributions that were proposed for infrastructure and the use of private roads that were not to be adopted and whether the street lighting on these roads would be maintained by the local authority. It was noted that the number of houses was over the allocation. There was a request for a pedestrian crossing.

It was proposed by Councillor R I Jackson and seconded by Councillor D D Pringle that the item be deferred to allow the applicant to address concerns regarding private roads, street lighting and over intensification. On being put to the meeting the proposal was carried.

**RESOLVED that the application be deferred.**

66.6 APPLICATION NUMBER 20/00056/OUT

Outline application to demolish White House Farm and construct up to 250 dwellings, including the provision of new areas of open space, childrens play, landscaping and storm water attenuation, with all matters reserved except for the formation of a vehicular access from the A6096 Shilo Way (Awsorth Bypass) and secondary access from Newtons Lane.

Land West of Awsorth (inside The A6096), Including Land at Whitehouse Farm, Shilo Way, Awsorth

The application was brought to Committee as the Section 106 contributions were not policy compliant.

There were a number of late items comprised of an email from the applicant requesting a condition to allow for development to be phased, changes to conditions and a number of emails from residents raising concerns about the development, along with an update on the Awsorth Local Plan.

Joanne Neville, on behalf of the applicant, Ian Poynter, objecting and Gillian Thornhill, objecting, addressed the Committee prior to the general debate.

Consideration was given to the application with particular concern regarding access through Newtons Lane. It was considered this would open up the bypass, that

Newtons Lane would become a rat run and that the proposed Section 106 contributions were inadequate. There was also concern that some of the houses shared a single drive.

Debate progressed to worries that the site was difficult to develop and that the phasing could lead to a partially built estate that would not deliver on Section 106 contributions or housing targets. It was stated that the Committee would benefit from a site visit so that the concerns about traffic could be fully understood.

It was proposed by Councillor D D Pringle and seconded by Councillor L A Ball BEM that the application be deferred so that the applicant could address concerns regarding access, Section 106 contributions and phasing. On being put to the meeting the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED that the application be deferred.**

#### 66.7 APPLICATION NUMBER 20/00820/FUL

Construct two storey side and rear extension  
18 Princess Avenue, Beeston

The application was brought to the Committee at the request of Councillor P Lally.

There was one late item, an email from the applicant in support of the application.

Chris Burton, applicant, made representation to the Committee prior to the general debate.

The debate focused on the size and scale of the proposed development, considering it to be too large for the plot, leading to a negative impact on neighbouring properties. It was considered that the style of the extension meant that it was not subservient to the main building and that this could set a precedent that could lead to a terracing effect.

**RESOLVED that planning permission be refused, with the precise wording of the refusal to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Economic Development in conjunction with the Chair of the Planning Committee.**

#### Reasons

The development is overbearing and disproportionate to the plot and would set a precedent that could lead to a terracing effect. Also, the extension would impact on neighbour amenity.

#### 67 INFORMATION ITEMS

##### 67.1 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Committee noted that the first round of consultations on the National Planning Policy Framework was currently underway and that the deadline for submissions was 27 March 2021.

There was a discussion about whether a response would be sent on behalf of the Council. It was stated that all Members would be written to requesting their views and that responses would be collated and submitted by the Council.