

Meeting PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

Date Tuesday 20 January 2015 (commencing at 10.30 am)

membership

Persons absent are marked with `A`

COUNCILLORS

John Wilkinson (Chairman)
Sue Saddington (Vice-Chairman)

Roy Allan
Andrew Brown
Steve Calvert
Jim Creamer
Stan Heptinstall MBE

Rachel Madden
Andy Sissons
Keith Walker
Yvonne Woodhead

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

David Forster – Democratic Services Officer
Jerry Smith – Team Manager, Development Management
Sally Gill – Group Manager Planning
David Marsh – Major Projects Leader
Sue Bearman – Solicitor
David Kerfoot - Solicitor
Ruth Kinsey – Planning Support Officer
Suzanne Osborne-James – Principal Planning Officer
Jonathan Smith – Principal Planning Officer

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING HELD ON 16 DECEMBER 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2014 having been circulated to all Members were taken as read and were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillor John Wilkinson declared a Private Non pecuniary interest in agenda item, 6 Erection of a Two Storey Replacement Primary School Holgate Primary School High Leys Road Hucknall, on the grounds he is a Governor of the school. He also informed Committee that he would step down from the Chair for this item.

DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING OF MEMBERS

There were no declarations of Lobbying

CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

With the consent of the Committee the Chairman changed the order of business

Following the Chairman's declaration of interest at the commencement of the meeting the Vice Chairman took the Chair for this item

ERECTION OF A TWO-STOREY REPLACEMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL ANNIE HOLGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL HIGH LEYS ROAD HUCKNALL

Mr Smith introduced the report and highlighted the proposed development is in line with the school replacement programme set by the Government. He informed members that in line with the County Councils policy regarding speed limits around schools. A Traffic Regulation Order was to be introduced by the end of March 2015. Particular reference was made to the proposed windows and scope for overlooking of a nearby property. He also informed members that the Condition 7 sent out in the appendix 3 attached to the report should read Revision P07 and not "Revision PO5".

Following the opening remarks of Mr Smith, Mr Fenson, a firefighter and local resident spoke against the application and highlighted the following.

- High Lees Road is not suitable if there are any incidents that require a Fire Engine to be in attendance as it would need to ram through the space.
- The school could reiterate to parents that there is a safety issue at peak times and consideration given to parking along High Leys Road.

In response to questions Mr Fenson responded as follows:-

- The police have been informed about the problems regarding parking in this area.
- The increase in numbers attending the school will create more traffic therefore the increase in parking spaces will not have the desired effect.
- There are schools in the area which have a similar problem however this school is by far the worst.

Mr Wilson, local resident, spoke against the development and highlighted the following:-

- The main issue is privacy as some of the school's windows overlook the garden.
- The issue of the drainage from the development will cause flooding on his property.

In response to a question Mr Wilson replied that anyone in the staffroom could stand looking into the garden and it would make it uncomfortable sitting in the garden by the fact it is overlooked.

In response to comments and questions following the objector's presentations, Mr Smith responded as follows:-

- The school's published admissions number is 420 and this will not change with the new development.
- Paragraph 64 sets out a response received from the Ambulance Service stating there had been no incidents to report in this area.
- The Fire and Rescue Service will respond under Building Regulations.
- Property Services are currently looking at the possibility of creating a second entrance to the school which, subject to funding could ease the traffic problems along High Leyes Road.
- The windows as shown on plan 6 attached to the report shows the distance from the development and the closest properties.
- The Environment Agency have not objected to the development as one of their conditions is that the new school building should not increase the flood risk to any existing property.

Mrs S Williams, representing the Children Families and Cultural Services Department, spoke in favour of the development and highlighted the following:-

- This development is in line with the Departments programme for replacing schools.
- The highway department have worked with the design team over the planning and transportation issues associated with the development.

The Vice-Chairman thanked all the speakers and moved the recommendation set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Wilkinson for discussion.

Members made the following comments:-

- 42 Metres distance is better than most people have for privacy in their gardens.
- The drainage in the area will not worsen existing flood risk
- There are no increases in the published admissions number.
- Could locals be involved in the establishment of the School Travel Plan

On a motion by the Vice-Chairman, seconded by the Councillor Allan it was:-

RESOLVED 2015/001

That planning permission be granted for the purposes of Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 3 with the amendment to condition 7 and the addition of an Informative encouraging the involvement of local residents in the establishment of the School Travel Plan"

Councillor Wilkinson returned to the chair.

USE OF DERELICT SANDSTONE CUTTING FOR THE DISPOSAL OF INERT WASTE MATERIAL (INCLUDING SUBSEQUENT RESTORATION SCHEME SECURING LANDSCAPE AND ECOLOGICAL BENEFITS) LAND ADJACENT TO SHENTON LODGE DERBY ROAD KIRKBY-IN-ASHFIELD

Mr Smith introduced the report and highlighted that there are sufficient facilities in the area to deal with the amount of inert waste expected. He also highlighted that Waste Core Strategy Policy WCS3 confirms that this method of disposal is the least favourable option.

Members made the following comments

- This is a Green Belt and therefore should not be used as an area for waste
- Traffic would be made worse in the surrounding area especially on the A611
- Wildlife would be disturbed if the development was to go ahead.

On a motion by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, it was:-

RESOLVED 2015/002

That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Appendix attached to the report.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN REPORT LEARNING LESSONS FROM COMPLAINTS

On a motion by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, it was:-

RESOLVED 2015/003

That the Local Government Ombudsman Report be noted

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

On a motion by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, it was:-

RESOLVED 2015/004

That the Development Management Report be noted.

WORK PROGRAMME

On a motion by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, it was:-

RESOLVED 2015/005

That the Work Programme be noted

The meeting closed at 12.05 pm.

CHAIRMAN