

Meeting PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE – VIRTUAL MEETING

Date Tuesday 13 October 2020 (commencing at 10.30am)

Membership

Persons absent are marked with 'A'

COUNCILLORS

Chris Barnfather (Chair)
Jim Creamer (Vice-Chair)

Pauline Allan	John Longdon
Andy Brown	Rachel Madden
Neil Clarke MBE	Tracey Taylor
Sybil Fielding	Keith Walker
Tony Harper	Andy Wetton
Paul Henshaw	

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Pete Barker – Chief Executive's Department
Rachel Clack – Chief Executive's Department
Sally Gill – Place Department
David Marsh – Place Department
Joel Marshall – Place Department
Fiona Needham – Place Department
Jonathan Smith – Place Department

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING HELD ON 8th SEPTEMBER 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September, having been circulated to all Members, were taken as read and were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no declarations of interest.

4. DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING OF MEMBERS

Councillor Taylor informed Committee that for Item 7, Temporary Operations for 10 Years for Soil Treatment Facility at Daneshill Landfill Site, Daneshill, she would be speaking as the Local Member and would therefore take no part in the debate or the vote for that item.

5. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LICENSING WORK CARRIED OUT BY THE TRADING STANDARDS AND COMMUNITIES SERVICE

Ms Needham introduced the report which updated the Committee on the work carried out by the Trading Standards & Communities Service.

Following Ms Needham's introduction members then debated the item and the following comments and questions were responded to: -

- The decline in the number of smaller independent petrol storage and dispensing premises continues, in part because automotive garages rarely dispense petrol as they did in the past. Ms Needham undertook to supply members with more information outside of the meeting.
- The new Asda store referred to in paragraph 18 of the report is now open and is dispensing petrol.
- Members paid tribute to the hard work of the small Trading Standards team.

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

RESOLVED 2020/016

- 1) That the appropriate use of the media to highlight the results of the fireworks safety inspections programme for the coming licensing period (October/November 2020) be approved.
- 2) That a further update report be brought to the meeting of the Committee in June 2021, to cover the complete financial year 1st April 2020 – 31st May 2021.

The Chair informed the meeting that the original Item 6, Change of Use of Land to Allow for the Extension of the Existing Yard, Briggs Metals, Great North Road, Newark, had been withdrawn.

6. TEMPORARY OPERATIONS FOR 10 YEARS FOR SOIL TREATMENT FACILITY AT DANESHILL LANDFILL SITE, LOUND

Mr Smith introduced the report which considered a full planning application seeking a 10-year permission for a proposed soil treatment facility (STF) to treat imported non-

hazardous and hazardous soils, including those containing hydrocarbons and bound asbestos debris, on land forming part of the Daneshill landfill complex near Lound, north of Retford. Mr Smith informed members that the key issues related to the principle of the development at the site and its relationship with the wider landfill site, including its restoration, the impacts on local amenity and ecology, and the concerns raised in relation to possible health effects from airborne emissions of asbestos fibres.

Mr Smith informed Committee that as part of the permit application process the Environment Agency (EA) may choose to hold a public consultation exercise, especially given the significant public interest generated around air emissions. Mr Smith stated that if the Committee were to approve the application then it is proposed that the Chair of the Committee write to the EA requesting that such public consultation is carried out as part of the permit application process.

Mr Smith then informed the Committee of correspondence that officers had become aware of after the papers for this meeting had been published. Mr Smith informed members that officers had been copied into correspondence from Friends of the Earth (FoE) that requested the Secretary of State issue a screening direction as it considers the application one that constitutes Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development and which therefore requires an environment statement prior to the determination of planning permission. Mr Smith referred members to paragraph 69 of the report which stated that the applicant had requested a 'Screening Opinion' from the Waste Planning Authority (WPA) but that the WPA was not of the opinion that one was required. Mr Smith informed Committee that officers had continued to keep the situation under review and though it is still considered that a screening opinion is not required, given the FoE's correspondence officers have revised the Recommendation as follows :

"It is RECOMMENDED that, subject to the Secretary of State first issuing a negative EIA Screening Direction, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report."

Mr Smith informed Committee that in this case if the application were approved, planning permission could not be issued until it was confirmed by the Secretary of State that an EIA is not required. If the Secretary of State responded by stating that an EIA was required, the applicant would have to prepare an EIA which would be subject to consultation and publicity and the application would then be reported back to Committee for determination following that public consultation.

Following Mr Smith's introduction, Mr Chris Chambers was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I would like to comment upon the risks of asbestos and state that I am recognised as one of the UK's leading independent experts in the field.
- This application represents a significant risk from asbestos in the transport of contaminated soils and the subsequent tipping, screening, storage and picking operations.
- The controls proposed by the applicant fall well short of those required in common law. Similar work at another of the applicant's sites at Rowley Regis

in the West Midlands, is undertaken indoors with filtration and water suppression used.

- This application could result in the handling of one of the most dangerous types of asbestos outdoors.
- There is the possibility of contaminated soils being rejected at the applicant's other site and being transported to Daneshill for processing resulting in an increase of lorry movements.
- The sampling undertaken by the applicant is not sensitive enough to gauge whether the emissions will exceed normal background levels.
- The application should be refused or paused pending a decision on the screening direction and more conditions agreed with the applicant.

Following Mr Chamber's speech, the following comments and questions were responded to:

- One result of the permit application could be the requirement for this operation to take place indoors. If this proves to be the case, planning permission for that building would be required from this authority and members would have the opportunity to consider the matter again.

Ms Vivienne French was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I will refer to NCC reports relating to Daneshill for September 2018 and October 2020.
- The variations suggested in September 2018 are for a short-term restoration plan reducing over time until 2023.
- Why does this revised short term restoration plan remain unapproved? What are the 'unresolved concerns' raised in 2020 parts 27 and 163?
- Point 110 says "the variations do not relate to a new facility which in principle would not be acceptable in the open countryside"
- FCC in October 2020 is now applying for a new facility - soil treatment with asbestos picking in open countryside.
- Confusion, misleading and contradictory statements refer to a "temporary, ten-year open-air project" A similar operation by FCC at Rowley Regis is described as "completely safe" however there the asbestos picking is not in the open air but enclosed inside a large building.
- How can any decision be made today concerning a project with such hazardous material as asbestos without input from the Environment Agency which admits that they have insufficient information?
- FCC has not followed standard protocol to "twin track" this with an Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure the Planning Authority are cognisant of the likely significant environmental effects before making a decision. This would have reassured the local residents that there would be

safety controls and monitoring of emissions and dust from this potentially dangerous project.

- Does this development qualify under schedule 3 for an Environmental Impact Assessment on grounds of "pollution risks to human health and risks due to air pollution from loose asbestos fibres"?
- FCC says " HGV's would tip their loads and soils would be moved by front loaders" Surely dust emissions are an obvious consequence.
- To align with the Waste Core Strategy Policy there must be a clear need for such a new facility. It would appear that by failing to find uncontaminated soils locally for restoration they have created this need for the financial gain of their Company.
- I suggest that the best outcome is for the September 2018 revised plan to be approved, importing soils from the many large, local building projects.

Following Ms French's speech, the following comments and questions were responded to:

- The NCC report of 2018 referred to by Ms French granted planning permission to create an inert waste facility with the applicant at the time believing that there would be enough inert material available to restore the site. It has not proved possible to source sufficient quantities of suitable material so the applicant has changed their rationale and submitted this application.
- Officers have recommended the twin track approach to the applicant but this advice has not been followed. There is no legal requirement to adopt a twin track approach, with the applicant in this case preferring to try to gain planning permission before applying for a permit. Officers understand that the permit application has been drafted and is ready to be submitted to the EA. The permit process is a thorough and robust one and if any changes are needed then the application may well come back through the planning process, but officers cannot insist that applicants adopt the twin track approach.
- The applicant's approach in this case is not unprecedented and as the report makes clear the processes for obtaining planning permission and a permit are completely separate. The EA administers the permit application and considers such matters as air borne pollution whereas this authority deals with the planning application and considers whether the proposed development is a suitable use of the land. The EA often recommends the twin track approach and it is clear they prefer this approach but if this does not happen then the applicants still have to go through the full process.

Mr Ian Prince was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I understand the health risks associated with asbestos fibres better than most and there is no safe health limit for airborne asbestos fibres. These fibres are microscopic so cannot be picked out when dumped by lorry.

- I am appalled that this is even being considered as a reasonable use of the land. This will affect nearby villages and residents and the wider area as the fibres get carried in the air.
- The twin track approach should be forced on to the applicants who are just here for profit. If they have a site in the West Midlands why do they need to bring material they cannot dispose of elsewhere to Daneshill?
- Daneshill has changed significantly in the last 30 years. Why can the applicant not find suitable materials locally? It is a failure on the Council's part who are now taking the worst option.
- Given the negative long term health effects of asbestos fibres, including the development of tumours, this application should be rejected.
- This is not an operation that should be taking place in the open air.

Following Mr Prince's speech, the following comments and questions were responded to:

- Officers reiterated that the permit process considers the issue of asbestos and though it would be useful if the applicant had adopted the twin track approach but this is not a statutory requirement and the authority cannot force the applicant to take this approach.
- The asbestos arriving at the Daneshill site would be bound.
- The development cannot go ahead without both planning permission being granted and a permit being issued. They are two separate processes and the granting of planning permission does not automatically guarantee that a permit will be issued.

Mr Nick Prout, on behalf of Lound Parish Council, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- This proposal to handle the most dangerous types of asbestos in the open air at Daneshill has struck fear into the residents of Lound. It is a fear of a substance which, if allowed to escape through inadequate containment and control, is a killer.
- You have already heard about the applicant's facility at Rowley Regis, where the type of asbestos handled is many times less dangerous than that proposed for Daneshill. Despite this, the asbestos at Rowley Regis is handled inside a sealed building, which, in the applicant's words, "provides regulators with some degree of comfort that emissions can be controlled more easily".
- In contrast, at Daneshill, the applicant plans to handle this hazardous material entirely in the open air. The picking operation is to take place in a small shelter, which will in no way contribute towards the containment of fine asbestos particles picked up on a dry windy day. The ability to handle the most

dangerous forms of asbestos will attract even more hazardous waste to Lound and this will necessitate the material being transported over even longer

distances. The proposed operating procedures are summed up by Via (Reclamation) in Mr Marshall's report "These processes and procedures are heavily dependent on the competence and integrity of the operatives undertaking the work and therefore risk cannot completely be eliminated". It is unfortunate then that a visit by the Committee to see the Rowley Regis plant was discouraged by the applicant.

- Given the above, it is hardly surprising that the residents of Lound have not found the description of the proposed operation to be reassuring. In reality, it will be almost impossible for the applicant to consistently exercise proper control over these very manual operations, outside, 5½ days a week, for the next 10 years, in such a remote location, without incidents occurring which will release hazardous asbestos particles into the environment. No mention is made of the senior site manager who will be needed to run the operations and to ensure that they are carried out correctly at all times.
- Very surprisingly, no Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out for this project. Also, liaison with the communities affected has been less than adequate. We believe that the proposal simply does not demonstrate the protections required to ensure a safe and successful operation.
- Ladies and Gentlemen, Lound Parish Council urges you to refuse the application.

There were no questions.

Ms Angela Close, on behalf of Sutton Cum Lound Parish Council, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- We fully support and agree with the concerns being raised in the presentations by our colleagues from neighbouring Parishes.
- Our concerns with this application focus on two points:
- First, the lack of consultation with our residents who live less than two miles from the Daneshill site and
- Second, the question of an increased volume of heavy goods vehicles travelling through the village illegally in breach of the current 18 tonne weight restriction.
- Sutton cum Lound Parish Council was initially not invited to comment on the application. A resident complained to the Council about lorries travelling through the village. The Case Officer contacted about this confirmed that this planning application had been submitted; but that he had not consulted with us due to this weight restriction. Presumably he felt that this application would not affect us.

- So - a village which is positioned less than 2 miles away from the site, would therefore have had no consultation at all had not lorry drivers for FCC broken the law travelling illegally through the village.
- I therefore contest that the consultation process for this application has not been conducted correctly and should be reopened to allow all our residents to have their say on this issue.
- If lorry drivers for FCC already break the law knowing that there is an 18-tonne weight restriction through the village, what other laws would FCC allow to be broken or deviate from to achieve their aims?
- We have to rely on the integrity of local businesses to respect and observe the law and if they don't how can we believe they will safeguard our health and wellbeing when it comes to handling asbestos?
- This may be a minor indiscretion, but it adds weight to local community beliefs that this company will not comply with other regulations unless strictly governed.
- As a Planning Committee you need to be assured that when you grant permission for any company to operate such a business for a 10-year period, they will undertake the required regulatory process seriously. This issue gives cause for doubt in this area.
- Should you be minded to approve this application, then we request that a condition is included in the approval that specifically details legal routing of vehicles.
- If FCC are found to breach this at any time during the 10-year period of the application, they will have breached this planning process and any licences provided to them should be revoked.
- In conclusion we believe that:
- We have not been adequately and correctly consulted in relation to this application and so it does not take into consideration our community's views.
- The company requesting this 10-year permission has already proven to be unreliable with respect to its adherence to the law and cannot therefore provide sufficient assurance around its handling of contaminated soil to safeguard local community health.
- Any approved application needs to include a condition detailing required vehicle routes and strict penalties for non-compliance.

Following Ms Close's speech, the following comments and questions were responded to:

- Officers were aware of the recent breaches by HGVs and when considering this application understood that vehicles may pass through Mattersey and as a

result drafted Condition 21 to ensure that HGVs would use the established route to and from the A-Road network.

- Officers included Lound, Torworth and Mattersey Parish Councils in the consultation process as these villages are on the available lorry routes. As Sutton Cum Lound is subject to an HGV restriction there is no reason for lorries to pass through the village and as no material impact could be identified Sutton Cum Lound Parish Council was not included in the consultation process. It is a judgement call taken on a case by case basis about who to consult. Officers are always prepared to receive and consider all contributions. In this case officers have exceeded the minimum consultation requirements.

Ms Alison Duce, on behalf of Torworth Parish Council, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- The land fill site has been in operation since 1982 - 38 years and millions of tonnes of waste has already passed through Torworth and made a significant impact resulting in loss of local amenity.
- This was inert waste, but the current proposal to process hazardous soils is a significant change in operation and would increase both short term risks for the 10 years of operation, but also will have longer term impacts on the site and surrounding areas after completion and restoration.
- Of major concern is the transportation of the hazardous soils to the site and contaminated waste products from the site. The HGV route to the site uses unclassified country lanes.
- Buildings down Daneshill Road are blackened due to exhaust pollution. The lanes have suffered years of litter and waste. Sheeting is not sufficient to prevent loss of loads along the route. This is worrying when future contamination could be hazardous waste.
- Comparable soil processing sites are indoors; this proposal for open air operations raises concerns on how effectively the asbestos fibres can be contained. The picking operation only removes visible fragments of asbestos, it will not remove all asbestos pieces and fibres and these do not degrade. There could be airborne spread and they will remain in the soil. FCC as operator and NCC as freeholder will remain morally and legally culpable for any resultant human suffering and health compensation claims.
- The bioremediation process requires containment of and safe disposal of polluted waste water and will result in some contaminated ground water capture. The site sits on the secondary Sherwood A aquifer, which is used for drinking water and watering food crops. It is a sensitive setting to be at risk of water pollution.
- The overall intended use of the site is a public access, nature and leisure area. Families, children and pets will play on this site - a site that would be created

from 300,000 tonnes of asbestos and oil spill waste reclamations. The association with such hazards will create a stigma and hinder successful adoption and enjoyment by the public.

- The site shares a boundary with Mattersey Hill Marsh SSSI and is opposite Daneshill Lakes and Nature Reserve. We do not believe the introduction of hazardous waste immediately adjacent to such sites demonstrates environmental responsibility and duty of care, when the world sits in such a delicate balance of environmental pollution.
- Decisions made now will be felt and judged by future generations, so they must be the correct ones. We all must take responsibility and be accountable for our part in these decisions. Please think carefully about this one.

Following Ms Duce's speech the following comments and questions were responded to:

- It is correct that the current site deals with non-hazardous waste and that the proposals involve the receiving of soil that may contain asbestos, but the permit scheme should ensure that ultimately the soil used on site will be safe.
- Condition 11 covers the management of all foul, surface or process waters on site.
- Litter picks in the area have found waste near the site but is difficult to link its presence directly to the site operations, though there is more commercial waste than general litter present.

Mr Dan Simpson, on behalf of Ranskill Parish Council, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- We object to this proposal and echo the comments made by the other Parish Councils.
- We question the need to use contaminated soils given the length of time being granted to complete the scheme and find it difficult to believe that the applicant cannot source adequate supplies of suitable material given the amount of development that has occurred locally.
- Ecological grounds have already been covered by previous speakers, but the processing of hazardous material in the open air is not acceptable.
- Ranskill Parish Council has not been consulted by the applicant or by Nottinghamshire County Council, this is disappointing, especially give the parish council's initial involvement in the development of the nature reserve. Residents have also complained about the lack of consultation.
- The pandemic has been given as a reason for not holding the usual public meetings, but we would have expected alternative on-line methods to have been used. The consultation has not been adequate.

- We object on transport grounds – there are frequently unsheeted lorries in the area and this has been an historic problem, especially along Daneshill Road. Traffic is likely to increase in the Ranskill area anyway given the expansion of

the sand and gravel operations at Scrooby Top meaning HGVs will pass through Ranskill and use the surrounding routes.

Following Mr Simpson's speech, the following comments and questions were responded to:

- Officers referred to paragraph 44 of the report which stated that only registered waste carriers would be allowed to transport contaminated soil to the site and that they would be subject to a high level of scrutiny as part of the Environmental Permitting conditions and Duty of Care Regulations.

Mr Sam Thistlethwaite, on behalf of the applicant, was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- I would like to thank the planning officers for the considered report we have just heard and for their proactive engagement throughout the determination process, the entirety of which has occurred over the last challenging 6 months.
- At the outset, I would like to state our complete understanding of the local residents' concerns regarding particularly the asbestos element of the proposals. There is no difference in the material permitted at the Rowley Regis site and the Daneshill site.
- Whilst this would be a new operation on this particular site, it needs to be highlighted that the approach proposed is a well-established method for treating soils with hydrocarbons and asbestos debris and is widely undertaken with full regulatory approval across the UK on many development sites in residential settings.
- What I hope is clear for members is both the high level of technical scrutiny and safeguarding measures that will be in place, as well as the anticipated very low volumes of actual asbestos containing material that are ultimately likely to enter the site which will be the equivalent of up to 1 skip full over a year.
- The applicant and the operator have committed to not exceeding an agreed background reference level for asbestos content in the air, not at the closest residential premises, but actually at the proposed operations.
- This is the most stringent air quality restriction on operations of this type that I have experienced in over 15 years of working on similar projects in the industry.
- The planning process which we are part of today, sits alongside the environmental permitting process to be completed by the EA. The application for which has been completed and will be submitted immediately following any planning approval.
- The EA will undertake a further very detailed review of the proposals to ensure it involves the best available technology and meets their comprehensive technical standards for environmental protection required prior to a permit being issued.

- This provides a “belt and braces” approach to the environmental controls in place on the scheme and should, I hope, provide comfort to members and local residents alike.
- Put simply, the project cannot proceed without the EA being satisfied that the environmental controls proposed are the best they can be and they will ensure that these high standards are always maintained through regular enforcement visits and by regularly reviewing air quality data amongst other information during the lifetime of the treatment facility.
- The EA have expressed no objections to the planned operations and have been consulted regularly by Nottinghamshire County Council.
- The site will provide employment for 10 local people.
- Given the government’s encouragement to boost the economy there should be an increase in the demand for the type of facilities provided at the Daneshill site.

Following Mr Thistlethwaite’s speech the following comments and questions were responded to:

- Although the operation at Rowley Regis is carried out inside, the majority of operations of this type take place outside using mobile equipment.
- Staff on site not processing the incoming material will only require standard PPE such as hats and boots.
- The applicant will check the soil at source for the presence of any asbestos fibres before the soil is transported to Daneshill. There is no point in the applicant taking soil to Daneshill that cannot be used there. The client carries out the initial acceptance testing but the applicant then checks that the waste description is accurate and a third check is made when the material arrives on site. Out of 4,000 loads received by the applicant last year only 3 were rejected. If an unacceptable load is tipped on site then dust suppression measures are adopted to ensure that no contamination occurs when it is removed.
- The applicant did not adopt the twin track approach as they did not want to pre judge the outcome of the planning process and also because the fee for the permit costs tens of thousands of pounds and is non-refundable. The applicant confirmed that the application for the permit had been completed and was ready to be submitted.

Councillor Taylor was then given the opportunity to speak and a **summary** of that speech is set out below:

- It is important that the concerns of the residents and the Parish Councils are taken into consideration. Many objections have been received.

- There are 5 parish councils who are affected by this development and 4 of them have spoken today – I think that shows the level of concern that there is locally.
- A safe outcome depends on the Environment Agency (EA) and the Waste Planning Authority (WPA) carrying out their respective roles properly.
- From a resident's point of view it does feel as if there is some abdication of responsibility taking place here. The WPA can grant planning permission without accounting for the fears of the objectors in terms of the ecological impacts and the EA has not commented with any great vigour though have mentioned the issue of groundwater.
- This is a longstanding, non-hazardous site but this application proposes to bring in hazardous materials.
- Residents are concerned that as it is an outdoors operation it poses a risk to health.
- This application speaks of holding areas, bunding and sealed drainage but I note that a past application in Councillor Fielding's division also involved asbestos but that was carried out inside.
- The applicant speaks of being commercially viable and that there are limited sites offering what Daneshill can, but my concerns are with the residents and not the applicant's commercial viability.
- The report states that the location makes practical sense as it is in a sparsely populated rural area but the asbestos fibres do travel in the air and I ask Committee members to consider the effects on my constituents.
- In my time as an elected member for the area applications have been heard regarding quarries, test drilling for methane and shale gas, landfill centres and recycling facilities. The only application not yet heard is for a nuclear reactor! My residents have taken more than their fair share for Nottinghamshire.
- An emotional plea might not count in planning terms but I ask members to consider the impact on residents and vote against the recommendation.

Following Councillor Taylor's speech the following comments and questions were responded to:

- If planning permission is granted, residents can still make their voices heard by writing to the EA about the applicant's permit application asking for a public consultation as the size of public interest is one of the criteria used to decide whether to hold a public consultation.
- The EA have engaged rigorously in the planning process but had no other observations to make other than about the issue with drainage/contamination. The EA does have its own thorough procedure which it will follow.

- From a planning point of view the site is acceptable for the proposed purpose – it is well screened with good access.
- If planning permission is granted, the Chairman confirmed that given the clear local concerns he would write to the EA requesting a public consultation on the applicant's permit application.

Members then debated the item and the following comments and questions were responded to:

- Officers acknowledged the concerns that the Committee had for the welfare of the residents and confirmed that following the receipt of consultation responses officers had sought and been given assurances by the applicant that the operation would be operated safely.
- If the application is successful both the EA and this authority would monitor the site. NCC has an enforcement team and the site has been visited twice this year. The frequency of visits depends on how busy the site is. Spot checks can also be carried out. There are many other developments in that part of the County so that it would be straightforward for the team to visit when passing. Condition 32 covers on site monitoring to ensure that airborne concentrations of asbestos fibres do not exceed background concentrations. Off-site monitoring may also be required by the EA as a result of the permit process if planning permission is granted. Condition 10 requires the establishment of a local liaison forum to ensure that any residents' concerns are addressed.
- Condition 21 governs the movements of HGVs, including those used as part of any contract with third parties for delivering or taking away materials to/from the site.
- Condition 8 refers to external lighting which is designed to be bat friendly. In terms of light pollution, each application is taken on its merits, in this case the light spill is minimal and the operation will not take place after dark.

On a motion by the Chair, taking into account the Screening Direction, and seconded by the Vice-Chair, it was: -

RESOLVED 2020/017

That subject to the Secretary of State first issuing a negative EIA Screening Direction, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

7. CHANGE OF USE OF CARETAKER'S BUNGALOW TO SCHOOL USE AND ERECTION OF HIGH SECURITY FENCING, WOODLAND VIEW, HUTHWAITE

Mr Marsh introduced the report which considered a planning application for the use of a former caretaker's bungalow as a school nurture unit at Woodland View Primary

School, Huthwaite. Mr Marsh informed the Committee that the key issue related to the amenity impact at a school entrance gate.

Following Mr Marsh's introduction there were no questions.

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

RESOLVED 2020/018

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 1 of the report.

8. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

Mrs Gill introduced the report, stating that it was the usual report brought regularly to Committee.

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

RESOLVED 2020/019

That no further actions are required as a direct result of the contents of the report.

The meeting closed at 1.06pm

CHAIR