

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF EAST LEAKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN THE PARISH OFFICE ON TUESDAY 26 JULY 2016 AT 7.15 PM.

PRESENT: Councillors Ron Hetherington, Marie Males, Conrad Oatey, Peter Rapley, Glennis Robinson, Mel Roper, Kevin Shaw, Liz Taylor, Carys Thomas, (Chair) John Thurman

The Clerk, Lesley Bancroft and Cllr Griggs were also present

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Cllr Gary Grayston reasons approved and accepted

16/PC/039 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

16/PC/040 DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

16/PC/041 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED

None

16/PC/042 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

16/01524/FUL

36 St Marys Crescent

Detached Garden Building

No Objection

In view of external lighting being erected, suggest some form of light restriction timing to be put in place during the hours of darkness so as not to disturb the neighbours

Agreed unanimously

16/PC/043 CORRESPONDENCE

Nottinghamshire County Council – Public Transport Improvements – Agenda for next planning meeting.

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Tree notification – Agenda for next planning meeting

16/PC/044 QUESTIONS TO CHAIR (IN ACCORDANCE WITH S.O. IU)

None

Meeting closed at 7.21 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF EAST LEAKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN THE PARISH OFFICE ON TUESDAY 9 AUGUST 2016 AT 7.00 PM.

PRESENT: Councillors Gary Grayston, Ron Hetherington, Marie Males, Peter Rapley, Glennis Robinson, Mel Roper, Kevin Shaw, Carys Thomas, (Chair) John Thurman

The Clerk, Lesley Bancroft and four members of the public were also present

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Cllr Conrad Oatey & Liz Taylor approved and accepted

16/PC/045 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

An additional item to discuss the format for a meeting regarding a planning application for 235 dwellings and primary school on land north of Rempstone Road - Agree

16/PC/046 DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

16/PC/047 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED

APP/P3040/W/16/3153355 Planning Appeal – Foxley Plot, 3 Station Road (16/00149/VAR) – it was agreed to write to the appeal to restate the committee's previous objections.

Kirk Ley Road It was noted, via a complaint, that there appears to be over enthusiastic removal of woodland on the site east of Kirk Ley road contrary to the plans. The storm basin area appears to have been covered with hard standing. The Planning Department has been notified. Enforcement Officers are due to visit the site.

16/PC/048 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The meeting closed at 7.05pm for public participation in the next item.

Public concerns were raised in relation to the trees having been removed, the dust being generated from the site, the dirty road conditions and the position of the roundabout. Concerns to be notified to Rushcliffe Borough Council with reference made to the conditions within the planning consent.

The meeting re-opened at 7.15pm.

16/01341/REM

Land East of Kirk Ley Road

Reserved matters for the construction of 78 no. dwelling and associated infrastructure

Object on the grounds:

- The willow tree is of prime importance to the village scene and should be retained. It is a fine mature tree, and this particular species is important to the village as it relates back to the basket making industry. The grass triangle and tree are something of a statement of our rural industrial heritage.
- The slip road to take traffic from Kirk Ley to Woodgate, which threatens the tree, is not necessary. Traffic can simply use the roundabout to turn left, as shown in the FW926 300/301 dated 12 Mar 2016 in application 15/00649/DISCON. The volume of flow of traffic in this direction is very light, as most traffic travelling that way uses the top road.

- A box on the plan (FW926 301E/300F) states:

Existing highway Weeping Willow tree to have all low hanging foliage removed to assist vehicle visibility and avoid pedestrian impediment as per NCC RSA recommendations. Alternatively, the tree is to be removed (subject to approval) and replaced with a different species in line with NCC Highway Officer comments received 13.07.16.

- The comments mentioned have not been made available publically. This solution is at odds with the Committee report for planning application 15/01484/REM (11 Feb 2016) which states:

99. A number of residents and the Ward Members have also raised concerns regarding the loss of the Willow tree that is located on the junction of Kirk Ley Road and Woodgate Road. Again it is noted that this tree is not within the current application site and therefore does not form part of the application. Regardless of this, the issue was raised with the developers who clarified that it is their understanding that the Willow tree is to be retained and that no part of the highway works will impact on its retention.

- There is grave concern about the access onto the highway for residents of the bungalows etc that adjoin the roundabout area. The current plan does not make adequate provision for people to access their drives safely.
- It appears that will be particularly difficult for some residents to turn right up Woodgate. Residents are asking for clarification of the raised/hatched areas to understand how this will be possible.
- An earlier plan was shown to residents and East Leake Parish Council, and projected at RBC Development Control Meeting in February 2016, which moved the roundabout further onto the land of the development, leaving the triangle area unscathed and a secondary road for residents to access their properties. This version of the plan, which was a significant factor in the decision by RBC Development Control to grant consent for the application, appears to have disappeared.
- The entrance road onto the estate is too narrow, not least because it will form the access to the new primary school if this goes ahead. There is concern that the parking provision for the houses is insufficient on this school approach road and there will be residents' cars parked on the road.

The Committee's comments are to be copied to the Highway Engineer, Nottinghamshire County Council and County Councillor Andrew Brown – Agreed unanimously

The following comments would additionally be made to the case officer:

- The work on the site has started with foundations being laid, and there are already comments from nearby residents about removal of trees contrary to the plans, the noise and dust from the site, and mud on the road. It does not appear that conditions 4 and 8 of the decision notice 15/01484/rem are being complied with – i.e. work has started before suitable access arrangements have been provided, and it does not appear that wheel washing facilities have been provided.

16/01756/VAR

OS Field 4570 Woodgate Road

Vary condition 15 of planning application 14/02313/FUL to permit the formation of a community orchard in lieu of allotments

No Objection. Generally in favour and pleased to acknowledge the site for use as a community orchard. Allotments might be considered in the future if needed subject to consultation and management being agreed. Suggest that the variety of fruit species could be improved by adding for example local old English varieties of fruit and including Damson, Quince, Cherry and Mulberry trees to reflect the road naming scheme. Noted that the specimens to be planted are quite small and would suggest the same number of trees planted but more mature samples. – **Agreed Unanimously**

16/PC/049 TO DISCUSS NALC SURVEY OF COMMUNITY LED HOUSING

No response considered necessary as proposed government funding to alleviate the impact of second homes is not applicable to this area - Agreed

16/PC/050 TO DISCUSS PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT – GOTHAM ROAD

Agree with proposed improvement – No objection.

16/PC/051 TO DISCUSS AND FORMULATE A RESPONSE TO WORK ON TREES IN CONSERVATION AREA, 7 COSTOCK ROAD

No objection to work being carried out. Thanks go to the applicant for sending so much detail and thanks to Rushcliffe Borough Council for allowing the Parish Council to comment. Suggest option 2 “respond in writing allowing work to proceed” – Agreed.

16/PC/51A LAND NORTH OF REMPSTONE ROAD, EAST LEAKE

A public meeting is to be held on Wednesday 31st August at 7.00pm at the Village Hall to discuss planning application 16/01881/OUT for up to 235 dwellings, primary school, infrastructure, green space, associated surface water attenuation & landscaping on Land North Of Rempstone Road. Letters to go out to residents in the local area if possible with the newsletters.

16/PC/043 CORRESPONDENCE

Rushcliffe Borough Council approved the following applications:

- Ref 16/01430/CMA, British Gypsum Works, Gotham Road – Periodic review of mineral permissions pursuant to Section 96 of Environment Act 1995
- Ref 16/01432/CMA, British Gypsum Works, Gotham Road – Vary condition 2 of planning permission 00/01321/CMA to extend operation of mine until 22nd February 2042
- Ref 16/01433/CMA, British Gypsum Works, Gotham Road – vary condition 4 of planning permission 11/01544/CMA to extend the operation of the mine until 2042.
- Ref 16/01362/FUL, 3 Rushcliffe Grove – single storey front extension; refurbishment of bungalow; rear terrace
- Ref 16/01090/FUL, 50 Brookfields Way – Garage conversion incorporating new bay window; infill porch

- Ref 16/01326/FUL, 7 West Leake Road – Detached garage building
- Ref 16/01279/FUL, 45 Oldershaw Road – Single storey side/rear extension
- Ref 16/01479/FUL, 43 Potters Lane – Two storey and single storey rear extensions; change garage roof from flat to pitched; alterations to porch
- Ref 16/01323/TPO, 33 Ropewalk – Coppice ash tree

16/PC/044 QUESTIONS TO CHAIR (IN ACCORDANCE WITH S.O. IU)

No questions

The meeting closed at 7.44pm

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF EAST LEAKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN THE PARISH OFFICE ON TUESDAY 16 AUGUST 2016 AT 7.15 PM.

PRESENT: Councillors Gary Grayston, , Marie Males, Conrad Oatey, Peter Rapley, Glennis Robinson, Kevin Shaw, Liz Taylor, Carys Thomas, (Chair) John Thurman

The Assistant Clerk, Sue Lewis and Cllr Donna Griggs were also present

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Cllr Ron Hetherington, Mel Roper approved and accepted

16/PC/054 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Reminder that there is still a large amount of newsletters waiting to be delivered

16/PC/055 DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

None

16/PC/056 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED

Kirk Ley Roundabout – The Chair reported the comments made at the previous meeting had been sent to Rushcliffe Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. She has also spoken to Rushcliffe Borough Council who informed her that Nottinghamshire County Council is the body which approves the design of the roundabout. John Thurman reported on his discussions and investigations at Rushcliffe Borough Council. Cllr Andy Brown has been informed and will take this up at NCC. In future all comments made on plans that involve the highway and other County Council matters to be sent to Cllr Brown.

16/PC/057 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

16/01717/FUL Parkside Works, 59 Main Street

Change of use or part factory from B1/B8 to garage workshop for pre-mot inspections, vehicle servicing and light mechanical repair

Object on the grounds that:

- The Neighbourhood Plan has several policies that deal with use classes in different areas of the village and clearly indicates that B2 applications are not appropriate in the area designated as the village centre. The relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies are B2(a), B3(b) and V1(a)
- Furthermore this location is at the heart of the village conservation area and shopping centre, a highly inappropriate location for industrial use.
- The issues giving concern which the Parish Council has objected to already have not been adequately addressed in the resubmission
- Entrance and egress is still a problem with a narrow drive onto the pavement in the busy shopping area with limited visibility and cars parked on the highway adjacent and opposite.
- Multiple cars are parked in the area in front of the garage early in the morning, contrary to the applicant's statement, which implies that cars will be delivered and collected for particular time slots.
- There are concerns about noise and fumes in this small enclosed yard, even with the addition of extraction equipment.
- Surrounding businesses include Accountancy, PR, etc where client conversations are important, and being made difficult or impossible by the noise.

- It was noted that NCC Highways initially objected to the proposal on the following grounds:

The access driveway is of insufficient width to accommodate two-way traffic. This is likely to result in shunt type collisions when drivers are forced to wait on the carriageway to allow vehicles to exit the site.

Visibility at the vehicular crossing is approximately 2.4m x 14m to the right and 2.4m x 24m to the left, both of which are sub-standard. The proposed use will intensify the number of trips at what is a sub-standard access, and therefore increase the likelihood of collisions taking place.

The proposal has not demonstrated how/where drivers will turn within the curtilage so that they can enter/exit the development in a forward gear. The lack of such provision will force drivers to exit the site in reverse, which is a practice that restricts visibility, and therefore increases the likelihood of collisions taking place.

The site is located in East Leake town centre and is accessed from the main distributor road going through it. In this instance, the footways adjacent to the highway attract higher levels of pedestrian footfall. Pedestrian visibility at the highway fronting the proposal is restricted by the adjacent buildings. The additional traffic generated by the proposed development will increase the risk of pedestrian/vehicle conflict as drivers exit the site which is not acceptable.

They subsequently changed their view on the basis of alleged past use of the site. It should be noted however that the Neighbourhood Plan is now in force and the village has increased in size considerably with consequent huge increase in vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

It was agreed that this information would be referred to Cllr Andy Brown.

It was noted that there is support for a garage operation in the village, but not at this location.

Agreed Unanimously

16/PC/058 CORRESPONDENCE

None

16/PC/059 QUESTIONS TO CHAIR (IN ACCORDANCE WITH S.O. IU)

There were no questions

The meeting closed at 7.40pm