

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 2025

Present:

Councillor Lee Hartshorne (Chair) (in the Chair)
Councillor Tony Lacey (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Andrew Cooper
Councillor Mark Foster
Councillor William Jones
Councillor Fran Petersen

Councillor Michael Durrant
Councillor Christine Gare
Councillor Heather Liggett
Councillor Kathy Rouse

Also Present:

S Sternberg	Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer
D Thompson	Assistant Director of Planning
A Kirkham	Planning Manager - Development Management
D Cunningham	Principal Arboricultural Officer
C Rouse	Planning Officer
A Bryan	Governance Manager
T Fuller	Governance Officer
M E Derbyshire	Members ICT & Training Officer

PLA/ Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

51/2

4-25 Apologies for absence were received by Councillors D Cheetham.

Councillor M Durrant attended as a substitute for Councillor D Cheetham.

PLA/ Declarations of Interest

52/2

4-25 Councillor A Cooper declared an interest in item 6 on the agenda, NED/24/00933/FLH, as the application was within his Ward. He indicated that he would leave the room at the appropriate time and would not participate in the Committee's consideration or determination of the application.

PLA/ Declaration of Predetermination

53/2

4-25 None.

PLA/ Minutes of Last Meeting

54/2

4-25 RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2025 were approved as a true record.

PLA/ NED/22/00387/OL

55/2

4-25 The Committee considered an application that had been submitted for a Hotel, public house, wedding venue and early years nursery (Major Development) at Land Northeast of Allotments, Williamthorpe Road, North Wingfield. The

application had been referred to Committee by Councillor L Stone, who was in support of the proposal.

The recommendation by officers was to refuse the application. The report to Committee explained the reasons for this.

The report contended that the proposal would result in harm to the interests of sports provision for the residents of Williamthorpe Fields. Additionally, the development would erode the settlement gap between Holmewood and North Wingfield and would result in visual and landscape harm. Officers accepted that the scheme would provide some economic and social benefits, but these were unquantified and the need for a commercial development of this type was unproven. As a result, officers contented that the benefits did not outweigh the harm caused to the sports provision and landscape.

Officers had concluded that the proposal was not in accordance with the whole of the development plan. They recommended, therefore, that the application be refused.

Before the Committee considered the application it heard from the Applicant, Mr D Atkinson, and the Agent, Mr C Reford.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. These included Local Plan policies ID10, concerning sports facilities, SDC12, concerning high quality design and place making, and WC5, concerning visitor and tourism development. Committee also considered an objection to the application made by Sports England, on the grounds of unnecessary impact on the provision of sports facilities.

Committee discussed the application. Members considered the impact of the proposal on the settlement gap between Holmewood and North Wingfield, as well as the impact on the provision of football pitches. In this context, Committee agreed that the proposal represented significant harm. Members felt that the scheme was contrary to large portions of the development plan and would represent a bad precedent if it was to be approved. In this context, it was suggested that the report provided a clear recommendation, backed up by planning policy, that should be followed.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor L Hartshorne and Councillor W Jones moved and seconded a Motion to refuse the application. The Motion was put to a vote and approved.

RESOLVED –

That the application be refused, in line with officer recommendations.

That the final wording of the reasons for refusal be delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Management).

Reasons

- 1) The development would result in the loss of a football pitch facility required

under the conditions of planning permission 17/00269/FL to meet the needs for sports provision arising from the Williamthorpe Fields housing development. There is no alternative proposal put forward that is of equivalent sporting benefit or for which there is a mechanism in place for its delivery and on-going management. The development therefore fails to accord with Local Plan policies SS1, LC1, ID1 and ID10. It is considered that there are no other material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh this conflict with the Development Plan.

2) The proposal would result in a major development of urban character and appearance within a gap between the settlements of North Wingfield and Holmewood. It would erode the gap, dilute the identity of each settlement and result in visual and landscape harm. As such it would fail to accord with Local Plan policies SS1, LC1, WC5, SDC3 and SDC12. It is considered that there are no other material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh this conflict with the Development Plan.

Councillor A Cooper left the meeting.

PLA/ NED/24/00933/FLH

56/2

4-25

The Committee considered an application that had been submitted for a garden landscaping scheme including two outbuildings (Amended Plans) at 7 Hornbeam Way, Stretton, Alfreton. The application had been referred to Committee by Councillor A Cooper, who had raised some concerns about it. An update report had been circulated which set out late representations regarding the application.

The recommendation by officers was to approve the application. The report to Committee explained the reasons for this.

The report contended that the proposal was acceptable in terms of the principles of development, its impact on the surrounding street scene and landscape character, its impact on the health of the protected trees, and its impact on the privacy and amenity for the residents of neighbouring properties.

Committee heard that a late representation submitted by the Agent had resulted in the wording of condition 3, concerning the impact on the root protection area of protected trees, being amended.

Officers had concluded that the development was in accordance with the development plan. They recommended, therefore, that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Before the Committee considered the application it heard from Local Ward Member, Councillor A Cooper, objectors, Mrs L Harries and Mr D Harries, and a supporter, Mr Pearson-Ward. Committee also heard from Mr Thompson, who was speaking on behalf of the applicant.

Committee considered the application. It took into account the relevant Local and National Planning Policies. These included Local Plan policies LC5, concerning residential extensions, SDC2, concerning trees, and SDC12, concerning high quality design and place making. Committee also considered the British Standard for trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

Committee discussed the application. Members accepted that the proposal would impact the root protection area of surrounding trees. However, it was felt that this impact was minimal, and Members were satisfied that the trees would recover. In this context, some Members suggested that the proposal was in accordance with planning policy and there were no material reasons for rejecting the application.

At the conclusion of the discussion Councillor M Durrant and Councillor T Lacey moved and seconded a Motion to approve the application The Motion was put to a vote and approved

RESOLVED –

That the application be approved, in line with officer recommendations.

That the final wording of the conditions and legal agreement be delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Management).

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be started within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the following drawing numbers - • 2003 Rev A (Shed Design Detail) • Greenhouse Image: date scanned 31.01.25 • Greenhouse Dimensions: date scanned 31.01.25 • Greenhouse Details/Spec: date scanned 31.01.25 • 2002 Rev A (RPA Impact Plan) • 2001 Rev C (Existing and Proposed Garden Layout) - unless otherwise subsequently agreed through a formal submission under the Non Material Amendment procedures.

Reason: For Clarity and avoidance of doubt.

3. Notwithstanding the membrane detail shown on Detail 01 on drawing 2001 Rev C, the greenhouse base geotextile shall be built using a polypropylene or a high-tenacity polyester geosynthetic material.

Reason: To satisfy the Local Planning Authority that the trees to be retained will not be damaged during construction and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality, in accordance with NEDDC Local Policy SDC2 and pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Councillor A Cooper returned to the meeting.

PLA/ Planning Appeals - Lodged and Determined

57/2

4-25

The Committee considered a report which set out planning appeals that had been lodged and determined. The report set out that two appeals had been lodged, one

enforcement appeal had been lodged, three appeals had been allowed, one appeal had been dismissed, and no appeals had been withdrawn. The relevant applications the appeals were in respect of was set out in the report.

Committee heard that appeals were now being determined on the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

PLA/ **Matters of Urgency**
58/2
4-25 None.