

Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council
Minutes of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting held in the Radcliffe Room,
The Grange, on Monday 27 March 2017
at 7.00pm

Councillors

Martin Culshaw (Chairman)	Keith Agar (Vice Chairman) (A)	Penny Astill (A)
Joe Bailey	Rod Brears	Graham Budworth
Sue Clegg	Gillian Dunn	Graham Leigh-Browne (A)
	Pam Thompson	Jean Robinson

Ex-Officio: Georgia Moore (PC Chairman) and David Barton (PC Vice Chairman)

Also present: Jacki Grice (Parish Clerk) RBC Cllr Roger Upton and two members of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence

Cllrs Keith Agar, Penny Astill and Graham Leigh-Browne - Approved.

2. Declaration of Interest

Cllr Rod Brears – Planning Application ref 17/00481/FUL & 17/00506/FUL, he left the room during the discussion and did not take part in any vote.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 06 March 2017 for Approval

It was **Resolved:** "That minutes of the meeting held on the 6th March 2017 were approved as an accurate record and were signed by the Chairman, save for the following amendments" - Minute ref 4 delete 'not'. Minute ref 12 ' Correct the name spelling of John Macquarrie' insert 'more support for commuter trains' and insert 'John Macquarrie shall convene a bespoke meeting with EMT.'

4. Chairman's Announcements

There were no announcements.

5. Clerk's Report on Previous Minutes

The A52 Junction Improvements have been delayed due to unforeseen work required by Statutory Services. The Clerk has contacted the Highways England A52 Project Manager to see if in the meantime the Cropwell Road junction could be opened up to allow traffic flow as there has been no sign of activity for weeks.

6. Open Session for members of the public to raise relevant matters, limited to 15 minutes

Standing orders suspended at 7.05pm

Local residents advised that there are issues with the access driveway for planning application ref 17/00506/FUL, in that the applicant does not own the drive, they only have access to it, at present the width of the driveway would not accommodate large plant and machinery that would be required for the builds, there is also no provision for bin storage.

RBC Cllr Upton advised that he supports the PC draft response to RBC with regard to the Local Plan, Green Belt and C.I.L Consultations. He also advised that the Neighbourhood Plan was progressing as the Independent Inspector had 'walked' the Parish and produced a draft report which is at the fact/grammar check stage. A meeting will be arranged in the near future for the Steering Group, Phil Marshall RBC Planning Officer and BPUD Consultants to attend to consider the draft report.

Standing orders resumed at 7.13pm

7. **Recent Rushcliffe Borough Council Decisions as per the attached list**

There were no decisions recently received.

8. **Planning Applications as per the attached list**

Resolved: "The applications received were reviewed and the decisions taken as outlined on the attached document."

9. **Applications Subsequently Received**

None Received.

10. **Trains Working Group Update**

- A letter has been sent to Jake Kelly, MD East Midlands Trains, cc to John Macquarrie of the Department for Transport. The letter welcomed another meeting with Mr Kelly to discuss further timetable improvements for implementation in December 2017.
- Conversations have been held with Cllrs and the Clerk of Bottesford so that they are now in the loop as they also require additional stops.
- A Stakeholder meeting was recently held facilitated by RBC, who in partnership with Gedling BC and N.C.C have appointed consultants Mott Macdonald to build a business case for improved services, the report is due in May and is formatted in a way that the DfT would assess bids. (The Chairman expressed hope that it would be supportive of the aspirations of Radcliffe on Trent.
- It was noted that Radcliffe on Trent and Bottesford want additional train stops, Aslockton do not wish for any more stops and Bingham's priorities are a footbridge and car parking. The next Stakeholder meeting is 19 April 2017.

11. **RBC Consultations: Local Plan, Green Belt & Community Infrastructure Levy: To Consider and Approve Draft Responses**

Proposed by Cllr Thompson and seconded by Cllr Clegg, **It was Resolved:** "That the draft consultation responses for all three areas are approved, save for the following amendments" ' Replace all references to RPT to RPC' ' Replace all references to over 500 possible new houses to up to 500 possible new houses.' (Revised document attached). Cllr Culshaw was thanked for his work on the response document.

12. **Correspondence**

None Received

13. **Councillors Reports**

Cllr Moore advised that the NatWest in Bingham is closing in September 2017.

14. **Date of Next Meeting**

Planning & Environment Meeting confirmed as Monday 24 April 2017.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.16.pm

Signed: Chairman.....Date.....

PLANNING DECISIONS 27 March 2017

RBC REF	DATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION	DETAILS	Dec.	Vote.	OBSERVATIONS
27/00486/COU	06.03.2017	Miss Wendy Preece	12C Main Road, R-O-T NG12 2FH	Change of use to allow footcare (D1) at ground floor and hairdressers (A1) at first floor	DNO	UNAN	
17/00481/FUL	07.03.2017	Mr Julian Naylor	59 Cropwell Road, R-O-T NG12 2JG	Single storey side extension	DNO	UNAN	
17/00464/TPO	07.03.2017	Mr John Whelan	12 Berkeley Crescent, R-O-T NG12 2NW	Crown reduce 2 no Ash and 1 no Oak by 7m and reduce lateral branches by 2m	DNO	UNAN	Subject to the views of RBC Tree Officer
17/00510/FUL	13.03.2017	Mr John Harrison	9 Yew Tree Close, R-O-T, NG12 2AZ	Two storey and single storey front extension	DNO	UNAN	
17/00461/FUL	13.03.2017	Mr McHugh	48 Bailey Lane, R-O-T NG12 2DA	Single storey and two storey rear extensions	DNO	6 for 3 against	
17/00509/FUL	14.03.2017	Mr and Mrs Davis	2 Berkeley Crescent, Upper Saxondale NG12 2NW	Two storey rear extension	DNO	UNAN	
17/00506/FUL	17.03.2017	Mr Andrew Bouch	Trelaw, 139 Shelford Road, R-O-T NG12 1AZ	Demolition of existing dwelling, construction of two new detached dwellings, associated means of access and enclosure, hardland soft landscaping	DNO	7 for 1 against	Subject to any legal issues with use of the driveway being resolved to the owner's satisfaction. The P.C is also concerned about access onto Shelford Road.
17/00540/FUL	17.03.2017	Mr S Sawyer	9 Ridge Lane, R-O-T NG12 1BD	Single storey rear extension, replace rear balcony, single storey and first floor front extension, new double garage and boundary walling.	DNO	UNAN	

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL DECISIONS

RBC REF	APPLICANT	LOCATION	DETAILS	PC Dec.	RBC Dec.

APPLICATIONS SUBSEQUENTLY RECEIVED

RBC REF	DATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION	DETAILS	Dec.	Vote.	OBSERVATIONS

Comments by Radcliffe Parish Council (RPC) on:

Rushcliffe Local Plan Consultation

Green Belt Consultation

Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation

March 2017

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Further Options

Question 1: Yes

Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11: No comments – not directly relevant to Radcliffe-on-Trent

Page 26, final paragraph: RPC accepts and has always accepted that the target up to 2028 is “a minimum 400 new homes.” In the light of the current shortfall in Rushcliffe in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years, Radcliffe Parish Council accepts that “It may now be necessary for the village to accommodate more homes than the minimum 400 home requirement.”

Question 12: As there is very little scope for further infill in Radcliffe-on-Trent, RPC accepts that further new houses will have to be located within the greenbelt. However, to minimise the impact of new housing on the greenbelt, we wish the number of new houses to be minimised. We have already accepted that there will have to be a minimum of 400 new houses, all within the current greenbelt. In the light of the current lack of progress to meeting Rushcliffe’s target for new housing to 2028, RPC is prepared to accept a maximum of 500 new houses to 2028. The exact timing of the building is not of concern *provided* that school, health centre, transport and leisure impacts are addressed and mitigated. We would point out that the figure of 500 represents a substantial increase of 25% over the previous minimum figure of 400.

Question 13: RPC does not support housing development on Site RAD 11. This site rises in elevation from Shelford Road towards the River Trent. Because of this, development on this site would be excessively intrusive both from the south and, particularly, from the north, looking towards the site across the Trent Valley. This site also lies in the greenbelt. However, unlike most of the other sites located in Radcliffe-on-Trent, this site is only bordered on *one* side by current development. Development of Site RAD11 would create an unnecessary extension of the urban edge of Radcliffe-on-Trent into the greenbelt. We also note that this site lies not within the Parish of Radcliffe-on-Trent but in the Parish of Shelford. We are concerned that, in the event of any development, some of the Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy monies may be allocated to Shelford Parish Council rather than RPC even though the effects of this development on facilities and infrastructure would be mostly on Radcliffe-on-Trent. Further, sites RAD1-10 provide more than enough land to accommodate up to 500 possible new houses. Therefore,

development on the less advantageous Site RAD11 is not necessary and is less desirable.

RPC does not support housing development on Site RAD 12. This site lies within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 2 and so may be susceptible to flooding. Also, the site lies within Radcliffe-on-Trent's Neighbourhood Plan's 'Leisure Arc' that runs from Radcliffe Cricket Ground to Wharf Lane. It is the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to preserve the area within the Arc for future leisure development. Further, sites RAD1-10 provide more than enough land to accommodate up to 500 possible new houses. Therefore, development on the less advantageous Site RAD12 is not necessary and is less desirable.

RPC has commented previously on Sites RAD1-10 and those comments remain our view on future housing development.

Question 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. No comments – not directly relevant to Radcliffe-on-Trent.

Question 28: No comments.

Rushcliffe Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages

RPC notes that two additional sites for housing development have been submitted for development during previous consultations on the Local Plan Part 2. We have provided comments on these sites as part of our response to the consultation on the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Further Options. Below we provide comments in relation to possible removal of these sites from the greenbelt.

Site RAD11 lies on open countryside to the immediate north east of Radcliffe-on-Trent. We note that in the Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) this area of land is rated as being of medium-high greenbelt importance meaning that it scores well in terms of greenbelt purposes. When all the required housing development can be accommodated within other sites of lower importance, we believe that it is completely unnecessary to remove this area from the greenbelt. We note also that the lack of a strong boundary to the northeast of current development means that there is a future risk of urban sprawl. We believe that removal of this site from the greenbelt would be significantly detrimental to the greenbelt's purpose.

Site RAD12 lies in an area of flood risk on the west side of Radcliffe between current housing development and a used and disused railway line. RPC in its draft Neighbourhood Plan has identified this site as being in its designated "Leisure Arc." Dropping of this site from the greenbelt would leave it more vulnerable to housing development which would remove permanently the use of the land for leisure. This is particularly important given Radcliffe-on-Trent's general lack of leisure facilities. We note, also, that leisure facilities can be developed within the existing greenbelt. When all the required housing development can be accommodated within other sites

around Radcliffe-on-Trent, we believe that it is completely unnecessary to remove this area from the greenbelt.

Rushcliffe Community Infrastructure Levy: Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

RPC notes that while the majority of Radcliffe-on-Trent falls in Charging Zone 3 (CIL £100 per square metre) some of the village falls in Zone 2 (CIL £75 per square metre). The consequences of this are obvious – less money available for essential infrastructural development. There appears to be little logic to this when both Zones are designated for residential development (dwelling houses). We would suggest that all of Radcliffe-on-Trent should fall into Zone 3 given the significant impact of future housing development on schools, health facilities, communication infrastructure (particularly roads) and leisure facilities. We also note that where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place (Radcliffe-on-Trent expects to have its plan approved later in 2017 – the plan is currently out for examination with a referendum on it expected later this year) RPC would receive 25% of the CIL to spend "on infrastructure that they want." Consequently, the designation of parts of Radcliffe-on-Trent to Zone 2 would have significant economic consequences.

We note that Rushcliffe Council has identified four types of infrastructure for whole or part funding by CIL funds:

- Park and ride facilities along the A52 corridor;
- Additional primary school places;
- Additional secondary school places;
- Provision of health facilities.

In Radcliffe-on-Trent we are in urgent need of better leisure facilities and we strongly recommend that leisure facilities are added to the above list.