

Radcliffe-on-Trent Parish Council
Minutes of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting held in the Radcliffe Room,
The Grange, on Monday 26 March 2018
at 7.00pm

Councillors

Martin Culshaw (Chairman)
 Joe Bailey
 Sue Clegg

Keith Agar (Vice Chairman)
 Rod Brears
 Gillian Dunn
 Pam Thompson (A)

Penny Astill
 Graham Budworth
 Graham Leigh-Browne (A)
 Jean Robinson

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

Also present: Jacki Grice (Parish Clerk) Jacque Earp (Admin Assistant), RBC Cllr Neil Clarke, RBC Cllr Roger Upton and 8 members of the public.

1. **Apologies for Absence**

Cllr Georgia Moore, Cllr Pam Thompson and Cllr Graham Leigh Browne - Approved.

2. **Declaration of Interest**

None received.

3. **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no Chairman's Announcements.

4. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on the 5th March 2018 for Approval**

Resolved: "That the minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman."

5. **Clerks report on items arising from these minutes**

M.2: Following the report by Adam Greest from STW at the last Planning & Environment meeting on the 5th March, STW have now confirmed they will not be able to connect the water to the Wharf Lane Eco-Toilets for free, however the funding applications to other agencies for the Skatepark have included this work.

M.6: Cllr Agar had been unsuccessful in contacting Bob Philips from 'Urban Imprint' regarding the RBC Housing Allocation clarification and Monitoring, however he will try and contact him again and report back to committee.

M.11: The Friends of the Railway Station carried out a 'Station Tidy up Day' in Radcliffe on the 16th March which had been a great success.

M.15: The Clerk has responded to the 2018-22 'RBC Off Street Parking Strategy Consultation'.

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

Standing Orders were suspended at 7.12pm

- *A member of the public who lives at the top of Shelford Road confirmed his home would be the most affected by the proposed William Davis Housing Development. He is highly disappointed that after representations had been made at the initial outline planning last year that mitigation has not been considered. The RBC Planning Officers had previously advised that it was too early to talk, however there is now a new plan that doesn't consider any kind of mitigation or buffers for his neighbouring property. The new plans outline tree coverage on some boundary areas but not near his home. PC support is requested as after several attempts with the developers there has been no response, there has been a trust breakdown, therefore a more formal approach to the issues are needed. The Chairman reminded the member of the public the Planning Application was still only at the outline stage, therefore there will be a later submission of all the details.*

- A member of the public confirmed his home was the second most affected by the housing development. He is concerned that the original plan of a mini roundabout to access the development is being up scaled to between 40 – 50 metres in diameter, which means it has moved 5 metres closer to his property. He also feels that the developers are not giving any regard to the voices of the local community.
- A member of the public agreed there has to be housing at this site as per the Neighbourhood Plan, however she is concerned about the School. Consultation should take place with villagers, local organisations and the PC concerning the proposed infrastructure and the right place to site the school. The local Infant and Junior schools have a subcommittee with proposals to put forward, therefore they should be fully consulted by all organisations affected by this housing development.
- A resident who lives on the corner of Clumber Drive is resigned to the fact the land to the rear of his home will be built upon. His biggest concern is the amount of extra traffic coming from the site directly onto Shelford Road. Four hundred houses may mean an extra six hundred cars travelling down Shelford Road a day and children walking to school would have potential difficulties crossing the road. It is currently very difficult to access Shelford Road. Although Traffic Surveys have indicated there is less traffic travelling the road than previous years, the resident would like to know when the survey was done as he believes the traffic is increasing and not decreasing. Confirmation regarding the second access point onto the A52 was raised as in his view this would alleviate the Shelford Road traffic. The resident also believes the services and car parks in the village would not cope with additional cars, and that the houses available would be too expensive for younger people to buy.
- Another resident believes it is inevitable that properties will be built in Radcliffe and that housing is probably needed. A proper infrastructure for roads, doctors and schools should be in place beforehand, however a second road leading through to the A52 would create an additional rat run and increase in traffic. The resident also asked for assurances from the PC that the Local Plan Part 2 and the Greenbelt Review would coincide simultaneously for Radcliffe.
- RBC Cllr Neil Clarke confirmed the Local Plan Part 2 is going through a process and will hopefully be completed at the same time as the Greenbelt Review. There are also other local sites that are being proposed for development in the Local Plan Part 2 and is in favour of the Shelford Road Planning Application in principle, subject to a large amount of mitigating measures. The main areas of mitigation being the increase of traffic travelling down Shelford Road, not just from this site but from other potential developments at Newton and Lowdham. The traffic implication would be the biggest impact for Radcliffe as a community as the traffic would eventually hit the mini roundabout parallel to the Co-Op. As a result of this development and others it is believed a mini-relief road is needed and also a roundabout further North, whereby the priority would be for traffic coming down Shelford Road to carry onto a new road to the east of the boundary, over the railway line to join the A52, which in effect would take traffic away from the mini-roundabout. In conjunction with any other developments, Cllr Clarke advised there needs to be a liaison with Network Rail and The Highways Agency about the potential future implications of a road bridge over the A52. Cllr Clarke is against siting a Health Centre at the new development, as anybody without a car would find it too far to walk. The RBC needs to have a renewed effort to encourage the existing Health Centre to redevelop their building and any financial contribution proposed for a new Health Centre, put towards the redevelopment of the existing one.

It was Resolved: "To extend the Open Session beyond 15 minutes to allow members of the Public to speak for longer"

It is also important to ensure mitigation for current dwellers. Cllr Clarke also asked for any other comments to incorporate into his Consultee response. Infrastructure and supporting community facilities including play areas need to be checked.

- RBC Cllr Upton introduced himself as RBC Cllr for Radcliffe and also a Member of the RBC for Planning and Housing across Rushcliffe Borough. Cllr Upton provided an overview to the key points of the outline planning application for Shelford Road. Access is the main part of the outline planning application, all other matters are high level and reserved for future discussion. The current housing market is in crisis. The average home costs eight times the cost of average earnings, and many people find it difficult to get on the housing ladder. Rent also continues to rise and 300,000 homes a year need to be built to provide new generations the opportunity to buy. Rushcliffe has been voted a place in the top ten areas where people want to live, and many more people would like to join the Borough. The RBC offered to build 9,000 houses, however the government upped that figure to 13,150, an increase of 28% which is a large task.

Work has started on six large strategic sites, but cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, as RBC only has 3.1 years supply. Planning Appeals are being lost, so the PC and RBC are having to accept development. Houses need to be built on the small and medium sites and Radcliffe has been identified as a sustainable key development for housing. A minimum of 400 homes identified in the Local Plan Part 2, a greenbelt is tightly drawn around Radcliffe and it is impossible that the proposed development can be done without taking part of the Greenbelt. The Neighbourhood Plan recognises this and proposes the new houses be in the East and West. He points out that this site meets this policy. The National Policy Planning Framework is in favour of development, so unless reasons are provided not to build, there is a presumption that new houses will be built. As this site remains in the greenbelt special circumstances need to be satisfied, but has been identified by the RBC as a preferred site. There is a special meeting on Thursday 26th April, all are welcome to attend. If the RBC agree the proposed Part 2 Local Plan, it may take the rest of the year for the government to examine this. In the meantime this site will remain part of the greenbelt, until the review is formally adopted. In discussions with local residents some are for the development, some are against and some remain neutral. In Cllr Upton's view, Radcliffe needs this new provision, 30% (120) of the houses would be affordable homes, which is promoted by the Neighbourhood Plan and there is significant 106 contributions to the local community. One strength is that young people and families are needed for the village against an ageing population, however a weakness for the development is the siting of the new School and Health Centre, as it contradicts the Neighbourhood Plan which states they should be in the centre of the village. Increased traffic on Shelford Road is a big negative, and traffic is on the increase. In terms of the loss of the open countryside aspect, the site is classed as low value. Cllr Upton also reminded the meeting that the PC are consultees only and that the Planning Application is in its outline stages only.

Standing Orders resumed at 7.42pm

7. **Recent Rushcliffe Borough Council Decisions** as per the attached list
There were no recent Rushcliffe Borough Council Decisions.
8. **Planning Applications** as per the attached list
Resolved: "To change the order of business to enable the William Davis/Shelford Road Planning Application to be considered first. All applications received were reviewed and the decisions taken as outlined on the attached document."
9. **Subsequent Applications**
There were no Subsequent Applications
10. **Trains Working Group: Update**
The process of finding a new contractor to run the East Midlands Railway Network is ongoing and RBC has informed the PC that it is not appropriate for them to get involved at this sensitive stage of the tender process and therefore will not be arranging any more stakeholder meetings with the bidders. The Friends of the Railway Station have made excellent progress in tidying up the car park. The ivy from the fencing will be removed next time to enable painting.

11. **Planning Meetings – Latest Report and Future Representation (Meeting dates = 12/4, 17/5)**
It had been previously confirmed with the Chairman that Cllr Thompson would attend the meeting on the 12th April, and Cllr Agar confirmed that he could attend the RBC Planning meeting on the 17th May.
12. **Correspondence**
N.C.C. Cllr Kay Cutts – SNA Parking Issues
Cllr Cutts responded to the Clerk's email seeking the County Council's support for addressing the parking problems outside the school. *"Although there has been no traffic accidents reported on Cropwell Road for the last 3 years, I have requested N.C.C Officers to appraise the possibility of providing a pedestrian crossing. The Head teacher has also been advised that he can request N.C.C's camera car to attend and obtain a video of traffic activity. Other options such as parking restrictions will also be looked into".* Cllr Upton has also advised that a specialist group has been tasked to come up with a plan to improve road safety around local schools. Noted.
13. **R.B.C Cllr Roger Upton – PC/RBC Conflicting Decisions – Process for Information**
Cllr Upton had taken two examples of a difference of Planning Decision between the PC and RBC and had downloaded additional information from the RBC Website to support their reasons for the decision. These examples were discussed and Cllr Barton suggested that if reasons are required then Cllrs should extract this information for themselves and not expect the PC Office staff to do this for them. Cllr Clegg then confirmed that there will be Cllr training at the Arena, to cover this issue and will therefore report back to a future meeting on how this can be done.
14. **Resident Email re: Tesco and Litter**
Noted. Cllr Dunn suggested that Tesco staff be invited to join the Litter Pick on the 7th April, and for them to be aware of the litter problem outside the store.
15. **N.C.C. Main Road Street Trading (for information)**
Noted. Cllrs agreed NCC had provided a sensible response to the Radcliffe resident who had queried the legality of Market Stalls/ street traders that stand on Saturday morning in the village.
16. **Councillors' Reports**
 - Cllr Dunn confirmed there will be a litter pick on the 7th April, 10am – 12pm. All Cllrs are welcome to join in. The Chairman thanked Cllr Dunn for her hard work in arranging this.
 - Cllr Clegg confirmed there will be a Residents Association meeting tomorrow at 1pm.
17. **Date of Next Meeting: 23 April 2018**
Planning & Environment Meeting confirmed as Monday 23 April 2018. Cllr Agar cannot attend the next meeting and therefore sends his apologies in advance.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.52pm

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

PLANNING DECISIONS – 26 MARCH 2018

NCC/RBC REF	DATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION	DETAILS	Dec.	Vote.	OBSERVATIONS
18/00494/FUL	09.03.2018	Mr Leigh Birch	4 Yew Tree Close, R-O-T, NG12 2AZ	Single storey side extension with raised patio, new hipped roof to existing dormer, new infill garage, and replacement open porch	DNO	UNAN	
18/00580/TPO	12.03.2018	Mr Kevin Sharman	8A Nottingham Road, R-O-T NG12 2DW	Crown lift and crown reduction of beech (1) by up to 20%, crown reduction of sweet chestnut (2) by up to 30%, and reduce height of rowan (3) by approx 2m.	DNO	UNAN	Subject to the views of the RBC Tree Officer
18/00506/FUL	12.03.2018	Ms Alison Rhodes	11 Douglas Close, R-O-T NG12 2ED	Single storey rear extension	DNO	UNAN	
18/00575/FUL	15.03.2018	Sarah Mayfield & James McDonald	1 Manvers Grove, R-O-T NG12 2FT	Two storey and single storey side and front extensions and 2m high boundary fence (re-submission)	DNO	UNAN	
18/00550/FUL (New application)	20.03.2018	Mr C McHugh	48 Bailey Lane, R-O-T NG12 2DA	Single and two storey rear extension	DNO	FOR x 9 AGAINST x 1	
13/02329/OUT (Revised Plans)	20.03.2018	William Davis Limited	Land Off Shelford Road, (Shelford Road Farm) Shelford Road, R-O-T	Outline application for development of up to 400 dwellings, a primary school, health centre and associated infrastructure including highway and pedestrian access, open space and structural landscaping	OBJECT	UNAN	See below ***

***The Parish Council does not oppose the Planning Application in principle but does object to the application in its current form on the following grounds:-

- The location of siting 400 homes on one site:** Neighbourhood Plan 10.5 and justification 5.25 (5) states that 'residential development sites should be designed to deliver development on a number of sites so that the direct impacts of development are spread across the village', and goes on to state 5.25 (5) locating all 400 new houses on one site would be detrimental to local character and amenity (e.g. effects upon landscape and traffic).
- Volume of traffic on Shelford Road, Main Road and through the village:** The developers have stated that they do not consider a new road link from Shelford Road to the A52 to be a reasonable requirement (Doc A 4.1.1). There is the potential of an additional 800 cars per day at peak times from this development alone.
- Location of the Health Centre and School:** Neighbourhood Plan 4.5 states that a key consideration of the NP is to ensure that the 'walkability' of the village is maintained. The Health Centre will not be easily accessed by residents from the Harlequin and other outlying areas who do not have access to transport. The siting of the Health Centre and School on this development is also against Policy 1 which is aimed to encourage the Village Centre first.
- Lack of Provision of Affordable Housing and Bungalows for the Elderly & Housing Mix:** Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12 Housing Mix and Density. The developers have stated that the mix of dwellings has yet to be decided but will include 30% of the dwellings as affordable homes. They have also stated that there will not be this proportion during stage 1, so what guarantees do we have that they won't simply change their minds. (Doc A 4.1.20) Cannot find any reference to the building of bungalows within the developer's documents. The design and access statement makes frequent references to the predominance of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings with the occasional 2.5 storey.
- Only 1 Proposed Access Point Through the Site:** The development could take approx 8 years with construction traffic and residential traffic through the site, including access to the proposed Health Centre and the School. This would be unsafe and unworkable.
- No Mitigation for Neighbouring Occupiers:** The application shows no consideration to the residential properties that would now have to directly face the large roundabout and also offers no assurance of privacy (hedge/tree) screening being in place or that existing properties will not be overlooked by the new development.
- Services:** The Parish Council would require confirmation from the Utilities Companies that adequate provision would be made for the new development. In particular, assurance that the current sewage system could cope or that it would be upgraded.