

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Thursday, 16th February, 2017**

Present:- Councillor Atkin (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Bird, D. Cutts, M. S. Elliott, Jarvis, Khan, Price, Sansome, R.A.J. Turner, Tweed, Walsh and Whysall.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ireland.

**59. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no reported Declarations of Interest.

**60. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH JANUARY, 2017**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Regulatory Board held on Thursday, 26th January, 2017, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**61. DEFERMENTS/SITE VISITS**

There were no site visits nor deferments recommended.

**62. VISIT OF INSPECTION - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO LEISURE RESORT INCLUDING THEMED ACCOMMODATION AND GLAMPING FACILITIES; FORMATION OF ACCESS, CIRCULATION ROADS, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING; AND ERECTION OF 2 THEMED HOTELS, 12 LODGES, SERVICES BUILDINGS, COMMUNITY BUILDING, ECOLOGY CENTRE, CAMP RECEPTION BUILDING, ENTRANCE FEATURE, RESORT CHECK IN BUILDING, SECURITY HUT AND BOUNDARY FENCING AT LAND OFF MANSFIELD ROAD, WALES (RB2016/1454)**

Before the formal meeting of the Planning Board, Members of the Board made a visit of inspection to the following site, the subject of two applications, with Ward Representative Councillor Taylor in attendance.

**(a) Change of use of land to leisure resort including themed accommodation and glamping facilities; formation of access, circulation roads, car parking and landscaping; and erection of 2 themed hotels, 12 lodges, services buildings, community building, ecology centre, camp reception building, entrance feature, resort check in building, security hut and boundary fencing at land off Mansfield Road, Wales (RB2016/1454)**

In accordance with the right to speak procedure, the following people attended the meeting and spoke about these applications:-

Ms. J. Dalton (Applicant)

Mr. J. Lund (Supporter)

Mr. C. Savage (Objector) was unable to be in attendance, but his submission was read out on his behalf.

Resolved:- (1) That the application be referred to the Secretary of State (National Planning Casework Unit) under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(Direction) 2009, being inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

(2) That the applicant completes a Unilateral Undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the purposes of securing the the linking of the two related planning applications (RB2016/1454 and RB2016/1455) by way of an agreed phasing plan.

(3) That subject to the National Planning Casework Unit not calling in the application for determination, and to the satisfactory signing of the Unilateral Undertaking, planning permission be granted for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report.

**(b) Proposed theme park comprising of themed leisure facilities; indoor leisure attractions; a 40m observation tower; a pet resort; themed hotel, two main entrance buildings, facility building supporting restaurants/food outlets; ancillary retail facilities;; boundary fencing, new access; car parking and landscaping at land off Mansfield Road, Wales (RB2016/1455)**

Resolved:- (1) That the application be referred to the Secretary of State (National Planning Casework Unit) under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(Direction) 2009, being inappropriate development in the Green Belt and exceeding 5000sqm floorspace limit for retail, leisure or office use in an out of centre location.

(2) That the applicant completes a Unilateral Undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the purposes of securing the the linking of the two related planning applications (RB2016/1454 and RB2016/1455) by way of an agreed phasing plan.

(3) That subject to the National Planning Casework Unit not calling in the application for determination, and to the satisfactory signing of the Unilateral Undertaking, planning permission be granted for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and subject to an amendment to Condition No. 34 from:-

“Prior to the development being brought into use a detailed landscape scheme (excluding those areas within the fenced off theme park) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”

To:-

Prior to the development being brought into use a detailed landscape scheme (excluding those areas within the fenced off theme park, shown outlined in black on drawing number GV-TPASA-003 ) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Following a request from a member of the public the Planning Board agreed that the vote for the applications be recorded as follows:-

Councillors Atkin, Andrews, Bird, Cutts, Elliott, Jarvis, Khan, Price, Sansome, John Turner, Tweed, Walsh and Whysall all in favour of the applications (unanimous decision).

**63. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

Resolved:- (1) That, on the development proposals now considered the requisite notices be issued and be made available on the Council's website and that the time limits specified in Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 apply.

In accordance with the right to speak procedure, the following people attended the meeting and spoke about the application listed below:-

- Retrospective application for use of land as storage and distribution depot for containerised goods at land off Grange Lane Brinsworth for Newell and Wright Transport Ltd. (RB2016/1099)

Mr. C. Jarvis (on behalf of the applicant)

Mr. B. Muffett (Objector)

Mrs. Berry (Objector)

Mr. J. Adams (Objector)

- Erection of 5 No. buildings to form 13 units for use within classes B1(c) (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution), with associated car parking at Magna 34 Sheffield Road Templeborough for Jaguar Estates (RB2016/1178)

Mr. P. Herbert (Applicant)

(2) That application RB2016/1099 be granted for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the relevant conditions listed in the submitted report.

(3) That application RB2016/1178 be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

(4) That, with regard to application RB2016/1419:-

(a) The Council shall enter into a Legal Agreement with the developer

under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the purposes of securing the following:-

- 25% Affordable Housing Provision
- Financial contribution towards the provision of primary school places in Wath based on the formula of £2,342 per dwelling, £1,171 per apartment (50% reduction) and no contribution on the affordable units. 50% of the money payable upon 50% occupation with the remaining 50% payable upon 80% occupation.
- Financial contribution of £500 per residential unit towards the provision of sustainable transport measures.
- Annual payment to The Manvers Lake Trust of £4,077 towards the ongoing management and maintenance of Manvers Lake based on a formula of £0.27 per sq. metre (1.51 hectares).
- Establishment of a management company to manage and maintain the on-site landscape and open spaces.

(b) That, subject to the signing of the Section 106 Legal Agreement, outline planning permission be granted for the proposed development subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report.

**64. UPDATES**

The following update was provided:-

Outcome of the Public Inquiry for the development on land at Blue Man's Way, Catcliffe (RB2014/1342) – Appeal Upheld, where the Inspector concluded:-

“Having regard to all of the above considerations I find that the appeal proposal would cause no harm to the Council's approved spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. I find that the proposal would secure a significant enhancement in the value of the 'retained land' as urban green space and would make a positive overall contribution to the green infrastructure corridor along the A630 route. I also find that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the protected trees within the site. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal complies with Core Strategy Policies CS 1 and CS 19 and with saved UDP Policy ENV5.1.

Although I have considered the arguments put forward by the appellant I do not consider that any of these policies is so inconsistent with the policies in the Framework such that they should be given less than full weight having regard to the advice at paragraph 19. As I have found no conflict with any other relevant policies I conclude that the proposal complies with the development plan as a whole”.