

	that drainage strategy be implemented on third party land (with relevant land owners joining in) prior to any other development being carried out on the site
Monitoring contributions for all contributions will also be sought along with appropriate standard triggers for all	As per SPD

In accordance with paragraph 12.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Vote</b>
R. Blaney	For
L. Brazier	Apology for absence
M. Brock	For
R. Crowe	Took no part in the vote
Mrs L. Dales	For
Mrs M. Dobson	Apology for absence
L. Goff	For
Mrs R. Holloway	Abstention
Mrs P. Rainbow	For
Mrs S. Saddington	For
M. Skinner	For
T. Smith	Apology for absence
I. Walker	For
K. Walker	For
Mrs Y. Woodhead	For

267 FIELD REFERENCE NUMBER 7108 EAKRING ROAD BILSTHORPE - 20/00873/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought planning permission for a residential development of 103 dwellings and associated access and infrastructure.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager - Planning Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

A schedule of communication was tabled at the meeting which detailed correspondence received after the Agenda was published from the Dlp Planning on behalf of the applicant.

Members considered the application and the number of large developments which were being considered within Bilsthorpe were commented upon. Three large applications were being submitted, this one in the North, one in the south and one in the west, which had a combined increase in housing of 28% within the village. Two of the developments would be constructed at the same time which would cause problems for residents with increase traffic levels and the loss of open green space. Bilsthorpe had currently a significant amount of traffic travelling through the village to

access the recycling centre. The village was also used as a rat run at busy times. Bilsthorpe Parish Council had also requested a level crossing be included within the plans, however that had not been addressed. On the positive side a significant amount of money had been secured through the Section 106 legal agreement, which was reported to have a significant impact for the village hall improvements project and the play parks. It was further commented that although the land had been included as allocated land, the indication was for seventy-five dwellings, consent had been for eighty-five, however the developer had come back with a proposal for one hundred and three dwellings. It was suggested that planning permission could be refused on the grounds that the proposal does not manage the transition in the built up area of Bilsthorpe as required within the Council's Allocation document.

A vote was taken and lost to approve planning permission, with 4 votes For and 8 votes Against.

AGREED (with 9 votes For and 3 votes Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation, full planning permission be refused on the grounds that the number of units as proposed does not manage the transition in the built up area of Bilsthorpe as required in the Council's Allocation document and the issues of tandem parking, number of units, housing mix/design forms the reasons for refusal.

In accordance with paragraph 12.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Vote</b>
R. Blaney	For
L. Brazier	Apology for absence
M. Brock	For
R. Crowe	Against
Mrs L. Dales	For
Mrs M. Dobson	Apology for absence
L. Goff	For
Mrs R. Holloway	For
Mrs P. Rainbow	Against
Mrs S. Saddington	For
M. Skinner	For
T. Smith	Apology for absence
I. Walker	For
K. Walker	Against
Mrs Y. Woodhead	For

268 LAND OFF MAIN STREET BALDERTON - 20/01405/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought material change of use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation with associated development (new access, hard standing, utility block). The application was part retrospective.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which