

Draft Minutes of Meeting: PLANNING COMMITTEE -
Date and Time: Wednesday 5th August 7.00pm
Venue: Remote video link via zoom Link:

Present Councillors Scorer (Chairman), M Brock , D Martin, K Roberts, S Reynolds, L Harris, M Jeffery, S Perry and P Harris

In Attendance, L Wright (Planning Clerk), T Broughton (Town Clerk), 10 members of public

1 Apologies for absence – None

2 To receive any declarations of interest

Members are hereby reminded that, under the provisions of sections 26-34 and Schedule 4 of the Localism Act 2011, a member with a Disclosable pecuniary interest of which they are aware in a matter who attends a meeting of the council at which the matter is considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

Cllr L Harris, P Scorer & M Brock - 5.12, 5.13, known to applicant

All Cllrs excluding Cllr Perry and Roberts - 5.5 known to applicant

3 Approval of Minutes of previous meetings:

3.1 Planning Committee Minutes 1st July

Agreed Proposed, Cllr Roberts, seconded Cllr Reynolds,
Unanimous of those present at previous meeting

3.2 Matters arising – none

4 Break for questions and planning responses from Members of the Public – none

Cllr Scorer noted all the correspondence from members of the public had been circulated to Councillors before the meeting and asked only for new comments to be submitted at the meeting

5 Planning applications –

STC Ref	NSDC ref	Location	Details	STC decision	Observations
5.1	20/01190/OUTM	Land Rear Of The Vineries Lower Kirklington Road	Outline planning application for 45 dwellings	Objection Proposer Cllr Scorer Seconded Cllr Martin No Vote Cllr Brock	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01190/OUTM Land Rear Of The Vineries Lower Kirklington Road and agreed by majority to object to this application for the following reasons: - some of the assumptions made in the flood risk analysis are erroneous. The flood study dated 2015 is considered fundamentally flawed. There is a very high flood risk on the southern boundary and therefore significant care is needed in the design of the mitigation plans to deal with surface flood water. - The plan to use the culvert behind the dwellings on Springfield Rd is also flawed in that whilst it may have the size to cope with water anecdotal evidence indicates that its not in good condition and is partially blocked in some areas – this needs checking and clearing, which the developers have agreed to do The whole aspect of the maintenance of streams and culverts is in this case crucial

					<p>because the most critical area mentioned above is outside of this application area and is therefore not the responsibility of the developer but because they may be putting additional water into the culvert during a serious flood situation they have an underlying responsibility but the prime responsibility lies elsewhere. This is an aspect which needs further investigation</p> <p>-it should be mandated on the developers to create a system whereby maintenance of the flood paths is undertaken</p> <p>- mini roundabout is a concern, as if constructed it would be an issue for the site to the north SS5 for which a four-arm mini-roundabout was rejected by County Highways. The committee suggest a plain crossroad with traffic calming like this example from Witney in Oxfordshire</p> <p>- The conditions listed in the letter from Ross Marshall of NCC to Matt Lamb dated 28/07/20 should form part of the conditions of any planning approval given. Its important that the attenuation ponds are correctly sized using realistic run-off rates for the whole site. There are concerns on environmental grounds due to habitat loss and Bat survey not completed.</p> <p>-Confirmation of the ownership and management of the land on which footpath 55 runs is required as it could be relevant to maintenance issues. Also could the footpath be re surfaced due to the higher expected pedestrian traffic</p> <p>- No consideration of cycle provision on or off site</p> <p>- the parking at units 13 & 14 are in tandem, they could cause problems, the committee asked that this is re-configured</p>
5.2	20/01242/FULM	Land North Of Halloughton	Construction of a solar farm and battery stations together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.	<p>Object Proposed D Martin Seconded M Jeffrey</p> <p>No Vote Cllr Brock</p>	<p>Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01242/FULM Land North Of Halloughton and agreed by majority to object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>-Overall size, The proposed site is too large at 260 acres. They prefer to see a much smaller site</p> <p>- Loss of over 100 hectares of Grade 3 (according to the DEFRA maps and local evidence) agricultural land in a rolling landscape, (Govt policy to prefer flat landscapes for Solar Farms)</p> <p>- Lack of an adequate archaeological report, a full report is required as this area is of archaeological interest</p> <p>- Intrusive nature of the fencing and CCTV cameras, there are 138 three metre high CCTV poles around the fencing, could this height be reduced and could it be confirmed that these</p>

					<p>are infra red cameras to reduce any risk of light pollution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There will be a loss of amenity to well used public footpaths around and through the site also the loss of views and 'hedging-in' of footpaths - Loss of amenity to the people of Halloughton from both the panels and the siting of the access road within the conservation area. Many of the shielding features of Woodland and hedges are on other people's land and the removal of any of these would have a dramatic visual impact on the area and is out of the developer's control - Inadequate flood mitigation measures especially in the Halloughton catchment. Also there seems to be no account taken of the probable silting of the attenuation ponds. - Height of the panel arrays - It goes against Southwell Neighbourhood Plan in E4, E5 and in particular policy E6 which states: it should not 'impact negatively on the local landscape character' There will be loss of amenity to well used public footpaths around and through the site. The area around Westhorpe Dumble will be significantly impacted and there will be significant loss of established wildlife corridors
5.3	20/01216/S73	Land To The Rear Of 51 The Ropewalk	Application to vary conditions 2, 5, and 6 attached to planning permission 19/01693/FUL Construction of a four bedroomed dwelling (resubmission of 19/01003/FUL)	Object Proposed D Martin Seconded M Jeffrey	<p>Southwell Town Council considered application 20/0216 /S73 Land To The Rear Of 51 The Ropewalk and agreed by majority to object to this application for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Vision splays are drawn 1m out into the road contrary to p83 in the DfT Manual for Streets which shows them drawn to the kerbline. To achieve this would involve the removal of an unacceptable amount of hedge due to this unfortunately permitted back land development which is in contravention of NSDC planning policies. - There are still no flood mitigation measures shown and this area is known to be at risk - Concern was expressed by Councillors that the tree in the neighbouring curtilage, which was the reason for the recent refusal of the change to the site layout, has now been removed. This is not the first time this has happened in Southwell. Can something please be done to prevent this loss of trees happening in the future? Would it be possible to insist on its replacement ?
5.4	20/01163/FUL	47 Lower Kirklington Road	Proposed Bungalow (resubmission)	Object Proposed DM Seconded MJ	<p>Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01163/FUL 47 Lower Kirklington Road and agreed by majority to object to this application for the following reasons:</p>

					-in the Flood risk section on the application there is a statement that the development is in flood zone 1 ie low risk , this is on a medium risk flood path and there are no flood mitigation comments on how to the application will deal with the excess water
5.5	20/01163/FUL	Little Corkhill Farm Corkhill Lane Kirklington	Conversion of traditional barn to 3no. holiday lets	Support Proposed DM Seconded MJ	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01179/FUL Little Corkhill Farm Corkhill Lane Kirklington and agreed unanimously to support this application
5.6	20/01296/FUL	24 Woodland View	Householder application for single storey	No objection Proposed PS Seconded SR Unanimous	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01296/FUL 24 Woodland View and agreed unanimously to no objection to this application
5.7	20/01231/FUL	8 Halloughton Road	Change of Use of Garden Gazebo to Hairdressing Salon	Object Proposed P Scorer Seconded M Jeffery 1 abstain 1support	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01231/FUL 8 Halloughton Road and agreed by majority to object to this application for the following reasons: -Over intensive use of the site -Highway safety, as there is no footway to the site, insufficient parking and access onto a busy road - concern over the lack of previous planning permission (15/01507) for the driveway which appears not to conform to Highways standards with no drainage channel to prevent excess runoff onto the highway
5.8	20/01067/FUL	4 Arnold Avenue	Householder application for proposed single storey extension	No objection Proposed P Scorer Seconded D Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01067/FUL 4 Arnold Avenue and agreed unanimously to no objection with the following proviso: -treatment of surface water mitigation measures are taken into consideration
5.9	20/01212/FUL	Land On South-East Side Of Hockerton Road	Formation of access to be used for maintenance of the site and erection of gate and fencing	Object Proposer P Scorer Seconder Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01212/FUL Land On South-East Side Of Hockerton Road and agreed unanimously to object to this application for the following reasons: -Road safety, as mentioned in letter from many locals, as cars exit site into speeding traffic -Noted Officer's comments about lack of consideration for drivers turning into the site -Concern over water disposal -Concern over suitability of style of gates (see Conservation Officer's comments) - Large loss of wood/hedge row.
5.10	20/01138/LBC	Maythorne Farm Maythorne	Proposed ground floor front extension.	No objection Proposed D Martin Seconder M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01138/LBC Maythorne Farm and agreed unanimously to no objection

5.11	20/01137/FUL	Maythorne Farm Maythorne	Proposed ground floor front extension.	No objection Proposed D Martin Seconder M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01137/FUL Maythorne Farm and agreed unanimously to no objection
5.12	20/01083/LBC	9 Church Street	Change of Use from A2 to C3(a), proposed alterations to listed building	No objection Proposed D Martin Seconded S Perry 1 abstain 1 against	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01083/LBC 9 Church Street and agreed unanimously to no objection with the following proviso: The position of the sunken terrace may risk flooding in that area The car parking and turning area is too limited There is no bin collection point if ground levels are disturbed then an archaeological survey should be carried out
5.13	20/01082/FUL	9 Church Street	Change of Use from A2 to C3(a), proposed alterations to listed building	No objection Proposed D Martin Seconded S Perry 1 abstain 1 against	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01082/FUL 9 Church Street and agreed unanimously to no objection with the following proviso: The position of the sunken terrace may risk flooding in that area The car parking and turning area is too limited There is no bin collection point if ground levels are disturbed then an archaeological survey should be carried out

6 Agenda Item: Planning Decisions and Notifications

STC Decision

6.1 Applications approved:

20/00862/S73 Land To The Rear Of Home Farm Bungalow Corkhill Lane Normanton
20/00856/S73 Rutland Burgage Lane
20/00742/FUL The Old Rectory Church Street
19/02263/FULM U C D Crew Lane
20/00984/TWCA Cedar Lodge Burgage Lane

No objection
No objection
No objection
No objection

6.2 Applications refused:

20/00809/FUL Land Off Lowes Wong
20/00748/S73 Land To The Rear Of 51 The Ropewalk
Objection

No objection

6.3 Appeals Dismissed

Appeal A - Ref: APP/B3030/W/19/3234051 Land off Lower Kirklington Road
Appeal B - Ref: APP/B3030/W/20/3244627 Land off Lower Kirklington Road

7 Chairman's Notices – the two suggestions for Street naming were declined and The Rise and Private Drive were adopted. The law stated the developer should choose the road names, but with the new planning control being changed, the emphasis should be on the Local and Parish council to decide.

8 Planning enforcement Policy – Cllr Scorer expressed concern that the enforcement policy is discretionary. NSDC has recruited recently a new enforcement officer. The committee have no comments to submit

9 Highway Matters – it was noted that many of the issues have been outstanding for a considerable time

10 Lower Kirklington Road – Installation of Zebra Crossing Consultation – comments required by 26th August 20

A request that the proposed resurfacing and the installation of the crossing are carried out together
Proposal to support the Installation of the Zebra Crossing

Agreed **Proposed Cllr Scorer Seconded Cllr Perry**
Unanimous

To suspend standing order for members of the public to speak

Proposed Cllr Scorer Seconded Cllr Martin

Unanimous

- 11 Final submission for Traffic improvement to NCC/Via for 21/22** — Item 1 could also be part of the Sunak/ Shapps money for cycling and footpath improvements, as it meets most of the criteria. Bushes at Newark Road junction mask traffic from Easthorpe and need to be cut back
There is concern from a resident that the Kirklington Road work has been put aside by the council. It was suggested that the planning committee agree on a 2 - 3 year rolling plan for traffic improvements. The proposals should be talked through personally with a member of NCC/Via once they have been submitted. A vote of thanks was expressed to the two residents for all their work on the paper. Cllr Scorer to make word adjustments before submission.

Proposal to adopt the submitted paper, with any revisions, and to submit it to County Highways, Via and our County Councillor

Agreed Proposed Cllr Jeffery Seconded Cllr Perry

Unanimous

- 12 Date of next meeting: Wednesday 2nd September 2020 19.00**

- 13 Items for discussion at next meeting - Street Naming Policy, New Planning Policy-** precis of changes to be prepared before next meeting, also ask the NSDC planning to present how they are to interpret the new policy

Meeting Closed at 20:52

Signed.....Date.....

Chairman, Planning Committee