

**Minutes of Meeting:** PLANNING COMMITTEE -  
**Date and Time:** Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> September 7.00pm  
**Venue:** Remote video link via zoom Link:

**Present :** Councillors Scorer (Chairman), M Brock, D Martin, K Roberts, M Jeffery and S Perry

In Attendance, L Wright (Planning Clerk), T Broughton (Town Clerk), 2 members of public

**1 Apologies for absence** - Cllr S Reynolds and L Harris – personal

**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. - None*

**3 Approval of Minutes of previous meetings:**

3.1 Planning Committee Minutes 5<sup>th</sup> August

**Agreed** **Proposed, Cllr Jeffrey, seconded Cllr Brock,**  
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

**5 Planning applications –**

click to the NSDC ref below and it will link to the relevant application

STC Ref	NSDC ref	Location	Details	STC decision	Observations
5.1	<a href="#">20/01190/OUTM</a>	Land Rear Of The Vineries Lower	Outline planning application for 45 dwellings	Objection Proposer Cllr Scorer Seconded Cllr Martin  I abstain	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. The committee re iterate their previous comments below with the addition of the following: -The changes to the roundabout do not resolve the fundamental principle that a mini roundabout is unnecessary and will causes issues with the site SS5 to the north - they support the comments and concerns of the Southwell Flood forum and local residents, with particular reference to the photos and comments submitted by Mrs J Huson Previous comments include: - some of the assumptions made in the flood risk analysis are erroneous. The flood study dated 2015 are considered fundamentally flawed. There is a very high flood risk on the southern boundary and therefore significant care is needed in the

					<p>design of the mitigation plans to deal with surface flood water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> </ul> <p>The whole aspect of the maintenance of streams and culverts is in this case crucial 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 -it should be mandated on the developers to create a system whereby maintenance of the flood paths is undertaken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p>There are concerns on environmental grounds due to habitat loss and Bat survey not completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Confirmation of the ownership and management of the land on which footpath 55 runs is required as it could be linked. Also could the footpath be re surfaced due to the higher expected pedestrian traffic</li> <li>- No consideration of cycle provision on or off site</li> <li>- the parking at units 13 &amp; 14 are in tandem, they could cause problems, they the committee asked that this is re-configured</li> </ul>
5.2	<a href="#">20/01211/FUL</a>	5-7 Westgate Southwell	Change of use from A2 (bank)	Objection Proposer Cllr Scorer Seconded Cllr Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01211/FUL 5-7 Westgate Southwell and agreed by majority to object to this application for the following reasons

			to A3 (desert bar)	5 for 1 against	-There is not a designated area for rubbish bin - the potential for increase illegal parking in an area which already has a high incidence of this - an observation for future consideration - a new sign would require Advertising Consent
5.3	<a href="#">20/01420/FUL</a>	Hockerwood Park Hockerwood Lane	Erection of an agricultural building to house livestock and ancillary equipment.	No objection Proposer Cllr Roberts Seconded Cllr Perry	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01420/FUL Hockerwood Park and agreed unanimously to no objection
5.4	<a href="#">20/01418/FUL</a>	Land Rear Of 49 The Ropewalk	Erection of 4 No. 2-storey dwellings (Scheme A)	Objection Proposer Cllr Jeffrey Seconded Cllr Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01418/FUL Land Rear Of 49 The Ropewalk and agreed by majority to object to this application. - it is in contravention of the neighbourhood plan E2 Flood Resilience Design, as there are no flood mitigation measures in the application. This is an area which is prone to flooding and the incorrect treatment of surface water drainage could negatively impact upon land and dwellings further downstream -over intensification of the site
5.5	<a href="#">20/01421/FUL</a>	Land Rear Of 49 The Ropewalk	Erection of 3 No. dwellings: 2 x 2-storey and 1 x single storey (Scheme B)	Objection Proposer Cllr Jeffrey Seconded Cllr Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01421/FUL Land Rear Of 49 The Ropewalk and agreed by majority to object to this application. - it is in contravention of the neighbourhood plan E2 Flood Resilience Design, as there are no flood mitigation measures in the application . This is an area which is prone to flooding and the incorrect treatment of surface water drainage could negatively impact upon land and dwellings further downstream
5.6	<a href="#">20/01422/FUL</a>	Land At Rear Of 49 & 49A The Ropewalk	Erection of 2(no.) 2.5-storey dwellings (Scheme C)	Objection Proposer Cllr Jeffrey Seconded Cllr Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application <a href="#">20/01422/FUL</a> Land Rear Of 49 The Ropewalk and agreed by majority to object to this application. - it is in contravention of the neighbourhood plan E2 Flood Resilience Design, as there are no flood mitigation measures in the application. This is an area which is prone to flooding and the incorrect treatment of surface water drainage could negatively impact upon land and dwellings further downstream - the height 2.5 storeys dwelling will cause loss of privacy to surrounding residents
5.7	<a href="#">20/01433/FUL</a>	Land At Rear Of 49 & 49A	Erection of 5(no.)	Objection Proposer	Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01433/FUL Land Rear Of 49

			single storey dwellings (Scheme D)	Cllr Jeffrey Seconded Cllr Martin	The Ropewalk and agreed by majority to object to this application. - it is in contravention of the neighbourhood plan E2 Flood Resilience Design, as there are no flood mitigation measures in the application. This is an area which is prone to flooding and the incorrect treatment of surface water drainage could negatively impact upon land and dwellings further downstream
5.8	APP/B3030/W/20/3255351 Previously circulated	Land At Rear 37 Easthorpe	Application to vary condition 02 to add extension to approved dwelling,	No comment	No comment as the council had no objection to the application

## 6 Agenda Item: Planning Decisions and Notifications

## STC Decision

### 6.1 Applications approved:

20/00900/LBC	Land Adjacent To The Old Rectory	No objection
20/00919/FUL	Land Adjacent To The Old Rectory	No objection
20/00907/RMA	The Orchards Golf Course	Object
20/01082/FUL	9 Church Street	No objection
20/01083/LBC	9 Church Street	no objection
20/01231/FUL	8 Halloughton Road	Object
20/00983/TPO	Cedar Lodge	
20/01235/TWCA	Hollydene, Burgage	
20/01311/TWCA	45 Westgate	
20/01319/TWCA	40-42 Westgate	

### 6.2 Applications refused:

20/01163/FUL	47 Lower Kirklington Road	Object
--------------	---------------------------	--------

## 7 Chairman's Notices - NSDC planning meeting on 08/09/20 to discuss application 20/00886/FUL

<b>Agreed</b>	<b>To suspend and subsequently re-instate standing orders for members of and public to speak</b>
	Proposed P Scorer Seconded D Martin
	<b>Unanimous</b>

**8 Highway Matters – outstanding highways issues list** – noted. Some issues were being addressed, but the Chair expressed concern on issues which are not being rectified, in particular blocked drains. A member of the public explained his understanding that the sampling taking place on the former A612, is to check its integrity and to establish the extent of resurfacing required. Church street has also been marked with all the underground pipes for further work to take place. Letter to be sent to enquire on the inclusion of Chatsworth Avenue in the resurfacing program and also the reason for the boring on the former A612

**9 Report on the progress of the submitted Traffic improvement plan.** The plans have been submitted to NSDC/Via. Clerk to write regarding the progress of the Zebra Crossing. An email has been sent to Nottinghamshire police regarding the deployment of a speed radar van in Southwell

**10 Review of the Street naming policy and addition of agreed names** –the policy circulated is based on the previous policy, with the addition that suggestions for road names be submitted at the planning application stage. Cllr Roberts requested that St Edburga be added to the list of street names. Cllr Perry has submitted an updated version which is to be reviewed by the Chair. A final policy is to be reviewed at the next meeting

**11 Review of the 'Planning for the Future Paper' and responses to date.** The Chair stated the district council are still reviewing the white paper and the 30 months' time scale for the compilation of a local plan was noticeably

short. Cllr Martin expressed concern on how development sites are to be allocated, with reference to flooding. It was decided to submit comments as a council as there is a general concern regarding the fundamental principles of the policy. Comments are to be submitted by 10<sup>th</sup> October, therefore The Chair is to compile a list of comments to be reviewed and added to by members of the committee prior to submission to the next Full Council meeting for approval.

**12 Date of next meeting: Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2020 19.00**

**13 Items for discussion at next meeting** – Review of progress of Traffic improvement plan, Street naming Policy

**Meeting Closed**

**Signed .....** **Dated .....**

**Chairman Planning Committee**