

Minutes of Meeting: PLANNING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE -
Date and Time: Wednesday 6 July 2022 19.00
Venue: The Old Courthouse Burgage Southwell NG25 0EP

Present: Councillors D Martin,(Chairman), M Jeffrey, M Brock, S Reynolds

In Attendance: L Wright (Town Clerk),4 members of public

Questions and planning responses from Members of the Public –

A resident expressed concern over the condition of the following footpaths, Westgate to WMRG and Wands Close – Chair and Clerk to investigate

PH22/07/13 Apologies for absence – Cllr P Scorer, L Harris, K Roberts

PH22/07/14 To receive any declarations of interest

Members are hereby reminded of sections 26-34 and Schedule 4 of the Localism Act 2001,

Cllr M Brock – 16.1,16.2,16.7,16.20,16.21 – Non pecuniary

Cllr D Martin – 16.14, 16.19, 16.20,16.21– Non pecuniary

Cllr S Reynolds – 16.6 – Non pecuniary

PH22/07/15 Approval of Minutes of previous meetings:

15.1 To approve Planning Committee Minutes 1 June 2022 to include the recording of Cllr S Reynolds apologies for the meeting

Proposed D Martin Seconded M Jeffrey

Approved Unanimously

15.2 Matters arising – Brackenhurst signs and Halloughton Road to be discussed at the Via meeting

PH22/07/16 Planning applications –

STC Ref	NSDC ref	Location	Details	Decision	Observations
16.1	22/01106/FULM	Land At High Gables Lower Kirklington Road	Erection of 64 residential dwellings with associated access and infrastructure including the demolition of the High Gables	Object Proposed M Jeffrey Seconded S Reynolds	See attached comments
16.2	22/01089/FUL	Pear Tree Cottage Lower Kirklington Road	New dwelling and garage, relocation of garage to existing house and alterations to access and drive.	No Objection Proposed S Reynolds Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01089/FUL Pear Tree Cottage Lower Kirklington Road and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.3	22/00904/HOUSE	5 Caudwell Close Southwell	Single Storey Rear Extension	No Objection Proposed S Reynolds Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/00904/HOUSE 5 Caudwell Close and agreed unanimously to

					no objection with the appropriate SUDS
16.4	22/01056/HOUSE	5 Lowes Wong, Southwell	Removal of existing conservatory and proposed rear ground floor extension.		Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01056/HOUSE 5 Lowes Wong, Southwell Road and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.5	22/00912/HOUSE	31-33 Easthorpe, Southwell	Erection of a boundary wall	Objection Proposed S Reynolds Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/00912/HOUSE 31-33 Easthorpe, Southwell Road and agreed unanimously to object to this application, due to the loss of a hedgerow without any reasons for its replacement
16.6	22/00634/LBC	31-33 Easthorpe, Southwell	Erection of a new boundary wall	Objection Proposed S Reynolds Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/00634/LBC 31-33 Easthorpe, Southwell Road and agreed unanimously to object to this application, due to the loss of a hedgerow without any reasons or explanation for its replacement
16.7	22/00415/FUL	The Old Vicarage Boutique Hotel, Southwell	Siting of 4 glamping pods and 1 storage shed	Objection Proposed M Jeffrey Seconded D Martin	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/00415/FUL The Old Vicarage Boutique Hotel, Southwell Road and agreed unanimously to object to this application, due the inappropriate design in a conservation area and the location of the glamping pods in an urban area
16.8	22/01011/DISCON	Worldwide Travel Centre, 1 King Street, Southwell	Request for Confirmation to discharge conditions 3, 5, 8, 9 attached to 22/004396/LBC; and internal works	No comment	
16.9	22/01024/FUL	Land adjacent to Crink Lane, Southwell	New build Skills Centre to create new specialist laboratory and Enterprise Hub with supporting rooms.	No Objection Proposed S Reynolds Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01024/FUL Land adjacent to Crink Lane, Southwell and agreed unanimously to

					no objection and concur with the planning officer comments
16.10	22/01008/HOUSE	Middle Corkhill Farm, Corkhill Lane, Kirklington	1 st floor eaves raised with new roof structure and internal alterations.	No Objection Proposed S Reynolds Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01008/HOUSE Middle Corkhill Farm, Corkhill Lane, Kirklington and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.11	22/01023/FUL	90 Kirklington Road, Southwell	Proposed single storey extensions to replace existing outbuildings to form annexe.	No Objection Proposed M Jeffrey Seconded M Brock	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01023/FUL 90 Kirklington Road and agreed by majority to no objection but expressed concern over the reduction of the parking area with no alternative location
16.12	22/01025/DISCON	3 Park Terrace, Nottingham Road, Southwell	Request for confirmation of discharge of conditions 3 & 4 attached to planning permission 22/00441/HOUSE;	No comment	
16.13	22/00981/LDC	2 The Riddings, Southwell	Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed single storey extension.	No comment	
16.14	22/01216/LBC	15 Westgate, Southwell	Upgrade glazing in 5 windows to rear of property.	No Objection Proposed M Jeffrey Seconded S Reynolds	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01216/LBC 15 Westgate and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.15	22/01231/DISCON	Land Rear of 49 The Ropewalk, Southwell	Application to discharge conditions 3, 6, 8 & 12 of planning permission 20/01421/FUL-	No comment	
16.16	22/01197/HOUSE	The Barn, Halam Road, Southwell	Single storey side extension	No Objection Proposed M Jeffrey Seconded M Brock	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01197/HOUSE The Barn, Halam Road, and agreed unanimously to no objection subject to suitable flood measures being put in place
16.17	22/01170/CPRIOR	The Nottingham Trent University, Hickling Lane, Southwell	Repairs & refurbishments of existing 1960s workshop block. Minor alterations, Asbestos roof	No Objection Proposed M Jeffrey Seconded S Reynolds	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01170/CPRIOR The Nottingham Trent University, Hickling Lane

			replaced with grey-green metal (schedule 2, Part 7, Class M)		and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.18	22/01139/LDC	Brackenhurst Campus, NTU, Hickling Lane, Southwell	Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed ancillary use of the Lyth building for hosting weddings (resubmission)	No comment	
16.19	22/01133/FUL	Woodland Cottage Westhorpe Southwell	Replacement dwelling and associated landscaping	No Objection S Reynolds Proposed Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01133/FUL Woodland Cottage Westhorpe and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.20	22/01082/HOUSE	Hardwick House, Queen Street, Southwell	Proposed detached garage and outdoor swimming pool.	No Objection S Reynolds Proposed Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01082/HOUSE Hardwick House, Queen Street, and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.21	22/01083/LBC	Hardwick House, Queen Street, Southwell	Proposed detached garage and outdoor swimming pool.	No Objection S Reynolds Proposed Seconded M Jeffrey	Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01083/LBC Hardwick House, Queen Street and agreed unanimously to no objection
16.22	22/01070/FUL	Orchard Cottage, 41 The Holme, Southwell	Demolish existing store and replace with garden room and store.		Southwell Town Council considered application 22/01070/FUL Orchard Cottage, 41 The Holme and agreed unanimously to no objection

PH22/07/17 Agenda Item: Planning Decisions and Notifications – noted

17.1 Applications Approved

22/01072/NMA – 7 Woodland Drive, Southwell

22/00922/HOUSE – Spinney Hill, Ash Tree Close, Southwell

22/00885/HOUSE – Pear Tree Cottage, Lower Kirklington Rd

22/00867/HOUSE – 48 Springfield Rd, Southwell

22/00697/S73M – Southwell City Football Club, Brinkley

22/00366/HOUSE – 4 Wakeling Close, Southwell

22/00816/HOUSE – 24 Norwood Gardens, Southwell

22/00734/HOUSE – 9 Hillside Drive, Southwell

22/00738/FUL – The Minster Centre, Church Street, Southwell

22/00643/HOUSE – 53 Fiskerton Road, Southwell

22/00625/HOUSE – 212 Norwood Gardens, Southwell

22/00599/HOUSE – 140A Westgate, Southwell

22/00548/LDC – 16A Queen Street, Southwell

22/00521/LBC – 1 Westgate Southwell

STC Decision

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

OBJECTED

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

NO OBJECTION

OBJECTED

OBJECTED

22/00510/HOUSE – Peasbloom, Crew Lane, Southwell	NO OBJECTION
22/00479/LBC – 15 Westgate, Southwell	NO OBJECTION
22/00444/HOUSE – Factory House, Burgage, Southwell	NO OBJECTION
22/00439/LBC- 16A Queen Street, Southwell	NO OBJECTION
22/00235/FUL – 20 King Street, Southwell	NO OBJECTION

NB- pre-planning advice

22/00815/NMA – 23 Woodland View, Southwell – not required
 22/00797/AGR – Maythorne Farm, Maythorne – not required

17.2 Applications Refused

STC Decision

17.3 Tree Works Applications - Noted

STC Ref	NSDC ref	Location	Details
17.3.1	22/01217 /TWCA	War Memorial Recreation Ground	removal of 1no dead Corsican Pine (no. 156 on plan)
17.3.2	22/01218 /TWCA	War Memorial Recreation Ground	1no Lime tree (no 163 on plan) pollard to point 1m above main union
17.3.2	22/01172 /TWCA	The Minster Centre, Minster Office, Church Street, Southwell	T1 Yew- Lateral reduction to give 1.5m clearance of property T2 Plum – 2m reduction all round and 20% thinning of upper canopy T3 – Acer spp – Remove 1no stem t source T4- Malus- remove to ground level T5- Eucalyptus – thin canopy by 20%
17.3.3	22/01161 /TWCA	21 Station Road, Southwell	Remove 1no silver birch
17.3.4	22/01144 /TWCA	106B Westgate, Southwell	Fell 3no Ash Trees
17.3.5	22/01121 /TWCA	Seven Limes, Bishops Drive, Southwell	Reduce laterally and in height by a maximum of 2m to create a more uniform tree

17.4 Tree Works Approved – noted

22/01001/TWCA Grass Verge to South of Westhorpe
 22/00729/TWCA Burgage Paddock, Burgage Lane, Southwell

- PH22/07/18** Chairman’s Notices – A Costa Coffee cup has been installed near the entrance to Leisure Centre on Nottingham Rd, the Clerk to write to NSDC and NCC expressing the council concerns over its siting
- PH22/07/19** NSDC Scheme of Delegation – for information - noted
- PH22/07/20** Feedback from the Via/STC meeting – Clerk to chase Via on a meeting date
- PH22/07/21** Update of the Neighbourhood Plan – A meeting has been arranged to discuss design codes next week
- PH22/07/22** Discussion on the Fast Bus to Southwell - deferred to next meeting
- PH22/07/23** Highway’s update – noted
- PH22/07/24** Date of next meeting: 3 August 2022
- PH22/07/25** Items for discussion at next meeting –
Fast bus to Southwell
Pavement Parking

Meeting Closed 20.30

Signed

Date

Agenda item 16.1

Comments on Application 20/01106/FULM

Southwell Town Council considered application 20/01106/FULM Land at High Gables Lower Kirklington Road and agreed unanimously to object to this application for the following reasons:

The layout is a very regimented and geometric with ranks of detached houses almost touching. We would hope to see more variety in the roofline, more curves in the roads and a more “free form” feel.

The row on the western boundary does not “address the site’s gateway location” nor “manage the transition into the built-up area” as required by the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) policy SS5 ii. It is important to note that a recent appeal the inspector made the comment that gateways into a historic town like Southwell should be carefully protected and managed

There isn’t a sufficiently wide strip to maintain the landscape screening on the western boundary, nor the north end of the eastern boundary. NP policy E3 – The Design Guide requests 8m. minimum.

It doesn’t retain the “important landscape feature” of the hedge in the centre of the site.

The affordable housing is not scattered in accordance with NSDC Affordable Housing SPD paragraphs 3.14-3.16.

Although there is a central open space and play area it feels more like a bit of spare land rather than a specially created to give a “sense of place”. There is no area for residents to congregate apart from the play area.

The District Council criticised tandem parking in the previous developer’s application and in this layout, we have triple banked parking if we include the garage. This is likely to lead to on-street parking which the Town Council hopes to avoid as much as possible, although the appeal inspector played down this issue.

On the eastern boundary there is no account taken for the fact that the houses are overlooking the existing buildings in Orchard Close, - they are far too close and overlook some gardens and windows, this comment also applies to Pear Tree Cottage on the Western side

Access

The committee has reservations about the location of the new access. Traffic speeds into town along this road are very high, with local residents constantly complaining about it. It is especially dangerous coming out of Orchard Close with the blind brow of the hill to the east. When the access was opposite Kirklington Road the Town Council argued that all it needed was a simple crossroads, so long as traffic calming measures were in place to genuinely slow down approaching traffic. Double chicanes with priority signs appear to work well approaching towns like Witney. The junction would be no busier than the crossroads at the Burgage/Station Road junction.

This new location would leave three accesses (SS5, SS4 and Orchard Close) in close proximity with Kirklington road and this will create a complex situation, it might be more difficult to insert an effective chicane or similar on either side of the junctions. This is a very important aspect which could create an unsafe situation so great care is needed.

Built form.

There is a comment that the town centre is Georgian (with the implication that it is the only such area) however there are many other historic houses of varying ages outside of the town centre and in many distributed locations. The house types in the application are completely alien to the historical vernacular of the area and are

more akin to a city suburb. It is noticeable that most of the examples given of “Southwell Vernacular” are of late 20th or 21st century houses with a concentration of photos of The Ropewalk.

The house styles are certainly inappropriate for a gateway site such as this which should represent the historical vernacular much more strongly. Apart from some unfortunate 1960s/70s estates, Southwell is mostly red brick without bargeboards, very little use of render or exposed timber gables. Leaded glass is rarely used and probably never in older properties.

House Sizes

Although the percentage of affordable housing is correct, the percentages of different house sizes does not conform to Neighbourhood Plan Policy HE1, *nor the more up to date NSDC HNA 2020*.

The comparison table is below. It is accepted that the Neighbourhood Plan policy HE1 was derived from a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) completed in 2013. A new HNA has recently been done to inform the Review of the NP which is on-going. It is stressed that this is not yet agreed policy but is illustrated here for comparison purposes.

	Neighbourhood Plan	Redrow Proposal Market	Redrow Proposal Affordable	AECOM HNA 2022	NSDC HNA 2020 Market need	NSDC HNA 2020 Affordable need	NSDC HNA 2020 Intermediate need
1 or two bedrooms	40%	0%	68.4%	30%	6.6%	0%	6%
1 or 2 bedroom bungalows	20%	6%	10.5%		14.8%	23.6%	10.3%
3 Bedroom	15%	17%	21%	70%	48.5%	42.3%	35.8
4+ Bedroom	25%	75%	0%		24%	0%	35.8%

The following comments relating to the NP were made to Redrow by a member of the NPWG

- a) Policy E2 requires that provision for a minimum 8 m wide buffer strip should be made (unless impracticable or unviable) between the boundary of any property and the top of the bank of any water course adjacent to the site to allow for maintenance of the watercourse and as a pollution prevention measure.
For this site it was essential this was followed because the watercourse partially on it at the northwest boundary was a main drain taking water from a large catchment including the golf course to the river Greet.
As part of this watercourse diverted from the development site onto a neighbour’s land there could be no guarantee that this section would be adequately maintained and there was therefore a need to ensure that a continuous drain/watercourse could be constructed on the development site itself to prevent flooding there.
The answer I was given was that Redrow were in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority for it to take over the maintenance of the watercourse – This needs to be verified with the LLFA .
I also asked how the SUDS provision in the middle of the development would be able to take surface water drainage from the lower end of the site eg along the railway embankment.
- b) Policy E3 -Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity requires that the development needs to make provision for a net gain in biodiversity along with buffer strips between the boundaries of properties and vegetation of historic, landscape or ecological importance of and for and a plan for

the long term maintenance of such.

The response was that this would be addressed at a later stage

- c) Policy E4 -Public Rights of Way and Wildlife corridors requires that Public Rights of Way (PROWs) should wherever possible enhance the Green Infrastructure in Southwell Parish, be multifunctional not only for human access but to be useful as wildlife corridors.

Additionally, when a new PROW is to be made or a route changed any alignment should avoid the use of estate roads wherever possible and preference given to paths through land.

As an addendum to this I asked if the company would avoid making footpaths into human corrals with high boarded fences on each side.

The response was that the existing footpath from the present access to the site off Lower Kirklington Road would be provided , at public request, along the pavement to the proposed housing on the side of the new road.

I commented that to meet Policy E4 it would be entirely possible to route a footpath along the buffer strip which should be instated against the north western watercourse as required under Policy E2.

This would give the public two options – to use the pavement along the road (which will be a statutory requirement)or take the scenic route along ide the water course.

Additionally I asked if Redrow would be prepared to negotiate with the Nottingham shire County Council to see if direct access could be provided from the proposed development onto the Southwell Trail as an amenity asset and cycle/ pedestrian link to Southwell to meet Policy TA1 - Cycle and Pedestrian Routes.

It was discussed that the provision of a footpath along the northwest watercourse would preclude the development of the singleton property adjacent to the existing entrance to the site with access onto Lower Kirklington Road.

My response was that perhaps the property could be resited to allow access but there must be a real question as to the whether there should be a dwelling in this situation any way when it relies on an entrance onto Lower Kirklington Road within a few metres of the mini roundabout proposed to take traffic from site (So/Ho/4) -Land East of Kirklington Road .

- d) Policy CF2 Green and Open Spaces and Burial Grounds

The Redrow staff gave assurance that the development would provide the green and open spaces area requirements as identified in the NSDC Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document on the site and there would be no recourse to commuting this to a cash equivalent.

Flooding

Assumptions regarding flood risk in the development area are erroneous in that the EA maps show the flood risk to be medium and in one small area high and the FRA is based on low risk.

There is serious flood risk coming from the golf course and the Maythorne feeder and this will put the development at risk if not correctly dealt with.

The situation about sewage is even worse in that the two houses that are within 50m of the boundary (Hopkiln and Maltkiln Cottages) frequently overflow with high rainfall. It would be advantageous if the two cottages could be linked into the sewage system of the development. This would totally overcome the problems that the two Cottages suffer with regard to sewage.

It is crucial that he the flooding and sewage issues are taken into account and as Mrs Annette Hambidge said in her comments that :-

“No development of the site should be allowed until there is proper provision for the volume of water now being channelled into the Maythorne feeder to flow freely to the river Greet and a more detailed flood assessment should be raised taking into consideration the risks of flooding not only from local rainfall levels but from the overspill of this inadequate system of ditches.

As it stands my property is at risk of increased flooding from these”