

## **South Leverton 9<sup>th</sup> NP Steering Group Meeting**

Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019

### **Agenda**

- 1 Apologies for absence
- 2 Members Present
- 3 Declarations of interest
- 4 BDC Statutory Review of sites submitted for development
- 5 Arrangements for residents public meeting
- 6 Engagement of AECOM
- 7 Consultation with land owners
- 8 AOB
- 9 DONM

### **Discussion**

#### **1 Apologies**

Received from Andy Marsh.

#### **2 Members Present**

Colin Wilkinson was welcomed to the SG as BDC representative replacing Luke Brown, and he signed the members data protection schedule authorising members access to personal contact details for communication purposes. Members present were Catherine Hoyle (chair), Gerry Wareham, Gordon Muir, Terry Lickorish, Andrea Scott James, John Landreth, Lisa Hughes, Dave Hampton along with the further BDC representative Will Wilson (part time)

Eight residents attended this meeting.

#### **3 Declarations of Interest**

Four of the confirmed sites were submitted by original members of the SG, and so these members were noted as having a potential pecuniary interest. These members are: - Catherine Hoyle, Gordon Muir, Andrea Scott James, and Jamie Spittlehouse. The chair noted that Jamie Spittlehouse had not attended any SG meetings in the last 6 months and was no longer considered to be a member of the SG. Secretary to remove his details and update the members list **Action: Gerry Wareham**

#### **4 BDC Statutory Review**

Initially Will enquired of any queries from the SG with regard to the BDC housing review documents that he had compiled and which had been circulated to the SG members. Numerous queries were raised, and a wide ranging, robust discussion followed. Unfortunately, this resulted in an unstructured meeting including switching from one agenda item to another and back again. As Eric Morecombe might have said "We were playing all the right notes, but not necessarily in the right order" The remainder of these notes attempt to summarise, hopefully, relevant issues raised with no particular agenda heading: --

- Were the findings of the review to be considered as mandatory in accordance with the understanding of the term “statutory” which is “compliance with statute” i.e in this case compliance with BDC policies / legislation. This being the case then any site declared by the BDC review as being unsuitable for development should be deleted from the SL NP. Will Wilson clarified that this was not the case and further ongoing review of the sites was possible, subject to appropriate further review and associated evidence being presented. The SG was encouraged to respond to the review accordingly.
- Were comments from BDC legal department expected, relating to possible issues such as protected rights of way crossing development sites; restrictive covenants preventing building on a particular plot; sites known to be subject to a change of ownership. Will Wilson indicated that BDC could assist with particular site legal issues when raised during progress of the NP preparation.
- A number of SG members considered that there were inconsistencies in the review e.g Cottam Road was declared by the review as not being suitable for development sites whereas Town Street appeared to be acceptable. The SG highlighted that Cottam Road was simply a continuation of Town Street, there being no difference between the two. Both road surfaces were in urgent need of repair. A possible explanation put forward was that properties further along Cottam Road away from Town Street, did not have mains sewage available and were dependent upon septic tanks.
- The requirement for 2m wide road side footpaths for development sites was questioned as being unreasonable compared with existing village foot paths.
- BDC Engineering Department had not made any comments against specific sites but had commented to Will Wilson that drainage/sewage could be arranged for all the proposed sites. The SG questioned this suggestion, particularly as it is known that the existing sewage disposal pumping station is already working at full capacity, and furthermore there would be an obvious need for some of the proposed sites to require drainage across existing housing sites which it is thought would be challenged by the associated existing property owners.
- The need for further land development sites in Bassetlaw was questioned, as it was understood from the SL district councillor representative that the number and area of land sites already submitted to BDC were far in excess of their requirement to meet the targeted housing developments in Bassetlaw. Will Wilson clarified that whilst there had been a large number of sites submitted, this did not mean they would all be developed, and furthermore it was in the interest of SL to prepare a NP as this would contribute to the future of SL.
- A view was expressed that it would be necessary to obtain all review comments from all relevant parties before any of submitted sites were excluded from the NP. It was argued that the SG should engage AECOM and await their review, along with consulting with land owners, before holding a public meeting to update residents and obtain their views with regard to selection of the submitted sites. It was pointed out that the SG had not held a residents meeting since 4<sup>th</sup> July’18. Residents were already questioning members of the SG in regard to the outcome of BDC review. Catherine said she was thinking of a public meeting in late February after AECOM had submitted their review of the proposed development sites and receipt of written responses from land owners with regard to their intended developments. It was argued that obtaining comments from all of these parties first could result in extensive delay to a further residents meeting and possibly result in a loss of public confidence. It was argued that at least a progress statement should be circulated to village residents. Catherine proposed to contact AECOM with regard to a timescale for their review, and to write to land owners requesting confirmation of their continued interest and their

conceptual views with regard to the development of their sites.

**Actions: Catherine Hoyle**

- A specific personal analysis of the BDC statutory review was tabled by John Landreth who had used a traffic light colour technique to illustrate his opinion with a red background for unsupported sites, amber for sites which may be possible to support, green for sites which are supported, and clear for sites without comment. It should be noted that all clear comments were under BDC Planning who only made comments in regard to sites which they considered appeared to be unsuitable. Hence it is reasonable to deduct that clear backgrounds should have been coloured green as being supported for development. John argued that a statutory review which clearly identified unsupported sites should mean that the SG should exclude these sites from the NP at this time. This analysis will be emailed to members for their consideration.
- A further personal attempt to analyse the BDC review was tabled by the undersigned, which simply incorporated P, H1, H2, C, L, E symbols onto the digital map of SL to identify the various considerations received from BDC. This analysis will also be circulated. The overall conclusion of this analysis was there were a very limited number of sites which were considered to have no adverse criticisms but a significant number of sites which possibly could be supported subject to further future review. Hence in the undersigned's opinion further consultation was necessary for the majority of sites but like John Landreth, considered those sites which were clearly not supported by BDC because they would not comply with planning policies should be excluded from the NP. For example, NP15, NP18, NP19, NP20 are all dependent for access through High Street. Highways Authority statutory reviews states "High Street is not considered acceptable to receive additional development due to its narrow width, substandard or absent footways, lack of turning provision, and the lack of visibility from accesses along its length", The Why would the Highways Authority change their opinion as they clearly consider further developments would introduce public safety issues. They will not be prepared to put public safety at risk. It is not possible to widen High Street due to existing housing developments. Hence in the undersigned's opinion the first action should be for the Highways Authority to confirm / otherwise their refusal to support these sites with associated reasons. If confirmed then the SG know such sites have no prospect of receive planning permission at any time in the future. This task could be accomplished for all sites specified by BDC (Highways, Planning, Conservation) as unsuitable for development in a matter of days by Will or Colin returning to / discussing with the relevant BDC authorities. This would contribute as meaningful progress to clarifying the available sites for development and reducing the number of sites to an appropriate number for the required NP housing developments in SL. No action was agreed.
- The SG now understood that the required minimum number of new houses to be developed in SL between 2018 and 2035 as specified by the newly published BDC Draft Local Plan is 22, and the maximum is 39. The new houses to be developed in the NP will be in excess of any new houses for which individual property owners have already obtained planning permission or are currently in the process of independently seeking planning permission. No date was set for the next meeting, awaiting the feedback from Catherine with regard to the actions she was investigating.  
It is appreciated these notes are not necessarily thorough. Further comments / amendments which members wish to be included would be welcomed.

Gerry Wareham