



MEETING OF THE
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

29 June 2017

PRESENT:

J Illingworth (Chair), B Rhodes, P Baguley,
G Botterill, P Chandler, P Cumbers, P Faulkner,
M Glancy, T Greenow, E Holmes, J Wyatt

Solicitor to the Council (SK), Head of Regulatory Services,
Regulatory Services Manager (PR), Planning Officer (GBA),
Administrative Assistant (SL)

PL1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Posnett could not attend the meeting and was substituted by Cllr Rhodes.

PL2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

More than one objector was listed for each application. The Chair asked if standing orders could be suspended. Cllr Holmes proposed that they could, Cllr Glancy seconded this. It was unanimously decided that standing orders would be suspended.

Cllr Chandler declared an interest on application 17/00080/OUT as the applicant is Belvoir Estate. She stated that her son is a tenant of the applicant.

Cllr Greenow also declared an interest on application 17/00080/OUT as he is personally known to the applicant.

Cllr Botterill also declared an interest on application 17/00080/OUT as he is a tenant of Belvoir Estate.

Cllr Rhodes declared that he is a county councillor and there are LCC issues referred to in the report.

PL3. MINUTES

Minutes for the previous meeting will be available at the next normal meeting of the Committee.

PL4. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

(1) **Reference: Waltham on the Wolds 'Common Issues'**

(a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that:

This report seems the correct place to update the Committee on representations that also address 'common issues'.

14 more representations since publications relating to the cumulative effects.

- How can the character been retained?
- Can't cope with the level of development
- Excessive amount
- Doctor's surgery not big enough
- Traffic safety concerns on High Street
- Traffic safety concerns on A607 particularly the school and pupils crossing.
- Speeding traffic on A607
- Expansion of school and Doctors surgery? Can these be extended? Developers would need to do this
- Village in danger of becoming a suburb of Melton

The report itself sets out policy basis. The key message is that applications are difficult, in light of the policy status of the MLP and the WOTW NP.

Severn Trent (STW) have been pressed further. Their message is that they will make developers do what is necessary. Not adding more burdens on the existing. If new is required this is what they will have to do and will require that developers fund such improvements.. They are particular that they will only define what is required at the time of connection as demand is changing all of the time until that point from exiting users and new connections. They cannot adequately predict what is needed until that time.

Sewerage is largely the same. They have the power to require developers to make the system work correctly even if this means a large financial burden.

They have advised of their awareness of Odour issues – aware of blockages but think they have remedied these.

Education – scenario testing has been done, in table 1. The LEA's approach

to how the school could expand is dependent upon the phasing of possible developments. Whichever permutation is granted the school can cope according to the LEA. Costs are provided, relating to the phases.

The Chair thanked the Head of Regulatory Services for the report. Referred to the recommendation at the bottom of the report and reminded Members that applications should be determined on the individual merits.

A Cllr queried if the Head of Regulatory Services had investigated the zebra crossing for the school on the A607. 80% of accidents are outside schools, regardless of if you have the barriers up. Queried if the Head of Regulatory Services has asked STW and Sewerage. WOTW has no water now, and smells in the High Street last night. A Cllr thought that we should go back to STW re the water and sewerage. WOTW has insufficient services now, further housing would be appalling whilst this is still outstanding.

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer all of the applications as they already have insufficient services.

The Chair stated that this is one step too soon. He stated that there needed to be a discussion on whether to accept the recommendations at the bottom of this report.

Cllr Holmes proposed that the recommendations on the report should not be accepted.

Cllr Rhodes stated that he seconded the proposal. He stated that the report is logical. Water and sewerage has no analysis in the report like schools etc. Concerned that the substantial charge that would be put to the developers would question if there is sufficient headroom in the viability to pay for this and all of the other things that would be required by S106 to make the scheme viable. Supported the suggestion to go back to STW.

The Chair confirmed that by refusing to accept the recommendations of the report they therefore proposing a blanket deferral for all four applications.

The Head of Regulatory Services sought to confirm what information is required to support.

Cllr Holmes stated that since there is no water at WOTW now, need to make sure from STW that the water will be available now, not in the future. So many houses already passed putting more pressure on the supply. There are great problems with the water and sewerage and can smell it. Need to go back to STW to get an update before more houses are developed

The Head of Regulatory Services sought to confirm the exact queries.

Cllr Holmes stated that sewerage went in in 1974 along the main road and

High Street. Since then the refuse dump has been capped, but thinks that the sewerage pipe in the High Street is cracked, needs to be investigated further.

Cllr Glancy supported the deferral, and stated that consideration also needs to be given on the impact on the doctors. This is picked up in the 16/00971/OUT application, but not in the other 3, and needs to be included.

The Chair stated that this doesn't refer to the application, this is a potential deferral due to the WOTW 'common issues' report and not accepting the recommendations of this report.

Cllr Holmes confirmed that this is important point

A Cllr wanted to add about the power required and if this has been checked for all of the new homes. It's not in the report.

The Chair stated that this should be dealt with for each individual application.

A Cllr stated that this should be asked now not next time so that we don't need to defer again.

The Chair advised that officers can ask this in the background, protocol – this isn't in this report.

A Cllr stated that this confirms that there are a whole series of issues relating to water and sewerage, adding to the financial burden development would need to carry. It does affect the overall viability of the schemes.

A Cllr stated that they have experience with STW in Bottesford. Their follow up in Bottesford was non-existent, the Chairman of STW had to come out and have a look at it. This was only because the LCC Cllr knew him. They needed a new main from Nottingham. It is not only WOTW suffering, it's the farms in the Vale as the cattle etc. need a lot of water. The Councillor also commented on the point about doctors. Practice that operates in Harlaxton and WOTW, Bottesford patients are often referred to WOTW – it's a problem that needs investigated.

A Cllr stated that STW need to look at the service provision, it's shocking, been going on for some time particularly sewerage. Not giving the service that they should and should be put right before any new builds.

Cllr Greenow stated that viability of the development is not a concern to Cllrs. He did not support the deferment and wanted to take the cases individually.

The Chair stated that they can add other aspects to be incorporated into this

motion. Talked about surgery, power, STW and sewerage and financial implications of these issues. Sought confirmation from Cllr Holmes, the proposer, that she is happy to have these items added.

Cllr Holmes confirmed she was happy to have the items added and stated that several people have approached her about power supply

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer the applications.

Cllr Rhodes seconded the proposal to defer.

A Cllr stated that these are things that can easily be overcome with enough money. They did not support the deferment.

Cllr Holmes stated that she did not want just an assurance from STW, but wanted to establish what action would be taken for sewage and water.

The Chair confirmed that Cllr Holmes is looking for an action plan and costings.

A vote was taken: 9 Members voted in favour of deferral. 2 Members voted against (Cllr Wyatt and Cllr Greenow).

It was decided that all four applications would be deferred for the issues raised to be Pursued and presented to a future meeting of the Committee

PL5. URGENT BUSINESS

None

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 6.33 pm