

Chedburgh Parish Council

MINUTES

of a Meeting held at the Erskine Centre, Chevington Road, Chedburgh on

Monday 10th February 2019 at 7.30pm

Present: Councillors: Margaret Rickard (Chair), Jon Cardy, Michael Chester, Teresa Landymore, Alan Noyes and Sue Roberts.

In attendance: Maximilian Clay (Clerk to the Council);
1 Member of the public.

79. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Chester, who would be late.

80. Declarations of Interest

- a. There were no declarations of Pecuniary Interests in matters on this agenda.
- b. There were no declarations of Other Disclosable Interests in matters on this agenda.

81. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council held on 13th January 2020 were agreed to be a true record and the Chair was authorised to sign them as such.

82. Public Forum

No matters were raised by members of the public.

Cllr Chester joined the meeting

83. Clerk's Report

This being an additional meeting, there were only two matters to report.

- ◆ The Clerk had received formal notification of Cllr Varney's resignation from the Council.
- ◆ The Clerk confirmed to the meeting that he would now be willing to stay on beyond April.

84. Planning and Environment

a. Planning Applications

- i. **Marquis Cornwallis Public House, The Street:** Application for Lawful Development Certificate for Existing Use or Development - A3.

The application states that this was the last use of the building. In discussion it was noted that:

- ◆ The premises is a licenced public house, closed down by the applicant in 2016 not long after acquiring it.
- ◆ In the memory of Members of the Council going back several decades, including one member who had worked at the pub, it had never been a restaurant nor had it been marketed or represented itself as such.
- ◆ Food had been served as part of its offer as a public house at certain periods of its history but never as an offer distinct from being a pub.
- ◆ It is surprising that the applicant is unaware that it is not true, as the application states, that serving food "...is the last use this site was in." because the last use of the site was under the applicant's control (before closing it down and stripping it of its fittings and much of its floor). No food was served at all in this period and so, in making this statement, the applicant's memory must therefore be at fault.

The meeting resolved to **object** to the application on the grounds that the 'existing use' represented in the application did not exist and on the grounds that both the Council and the community are strongly of the mind that the site is and should remain a pub.

ii. DC/20/0132/FUL - *Majors, Queens Lane: New dwelling in the grounds.*

In discussion members noted that:

- ◆ There had been outline approval for the construction of a dwelling at the western end of the grounds of Majors since 1994.
- ◆ This outline permission had been renewed periodically for about fifteen years until, in 2011/12, detailed applications were submitted and full permission granted. The detailed approvals were for a rustic but austere simple, single-storey, box-shaped dwelling, with a small porch and a detached garage, and also included the new access from Queens Lane that is included in the current proposal.
- ◆ The 2011 approvals were renewed within a single full application in January 2016, which was supported by the Parish Council and approved by the planning authority.
- ◆ Under current guidelines it would be highly unlikely that permission for this proposal would be granted because of its proximity to and impact on Majors, which is a listed heritage asset. However, the principle of permission for a dwelling is well established, albeit that the current application is for a completely different design.

Because the established principle of permission over rides current guidance, the Council decided that the focus of its discussions should be on the particular design of the latest proposal. It was noted that:

- ◆ While not in any way ornate, the revised proposal is of a less austere design than before.
- ◆ Although the revised house appears to be a little larger than the previous proposal, it is of 1.5 storey construction and so seems to give a less box-like impression with a more traditional feel and detailing that was felt to be more sympathetic to the character of this area of the village.
- ◆ The position, orientation and scale of both the proposed house and the garage make them clearly distinct and subservient to Majors and the existing and proposed landscaping will screen them from Majors.

The Council resolved to **support** the application subject to the following:

- i.** The Council wished to ensure that the context, views of and views from the adjacent heritage asset would remain protected from the impact of the new build and so would like to see a condition requiring the maintenance of the protective landscaping features described in the application.
- ii.** Similarly, the Council would like normal permitted development rights to be curtailed, to ensure that the adjacent heritage asset remains protected from future expansion.
- iii.** The Council would also draw attention to the fact that drainage remains a problem on this stretch of Queens Lane with pluvial and sewage flooding being a regular problem in the road and some adjacent driveways. It was agreed that this should, if possible, be addressed before the start of works.

In more general comments the Council resolved that its response to the consultation should make a more general comment as to the desirability of requiring solar panels and/ or other eco-friendly energy installations for new builds along with the collection of rain water.

DC/19/0695/FUL - *Land off Kiln Lane, Chedburgh, IP29 4BL:* (i) improvements to existing access and track off Kiln Lane (ii) landscaped security bund (iii) farm office and welfare unit (part retrospective).

The Council noted that:

- ◆ This was a significant proposal (part of it retrospective because most of the work seems to have been undertaken already without permission, and without agreement that permitted development rights apply) and that a previous version had been considered by the Council in May 2019. At that time the Council objected on the grounds that the proposal could not be assessed because the information was incomplete and because of fears about increased traffic movements on the narrow lane.
- ◆ The Planning Authority's policy response to the original application was comprehensively negative and that the Authority had sought further information, pending a decision. Further information had not been forthcoming and so the application fell into abeyance.
- ◆ The new proposal provides much greater detail and argues that the proposals are necessary and justifiable and also wishes them to be considered as legitimate agriculture-related building which should be considered as permitted development.
- ◆ The siting of the proposed building is the same as before (or so close to the same as to not be clearly different from the plans) .

The following points were agreed in discussion:

- a. The increased use of wide traffic on Kiln Lane would add dangers to the highway and an increase of heavy and slow traffic onto the main Bury road that would also create unnecessary hazards.
- b. Although it is proposed to reduce the height of the bund (itself subject to retrospective permission within this proposal) and then plant it with trees, the bund itself remains and is not a natural feature of the landscape. Hence the Council felt that this was an introduced feature being proposed simply to mask another introduced feature.
- c. The building, although now to be clad in wood, is still a porta-cabin type building as proposed before and now in situ without permission. It is at odds with policy as to design.
- d. The applicant states that the "Welfare" building is agricultural in nature but it is to be used for occupation by workers - this makes it more than just a welfare building (which would typically relate to provision of loos and possibly washing facilities).
- e. There is nothing in planning regulations that allows for Permitted Development of housing, whether temporary or permanent. There is provision for housing to be allowed in strictly defined and closely justified cases.
- f. In this case there still does not seem to be a clear rationale for the necessity of the 'welfare' building in the first place. According to the applicant's own design statement the workers will not be employed at this site for most of the time - work typically takes place elsewhere for around 4 days at a time.
- g. The applicant seems to also rely on what is argued as an essential need for accommodation for skilled workers yet contradicts this by saying that most of the workers are seasonal student labour.
- h. The applicant states that transport will be provided for these workers so it is clear that this could be provided just as easily at nearby centres.
- i. Taking 5, 6 and 7 into account, the Council determined that, by definition, there is no *essential need* and therefore no justification for any residential accommodation.
- j. In any case buildings and other development that *are* justified for this purpose must be of a design that related to the character of the area and cause at little impact to the countryside as possible. The porta-cabin, with or without cladding, was felt to fail this test by a significant margin and is widely visible
- k. The applicant's 'Viewpoint' map is selective - it does not speak to views from the south-east (which were referred to in the original policy response) and it dismisses as insignificant the fact that the building would remain visible from a variety of aspects. Included in the latter, as acknowledged in the Design Statement, is the view from Rede

Hall, a Grade II Listed building set on a medieval moated site, a little way north east of the site.

- I. In addition, such screening as does exist is by virtue of a bund which is part of the substance of this application and which is itself out of character with the landscape and which even the application justifies on security grounds, rather than landscaping and visibility grounds.

The Council resolved as follows:

- i. to **object** to the improvements to the track, including widening of the access for the reasons set out in (a) above.
- ii. to **object** to the landscaped security bund for the reasons set out in (b) above.
- iii. to **object** to the 'Welfare'/ residential/ office building for the reasons set out in (c) to (l) above.

b. Updates on Planning Matters considered at previous meetings

It was reported that the surfacing of the roads on the Brocket Park/ Mulberry Park development had been completed.

85. Report on Staffing Matters - Reserved Business

86. Councillor Vacancy and Election of Chair

The resignation of Cllr Varney left a vacancy on the council and of the Chair. Notice will be given to the District Monitoring Officer so that the formal notice can be displayed and co-option to the vacant council seat will be discussed in due course, assuming that an election is not called.

Cllr Noyes had previously indicated that he would be standing down in May, which would have left another seat vacant but he confirmed that he would now be happy to remain on the Council, at least for the foreseeable future.

The office of Chair also needed to be filled and Cllr Rickard was suggested by several members. Although Cllr Rickard was reluctant to accept the office, after some persuasion she expressed willingness and, having been formally proposed and seconded was elected unanimously.

The meeting closed at 8.52pm.

Signed as a true record by authority and on behalf of the Council:

..... Chair

..... Date