

<u>FLITTON AND GREENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL</u>	
<p>Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held at the Church Hall, Flitton on Wednesday 6 July 2016</p> <p>Present: Cllrs N Thompson (Chairman), N Arthur (Vice-Chairman) G Ellis, J Fisher, T King, M Lowe, R Stokes and P Woodland</p> <p>Also Present: D Lawson (Clerk) plus members of the public</p>	
2607 APOLOGIES AND SPECIFIC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
<p>Cllrs D Jobling and J Jamieson sent apologies</p> <p>Cllrs Ellis and Fisher had sent prior notification that they needed to leave early and Cllr King may be late, the Chairman said he would adjust the order of the meeting accordingly, but would halt the meeting at 19:30h to open the public session.</p> <p>The Chairman announced that Cllr Jobling had tendered his resignation as he was moving away from the area shortly. Everyone expressed their thanks and gratitude to him for his period of service and wished him and his wife all the best for the future in their new home.</p>	
<p>Declarations of Interest: The Clerk declared an interest in any discussion about her salary and left the room during the discussion</p>	
2608 MINUTES	
<p>The Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 18th May were received and it was</p>	
<p>RESOLVED: That the Minutes be confirmed as a true record and signed by Cllr N Thompson. The following matters arising were noted: (other issues are picked up again on the agenda)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two new and one existing flower beds were looking very nice and thanks were expressed to all the volunteers for maintaining them. If anyone else would like to look after one elsewhere in the village, this would also be appreciated • Cllr Arthur agreed to speak to a resident about a liaison role with the school • Cllr Stokes gave an update about the allotments and those which were changing hands or where he was following up lack of attention • The speed watch sign survey had been done and was awaiting action by CBC • Cllr Fisher said she has been in contact with Cllr Jamieson about the average speed camera's but reported that that he was following up the enforcement issue through the Police and Crime Commissioner • The footpath outside the new house in Sand Road was still outstanding • Cllr Thompson is still waiting to speak to the Silsoe contact about defibrillators, with a couple of 'possible' locations in mind 	<p>NA</p> <p>RS</p> <p>JJ</p> <p>NT</p>
2609 UNITARY COUNCIL AND POLICE REPORT	
<p>Cllr Jamieson had sent apologies and there was no Police presence, so no items for discussion.</p>	
<p>At 19:30h the Chairman adjourned the meeting to allow for public comment to be made</p>	
<p>Residents were invited to comment on the two planning issues under consideration later in the meeting. The first related to the application in Sand Road</p> <p>Resident 1 made the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarification about what the previous CBC Local Plan said about infilling and the VDL. • noted that the coterminosity of the site with the village boundary, as mentioned in the application, was not correct as the site is outside the 	

VDL and goes well beyond the house line on one side of the road. Fear that any development could lead to loss of an important open space and the small village feel

- was worried that the access to the rear of the site may lead to further development
- felt that the development is out of keeping as the houses are the same and are sited in line along the street as opposed to the opposite side where development is staggered and properties are varied.
- queried what the parking arrangements would be as on street parking would lead to congestion and be out of character for the area
- wondered if all or any the houses were to be social housing (rented or shared ownership) and felt open private sale would be preferred

Cllr Ellis responded that CBC was currently in a difficult position as it did not have an existing Local Plan, but residents should by all means refer back to the previous one as part of their argument, using all the points made above about loss of character and feel of the small village as well.

Although also good to note, any reasons relating to the future of the rest of the site probably are not taken into direct account by the Planners.

Cllr Thompson noted that all new developments should contain a percentage of local social housing, although the application does not specify this.

Resident 2 commented that he had spoken to the agent about the access and it was deemed to be for agricultural use. A discussion followed about this land (possibly around Grade 3a agricultural) being historically used for agriculture and this being included as part of any argument against development.

He also felt that the existing drainage and sewage provision would not be capable of handling another 18 dwellings based on the size of the sewage pipe in situ and this must be addressed alongside the application

Resident 3 emphasised the development was not in keeping and could lead to a change in village character particularly as he had concerns about it opening the way for further development. Cllr Ellis again noted that it was perfectly acceptable to express concerns about the future as part of any response, to ensure that the Planners are aware of the local situation.

Resident 4 referred to the application and asked about the Henlow decision which is mentioned. Cllr Ellis confirmed that CBC is vulnerable to losing Appeals at the moment due to the absence of a Local Plan and is a reason why the Parish is striving to get a Neighbourhood Plan in place as soon as possible. There was a short discussion about the Parish Council's current role in the Planning process and the fact that comments are made but that the final decision rests with CBC as the Planning Authority. The Parish Council is seeking to increase its influence on planning matters by establishing a Neighbourhood Plan and all residents were urged to get actively involved in this and at least complete the questionnaire which will be circulated shortly. For the time being any responses should emphasise the small village status and sustainability issues

Resident 5 queried why comments about future concerns cannot be taken into account including a probable de-valuation of existing house values. Cllr Ellis responded that all planning applications are considered on their own merits, but the point to be made may be that this development is on the edge of a much larger site and that there is a fear of creeping development and its impact on such a small village. Also adding a note about the worry this is causing local residents.

In general all those present were encouraged to respond individually and ask other neighbours/residents to do the same to show the weight of feeling against the application. And to continue to do this should the application be re-presented, like the Greenfield Road Flitton application, where numbers of objectors fell between the first and second application. Comments are not

<p>limited to just neighbours.</p> <p>Resident 6 had counted the number of properties in Sand Road as 6 on one side and 16 the other (22), plus one new property recently completed and one about to be started making 24. Thus Sand Road had already been subject to a 10% increase in dwellings and felt that this should have been sufficient for any area of the village to absorb without a further 18, which practically doubled the size. Again this argument needed to reflect the impact the numbers may have on a small village community.</p> <p>Resident 7 talked about the profit driven motive of the developer without any regard to the village and how upsetting local residents find this. The village is without amenities and is unsuitable for large scale development. Agreed that a Neighbourhood Plan was necessary in the village and that any delay to the application process may be of benefit</p> <p>Resident 8 asked about the response time and it was noted that original consultees seemed to be given an earlier date of 14 July and that this should be aimed for to avoid any ambiguity</p>	
<p>The second comments related to the planning application to the rear of Fitzroy Cottages</p> <p>Resident 9 felt clearly that the application for 3 houses was over development of the site, although acknowledging that its use was under question at the moment with the business owner about to retire. They also made the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the access road is narrow and already causes problems for the commercial use, such that lorries park on the main road and materials being unloaded are shuffled onto site with a smaller loader. • Most of this activity takes place during the working day when residents are not at home and as such the site causes minimum impact • Development of the site would impinge on the narrow access at all times and would be a much bigger hindrance to existing residents • The road is fast at this point and dangerous to pull out on the corner • There would need to be turning space on each plot and the access is single carriage only • Existing residents will lose their turning circle as the plot is developed and this will cause a problem for access and egress and parking • Noise and light pollution at all times • The land is a brown field site and there are other more suitable green field sites in the vicinity <p>Councillors commented that the brown field aspect is harder to oppose as residential development may be seen as improving the site, but agreed that 3 houses is too many. Cllrs urged the current residents to check their Deeds and see what their Rolling Rights access was over the development site or to see if they had any established rights, which they should draw to the Planning Authorities attention.</p> <p>In opposing the site residents may have to acknowledge that there could be some development or even continued commercial use under a different regime and seek to impose as many conditions on access and design as they could to minimise any damage to themselves.</p> <p>Resident 10 asked about any disturbance to the flank wall of the end cottage under a more frequently used access road, but it was thought that the existing owner of the site had addressed this through underpinning some years ago. The danger of having to reverse off site into the busy road was reiterated and Cllrs advised residents to comment on the local Speed Watch project which is set up at this point due to speeding traffic.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked all residents for their attendance and said that</p>	

comments would be taken into account when the Council considered the applications	
2610 SUB COMMITTEE MEETINGS	
Planning	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes of the PSC held on 15 June 2016 were noted The following planning applications were discussed and the views of the public (as set out above) were taken into account when considering the Council's responses. Application Number: CB/16/02632/OUT Land off Sand Road, Flitton Decision to object based on the grounds presented by members of the public earlier in the evening Application Number: CB/16/02513/OUT Land rear of 50 Flitton Road, Greenfield, MK45 5DJ Decision to object based on the grounds presented by members of the public earlier in the evening Application Number: CB/16/02673/FULL 48 High Street, Greenfield, MK45 5DD Decision to comment based on the concern about loss of light to the adjoining property <p>There were no new planning decisions to note Cllr Arthur gave a brief update on the Neighbourhood Plan progress and said that the questionnaire should be available for circulation in August. Cllr Fisher also asked the Council to clarify that they were happy about the costs of the process should be divided between Flitton and Greenfield and Pulloxhill on a per capita basis and the feeling was that this had already been agreed and presented no problem</p>	
<p>AGREED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the Clerk submit the planning responses as above The Council agreed that the costs of the Neighbourhood Plan process should be divided between Flitton and Greenfield and Pulloxhill on a per capita basis 	<p>DL</p> <p>JF/GE/NA</p>
Playing Field Sub Committee	
<p>There had not been a meeting of the Sub Committee, but Cllr Arthur said he would call one shortly to consider the request for hedging to be planted in front of the tennis court car park fencing: along with the request later in the meeting by Maulden Parish Council.</p> <p>The filling up of drainage ditches outside the Village Hall and Playing Field was noted after the recent rain and the Clerk agreed to speak to both contractors to ask them not to leave any vegetation behind after any work there. However the Chairman agreed to follow up the bigger issue of the drains needing to be cleared annually by CBC and hoped to meet the CBC representative on site with Cllr Ellis.</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>NT</p>
Cemetery Sub Committee	
There were no matters to report	
Communications and Parish Plan	
There were no matters to report	
Allotments	
Cllr Stokes mentioned that he was still trying to follow up the water issue at Greenfield and one or two other matters about untidy plots and changes of tenants.	
Highways/Cycleways/footpaths/Grasscutting	
<p>There had not been a meeting of the Sub Committee but Cllr Ellis agreed to organise the next one to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Infra-structure proposal and any progress The issue of the chicane outside houses at High Street Greenfield 	GE

<p>and the request to replace it with a speed hump. Both he and the Chairman would visit the area to check out the practicalities and speak to the resident first.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street lighting on junction of Brook Lane and High Street Flitton following a recent assault, which he would raise first with CBC as the lighting authority • The footpath at Wardhedges following discussion with the new Highways local officer 	<p>GE/NT</p> <p>GE</p> <p>GE</p>
<p>2611 FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes of the Committee held on 15 June 2016 were received • The grant application made by the Parochial Church Council to help towards a new heating system in the Church was discussed and it was agreed to award £250 towards the project • It was agreed that the Accounts should be passed to the external auditor and the chairman signed the appropriate form • The quarterly cash book and reconciliation was noted • The Clerks salary was discussed and it was agreed to move the payment scale onto LC2 and the Clerk to point 26 	
<p>AGREED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That a grant of £250 be made to the PCC towards the new heating project • That the Clerks salary be moved to Point 26 on LC2 and this be backdated to the beginning of the April 2016 	<p>DL</p> <p>DL</p>
<p>2612 CORRESPONDENCE AND CLERKS REPORT</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request by Maulden PC for local councils to consider entering into a joint venture to provide facilities for disabled children was passed to the Playing Field Sub Committee for their more detailed consideration and Cllr Arthur would make contact with them • The consultation on the draft Technical Site Assessment Criteria for the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan was noted along with Cllr Arthurs attendance at the Local Plan conference the following week 	<p>NA</p>
<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p>	
<p>14 September 2016 at 19:30h in the Church Hall</p>	

The meeting ended at 20:35h

DATED this 14th day of September 2016

Signed - Chairman