



Castlethorpe Parish Council

Minutes of a Parish Council Extraordinary Meeting held remotely by video conference on 17th February 2021

PRESENT: Councillors Ayles, Forgham, Merritt, Sawbridge, Keane, Ward Cllr Bowyer and the Clerk. One member of the public was present for the public session and there were others viewing the meeting via Facebook and Youtube.

Public session:

A resident spoke outlining neighbours' objections to planning application 21/00016/FUL to be considered later under item 3.1.

- | 1 | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | ACTION |
|----------|---|---------------|
| 1.1 | Cllr Hinds & Ward Cllr Geary, alternative commitments: accepted. | |
| 2 | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST | |
| 2.1. | None | |
| 3 | TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS (previously viewed on line by Councillors) | |
| 3.1. | 21/00016/FUL - Proposed 3m single storey rear extension (resubmission of 20/02875/FUL). 12 Shepperton Close Castlethorpe – MODIFIED PLANS SUBMITTED
The application had been considered at the last meeting and the parish council had objected. Cllr Ayles was surprised that the applicant had now been allowed to submit modified plans without having to make a new application and the deadline for comments had not been extended, hence the need for this extraordinary meeting.
There was lengthy discussion about the revised plans and it was finally decided by a majority (with one abstention) to object as follows:
That the design is not compliant with Planning policy CNP in that a flat roof extension is included (whereas Policy 3 requires pitched roofs) and nor does the garage conversion and removal of the chimney stack match other properties on the estate required by Planning Policy D2 and D3.
The rear extension in particular is higher than the gutter line and doesn't have a matching fascia board and will block light to the neighbour's garage window.
It was further agreed that should the Case Officer be minded to approve the application, then the Parish Council would require the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A planning condition that the garage door frontage is maintained to prevent subsequent replacement with a door or window. The garage door has to be maintained in a like for like style as at present.• A planning condition that the 'Home Gym' is not converted to commercial use noting the existence of covenants preventing commercial activity on the estate.• Neighbours have expressed concern about overlaps of guttering, blocking out of their garage window and lack of matching fascia boards. The roof height of the flat roof rear extension must be no higher than the gutter line and that Planning ensures that detail finishing to the plans address these concerns.• The chimney stack must be retained to ensure the roof line remains consistent with the other dwellings in the Close. | |

It was further agreed that if the Case Officer is minded to approve the application without at least conditions 1,3 & 4 that the parish council require the decision to be determined at DCP at which they would speak.

4

TO CONSIDER RESOLUTIONS

- 4.1. MKC had asked Cllr Ayles for a meeting at very short notice about the Modified Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) to which key people could not attend. Despite requests to them to provide papers describing the MKC position in advance of any meeting they had not provided any such information. CPC had meticulously recorded and provided MKC with their position and it was unsatisfactory that this had not been reciprocated. There is a technical point that MKC need CPC as the Qualifying Body to give approval to go forward to referendum, to which the parish council have said that they will give no such approval until they have seen the Officer's position statement. CPC is very confident that the Plan Examiner was in breach of NPIERS guidelines that he should have (contractually) followed in examination of the Plan, specifically in not giving reasons why Gobbey's Field did not meet the recreational standards to qualify as a 'Local Green Space'. Also, MKC has got a duty under the 'Nolan Principles' to be transparent in what they have been doing, which they obviously have not been. Cllr Geary is trying to get hold of the acting Head of Planning at MKC to provide some knowledge and expertise to assist the MKC Officers involved, that currently seems to be lacking and the hopefully a meeting can be arranged before any decision is made by MKC.

11

TO AGREE DATE AND ATTENDANCE FOR FUTURE MEETINGS/EVENTS

- 11.1. Next Parish Council meeting will be a General Meeting and had been arranged for Monday 1st March 2021. The Clerk said that he had an urgent appointment at that date and time and asked that this meeting be rearranged or that someone substitute as Proper Officer. It was agreed to rearrange the meeting to the 4th March.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.35

Appendix A - Schedule of Reports & File Notes

APPENDIX A1 – CLERK’S REPORT 1/2/2021

1. MKC have confirmed that Stonewater have not submitted any Deed of Variation or new application for the Maltings 2 development and neither have they received any further correspondence.
2. All information for the defibrillators has now been gathered and the registration forms have been sent to SCAS. Training sessions and ‘opening event’ to be arranged when Covid-19 rules allow.
3. Order will be made next week for two memorial benches for sports ground and pre-approved bench to go next to bus stop in North Street (Haversham end).
4. On-site meet to be arranged with contractor to discuss outstanding work and fitting/removal of the two memorial benches:

Football

- Double doors for entry need repairing as letting in rain and not very secure
- Decorating

Cricket

- Motion sensitive lighting is not working
- Paving slab broken to be repaired
- Downpipe broken – front of pavilion
- Side door does not open

Tennis (CSA to arrange)

- Combination lock on the toilet
- Transfer of power for the floodlights into the tennis court

5. CCLA Deposit and Property Fund accounts are now open. £90,000 has been transferred to the Deposit account and £50,000 to the Property Fund.
6. Email sent to Clerk at Hanslope approving renewal of the Castlethorpe part of the landscaping contract with RTM
7. Unable to meet with the applicant for the groundsman position due to outbreak of Covid in his family. To be arranged for this month with SGC cllrs and CSA.
8. Cllr Merritt and the Clerk have constructed and sent a response to the ‘MKC Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan’ (shared with CPC before sending). This included a strongly worded request to improve the route from Castlethorpe to the railway arch at Lodge Farm Business Park. Also to re-define the cycle route to go down Fox Covert Lane rather than to route round the adjacent field. Cllr Keane to communicate CPC’s agreed views (at December’s meeting) on a suggestion to build a cycle track between Castlethorpe & Hanslope
9. Historic England (HE) have said that they will not approve planting of trees within the defined area of the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) at the Fishponds Play Area. This means that, of the three trees proposed for Fishponds, one is allowed (the one that blew down recently), one is not allowed (the one near the top of the slide) and one is under discussion as it is right on the boundary of the SAM. However, this last is funded by MKC and they have been asked to resolve with HE so CPC just needs to approve the replacement for the recent ‘blow down’.
Cllr Hinds has also expressed interest in exploring other locations for planting and HE have been asked if we can plant on the northern boundary of Castle Field. Response was no as this is a SAM but we argue that the motte and bailey is a long way back and have asked them to reconsider.
10. LED Streetlight conversion. MKC confirmed on 27th November that Castlethorpe is still in plan for 2021/22 and were awaiting a quote from Ringway. This was originally at a meeting with MKC on 4th March 2020 and has been regularly chased (17/9, 12/10, 27/11, 12/1) and there is concern that we will not have a quote before they are ready to begin work. Cllr Ayles will escalate.
11. In June 2020, we had complaints from several properties in BE Rd about flooding from the drains or off the highway and Cllrs Geary and Ayles escalated within MKC. In September, the drains were flushed through and the drains problem was hopefully solved. However, the flooding down the drives of properties on the east side of BE Rd continues and two continue to have problems with their garages flooding. Cllr Ayles has escalated again (21/1/21) but no response and Ward Cllr support is requested.
12. The government has indicated that elections will take place on 6th May and also that councils will be expected to hold their meetings physically from that date. NALC and BMKALC are lobbying that remote meetings can continue.

As a corollary, it would be wise to hold our Annual Parish Meeting on 12th April (its normal date) rather than subsequently when it would be after 6th May and probable that it would have to be held physically.

No progress/unknown status on outstanding actions:

- MKC Planning Enforcement have written to the resident in Shepperton Close where a porch way has been built without the required planning approval asking for it to be removed and the design reverted to be consistent with the rest of the area.
- Clerk to engage tradesman to repair fence and gate at west South Street entrance to Castle Field
- Review of draft plans for possible development of club house at sports ground
- Reach agreement with Allotments Association on transfer of land at sports ground to the parish council
- Quotes for both turfing and laying of artificial grass for the Village Hall garden to be commissioned.
- Clerk to get further quotes for maintenance of playground and outdoor aerobic equipment. No time this month.
- MKC have said that they will consider replacing the fading public footpath signs. Clerk has not had time to make the request this month.
- There has been no update on looking at replacement of street nameplates since meeting with MKC 15th January 2020. Low priority for MKC and on hold due to Covid.
- Cllr Ayles & Geary to consider MKC decision not to sell land at the side of 6 The Chestnuts
- CCTV at Sports Ground – clerk to contact suppliers to understand the management overheads. No progress this month
- Cllr Ayles has had no response on PSPO Dogs but was not expecting one yet as MKC have not made Order. Previous decision was just to consult

Steve Bradbury

1/2/2021

APPENDIX A2 – Proposed response to PLANNING APPLICATION 21/000016/FUL – 12 SHEPPERTON CLOSE

This is a re-submission of part of **20/02875/FUL** to which the Parish Council objected and the application was withdrawn. This application includes the extension and conversion of the double garage to form a large gym with separate entrance door.

The Parish Council would not in principle object to the conversion of a garage to a gym - see 20/03218/FUL in Station Road to which it offered no objection in January. This was a single garage conversion and extension to form study, utility room and small gym area though this is not within Character Area 2 (Consistency of Design) of the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan(CNP). However, given that 12 Shepperton Close is within Character Area 2 (4.4.4 CNP), and the scale and changes involved, the Parish Council objects.

Shepperton Close is a highly stylised neo-Georgian estate and forms one of the areas explicitly protected in the design guidance of the made 2017 Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan. There have been two other garage conversions (Nos 11 and 47) but these have been two storey with matching roofs, design and materials, do not form a separate building and have been done so sympathetically that it is hard to realise that they are not original.

Relevant Planning Policies

Policy 3: Design Guidance in the 2017 Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) which has been ‘made’ by MKC.

The Policy states that “ Development proposals will be supported, provided their scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials, including alterations to existing buildings, reflect and enhance the architectural and historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape in their specified character area, as shown on the Policies Map, as follows:

Both character areas:

- Two storeys building height;
- Roof pitch ranging from 35° to 45°; and
- Window openings are small in relation to the elevation of the building.

In Character Area 2, proposals should be constructed from materials similar in colour and texture to the materials and design found on adjacent buildings. **Extensions and other building works to existing buildings will be required to be constructed from materials and design matching the existing building.”**

The explanatory Notes add:

“4.3.4 The following areas are observed to have a consistency of design and materials and the policy requires that proposals for infill or redevelopment in these five locations have regard to the common building form, plot size, building line and materials in each location:

- The west side of Bullington End Road (Nos 1-45);
- Terrace of railway cottages in Station Road (Nos 39-53);
- and **all properties in Shepperton Close; The Chequers; and Thrupp Close.”**

Plan:MK Planning Policy D2.

2. The **character of the development is locally inspired** where appropriate (for example in or adjacent to conservation areas, or in existing areas with a strong positive character).

Plan:MK Planning Policy D3 DESIGN OF BUILDINGS

A. Development proposals that meet the following objectives and principles will be permitted:

1. The appearance of the building contributes to **the enhancement or creation of a positive character for the development or of a particular character area for larger developments.**

4. Buildings are of **appropriate scale in relation to other buildings** in the immediate vicinity in terms of their height and massing. Buildings of a greater scale than the surrounding context may be acceptable where it is demonstrated that this is necessary to reflect the development's location and the siting, function and importance of the building.

8. The proposed scale and design of extensions to existing buildings relate well to the existing building and plot, and **do not detract from the character of the existing building and the surrounding area.**

Objection

1. The application will substantially damage the front view of the property with an 'out of character' door in the converted garage visible from the public highway. It will not be similar to the design in adjacent buildings as required by CNP Policy 3.
2. Plan:MK Policies D2 and D3 also require the character of a development to be 'locally inspired', enhance the 'character...of a particular character area' and that its scale should not detract from the character of the existing building and surrounding area'.

This would be the only single storey garage conversion and the only single storey building other than garages in Shepperton Close and it would be out of character with all the other properties.

3. There does not appear to be internal access to the 'Gym and Studio' and an additional WC is being provided despite that there is already one on the ground floor of the existing building. This creates a large standalone building,

The Parish Council therefore seeks clarification that the new building is for personal and not business use. Should it be for business, not only would a change of use permission be required but the parish council would object. This is a residential estate. There is adequate provision for commercial premises in the parish noting both Lodge Farm Business Centre and Lincoln Lodge Business Centre.

All properties on Shepperton Close are also subject to a **Covenant** and the Fourth Schedule imposes restrictions:

1. **No trade or business shall be carried on** upon the land hereby conveyed or any part thereof nor shall any building on the land be used otherwise than as a private dwellinghouse for the use and occupation of one family only
2. No act or thing shall be done or suffered upon the land hereby conveyed which may **reasonably be considered to be a nuisance or annoyance to the occupiers or owners of any adjoining or neighbouring property**

A commercial gym would therefore breach the Covenant restriction and the neighbour has objected that it would also cause a 'nuisance and annoyance' exacerbated because there is only a single brick wall from the neighbouring garage.

Should the Case Officer be minded to approve, the Parish Council requests that it is determined at DCP and will provide a speaker to object. Should Planning Permission nonetheless be granted, the Parish Council would request a planning condition that it is used for personal and not commercial purposes and that noise insulation is added to the party wall.

Appendix A3 Proposed Response to Planning Application 21/00073/FUL 42 South St

The Parish Council objects this application because:

1. The rear roof extension does not comply with Policy CAS4 (Design Guidance) in the Neighbourhood Plan for Character Area 1 (the Conservation Area) in that the extension does not reflect the “historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings”, it does not have a roof pitch between 25-45°, it should only have two storeys and the materials do not match - they are required to be matching brick not timber cladding.
2. The front roof lights are not permitted on the front roofs of Buildings of Local Interest under CAS5 which requires preservation of the front roofline. The rear extension is so large that it would ‘result in harm to ... a Building of Local Interest’.

Castlethorpe Parish Council (CPC) therefore objects to this application and, if the Case Officer is minded to approve, requires that the determination is made by the Development Control Panel at which CPC would provide a speaker.

Appendix A4 Proposed Response to Planning Application 21/00129/FUL - New dwelling including new access and amenity space, new access and drive to existing dwelling at 1 Wolverton Road

This application appears to be a re-submission of 20/02803/FUL with amendments to the road splay onto Wolverton Rd.

Castlethorpe Parish Council has no objection in principle to a new dwelling being constructed at this site nor to the proposed design. However, the new dwelling will access the public highway onto Bullington End Road and the Council requests that the orientation of the new dwelling is rotated 90 degrees so that it faces the road from which it is accessed to comply with Plan:MK Policy D1(A.2).

The Parish Council objects very strongly to the new access proposed for the existing dwelling onto Wolverton Road.

1. This is close to the traffic calming ‘build out’ which forces all traffic onto the side of the road by the proposed access. We have had previous contact with the MKC Road Safety Officer in the context of employing further traffic calming such as humps actually to the west of the build out and the proposed access and this was not possible for road safety reasons as traffic typically remains on the ‘wrong’ side of the road until it reaches the Fox Covert Lane junction.
2. The Parish Council (and Neighbourhood Action Group) operate a Speed Indicator Device (SID) on a post opposite the site on Wolverton Rd. The results are variable but the critical 85th percentile speed for incoming traffic is usually between 35mph and 44mph with only about half of incoming traffic within the 30mph speed limit. Maximum speeds are recorded up to 65mph. Note that these vehicles are on the ‘wrong’ side of the road at the proposed access.
Prior to the SID, we conducted Community Speed Watch with TVP at this site and observed a number of dangerous confrontations at the build out (despite the advertised police presence) and we continue to work with TVP to conduct speed enforcement here.
3. This access would therefore be extremely dangerous and the parish council asks the applicant to either retain the existing access entrance or a new shared access on Bullington End Rd. The parish council understands that this prevents a ‘clean break’ between the existing and proposed new properties and the possible creation of a shared driveway but it will be much safer.

An alternative would be for the traffic build out to be located further away from the village with the associated extension of the 30mph zone. This would have to be in conjunction with MKC Highways and at the applicant’s cost.

The Parish Council therefore respectfully requests the applicant to modify its application on orientation and access. If the case officer is minded to approve the application, then we would request that the decision is referred to the Development Control Panel at which we would speak.

Philip Ayles
Chairman, Castlethorpe Parish Council