



# Castlethorpe Parish Council

Minutes of a Parish Council Extraordinary Meeting held remotely by video conference at 7.30 on 13th December 2021

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

## Public session:

A resident spoke outlining objections to planning application 21/02841/FUL to be considered later at item 3.1: The applicants had originally applied for a Certificate of Lawfulness but had been told that a full planning application is required because permitted development rights do not apply to Shepperton Close  
The application is retrospective as the fence is already there  
The height of the fence is greater than other fencing resulting in a loss of view and light  
The appearance of the fence is inconsistent with the neighbouring properties and includes concrete posts that cannot be seen elsewhere in the Close  
Fencing has been erected just 100 mm from an existing fence that is owned by a neighbour. This is bad building practice and makes ongoing maintenance 'almost impossible'.  
He asked that the parish council object to the application.  
The comments will be considered when item 3.1. is discussed.  
There were no further matters raised.

- |          |   | <b>ACTION</b> |
|----------|---|---------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>  |               |
| 1.1      | None.   |               |
| <b>2</b> | <b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>   |               |
| 2.1.     | None  |               |
| <b>3</b> | <b>TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS (previously viewed on line by Councillors)</b>   |               |
| 3.1.     | <b>21/02841/FUL</b> - Retrospective application for new timber fences to side boundaries 12 Shepperton Close:<br>Following considerable discussion Cllr Forgham proposed that objection be made on the grounds that the fencing contravened the Neighbourhood Plan's design guidance for Shepperton Close in that no other property in the character area has fencing higher than 1.4 meters and there are no other concrete posts. Additionally, the fencing can be seen from the public highway, from the Chequers and Shepperton Close. His proposal was rejected by a majority and therefore the parish council will not object.<br><b>21/02796/FUL</b> - Erection of a gazebo (retrospective): 5 School Lane<br>No objection |               |
| 3.2.     | <b>TO CONSIDER OUTSTANDING MATTERS AND TO ADVISE CLERK ACCORDINGLY</b>  |               |
| <b>4</b> |   |               |
| 4.1.     | Suggestions for naming the new housing development at Maltings 2 had been invited via Facebook and the suggestions made had been summarised and circulated. Each councillor chose their preferred suggestion(s) and they were all put to the vote. The name Carrington Close polled the most votes and it was therefore agreed that the parish council request that this name be proposed to MKC. <b><u>Clerk to write to MKC requesting the street name 'Carrington Close.'</u></b>  |               |
|          | <b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>   |               |
| <b>5</b> |   |               |
| 5.1.     | Cllr Ayles and the Clerk had walked the village with MKC and Ringway representatives to clarify the order for heritage style replacement streetlights for the Chequers, Shepperton Close, Bullington End Road and Thrupp Close. It was confirmed that the order that had been placed was 3 lights short of the number of units that were actually sited in the village. Two streetlights in Thrupp Close and one in Shepperton Close had not been included due to MKC mapping not being up-to-date.   |               |

Cost of introducing new lights would be c. £850 each. Cllr Ayles suggested that there are three lights that could be excluded from the order; two are the lights in Station Road that light up the road narrows (SR1 & SR2) which are outside of the village proper and a light at the base of the railway footbridge between Gobbey's Field and the railway footbridge (TC2). The Clerk had advised that as decisions had already been made to purchase 66 lights then no further resolution would be required to exchange these lights for the Thrupp Close and Shepperton Close lights, but that if a further three are required there would need to be a resolution at a future meeting. The majority of cllrs agreed that they do not want to convert light TC2 but would want a resolution at the next meeting to order the extra two lights for Station Road. Clerk to include on agenda for January meeting. Cllr Sawbridge later added that a comment on Facebook suggested that if the streetlights at the approach to the village on Station Road were converted then so should those on Wolverton Road.

**Clerk**

- 5.2.** Cllr Ayles had drafted a residents' survey asking for preference on installing a dual electrical vehicle point at Station Road. He asked the cllrs to respond with any comments.
- 5.3.** Cllr Markham asked whether the parish council would be able to nominate people to take up social housing at Maltings 2 when it is developed. Cllr Ayles responded that this had been discussed at the last meeting and it had been agreed that the parish council would be happy to endorse and application from someone with local connections, although it is not known whether this would have any impact on the housing association's allocation process. He added that MKC had formally declined the applicant's request to stand down the s.106 financials so that must be honoured by the applicant.
- 5.4.** Cllr Markham raised concerns about the drains by the War Memorial and suggested that they should be cleared. It was agreed that this be deferred to the next meeting.

**Clerk**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.38