

Loxley Parish Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting Held at Loxley School on 20th June 2016 at 19:30

Present: K Osborne (KO) (Vice-Chairman),
P Gregory-Hood (PGH), D Sutherland (DS), M Garcia (MG),
J Whitehorn (JW)

In Attendance: R D Armstrong (Clerk), 19 members of the public

1. Record of members present

As shown above.

2. To receive apologies and approve reasons for absence

Apologies were received and approved from G Jones (GJ).

3. Declaration of interests in any item on the agenda

Councillors were reminded that they are required to disclose an interest in any item on the Agenda.

4. To receive any questions or representations from the public

KO informed the members of the public present of the protocol to be followed when making representations to the Council.

KO further mentioned that the meeting had been called to discuss an application for outline planning consent in respect of land to the rear of Box Tree Cottage, Loxley under reference 16/01355/OUT.

The Clerk read two emails which had been received from J Baker and A Ashworth, highlighting material planning objections in respect of the application.

J Sloan mentioned that the site of the proposed development contained several springs and that a development of this nature was likely to disturb the water table.

A Turner reiterated the concerns regarding the water table and also commented on the dangers of allowing vehicular access onto Goldicote Road.

P Morris reported that two planning appeals had taken place in recent years, both of which were refused as they contravened the Village Design Statement.

W Freeman had concerns regarding the drainage of the site and the type of development.

H Mills repeated concerns regarding the water table and drainage and the potential for light pollution in a village where street lighting does not exist.

S Watts expressed concerns at the backfill which this application represents.

W Gadd reinforced the view that the development was not in keeping with the Village Design Statement and the dangerous nature of the access road onto Goldicote Road.

Initials _____ K Osborne (Vice Chairman)

5. Planning

KO read a letter of objection which the Council proposed to send to Stratford District Council in objection to the planning application.

JW requested that the letter highlight the Council's concerns in respect of the drainage issues raised by members of the community and the Clerk agreed to draft an amendment.

JW proposed that the letter form the basis of the Council's objection and this was seconded by **PGH** and was passed unanimously.

6. Any other business

There was no other business to be discussed.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Parish Council will take place on Monday 4th July 2016 at 19:30 at Loxley School.

The meeting closed at 20:15.

Signed: _____ K Osborne (Vice Chairman) Date: _____

Planning Application 16/01355/OUT Land behind Box Tree Cottage

2 messages

Annie Ashworth <annie@wordright.co.uk>

13 June 2016 at 09:31

To: Loxley Parish Clerk <loxleyparishclerk@gmail.com>, Deborah Sutherland <sutherland.deborah@gmail.com>, Justin Whitehorn <justinwhitehorn@hotmail.com>, Ken Osborne <oakwoodlodge@gmail.com>, Maria Garcia <mariaatcrofters@yahoo.co.uk>, Peter Gregory-Hood <maggie.linley@yahoo.co.uk>, Glynn Jones <loxleyparishchair@gmail.com>
Cc: Ian Davidson <itd8714@gmail.com>, Jonathan Baker <jonobaker@hotmail.com>, peter morris <peter.laneend@gmail.com>, Philip Seccombe <philip@seccombes.co.uk>

Hello

Unfortunately we won't be able to attend the extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council next Monday 20th June but we would like to make the following submission, in the hope that the Parish Council will object to the planning application above.

- A Neighbourhood Development Plan is underway in Loxley and the opinions of the village need to be taken before any planning applications should be considered.
- The proposed development is overbearing, and out of scale and character compared with existing development in the vicinity.
- The drawing submitted with the application is not to scale and not representative of what any final development could look like. The proposed area is not large enough for what is being suggested.
- The development would cause loss of views and disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- The development would affect the rural character of the neighbourhood.
- The development would result in over-development of the site which would involve loss of the open aspect for the neighbouring properties.
- The development would have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours including ourselves because of noise, overlooking, disturbance, loss of privacy and overshadowing.
- It is not in keeping with the Village Design Statement which states "The rural character of Loxley should be preserved and (sub)urbanisation avoided" and "Sufficient space should be left between and behind buildings to preserve the 'open aspect' of the village and retain links with open countryside beyond."
- Whilst we are not against all development proposals for the village, this proposal is not in keeping with the linear style of the village also identified in the design statement, but represents backfill. If it were to go ahead, it would set a precedent for the village and any future developments.
- It does not appear to include social housing which was a significant recommendation in the recent village design statement.
- The development would have a significant impact on wildlife, flora and fauna, and the environmental survey was too brief to be representative of the location.
- There is a very serious issue of safety with the location of the access to the site on Goldicote Road which is very close to the bend and The Old Post Office which has had 4 incidences of speeding vehicles crashing into it already. There has been a marked increase in traffic through the village, including prohibited HGV traffic, which will only increase as developments continue in the area and Loxley becomes even more of a rat run to Wellesbourne and the M40 than it is already. Vehicles coming out of the site would only add to a very worrying traffic issue on a narrow road, with one narrow pavement.
- We believe the number of additional cars outlined in the application is an underestimate for a development of this size.
- Traffic calming measures, overseen by Shipston Police, are already being looked into and actioned, even before additional traffic from a new village development becomes an additional issue.
- Additional traffic is also an issue because of the location of Loxley School which has no car park, and children are dropped off and collected when peak traffic is coming through the village on a very narrow stretch of road where residents are also parked.
- The road through Loxley is on the National Cycle Route and is used by a large number of cyclists. Any development in this location could endanger them.
- Many vehicles coming around the bend from the direction of The Fox Pub and village centre take the bend going over the central line. This presents an additional potential hazard.
- An application for a cottage in the garden of Hill Cottage, made (by the previous owner) in 1997, was turned down at appeal with the following as one of the reasons: "Policy H7 of the Structure Plan seeks to ensure that infilling and development of gardens and other open sites in towns and villages is not permitted if it would be detrimental to the character of the town or village... Loxley is judged to be category 3 settlement where policy H5 of the local plan states that residential development may only be permitted solely in a few limited circumstances. These include such situations as development of allocated sites, replacement dwellings, conversions, or those required in connection with agriculture." (<https://apps.stratford.gov.uk/eplanning/AppDetail.aspx?appkey=9600394OUT>) We do not believe that the land behind Box Tree Cottage is an allocated site or that Loxley has changed a great deal since this decision was made, and the proposed development is many times bigger than this application.

We trust that the above will be taken into consideration when making your decision on this proposal.

Best wishes

Annie Ashworth and Steve Pitts
Hill Cottage

Tel: 01789 470496
Mobile: 07967 821929

Jonathan Baker <jonobaker@hotmail.com>

13 June 2016 at 14:07

To: Deborah Sutherland <sutherland.deborah@gmail.com>, Justin Whitehorn <justinwhitehorn@hotmail.com>, Ken Osborne <oakwoodlodge@gmail.com>, Maria Garcia <mariaatcrofters@yahoo.co.uk>, Peter Gregory-Hood <maggie.linley@yahoo.co.uk>, Glynn Jones <loxleyparishchair@gmail.com>
Cc: Loxley Parish Clerk <loxleyparishclerk@gmail.com>, Ian Davidson <itd8714@gmail.com>, peter morris <peter.laneend@gmail.com>, Philip Seccombe <philip@seccombes.co.uk>

Dear Parish Councillor,

Re: Outline application for a residential development comprising up to 10 dwellings on land to the rear of Box Tree Cottage

I understand there is to be a meeting of the Parish Council (PC) next Monday 20th June to discuss the above proposal. I would very much like to have attended the meeting but have to be in London so I am hopeful that you will allow me to make some comments here in writing for consideration at your meeting. I have to begin by declaring a personal interest as the proposals concern land both to the side and rear of my property. I will be adding my own comments to the application but what I wish to raise with you are my concerns about the potential impact of this application on the whole village and parish of Loxley.

Firstly, I would like to refer you to the Loxley Village Design Statement (LVDS) which I believe was completed towards the end of 2006 and presumably formally adopted by the PC. In it the rural nature of Loxley is repeatedly stressed. For example, it states, 'The overwhelming 'feel' is rural, with houses maintaining open aspects to the rear' (page 3). The LVDS then states that a number of 'guiding principles' (page 6) have been adopted including that: the rural character of Loxley should be preserved and (sub)urbanisation avoided; that sufficient space should be left between and behind buildings to preserve the 'open aspect' of the village and retain links with the countryside beyond; that any development should 'preserve the landscape setting, protecting important views and settings into, out of and within the village'. Specifically regarding Infilling/Backfilling (page 6) the LVDS states as a guiding principle, that there should be '... no infilling/backfilling in fields behind the houses in Loxley and that the current density of one house next to the road is maintained'.

As I understand it, since the completion and adoption of the LVDS the parish has been successful in safeguarding these guiding principles. My concern is that were the above application to be successful this would be in complete contravention of the guiding principles in that the land concerned is a greenfield site immediately to the rear of several houses. In the outline plan of the proposed development, which is not to scale, it is clear that some of the ten houses would back directly onto the surrounding properties particularly those in Goldicote Road where there is not even provision for any kind of 'green buffer'. The point here I feel is that, should this application be successful, it would set a very clear precedent for any future planning applications for greenfield sites at the rear of other properties in the parish. Conversely, if the application is turned down this would offer an important precedent to enable the parish to safeguard these principles into the future.

My second point is with regard to the type of development proposed. Although I appreciate this is only an application for outline planning permission I note, unless I have missed something, that there is no reference made to the provision of affordable homes. Yet again in the LVDS, and the more recent Housing Needs Survey, I note that the parish preference and priority is for affordable homes to buy and rent along with 'the general desire to maintain a socially 'balanced' community'. At present I don't see the existing application addressing this need.

My third point concerns the proposed road access from Goldicote Road, which I view as a potentially serious hazard to road users as well as pedestrians and residents living by the proposed new road junction. I note that in the Traffic and Infrastructure Report provided by the applicant it makes reference to this. In Section 3.3 it states that 'generally 43m visibility in each direction from a distance of 2.4m back (from the proposed new junction) is acceptable for 30 mph roads based on the advice contained in the Manual for Streets (MfS)'. I question this. Firstly I question there is 43m visibility round the bend to the left from the junction of the proposed road access, and secondly it is well known that traffic regularly travels at speeds far in excess of 30mph around the bend by The Old Post Office.

In Section 3.4 the report states that for traffic turning onto Goldicote Road from the proposed development the 'required visibility splay can be achieved in the critical direction to the right' but goes on to admit that 'the visibility to the left (surely the true critical direction) *cannot be achieved* (my italics) to the nearest kerb due to the bend in the road but can be achieved to the centre of the carriageway'. It then goes on to say, 'However, due to the bend in the road it is unlikely that any vehicles travelling towards the site (ie. from the direction of the school) will cross the centreline'. Anyone, however, who has observed the traffic travelling around the bend will know, as I do, that vehicles frequently cross the centreline especially if they are manoeuvring around parked cars. More importantly the many large agricultural vehicles and other heavy vehicles that use the road have to cross the centreline by nature of their size. I feel the report is dangerously misleading especially as the proposals will undoubtedly have a detrimental impact on what is already a road 'black spot' in the village.

I have other concerns about the application but I hope that by raising these, which directly affect the future wellbeing of the whole parish, the PC will vote to make an objection to this application on the parish's behalf. As I understand it, this would then mean that the application would have to go before a planning committee, rather than a delegated officer. This in turn would enable those who wished to do so to make a further representation to the committee concerned in order to ensure that their voices are heard. I should add that I am not opposed to new development in Loxley which is why I joined the steering group driving the Neighbourhood Development Plan. I do, however, support the work done by the PC in the past to ensure that any future development retains the special character of the parish that made us want to live here in the first place.

Thank you for reading my submission and thank you for the time you will be giving up on Monday to discuss this application on the parish's behalf.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Baker

Christmas Cottage
1 Goldicote Road

Tel: [01789 842580](tel:01789842580)