

THRIELOW PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of an Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held in the Village Hall on Thursday the 22nd November 2018 at 7.35pm

Present :

Councillors – Jane Gough (Chairman)

Mark Brogan, David Easthope, Kit Jackson, Charlotte Kirby,
Owen Mackay, Barry Radley, Carly Richman, Terry Smith

Parish Clerk - Martyn Corbet

Residents:

W Aldred, Martin Arthur, Geoff Axe, Michael Braithwaite, Jan Chapman, Kevin Clarke, George Deller, Greg Elgar, Mary Forster-Lewis, Glen Link, Geoff Link, Katherine Martin, Bernard Meggitt, John Rimmer, Larry Seligman, Caroline Shaw, Gordon Shaw, Jean Tomlinson, Rosemary Tomlinson-Meade, Andy Walker, Shirley Wittering

Representatives from Developers and Architects

Simon Sommerville-Large (Laragh Homes);
James Small & Alan Smith (Snell David, Architects)

1. Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Peter Topping;

The meeting was then closed to allow the representatives from Laragh Homes and Snell David to present a presentation. After this residents were invited to ask questions and make representations.

2. Consideration of the following planning applications:

(a) S/3975/18/FL

Part demolition of existing barns; extensions, alterations and conversion of three barns to dwellings and erection of four new dwellings and widening of access at Rectory Farm, Middle Street; and

(b) S/3976/18/LB

Part demolition of existing barns; extensions, alterations and conversion of three barns to dwellings at Rectory Farm, Middle Street.

Cllr Gough explained that the documents relating to the planning applications had not been circulated to all parish councillors yet so a decision could not be reached at this stage.

Cllr Gough thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm

Chairman

Date

NOTES OF COMMENTS MADE

Kevin Clarke (KC) asked why 3 of the rooves were different. He thought that there should be tiles on all the houses. James Snell (JS) said that farm buildings were rarely constructed of the same materials. Slate was common when thatch was replaced. Clay tiles were expensive. KC went on to refer to the fact some buildings had metal rooves and thought this was not acceptable. JS explained that this was an attempt to introduce a darker colour onto the site. KC thought it look "cheap". JS said it was an attempt to produce a crisp and contemporary finish. The sheets are flat. The crisper effect is for 2 houses.

Greg Elgar (GE) asked about the elevation of number 4. JS showed a power point of this property. There would be 4 cart shed bays and the property (a former cart shed) would be extended on the right-hand side.

Shirley Wittering (SW) asked about windows and queried the installation of roof lights. JS said that residents of the house would not be able to see out because the lights were in the roof. The property will be a bungalow with just one floor.

Jean Tomlinson (JT) asked about the extension at the end of the building JS said that what was already there is being used.

SW said there are windows in the extension. Both SW and JT were concerned that this property would overlook neighbours. JS said this was not a major window. JT said she is unhappy this part of the farm is being developed at all. The building is part of the existing farm and some way from the other parts of the development. It should remain part of the farm.

SW referred to the fact that the driveway for part of the development will be more local a road and not rural as stated by JS. JS confirmed that the driveway in question is intended to be more like a track.

Mary Forster-Lewis (MFL) thought it is wrong to say the track is rural it looks more like a road.

Rosemary Tomlinson (RT) wondered what would be on the "inside" of the "L" shape. Space would be needed for people to manoeuvre. If this is the case then the material used for the surface needs to be looked at to avoid noise gavel would be noisy.

David Easthope (DE) said that part of the development is outside of the Village Envelope. Simon Sommerville-Large (SSL) said talks held with SCDC planning and that they were of this but that the viability of the site as whole was being considered. DE said that land outside the Village Envelope was not supposed to be developed. JS said that the planners are supportive. The barn is a precious building and should be preserved. The cost of doing this is dependent upon viability. He did confirm that part of the development is slightly out of the Village Envelope.

KC referred to the fact that on the plans there are 2 gates. One is for access. In which case how much traffic will there be? The other is for future access. SSL said this is for farm access. KC queried about a strip of land which had not been included with plots 6 and 7. He wondered why this was the case. SSL said that the developers do not have control of this. KC asked about the future of the field. SSL said that it would continue to be used as a meadow. SSL confirmed that the strip is being retained by the Deller family.

Derek Pinner (DP) asked if there was a smaller plan showing how the development fitted into the surrounding area.

Geoff Axe (GA) asked about a statement in the application that Barn A may be retained and converted. Alan Smith (AS) said this is in the Structural Report. Barn A has been listed since and is being retained.

Reference was made to bats in the barn. AS confirmed that between April and October no work can be done. In respect of the bats there needs to be a report to SCDC and work can only be done within certain conditions.

The report states there are 6 bus services per day to the village when there are only 3. As said that this needs to be queried with the persons who prepared the transport report.

DE referred to the fact that there are narrow roads in the village. This is especially so in respect of Middle Street. He suggested that extra houses in the village might generate some advantage to the village in terms of help for the traffic problem. Middle Street is overloaded with traffic. This is especially so when people go through the village to the tip etc at weekends. There has previously been discussion about a 20 mph speed limit. CCC Highways Department agreed to this but would not pay for it. The cost of the work is not the problem. It is the cost of the administrative and legal work which would be in the region of some £6,000.00. SSL said that discussion would need to take place regarding S106 monies.

Michael Braithwaite said that 30 years ago when he bought his property drainage in Middle Street was a problem. It still is. With 7 more properties this problem will increase. SSL said that there are plans to deal with the surface water on site which will not involve it going into the drains. Water will be controlled within the site. He said sewage needs to be looked at and there may need to be quite a lot of work done in consultation with Anglian Water and others. Removing surface water from the drains will help the drainage problems in Middle Street. AS said that water is to be diverted into Swales and tanks under the roads. JS said the site needs to be totally self-sufficient and have adequate sewerage drainage.

Reference was made to noise from gravel on the properties. AS said various possibilities were being considered such as "bound gravel".

BM referred to the fact that the current pond at the farm sometimes overflows, and that this is drained via a drain under a house next door on the right. The exit from this pipe is not shown at all. SSL said that the drainage was dealt with by Andrew Firebrace Partnership and this will need to be looked at. JS emphasised that local knowledge is invaluable. Residents will be consulted.

SW referred to the fact that the planning documents stated there is no risk of flooding. There was serious flooding in 2001. This lasted for 6 months. The statement is inaccurate. Alan Smith said the report was prepared by Andrew Firebrace Partnership. Owen Mackay (OM) asked for the details of the person dealing with the matter at Andrew Firebrace Partnership. The person is Peter Stewart. Barry Radley (BR) repeated that the site is only viable if there are 7 properties. He asked why there was an application for 7 plus 3. SSL said this was the way SCDC had listed the application. It was only an application for 7 houses.

MFL said Middle Street is a narrow road with pinch points and is used by young and old people getting to the shop and school. Traffic does not only use it to get to the tip but also during rush hours. Middle Street is the second busiest road in the village after Fowlmere Road. Speeding is a problem so is the weight of some of the traffic using the road. The is small village road not designed for such a flow of traffic. SSL confirmed that Middle Street is seen as a "cut through road". The developers are open to a solution and will consult with residents about this.

KC suggested at least a part pavement might be installed alongside the front of the barn say 150 yards. SSL said that a speed reduction might benefit residents and the developer would like to help. BM suggested one way streets. MFL was particularly concerned about heavy lorries. KC suggested a weight limit. Geoff Link (GL) said that everyone has to exist together.

Mark Brogan (MB) said Middle Street is a narrow country lane. A 20 mph speed limit is one step. It might be possible to re-route large heavy lorries away from the village

GE asked who owns the majority of the boundaries on the site. SSL confirmed that the developers would control most of the boundaries. GE has issues with the boundary between his property and the development. SSL agreed will work with him on this. SSL said it is beyond the control of the developers.

Jane Gough (JG) said that some time ago the parish council tried to get a weight restriction and it was not allowed. DP said that at the time more interest had been shown by CCC on work on the A505. JG said the problem was not just confined to Middle Street. DP said that at the time David Lines of CCC said there was a problem with traffic but CCC would not pay to deal with it. JG said weight restrictions will go on the agenda for the parish council meeting on the 14th January.

GE asked how long the development would take to build. SSL said 12-14 months.

SW emphasised there will be a need to carry out an archaeological search.

GL asked whether TPC have an opinion about the development. JG explained that the application has not been fully circulated yet.

Catherine Martin (CM) asked whether the farmhouse is going to be developed in the future. SSL said there are no plans to do this.

GA asked about construction vehicles on site. SSL said these will be retained on the site and not Middle Street.

MFL asked whether 7 houses might expand by 2 in the future. SSL said this is a possibility. JS said nothing is on the table or has been discussed.

Please note that these notes are not intended to be a verbatim record of what was said at the meeting. They are based upon the authors' notes taken on a contemporaneous basis.