## MORETON MORRELL PARISH COUNCIL

# MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 20<sup>th</sup> July 2015

PRESENT: Councillors: A Parry (Chair) ,J Gordon,

J Cleeton, E Greetham,

G Slora, B Keavy.

District Councillor: A Parry County Councillor: D Kendall Clerk: P Routly

3 representatives from Warwickshire College and 8

members of the public.

## 1. Public participation

Cllr Parry explained she would take comments on Triangle field at the appropriate point in the agenda. There were no other items raised.

## 2. Declaration of Interest

Cllr Parry declared an interest in the John Taylor Way planning application. Cllr Keavy declared and interest in the school transport consultation. Cllr Cleeton declared and interest in the village signs.

## 3. Apologies for absence

None.

## 4. Approval of minutes of previous meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2015

The minutes of the last meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2015 were proposed for acceptance by Cllr Cleeton, seconded by Cllr Gordon and unanimously accepted as a true record of proceedings.

## 5. District Councillors' Report

Cllr Parry pre filed the following report, she also explained in detail of the core strategy and the objections to the development on John Taylor way:-

## **Core Strategy**

At the Full Council meeting held on 22 June 2015, 21 policies within the Core Strategy were adopted on an interim basis and will now carry additional weight when determining relevant planning applications and for development management purposes. The policies are:

**CS.1** Sustainable Development

CS.2 to CS.9 inclusive (District Resources polices)

CS.10 to CS.14 inclusive (District Designation policies);

CS.20 Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

CS.21 to 26 inclusive (Economic Development and Infrastructure related policies)

Proposals ALC.3, REDD.1 and REDD.2 (employment land allocations)

The housing related policies CS.15 to CS.19 inclusive and the Area Strategies are continuing to be worked upon.

On Friday 10 July Cabinet papers for 20 July were published following the work which has been done regarding the assessment of the additional housing need across the district in response to the planning inspector's interim report. As a result of a net additional 12,100 jobs being forecast over the plan period to 2031, the increased housing requirement is being uplifted from 11,300 to 15,200 to 15,500 which includes a 5-7% headroom.

On a positive note, the Local Service villages across the district are to be protected from large scale development and will continue to retain their rural character. The focus for new large scale housing will therefore centre on the market towns and main rural village centres.

The outcome is that the following options are being recommended to deliver the new uplifted figure to meet the inspector's requirements:

- Inclusion of Long Marston Airfield (2100 homes to be built by 2031). This proposal also confirms the delivery of a substantial amount of supporting infrastructure including a new village centre, primary and secondary schools and transport related works including a relief road around the south-western side of Stratford-upon-Avon and public transport improvements
- Gaydon Lighthorne Heath (2300 to be built by 2031)
- Canal Quarter Regeneration zone (650 to be built by 2031)
- Land off Bishopton Lane SoA (around 450 homes)
- Land off Daventry Road, Southam (around 500 homes)
- Land off Alcester Road (providing around 65 homes)

These new figures are being put before Cabinet and taken to Full Council on 20 July for the vote by members.

#### **Planning**

#### John Taylor Way

I have been liaising with the planning officers in respect of both the Public Inquiry and second application in respect of 35 houses off JTW. I have been advised that the PI is unlikely to be held until February 2016. Representations are required by 30 July and I have expressed an opportunity to speak and am submitting a response which contains the following points:

- 1. Unacceptable high density and overdevelopment of the site with inappropriate site layout
- 2. Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, loss of privacy to residents in Chestnut Grove backing on to the development
- 3. Inappropriate site layout resulting in loss of existing views from neighbouring properties which would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners
- 4. Lack of public open space as Moreton Morrell College refused to renew or negotiate the renewal of the lease on the adjacent village playing field with Moreton Morrell Parish Council which runs out on 30 September 2017

- 5. Unsustainable development there is no shop in the village and no bus or footpath to the nearest main rural centre of Wellesbourne a distance of three miles plus which offers a Sainsbury's supermarket, post office, bank, pharmacy, medical centre, dental practice and a range of independent shops
- 6. Infrequent bus service to Leamington only twice a day early morning and late afternoon from the village or a 1.5 mile walk to and from Newbold Road (no footpath) villagers are totally reliant on cars and the need for a car per working member of the household.
- 7. Moreton Morrell an LSV category 4 village with a lack of public transport and has high LPG/Oil energy costs with no mains gas in the village. Demand for affordable living is consequently in Wellesbourne, a MRC category village, where residents are not reliant on the car to get to work or access services.
- 8. The Planning Inspectorate's Interim Report March 2015 highlighted the delivery of housing for 39 LSV's should not exceed 2000 and to date planning permission/construction has reached over 1500 dwellings for the period. The addition of 35 homes in Moreton Morrell would exceed its LSV 4 allocation by 70% in view of current planning permissions/constructions since 2011.

Representations for the second application are required by 27 July to SDC and in my view little has changed in respect of the second application; in fact the design and layout is even worse, particularly in respect of the visual harm to residents at 2, 4, 6, 8 Chestnut Grove and 23 John Taylor Way, with the affordable units backing on to their properties. It is disappointing that the comments made at the parish council meeting with DWH, MMC and their planners in respect of the layout have not been taken on board. Increasing the site's boundary with land across the road in order to relieve the density of the development is not an acceptable solution. Moreton Morrell is required to take a provision of new homes – up to 25 dwellings over the period from 2011 – 2031 as an LSV 4 category village. The triangle field site has been identified for development, however the allocation should relate to LSV requirements and reflect no more than 15 – 20 dwellings.

#### **Medical Centre**

Applications for 350 homes and a new medical centre will be heard at the Planning East Committee on 22 July. In the meantime I have been attending various meetings with the Parish Council and liaising with planning officers and developers to discuss finer details of scheme, CIL/Section 106 agreements.

#### A he or

## Wellesbourne & Kineton Community Forum

Attended meeting on Thursday 18 June at Wellesbourne Fire Station together with Cllr Cleeton and Cllr Gordon and the next meeting will be held in Ashorne Village Hall on Thursday 24 September 2015 at 6.30pm

#### Sainsbury's

I have written to the manager at Sainsbury's asking for a meeting to discuss the possibility of Sainsbury's providing some community transport to the store on a set day/time for local villagers who do not drive or have access to a car in Moreton Morrell and Ashorne. She has acknowledged my request and has passed the matter to a colleague to consider.

#### **Little Morrell Kennels**

I visited the new kennels last week which became operational on 1 July and am impressed with the quality and the specification of the facility. At the time of my visit there were eight dogs present and I could not hear any noise from barking at all. The double door system and quality of build would appear to be operating well from a sound proofing perspective. Each kennel is extremely generous in size and Mr George advised that the Inspector remarked that the facility was up to RSPCA standards.

## Footpath-Bridleway SD311

Attending the NPAPC meeting on behalf of the District and MMPC on Thursday 30 July.

## 6. County Councillors' Report

Cllr Kendall explained that the County Cllr Grant fund would soon be open for applications. He also explained that requests for improvements relating to safer routes to school to projects were required for the 12<sup>th</sup> of August.

## 7. Warwickshire College Report

Marcus Roberts, Angela Joyce (Group Principal) and Robert Bevan (Finance Director) attended from Moreton Morrell College. Marcus explained the negotiations were undergoing with respect to walking access and dog access around the campus . At the current position is not compatible with the duty of care the Ofted to require. There is a possibility and that a permissive path could be granted around box field. There is still also significant issue of dog mess on campus and a leaflet campaign will be run in conjunction with the parish council. Cllr Parry requested that the leaflet campaign extends to neighbouring villages. Marcus also said that there would be British Equestrian event at the end of September, that Italian students were on site over the summer, and there was an international floristry event in August. The new term would start on the 6<sup>th</sup> September.

#### 8. Sub Committee Reports and General Updates

- a) Playing Field Cllr Cleeton
  - i) Update and repairs
  - ii) Stile quote (Clerk)
  - iii) Lease (Cllr Greetham)

Cllr Cleeton reported there were several items that needed repairing on the playing field including the wood climbing frame which had the loose support pole. It was resolved for cllr Cleeton to seek quotations to repair the climbing frame or remove it from the playing field. Cllr Cleeton also reported that the newly formed playing field fundraising committee was holding a party in the park on the 25<sup>th</sup> of July. On this first occasion fee will be held at the school. Cllr Gordon enquired whether the football pitch to be marked out professionally, it was resolved to ask the grass cutting company. *Cllr Cleeton to organise*.

With respect to the stile quote the clerk said she had a quotation from Mr. Franklin for £105. The works were proposed by Cllr Gordon seconded by Cllr Keavy and approved unanimously. *Clerk to organise*.

Cllr Greetham informed the meeting she had discussions with John Vickery about extension of the playing field lease. He had indicated that the college was prepared to extend the lease. Mr Bevan who was present indicated this is not the case, any playing field lease extension was directly linked to the triangle field planning application.

## a) Planning – Cllr Parry

## i) Triangle Field Appeal (for new plans see item 11a)

Members of the public are given the opportunity to speak.

Brian Chalk of Chestnut Grove said there were concerns with density stating a new application said there were 26 houses per hectare when infact the was 35 if the field was excluded. There were issues with the safety of LPG and the cost, as well as flooding. There were no decent transport links, the school was full. And the site was completely unsustainable.

David Nuttall said there were still no agreement on the playing field and 106 contributions.

Alison Wedgewood said she agreed with all of Cllr Parry's comments it would set a further president to extend the village boundary. There were also concerns with the new layout with a social houses on the boundary of Chestnut Grove.

Steven Routly for the new application had the same reasons for objection as the original application. The density was the same. With the village been designated a category for service village was only allocation 25 houses until 2031. Moreton Morrell was already ahead of the distribution plan. He stated the college should reduce their expectations of the financial gain and agree to a more appropriate number houses.

Simon Jones also stated it was unacceptable, the roads were over crowded.

Peter Curtis asked whether there was a housing need in the village as the village plan was many years out of date.

Cllr Parry summarised and it was resolved unanimously to strongly opposed the appeal and refuse the new planning application. *Clerk to respond*. Cllr Parry also stated she had registered to speak at the appeal.

See section 11a for the planning comments.

## b) Speed awareness - Cllr Gordon

#### i) Speed reduction measures, police

Cllr Gordon informed the meeting that it had been decided not go down the DIY route with a speed camera. Instead he had attended the community forum and the police had agreed to visit the site. They have done a number of checks and warned several motorists. He also stated they continue to pursue the flashing speed reduction sign for Duffus hill. Cllr Cleeton stated that the zigzag lines and speed reduction measures outside the school needed to be repainted. Cllr Gordon said he would follow up with highways. *Cllr Gordon to action*.

#### c) Village Appearance – Cllr Keavy

i) Village signs new committee

Cllr Keavy said he would obtain a quotation from a local carpenter.

## d) Footpaths and Trees – Cllr Morgan

- i) Footpath survey
- ii) Rep for Moreton Morrell to Wellesbourne footpath committee proposed by NPAPC

Cllr Morgan was not present however Cllr Parry said she was going to be the representative on the Wellesbourne footpath committee which was going to meet on a 30<sup>th</sup> July. Cllr Cleeton asked whether the tree on the farm drive by the lamp post could be trimmed. It was resolved that she would obtain a quote from Mr Hall. *Cllr Cleeton to obtain quote*.

## e) Village Hall, Church and College – Cllr Cleeton / All

i) Update

Cllr Cleeton said there was nothing to report on the hall and Church. Cllr Parry said she had contacted John Parker to have a meeting to up the catch up on church matters.

## 9. Matters arriving from previous meeting

None.

## 10. New items

#### a) Village Hall Wifi

The clerk stated she had written to the village hall committee and had a positive response, they would discuss the broadband installation at the next committee meeting in August. A member of the parish council would be invited.

#### b) Dog Fouling

Cllr Cleeton and Cllr Parry had been liaising on measures to prevent dog fouling. A leaflet has been produced for distribution. It was also suggested that mark of paint should be used to shame, and poo bags should be distributed to all households in the village. The total cost would be around £100, this was proposed by Cllr Keavy, seconded by Cllr Gordon and carried unanimously. *Clerk to order*.

#### c) Website updates

The clerk requested that all Councillors provide photographs and contact details that there prepared have published on a website.

#### d) Welcome Pack Update

Cllr Parry explained there was a significant amount of updating required and she would attempt it with help from of the Councillors.

## 11. Planning

#### a. New Applications to consider at this meeting

15/02095/FUL Residential development of 35 dwelling with 35% affordable provision, associated landscaping, drainage attenuation basin, extension to existing LPG Compound and

additional infrastructure including pedestrian and vehicular access (Resubmission of previous application 14/00946/FUL). Land Off John Taylor Way Moreton Morrell

After discussion it was resolved to strongly objects . Clerk to respond

The following response was sent:-

The Parish Council strongly objects to this planning application.

The application is almost identical to 14/00946/FUL that was refused, and is now subject to Appeal. This is an attempt by the applicant to circumnavigate the appeal process with a cynical parallel application, that to all intense and purposes is the same. All the reasons for refusal remain. Please refer to our prior comments.

The density and proximity to neighbours has not been addressed, there are the same number of houses as in the original submission, but they are now counting a piece of land in the field opposite to optically improve the density calculation. By moving the social houses to the boundary with Chestnut Grove has made the proximity issues citied in the original refusal worse. Instead of one Chestnut Grove resident having one close neighbour, they now have four close neighbours gardens, this is not acceptable.

The green open space (playing field) has not been addressed, in fact the situation has become worse. The College Principal attended the council meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> July and made it clear the College would not negotiate on the playing field lease extension at this time. Therefore it cannot be assumed that there will be any open space.

There is still no S106 offer on the table.

SDC need to be consistent and refuse for the same reasons, and let the appeal process run.

The original reasons for refusal are listed below with update comments.

#### Policy

The draft SDC Core Strategy has designated Moreton Morrell mas a LSV with a 10 to 25 houses allocation over 20 years. The Parish Council is aware of 11 approved or pending applications since 2011, leaving a balance of only 17 for the next 17 years. The current Village Plan adopted by SDC only supports small / individual developments. If this development were to go ahead the main village dwellings would increase by about 18%, totally against policy for a LSC class 4. The total number for a single development should be around 15.

Given the Core Strategy is not approved, development of the site is not approved but is purely speculative. Therefore the suitability of the site needs to be tested under the NPPF sustainable development requirements, in particular it must serve an economic role, social role and environmental role. The application fails on all 3 counts.

There will be **no economic benefits** to the village, almost all residents are commuters, there is no shop or post office (contrary to the false claims), and very poor amenities and infrastructure. The developer only claims benefits during construction and this will not be for the community. It fails the NPPF test.

There is **no social role**, the local housing need is not proven, there is no data, it is not a high quality build, and the community cannot support the health or educational needs. The only supporting statement from the developer in section 4.16 is that current provision is over crowded. This is not proven. It fails the NPPF test.

There will **be no environmental benefit**, the only claim is that they will plant some trees and build a pond, this does not offset losing 2.5 acres of valuable agricultural land.

The ultimate NPPF test is whether the development is sustainable. Contrary to the false claims of buses and good transport, there is very little provision. There is a bus twice a day to Leamington Spa (none on Sunday). There is no shop or post office, in fact no provisions can be bought in the village. All houses including social/ low cost will require motor vehicles. The houses are built to the minimum standards and no CO2 is offset by renewables, not even rainwater collection is mentioned. The proposed LPG heating is the cheapest installed heating solution for the developer, but not sustainable and is the most expensive form of heating.

In conclusion the development fails on the sustainability test. There are much more appropriate areas to develop within the District that have supporting infrastructure to meet SDC housing needs., in particular the needs of social housing tenants. The Parish Council has no data suggesting the need for this number of social houses, and needed or sustainable with local employment.

Therefore in terms of Current Strategy, Draft Core Strategy and NPPF the proposal fails on all counts and should be refused.

There are also other significant issues with the proposal:-

#### **Density**

The applicant makes comparison with the density on John Taylor Way (JTW), but on this basis the number of houses should be 28 maximum, as JTW was measured as 1.48 hectares by Laing Homes and has 37 houses. Only one house on JTW is a 5 bed, this application has 6 off 5 bed dwellings. The overall density in terms of 46,000 square feet is much larger for a smaller area. All JTW dwellings are 2 storey, this development has 2.5 storey houses, dormer windows are totally out of keeping with the rest of the village street scene. The tree break on the opposite side of the road is now believed included in the calculations, to reduce the density calculations, this will revert back to the College, as it did on John Taylor Way, and hence should not be used in calculations.

#### Verges and parking

The applicant asserts the street scene on John Davis drive will follow JTW, this is un true the plans show the houses are only 5m from the road edge not 10m as on JTW. The front gardens have been eliminated; this is a result of density issues and is over bearing and therefore not in keeping. As a result of density and layout the internal site pavements also appear to have been eliminated, and there is no visitor parking provision. Many cars are parked on the kerbs in JTW and Chestnut Grove due to lack of space (many households with young adults at home have 4 or 5 cars) and this plan has less provision.

#### Sustainability

LPG is not sustainable and very expensive; many residents of Chestnut Grove including the private homes stated they cannot afford to heat their homes. The developer should have a made a proposal as a minimum to install mains gas as it is only a few hundred metres from the site, and would benefit the whole village. There is also a question of safety, as the tanks are much close to the houses than on JTW. It has also been mentioned the JTW tanks failed due to water table flooding; there is no provision to mitigate.

The houses have no sustainability measures included or renewable energy proposals. The pond provisional for flooding is deemed dangerous, and through local knowledge in the wrong location. Motors cars are the only means of transport, and all residents will end up commuters.

#### Section 106

The Parish Council was led to believe at the December developer meeting the local contribution would be circ £100K, now only £25k is proposed. If the SDC CIL payment was imposed (at £150/sqm as proposed) this would generate £650K with over £100K to the Parish. The current proposal is unacceptable, and makes no meaningful infrastructure contribution.

The applicant makes no provision for open space on the site due to the adjacent playing field. The playing field only has a 3 year lease from the College remaining, and therefore not secure. It is a legal planning obligation to provide open space, this must be done on the site itself, it cannot assumed to be provided by the Parish Council as the College may choose not to renew the lease.

The school has confirmed they have not been consulted by WCC Education Authority, and contrary to assertion, they do not have spaces in all classes, and have infrastructure needs. Any education provision must go direct to Moreton Morrell school.

There is an assumption made on health provision, but this is planned to go to the Health trust for hospitals, again this must be allocated directly to Wellesbourne GP Surgery as they cannot service current needs.

## Other issues

Traffic movements have been wildly under estimated based on JTW, all home owners need to use a car, to shop, travel to work or even visit a doctor. A combination of College traffic, JLR traffic, and the new homes proposed at Gaydon/ Lighthorne and Warwick, will cause major issues locally.

The Developer implies they have widely consulted, this is not true, one meeting was held that was planned at short notice, and neighbouring residents have never been directly involved.

In conclusion application is financially speculative offering no benefit to the community. It is premature and excessive in scale. It fails to meet all the NPPF tests, and the village infrastructure is inadequate for the number of dwellings proposed.

Based on the above SDC must refuse the application, as it did the prior application.

#### b. Decisions of committee since last meeting for information

15/01970/TREE- T1 lime: Lift crown to 4.5-5metres above ground level. Tip back mid to upper crown on The Lodge side (northern side) by 1-1.5metres, to shape. Thin remaining crown by 15%. Remove deadwood and prune off basal suckers to allow the arborist to inspect base of tree. (Alternative works as agreed with the agent). Moreton Manor Moreton Morrell Warwick CV35 9AL. **Objection to original felling** 

15/02044/FUL Installation of a velux window Hibiscus Moreton Paddox Moreton Morrell Warwickshire CV35 9BU . No  ${\bf Reps}$ 

#### c. District Decisions for information

15/01235/FUL - Proposed ancillary accommodation. East Lodge, Fosse Way, Moreton Morrell, Warwick CV35 9BX. **Permissions with Conditions**.

15/01092/FUL - Single storey rear extension. Rose Cottage, Middletown, Moreton Morrell, Warwickshire CV35 9AU. **Permissions with Conditions.** 

15/01970/TREE- T1 lime: Lift crown to 4.5-5metres above ground level. Tip back mid to upper crown on The Lodge side (northern side) by 1-1.5metres, to shape. Thin remaining crown by 15%. Remove deadwood and prune off basal suckers to allow the arborist to inspect base of tree. (Alternative works as agreed with the agent). Moreton Manor Moreton Morrell Warwick CV35 9AL. **Approved with conditions**.

## 12. Finance

## a) Approval of payments

The following payments were proposed by Cllr Keavy seconded by Cllr Gordon, and approved unanimously.

1.	RP Hall – mowing May	£168.00
2.	RP Hall – mowing June	£252.00
3.	EON Street Lightselec – May/June	£117.75
4.	Village Hall meeting rent July	£15.00
5.	SDC Election costs	£100.00
6.	Open spaces membership	£45.00
7.	WALC training - A Parry	£30.00
8.	Donation St Georges Churchyard Intenal Audit	£50.00
9.	P Routly Salary	£664.73
10.	HMRC - PAYE	£9.00
11.	P Routly Expenses	£57.88

## b) Receipts

None.

#### c) Internal Audit feedback

The Clerk informed the meeting there were no issues with the internal feedback, and the accounts had now been submitted for external audit.

## d) Risk Assessment Update

The Clerk had pre-circulated and revised risk assessment. It was proposed for acceptance by Cllr Parry, this was seconded by Cllr Keavy and carried unanimously.

## e) Transparency Act ( what we must publish on website )

The Clerk informed the meeting that the external audit regime was being removed for small councils but they would need to publish the following information. *Clerk to ensure compliance*.

- a. All items of expenditure above £100
- b. end of year accounts
- c. annual governance statement (Signed relevant page of Annual Return)
- d. internal audit report
- e. list of councillor or member responsibilities
- f. the details of public land and building assets
  - a. description (what it is, including size/acreage),
  - b. location (address or description of location)
  - c. owner/custodian, e.g. the authority or board manages the land or asset on behalf of a local charity,
  - d. date of acquisition (if known),
  - e. cost of acquisition (or proxy value),
  - f. present use.
- g. Minutes, agendas and meeting papers of formal meetings

## 13. Correspondence ( new)

The Clerk informed the meeting the following had been circulated by email

- a) SDC PlanningTraining
- b) WCC Flood grants
- c) School transport consultation

WCC flood grants were available all year if required.

On the subject of the school transportation, Cllr Keavy stated he agreed to document and was concerned that pupils would pass the 11 plus to go grammar school would be charged, was pupils would not passed would not be charged to attend the nearest school. *Councillors to respond to the survey, the link was sent by the clerk* 

## 14. Matters of interest – future meeting agenda items

It was resolved to add the following items to the agenda of the next meeting:-College footpath access, or there might be necessary to meet before the next meeting.

## 14. Any other business allowed by the Chairman as Urgent

None.

## 15. Date of next meeting

The next council meeting will be held in the Moreton Morrell Village Hall on Monday 21<sup>th</sup> September 2015.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.25 pm.