

# Lighthorne Parish Council

## **Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council held in Lighthorne Village Hall at 8.00pm on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2015**

**1. Present:** Cllr Archer, Cllr Dick, Cllr Steele, Cllr Daniel, Cllr Ryan and Cllr Williams.  
**To accept apologies for absence:** Cllr Mills.

**2. To agree minutes of the meetings held on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> August 2015.**

Cllr Dick proposes that they be agreed, Cllr Daniel 2nds. Agreed.

**3. Member's declaration of interest.** None.

**4. To take any questions from the floor.**

Village volunteers are monitoring traffic through the village at peak hours – the figures are being reported back to JLR/AML direct. Thanks to this group for their ongoing efforts.

Concerns raised from the floor about the planning applications – comments and objections put forward.

**5. Planning – See Attached list (reverse)**

**a. Discuss New Applications / Issues**

15/02828/OUT – Erection of 4 houses with access to Bishops Hill – Geoff Cotterill – Cllr Steele proposes an objection, Cllr Dick seconds, agreed.

15/02830/OUT – Outline for 4 dwellings – Pound Green – John Cole - Cllr Steele proposes an objection, Cllr Dick seconds, agreed.

15/03006/FUL – Demolition of Lighthorne Lamb – Erection of 4 houses and access road – David Tompkins - Cllr Steele proposes no representation but with comments, Cllr Dick seconds, agreed.

(Full account listed below)

**Update from Cllr Steele on New Settlement/ Parish Councils response**

Consultation response – representation on behalf of LPC, FORSE and Parishes being drafted. Cllr Steele proposes that LPC continues to support the joint representation – Cllr Daniel Seconds - agreed. First draft to be circulated amongst LPC this week. New letter from LPC required to officially give our support to the representation given elections have taken place since last year.

JLR Parish Council preview 8<sup>th</sup> Sept and Community Forum 8<sup>th</sup> Sept - Cllr Archer attended – JLR have unveiled their plans for their existing site (NOT land opposite, so NOT part of GLH), will include generating an additional 1,600 employees in the next 5 years. They have purchased 200 acres of land behind their site, to use as temporary accommodation whilst the upgrade and building etc to their site is in progress – they will create more parking on site.

JLR open days at Heritage Centre where all their plans can be viewed - 2pm to 7pm Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> to Friday 11<sup>th</sup>, then 11am to 4pm Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> September.

## **6. Parish Maintenance.**

### **a. Sports Pavilion/Sports Ground**

JLR have offered a days labour as part of their Community Help Scheme – It is suggested that they will clear the car park and undergrowth, strimming etc as required – Cllr Ryan will liaise.

### **b. Highways**

Concern over works at junction with B4100 – Cllr Mills had arranged for SDC enforcement officer to visit the site and also contact the land owner – no offences reported – the owner claims to be clearing the site to make it look bigger ready for sale. Cllr Williams reports that No licence would be needed to burn the piles of bushes etc in the field. Cllr Williams does not believe that there is any need for alarm about the intentions for this field.

Cllr Williams was asked to request that the Public Footpath sign be reinstated across field adjoining B4100 – It was reported to Cllr Williams that the footpath needs to be cleared.

Concerns regarding road safety and newly exposed verge from works in field adjoining B4100 raised with Cllr Williams – he said that there is nothing anyone can do – there is no requirement for the land owner to fence or delineate the land in any way.

Stepping Stones – John Pearce is in talks with WCC/Highways to resolve the issues arising from his earth works.

Dog Fouling on footpath from PO Lane reported – advised that Cllr Mills can source more ‘dog fouling’ signs upon his return from holiday – this will need to be chased up. LPC to ask Cllr Mills for an additional 2 to 4 signs.

Street Light in Verney Close still broken – Cllr Steele will obtain details from the specific telegraph pole and Cllr Daniel will report to WCC.

Reports received that cars parking on pavement in Verney Close and other roads causing danger to pedestrians – a specific car has been brought to LPC’s attention – Cllr Steele will attempt to speak to the owner and if not possible a polite note will be left on their car.

In spite of the leak in the Village Hall Car Park having been reported to Seven Trent Water, no action has been taken – Cllr Steele will report the matter again.

### **c. Playpark**

No update.

### **d. Trees**

No update.

## **7. Assets, Contracts and Finance.**

### **a. To receive the financial statements from the Responsible Financial Officer.**

Invoices presented for payment.

### **b. To authorise the signing of orders for payment**

<b>Payee</b>	<b>Cheque No</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Rainbow Gardens	001848	£540
Eon	001849	£68.32

Proposed to be signed by Cllr Steele, seconded Cllr Ryan. Agreed.

## **Government, other Councils, Council associations and local authorities**

Cllr Williams reports:

**Regionalisation – Greater Birmingham Authority.** As I have alluded to previously WCC are involved in discussions about the make-up of local government based on the Government's devolution agenda. Warwickshire has 3 options. Firstly, to join in with a greater Birmingham Authority and Coventry and Solihull; not a popular idea and possibly a last resort. Secondly, to form a separate authority with Coventry and possibly Solihull; this requires all districts to agree and Coventry to want it (they don't). Thirdly, to create a joined up agreement with surrounding shire authorities i.e. Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Leicestershire. This would be a complex but workable solution, if all round agreement could be reached. We have to combine with someone!

In the meantime, WCC is beginning to realise the implications of the reductions in government grant and the reductions in services that this has entailed, especially in housing related matters. As I have already intimated, this situation is being exacerbated by new legislation regarding the Care Act, integration with Health, deteriorating infrastructure, and ageing population and the effects of having to increase the minimum wage.

All things considered the County Council, last Thursday, voted not to proceed with Option 1, the combining of Birmingham, Coventry and Solihull. The preferred option would be for a new initiative to combine with Coventry but as this seems unlikely the County are pursuing the option of combining with other shire counties, which would mean that we can still maintain our independence and not be dependent upon Birmingham and other West Midland metropolitan authorities.

This matter has to be resolved by the end of February 2016. I will keep you informed of any initiatives that arise.

## **8. To consider any other matters which the chair decides urgent.**

## **9. Date for the next meeting.**

Tuesday 13th October 2015 at 8:00pm

Meeting closes at 9:20pm

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS June 2015

### New Applications and Decisions in Green

	<b>DETAILS</b>	<b>SUBMITTED BY</b>	<b>PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS</b>	<b>SDC DECISION</b>
15/00976/OUT	GLH – 2,000 houses etc	Bird/CEG	Object Full and detailed objection submitted	
15/02264/VARY	Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 13/03257/FUL to allow for the installation of conservatory to dwelling (new bungalow in garden with access from Church Lane)	John Pearce Stepping Stones	Object	Granted
15/02310/FUL	Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of 2 storey extension and first floor balcony balcony	Fiona Johnston Stone House	No Comment	Granted
15/02815/DDT	fell dead eucalyptus tree	Ben Thornton	No Comment	
15/02546/FUL	Extension to Village hall	Noel Hunter	No Comment Summary of reps received attached.	
15/02828/OUT	Erection of 4 houses with access to Bishops Hill	Geoff Cotterill	Object	
15/02830/OUT	Outline application all matters reserved except access for the demolition of existing barns and the erection of 5 dwellings	John Cole	Object	
15/03006/FUL	Demolition of Lighthorne Lamb buildings and erection of 4 dwellings with access road and associated works	David Tompkins	No Comment	

## **POUND GREEN**

Lighthorne Parish Council Strongly Objects to the outline application to build 4 dwellings at Pound Green (15/02830/OUT).

We object for the reasons set out in brief below and wish to register to make oral representations at the relevant meeting of the full committee charged with deciding this application in due course.

1. The proposal tends to urbanise a rural wooded lane – to enable access a large number of trees and bushes would have to be removed entirely – this fundamentally changes the nature and appearance of the area and amounts to a significant loss of visual amenity.

2. The land designated for access is entirely unsuitable leading onto a single track as it does.

3. The topography of the land is entirely unsuitable for a housing development. The location is one of the most elevated in the conservation village and rises some 15m above Old School Lane. This would have a very negative impact on the visual amenity of the village and rural character of the village.

4. The extreme elevation of this land as set against the listed buildings on its northern boundary would be detrimental for those residents - The properties would be visible from the listed dwellings below and would be oppressive and out of character to these historic buildings. It would damage irreparably their setting and character.

5. The proposed properties are not in keeping with the historical character stone of the conservation area. They would have a negative impact on the conservation area and undermine the historic character of the area. The temporary corrugated shelters sought to be demolished do not represent 'previously developed land' and are not visible from the road, so their removal would not provide any benefit to the area.

6. The development would tend to coalesce Lighthorne with Lighthorne Heath, something SDC have guaranteed in their Draft Core Strategy they will not allow to happen. The Inspector's Report from 1995 further reinforced that there should be no joining of the villages and that the conservation village of Lighthorne should be kept separate and distinct to preserve its historic character and status. The proposed Pound Green site would reduce the distance between the 2 villages to a mere one field - this goes against prior planning decisions and the current Draft Core Strategy.

7. The access is onto an already congested small lane, further development off this lane is entirely inappropriate. As recently as February 2015, Government Inspector Peter Drew and Dave Nash walked along Old School lane, Heath Lane and the footpaths/fields in between - it was emphasised by both of them that Heath Lane would not be permitted as an access for traffic, and that this would be prohibited.

8. Under the terms of the Emerging Core Strategy, Lighthorne is a category 4 LSV. Lighthorne has 165 dwellings and would therefore be expected to build no more than 13.2 houses to the end of the plan period end 2031 (8% of the current housing figure) - permission has been granted for 11 properties in the last 12 months. We would argue that to grant permission for 4 further properties would be contrary to SDC's policy for Cat 4 LSVs and the emerging Core Strategy. The village does not have either the facilities or the services to

support over development of this scale and pace. It would prohibit the natural expansion of the village up to 2031.

9. The information provided regarding wildlife and ecology is wholly inaccurate and cannot be relied upon - as an example, there are great crested newts in the field and woodpeckers in the adjoining trees. The assessment is flawed. The development would adversely affect wildlife and ecology by destroying their habitat. Of concern there is a history of Japanese Knotweed in the field - a full assessment on this specific issue is entirely absent from the application.

10. The proposed development is on greenfield agricultural land – this conflicts with the established policy to utilise brownfield sites for new development.

11. The application fails to deal adequately with or address the issues of flooding. There are numerous springs and streams in and around the field - the water levels fluctuate greatly and flooding occurs regularly. What guarantees are there that this development will not increase the flow of water to and through the whole village and surrounding area? There is inadequate information about or research into this. The development of the field is likely to have a detrimental effect on numerous properties throughout Lighthorne.

Lighthorne Parish Council objects to this application and asks that it be rejected as wholly inappropriate.

## **HOME FARM**

No objection in principle to development of the site for housing at Home Farm (15/03006/FUL) – 2 or 3 houses would be more appropriate given the poor access.

We raise the following questions and concerns:

- 1 This is a full planning application and although a level survey is submitted there are no finished levels shown for the proposed buildings and site works. Without this information it is not possible to assess heights in relation to existing surroundings.
- 2 The application refers to the site as being brownfield previously developed. It is our understanding that this only applies to the existing building and its adjoining parking area. The remainder of the site is classed as agricultural land. Is this correct?
- 3 What is the proposed surface treatment for the access road? We would object if this is not to be sealed due to the noise nuisance of traffic movement on loose surfaces.
- 4 Will the road be lit and, if so what are the proposals?
- 5 Will the road be adopted by the highway agency?
- 6 What is the proposed treatment and use of the public open space? The area is currently stripped of topsoil and covered in hard-standing. Who will be responsible for future maintenance of this space?
- 7 What are the finished levels and proposals for boundary treatment on the common boundaries? There are matters outstanding from previous development of the site

when support to the west boundary was removed. There are concerns over the security of the neighbouring properties given that they would be adjoining public open space.

- 8 The plans show that hedging and trees are to be planted along neighbouring boundaries. To ensure continuing enjoyment of their properties we ask that this planting is of non-coniferous indigenous species. The trees and hedging selected should not exceed a mature height of 6 metres and be positioned so that mature spread does not encroach onto neighbouring property.
- 9 We are concerned that there is a danger to pedestrians at the site entrance. The approach from the west on the public footpath is completely blind. The access road appears to narrow at this point preventing two vehicles passing which will necessitate reversing manoeuvres at a point where there is no pedestrian segregation. Further accurate survey information is required to clarify these issues. If the current situation continues with increased traffic it is only a matter of time before a child running along the footpath is hit by a car. The survey information given on this application does not extend beyond the site entrance and without that information it is not possible to accurately determine sight lines.
10. The application refers to the current number of cars allowed under the existing approval but this was dependent on construction of an access to suit highway requirements and use of the farm shop was time restricted. The shop never opened and the road works were not carried out. Taking into account the extended time use by traffic and deliveries to five properties (including Home Farm) this application increases the load on the access. It would also be useful to know what arrangements are to be made for refuse collection. At present HGV's generally reverse into the site.
11. The submitted site plans are incorrect in that they show the red outline of the site to include the public footpath and the verge. This gives an erroneous impression, which conceals the visibility problem, which exists at the point of egress from within the site. Correct plans should be provided showing the exact boundaries of the site.

### **LAND OFF BISHOPS HILL**

We object to the application to build four houses on the land off Bishops Hill (15/02828/OUT) for the following reasons:

1. The proposed access onto Bishops Hill would not be safe, and planning permission should be refused on this ground
2. Lighthorne is a category 4 LSV with 165 houses within the village - permission has already been given for 11 houses within the Core Strategy Plan Period, as such a maximum of 13.2 houses can be built pre 2031 (8 % max of village current housing), It would be contrary to SDC's emerging CS to give this application permission.