

# 31 July EOM Minutes

## Minutes Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting 7.00 Mon. 31<sup>st</sup> July 2023

Council Members:

Present: Geoffrey Dorrity [*Chair*]; Jenny Taylor [*Councillor*]; Andrew Watkins [*Councillor*]; Teri England [*Councillor*]

Absent: Zoe J North [*Vice Chair and Acting Clerk/Proper Officer*]

Number of residents or their representatives present: 14 + 4 councillors

1.0 Apologies for Absence : Cllr North due to bereavement

2.0 Conflicts: None

3.0 Minutes of Last Meetings

**Motion:** To adopt the draft minutes as a true record of the previous meeting of 12<sup>th</sup> July 2023

**Proposed : Cllr Taylor, Seconded: Cllr Dorrity**

**4.0 To discuss the Parish Council response to SKDC planning officer with regard to application S23/1252**

The chair stated that this was a Parish Council meeting and that public comments that were additional to the councils deliberations and comments would be taken following this. In addition the chair proposed that the material planning considerations as described by SKDC should be taken in turn in groups of three.

**4.1 -Number; size; layout**

**Number of houses: 3 plus the car port; Size: all houses are 3 bedrooms with a study; Layout: one parallel, two at right-angles to Fenton Road**

Comments:-

Cllr England –Personally, I feel that 3 properties on a plot of that size, 1500m<sup>2</sup>, is a lot but it is infilling an existing plot.

Cllr Watkins: adding in 9 bedrooms on that space will have quite a large amount of impact. When extra living space has been developed, LCC has stated that for a 4 bedroomed house there would be up to 3-4 cars. In this location the extra houses would result with in the region of 6-8 cars using that road and entry to the site.

Cllr Taylor also noted that she understands that the Stubton Neighbourhood Plan, though not statutory, has recommended that any new houses should be affordable, or the existing property can be extended or developed. But this is demolishing one and building three large houses which are somewhat squashed onto the 1500m<sup>2</sup> plot in places. It is important also to

# 31 July EOM Minutes

listen to the views of the occupants in neighbouring properties who have a noticeable impact on their privacy.

Cllr Dorrity corrected this from the new SKDC Local Plan; SP2 defines small villages of which Stubton is identified as such: SP3 allows small sensitive infill development in these villages generally expected to be no more than three dwellings. Cllr Watkins questioned this as infill since it is replacing an existing property. Cllr Dorrity informed us he had checked this with the planning authority before the meeting and in their view this development does meet the definition of infill as it is within the curtilage of the existing property and does not extend outside the envelope of the village.

Cllr Watkins also questioned the use of the building line and asked for this to be checked as appropriate by SKDC planning authorities.

In summary:

The properties have been well designed to fit in with the village.

Development fits in the condition of infill – no more than 3 properties.

**ACTION:**The building line needs checking as well as the control line which is how far from the road the property needs to be. Clarification and a professional opinion from the planning Authority.

## **4.2 - Siting, design and external appearance of buildings**

Cllr Dorrity – The design and external appearance of the buildings fits in the with the architectural styles of the village and is quite attractive. There was general agreement with this. However, please see 4.3 below.

## **4.3 - Proposed means of access to go with the landscaping; impact on the neighbourhood; living conditions for neighbours:**

Cllr Dorrity: The response from Highways indicates that the existing access will need to be widened for cars pulling out and in at the same time for the first 10metres. If the driveway does need to be widened then the public areas outside need to be reinstated as quickly as possible so that there aren't muddy patches outside. During the build, all the building materials and vehicles should be kept onsite or on the owner's land and not on the public highway outside to keep impact on the neighbourhood down to a minimum.

Also, the time for completion should have a deadline fixed. The Chair suggests 2 years from start to completion but would take advice on this, maintaining tidiness throughout that time.

# 31 July EOM Minutes

Cllr Taylor: agreed with the management of this since this is the entrance to the village and Stubton Hall which hosts various events throughout the year. An untidy building site may prompt complaints.

Cllr England stated that there would be a noise factor and there should be a clarification on building time and schedules to fit in with consideration for the village. Eg Curfew for building, delivery and heavy machinery noise.

Cllr Taylor: The height of the carport seems excessive. Property No.3 is quite close to the boundary of the neighbouring property. If we consider overlooking another property, Plot 2 could be a problem since it directly overlooks the neighbour's garden, two ways. Lovely houses that are rather squeezed onto the site. The size of the site location is more suited to 2 properties with, at most, one smaller one, rather than 3 large properties, which with 3 bedrooms and a study could be considered 4 bedrooms, for the reason of space and impact on the villlage.

Cllr Dorrity: Some buildings would appear to directly overlook the neighbour's garden with a potential intrusion of privacy. PLOT 2 is showing in one plan facing one way and then in the design and access document is facing the other way. Cllr Dorrity asked for clarification from a resident which aspect was correct. This was given.

Cllr Dorrity suggested that if Plot 2 was built with a different aspect, it would mean that there were no windows overlooking the neighbour's garden and help alleviate one potential problem. Maybe a change of layout would be judged as a sensitive move for the architect considering impact on neighbours.

Cllr Dorrity re-emphasised the height of the car port potentially overbearing for neighbours. Cllr Taylor questioned the need for such height. Is there a plan to create a further storey following the building? A resident answered saying he did not know why it was so tall. There is no other floor in the building. The ceiling has not been vaulted to allow for some storage but there won't be a physical floor.

## **In Summary**

- a) The architectural style fits well with the village
- b) the development fits the definition of infill although some concerns were raised regarding over development
- c) the development lies within the envelope of the village
- c) Plot 2 directly overlooks the neighbours garden ie loss of privacy (If Plot 2 building was moved through 90degrees and with slight amendments to windows as shown in mirror image in the snippet in the Design and Access document P17 would potentially alleviate that situation)
- d) The height of the carport may be overbearing on the neighbours site

# 31 July EOM Minutes

e) Taking into account Highways comment that the driveway may require widening - if so then the public areas outside the development need to be re-established swiftly

f) Request condition re the timescale for the development to be completed within 2 years from commencement

g) Request condition re keeping all building materials and builders' vehicles on site and not on public land or highway

h) Request clarification that the building and control line have been considered.

The chair then opened the meeting up to comments from the floor

A resident strongly reinforced the comment about the use of the land and that everything should be kept onsite. On a development of this scale there are going to be 5-6 vans and materials coming into the village every day. He suggests access of the adjoining land for this, owned by the applicant, even making an extra entry onto that land for materials etc. This would make the development so much easier for the village to accept.

A resident agrees with the comments about the car port height. The height could be easily reduced without losing space for cars but it would also be less imposing for next door. One relevant thing is that the land attached to Heatherway House is described as a garden on the property deeds, although until recently it has been used as grazing and paddock. The current position of plot 2 would mean this is directly overlooked and therefore they would support the proposal of reconfiguring the existing plan as suggested above.

A resident who has a particular interest agreed that all these comments are useful for the design, building and village harmony.

A resident with a personal interest said that they had already discussed their comments with the applicant. Another wanted to correct a statement on the 'Design and Access Statement June 23' and will be submitting their individual response to SKDC to report this, and other concerns. The PC have heard and read the views of direct neighbours many of which were raised by residents at the meeting and are included in these minutes and will be considered within the PC response to the planning application.

The Chair stated that the views from the meeting will be reflected in the comments to SKDC planning department.

The Chair thanked those attending and closed the meeting.

•