

At a meeting of THORNEY PARISH COUNCIL held at the Council Chamber,
Tank Yard, Thorney on Monday 19th March 2007 at 7.00 p.m.

PRESENT

Chair: Councillor W VanDriessche

Councillors: J.E.G. Bartlett, D. J Buddle, C. Evans, R Bevington, Ms. M Herdman,
P.A. Rowe, M. Amps-Woodward

Mr. Lynden Leadbeater, Peterborough City Council

9 members of the public present. Evening Telegraph photographer present.

Before the meeting 10 minutes was allowed for public discussion.

1. Apologies

P. Murphy, E. Gee, R.M. Harlock, G. A .Kilham, PCSO Brader,

2. Minutes

The minutes of the previous Meetings held on 12, 19 and 26 February (copies of which had previously been circulated to all members) were signed.

3. Matters arising from minutes.

3.1 Cars parked on Wisbech Road and Church Street – wardens unable to take action because of poor condition of double yellow lines

3.2 Councillors Bevington, Rowe and Buddle had now been given dispensation by the Standards Committee of Peterborough City Council to discuss planning application 06/02002/FUL Land On The East Side Of Station Road Thorney

4. Discuss complaint by Mr. Nightingale concerning Fair in Park

Mr. Lynden Leadbeater attended the meeting on behalf of the Environmental Health Pollution Team with respect to the correspondence received from Mr. Nightingale 17 Tavistock Close and issues raised regarding pollution attributed to the Fair at Thorney Recreation Ground.

Chairman outlined the activities of the children's fair. This has been active in Thorney Park for the past 8 years.

Mr. Leadbetter said vehicles and living accommodation could be positioned to deaden sound and negate any fumes from generators. He was of the opinion that no risk to health would occur and before any action could be taken officers from Peterborough City Council would have to be convinced that a nuisance would occur – they were not convinced.

The Chairman will liaise with the fair's organisers to minimise the inconvenience .

At this point Mr. Leadbetter left the meeting.

At this point a photographer from the Evening Telegraph entered and wished to take photographs. The Chairman asked members for comment on this. It was proposed by Councillor Bevington, seconded by Councillor Evans and unanimously agreed that no photographs would be allowed.

The ET photographer left the meeting.

5. Village Street Scene update

No further plans received from Peterborough City Council. Ongoing.

6. Planning

6.1 Planning Applications Passed/Refused/withdrawn

- 07/00165 Adjacent 20 Bedford Court – erection of dwelling – passed
- 06/02019 Rear 137 Wisbech Road – erection bungalow – withdrawn
- 06/00618 Sandpit Road – 1 dwelling and 2 semi-detached dwellings – appeal against refusal dismissed
- 06/01828 Barns Causeway Lodge – conversion – passed
- 07/00036 17 Northside – change of use of land to garden and creation new farm access – refused
- 06/01664 Pode Hole Quarry – installation sand plant – passed
- 06/02017 9 Orchard Court – fell sycamore tree – passed

6.2 Current Planning Applications

- 07/00113/FUL 61 Wisbech Road – relocation garage – no objections. Councillor Bartlett took no part in this discussion or vote
- 07/00223 Acca Atii, Russell Close – erection single garage – no objections. Councillors Bartlett and Buddle took no part in this discussion or vote because of a personal interest.
- 07/00156/FUL 1 Briggs Farm Cottage Willow Hall Lane - Two storey side extension – removal of front porch and bricking up opening will completely undermine the sense of being a pair of cottages. Why can't porch be retained as a feature? No objections if porch left.
- 07/00217/FUL White Hart Bridge Farm Station Road - change of use from agricultural to B1 and B8 - no objections. Councillor Bartlett objected.
- 07/00250 Pode Hole Farm The Causeway - Extensions to existing stock buildings - no objections
- 07/00313/CTR 8 Abbey Place - Prune and trim one Ash tree - no objections
- 07/00296/FUL Chestnut Farm New Cut - Change of use of redundant farm building to dog boarding kennels - no objections
- 07/00328/FUL White Hart Farm English Drove - Conversion of barns to form six dwellings - revised scheme - no objections
- 07/00243 2 Abbey Place – erection satellite dish at rear - no objections

6.3 06/02002/FUL Land on The East Side Of Station Road Thorney -

Residential development comprising 78 dwellings and new access off Station Road.

Councillor VanDriessche introduced the application and said that within the area covered by the Unitary Authority of Peterborough, it is planned that 25,000 houses will be built before 2021 and 20,000 jobs created. An obvious concern for the Parish Council and the residents of the village is that any development that takes place in Thorney should be “in the right place”. He said that development near the by-pass would give an “unbalanced” village and take up industrial land. Thorney Parish Council allotments adjoin the proposed development site and directly behind the allotments is an area of 13 acres owned by the City Council which could well, as a result of the granting of planning permission for the site of 78 houses, be brought

forward as a further development site. He felt that Peterborough City Council have a prejudicial interest in the proposed development. He outlined the SWOT analysis that has been sent out which outlines future village opportunities. The area near the by-pass was not the only area in the village where housing could be developed.

Councillor Bevington had looked in detail at the application and his comments were circulated. These were:

Do we want change of use from Industrial to residential? (Will other sites in the village be suitable for industrial and would they receive permission from PCC for industrial use. Does village want to forego this industrial site at risk of no other site in village becoming available?)

Loss of industry means loss of jobs in the village. Do we just want to be a residential enclave?

It may be thought that village needs to grow but should this be at the expense of work places/jobs on a site that is designated industrial?

However, use of this site for housing does not impact on existing open space in the village.

Is site too close to the new by-pass to be ideal for residential. What measures, if any, is the developer taking to reduce traffic noise to site.

Are there other adjacent noise factors that undermine the sites use for residential? Councillor Rowe said that PPG had made an official objection to the development as future complaints of noise from new residents from there factory could seriously affect their business.

Access, drainage, flooding etc are all dealt with professionally in the submission. Thorney Parish Council should query whether or not Peterborough City Council accepts the content of these submissions. An objection which has been voiced relates to the increase of traffic on Station Road and safety generally related to that road and in particular at the new by-pass roundabout. There seems no doubt that traffic on Station Road has increased. People coming into the village come via the new roundabout and people leaving the village go north on Station Road to join the A47 at the new roundabout.

Would not a mini- roundabout in Station Road provide safer site access and prove a speed reduction measure along Station Road?

Similarly the merit of the site for industrial use in the future is addressed in the submission. It concludes that for various reasons including lack of visibility that the site is not ideal for industrial. This seems more subjective and could possibly be challenged.

We need to be clear whether or not the Station Road site is appropriate for housing and whether this is the best use of the site. The Parish Council has the problem that no other sites are being proposed for residential at present. It is not possible, therefore, to set out the pros and cons for a variety of proposals and come to a

decision about a preferred location for residential. Do we think it would be more appropriate for new housing to be built nearer the centre of the village rather than on the village perimeter? Hopefully the SWOT analysis will give resident's views on this.

When villages are by-passed they create a sort of no-mans-land between themselves and the by-pass. It seems that this is immediately thought of as potential land for housing development denying the very reason for which the by-pass was constructed.

The submission is well documented and fairly comprehensive but to be properly judged more information is needed. There are 78 houses total of which 26 are to be affordable homes. The development is 35 houses to the hectare which is the maximum density permissible. To get the right mix of house sizes (number of bedrooms) this density has generated 3 storey houses and a 3 storey block of flats. Do we feel that this complies with guidelines of the VDS? Unfortunately a precedent has been set by Kingsline but could we argue that the VDS came after Kingsline and represents the contemporary views of the village on any future development. It could also be argued that there are other 3 storey buildings in the village i.e. around the Green and in Abbey Place. However, these are set in the immediate context of the Abbey which generates a different scale to the area. The new(ish) house on Gas Lane was strictly limited to a maximum roof ridge height in order that views of the Bedford Hall were not impaired. Should this criterion not be applied to the proposed development?

Higher density of course means less land use to provide the same number of units. Is it better to cram a site with as many houses as permissible to avoid the use of more extensive areas of land?

The proposal has a broad range of house types and materials. How do we think this fits with VDS? The houses proposed are just the developers 'off-the peg' house types which have been dropped into a site plan that happens to be in Thorney. It could be anywhere and pays no heed to the character, heritage or materials in Thorney. Has the developer consulted or is even aware of the VDS.

How well do proposals fit with their local context. This is very difficult to tell from the drawings submitted which only show site plan and individual houses. There are no sections showing relationship of housing in its broader context. There should at least be a north/south section and an east/west section. The developer should be asked to provide a model showing his proposals in their immediate context (including the by-pass). This would give a reasonable chance to see the true scale and extent of what they might be getting.

Documents with the proposal imply that existing infrastructure (water, flooding, traffic, school, etc.) can cope with a development of this size. Can these facilities accommodate development of adjacent sites as well?

How could the Village benefit from the development? Mr. Law, amongst other items, suggested we may want money to improve the school, put disabled facilities in the Community Centre, work on the Bedford Hall etc. It seemed he was suggesting that monies from development go toward improving/upgrading Peterborough owned buildings which one may think they should have a duty of care

to deal with anyway. It seemed like a circuitous way to get money into their coffers with which they can then sustain their own buildings. It may be the case that this is the only way to get work done on these buildings and it should therefore be considered but should Thorney Parish Council push for some other scheme such as the pavilion in the park that would be a new asset in the village that would be perceived as a tangible benefit from any development.

Decrease in population stated in the submission perhaps suggests that the village needs to grow if it is to sustain itself. The decrease quoted implies that a fair number of houses are needed to re-instate the status quo. Will there be other proposals for housing that may give the opportunity for this growth if, for any reason, the Station Road scheme did not proceed? Peterborough City Council should not judge the proposals as a benefit that will give possible access to Peterborough City Council own land.

Sale of the Thorney Parish Council allotments land could be perceived as the Parish Council having a biased interest in any development in this area. The support of the village on an item like this would seem to be critical. Peterborough City Council would need to cross the allotments to gain access to their land so Thorney Parish Council at least holds a ransom strip which will have a value. Peterborough City Council might consider compulsory purchase if Thorney Parish Council refuse to give access.

A request for further information including a model, a more comprehensive set of drawings and full details of materials of the development will be made to Peterborough City Council. If this is not forthcoming Thorney Parish Council could say we do not have sufficient information to make an informed decision or to discuss the project in an open forum with the village and set out what else we believe we need to fairly assess the proposal. Thorney Parish Council will also ask Peterborough City Council to declare their hand over the use of their land. Mr. Law turned it on to Thorney Parish Council to determine what the village would like or dislike but he was careful not to say how he or the council viewed development of that land and so far there has been no move by Peterborough City Council to start the "Planning for Real" process. At least with some knowledge of possible scenarios for the Peterborough City Council site Thorney Parish Council would have a slightly broader context in which to consider the Station Road proposals.

It was agreed that the area near the bypass would be better suited to industrial development. Councillor Bartlett suggested that the application should be deferred until village opinion is known. The Chairman agreed with Councillor Bartlett and said it was incumbent on Thorney Parish Council to seek village views before a decision is made.

It was proposed by Councillor Bartlett, seconded by Councillor Bevington and unanimously agreed to defer a decision until more information is received from Peterborough City Council on the matters outlined above

6.3 Date of Public Meeting for 06/02002/FUL East Side of Station Road

Decision on date deferred until results of SWOT survey known

6.4 Planning for real – update

Councillor Buddle had produced documents that have been distributed to each household for a SWOT analysis. On return of these they will be analysed and villagers suggestions compiled.

Mr. Law has confirmed he is the Lead Officer at Peterborough City Council in “Planning for Real” although as yet no proposal has been made.

Costs have now been received from Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation who were approached by Thorney Parish Council to support them in delivering a community engagement process that will enable local residents to put forward a view in response to a planning application for the development of 78 houses in the village.

Allotments adjoin the proposed development site and directly behind the allotments is an area of 13 acres owned by the City Council which could well, as a result of the granting of planning permission for the site of 78 houses, be brought forward as a further development site.

The Parish Council is also keen to develop a Village Plan which will cover the next 20 to 30 years and consideration will be given as to how to maximise the engagement of local people and gather views possibly on both issues. The Parish Councillors are looking to play an active role in the delivery of this process. All views gathered through the consultation events will be recorded and analysed and a Statement of Community Involvement will be produced by Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation for the Parish Council.

However the cost from Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation are considerable. To seek views, analyse results and prepare the Statement of Community Involvement for the Planning application in Station Road is £6490 with an extra £2530 for reports on a village plan.

It was agreed to leave a decision concerning the above proposal until after the SWOT survey results and further information from Peterborough City Council concerning their involvement in the Planning for Real process.

6.5 Other matters

06/00464 Podge Hole and Briggs Farm – Peterborough City Council has endorsed Thorney Parish Council views about this application. There is some justification for the reservoir. However, the use of Willow Hall Lane by minerals traffic is contrary to policy and there are short and long term impacts on the use of this lane, as part of the Peterborough cycle path, landscape, biodiversity, arboricultural and amenity impacts. The amount of sand and gravel to be extracted is also increased by nearly 100,000 tonnes because of the inclusion of ‘disposal pits’ for subsoils as part of the application. It is likely that this application will go before committee.

7. Crime Report

7.1 PCSO Crime report.

Councillor D Sanders was instrumental in getting Inspector Rogers to the village to speak to several people concerning the PCSO activities. PCSO Brader had provided a detailed report of his work and plans for next month. Speed checks have been carried out in Station Road with many offenders

Offences in the area were detailed and the report, which was circulated to all Councillors, will be attached to the minutes.

8. Allotments

9. Roads and Footpaths

9.1 Street lighting – Pode Hole main road lights still out

9.2 Other roads and footpaths

The very poor drainage occurring on Woburn Drive outside Mr Beeby's house has been investigated by Peterborough City Council and confirmed as a possible drain collapse. Work is scheduled for the next financial year.

9.3 Buke Horn Road – flytipping

9.4 Pigeons Corner – tyres dumped on roadside

9.5 Road sinking in Russell Close following building works at Acci Atti.

10 Burial Board

A suggestion has been made that an access footway be made to the cremated remains area from the entrance gate. Quotations to be obtained for a tarmaced footway.

It was agreed that the blue granite stone for the memorial of James Llewellyn's grave is suitable

11 Thorney Household waste site – update

11.1 Site to re-open on 17 February. Very few persons use site after noon on Sunday. New opening times to be Sunday 09.00 to 12.00 starting 1st April for a trial period of 3 months. Notice to be placed in Village Magazine.

11.2 Skip site personnel

Mr. Smith has indicated that with just a Sunday opening he would be happy to continue to man the site. This offer was accepted. A salary review will take place at the next meeting.

Mr. Lucken has indicated that working there at weekend will conflict with dry weather grass cutting.

Since reopening the site 38 people from outside the area have been turned away.

12 Village Sign repainting

Ongoing

13 Thorney Park – discussion on information from Peterborough City Council. To form a liaison committee

Committee to consist of Councillors VanDriessche, Bartlett, Bevington, Rowe, Amps-Woodward and Mr. Shuster and Mr. Shelton

14 War Memorial on Village Green

Mr. Jary has proposed that a remembrance memorial should be built on the Village Green. He has volunteered to provide all labour free of charge if Thorney Parish Council pays for the material.

Architect to design and seek planning consent.

15 Correspondence/Any Other Business

- 15.1 Acre circulars, CALC information- circulated
- 15.2 Various Countryside Agency publications – circulated
- 15.3 Fix-it-van service dates received up to August.
- 15.4 Letter from Department Constitutional Affairs concerning Memorial Safety in Cemeteries. Regular inspections must be carried out by the Thorney Parish Council safety team.
- 15.5 Letter from Fenland District Council concerning Delivery of Equality in Services
- 15.6 Consultation Paper issued by the Government on a Revised Model Code of Conduct for Local Authority Members
- 15.7 Quarterly Vacancies Inquiry by National Statistics
- 15.8 Cambridgeshire ACRE services user survey
- 15.9 NALC circular on review of the Quality Town and Parish Council scheme
- 15.10 Balloon take offs from Park should be referred to Peterborough City Council (Mr. Marsden)
- 15.11 Councillor Bartlett said that Mr. Rossington had suggested a joint meeting with Thorney Parish Council, Newborough Parish Council, and Eye Parish Council to explain what he was doing to help Parish Councils. This was viewed with some scepticism.

16. Finance

15.1 The following sums had been received:-

<i>From</i>	<i>Reason</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Anglia Reg. Coop Soc	Inter Mrs. Blanchard	£30.00
J G Cross	Memorial Mrs. Cross	£17.00
Thorney Society	Museum rent	£1.00
Anglia Memorials	Mem Mrs. Blanchard	£15.00
Peterborough City Council	Glass recycling credit	£34.20
Anglia Reg. Coop Soc	Inter Alan Harris	£30.00

The following Cheques were drawn and signed:-

<u>Payee</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Cheque No.</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Mr. B Lucken	Mobile telephone rental	S/O	£17.50
Mr. B Lucken	Mileage allowance	Bacs	£12.39
Shanks Waste Management	Cemetery skip	001441	£100.00
Shaw & Sons	PC Receipt Books	001442	£300.80
Walters Stationers	Cartridges Etc	001443	£105.68
Grounds Maint Services	Wood chipping Bedford Hall	001444	£47.00
David Richards Ltd	SWOT Analysis questionnaires	001445	£105.00
Peterborough Grass Machinery	Sundries	001446	£30.73
Mr. A E Hovell	Expenses	001447	£31.54
Peterborough City Council	Cemetery rates	001448	£367.20
Walters Stationers	Computer	001449	£695.89
Anglian Water	Water charges cemetery and allotments	001450	£56.04

The next meeting will be held on 16 April 2007
The meeting closed at 8.50 pm