

Meeting of THORNEY PARISH COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber, Tank Yard, Thorney
on Monday 8 July 2013 at 7.00 p.m.

PRESENT

Chair: Councillor: J Brooks

Councillors: R Bevington, Mrs. D Halfhide, Mrs. M Long, P Rands,
PCSO Yane Pokhum,
22 members of the public

281/13-14 To receive and approve apologies for absence

J E G Bartlett, D. J Buddle, Mrs. L Sheldrake, Mrs. S Selby, J Rowe, E. Gee, Peterborough
City Councillors D McKean and D Sanders

282/13-14 To receive Disclosable Pecuniary Interests Declarations

To receive Disclosable Pecuniary Interests Declarations in any items on the agenda –
memorial from Chapel Councillor Brooks personal interest

283/13-14 To approve minutes of the meeting of 10 June 2013

Minutes of the Council meeting held on 10 June were confirmed and signed

284/13-14 Matters arising from minutes

1. Response from Stagecoach was circulated prior to the meeting

285/13-14 Public Participation attendance of Jake D Nugent (Bidwells)

concerning Woburn Drive future development.

Bidwells are about to submit an application for outline planning permission and have said they would like to discuss with the Parish Council and Local Community how Thorney might benefit from the development if it should go ahead. Once application validated residents of Woburn Estate will be invited to make comments. Drainage is a major concern for any development in this area. Councillor Bevington made reference to the 2007 survey of the village needs and highlighted a pavilion, skate park, lights on Wisbech Road to have more appropriate lighting, footpaths across the Park to the play areas and churchyard, tree planting, education projects, provision for the elderly (seating area in the Park), and all weather play areas.

Skate Park could be situated in the Park. More use can be made of this area.

Planning obligations are determined by Peterborough City Council but developers wish to engage with the Parish Council on how their wishes could be incorporated. This would be off set by a lower level of affordable housing (30% criterion by Peterborough City Council). Localism Act now enables a lower level of affordable homes if local needs are incorporated into planning officers discussion.

The proposed outline is for 80 homes and a lower level of affordable homes makes the proposal more attractive to developers. Lower levels of affordable homes allows flexibility for other local benefits . Thorney Parish Council written reply to Peterborough City Council on the planning application should include the needs of the Parish.

Outline planning application submitted for 80 dwellings, green areas and a pond for sustainable drainage. If residents like the outline plan we can request Peterborough City Council to keep to these same proposals for the full application. Woburn Drive will be the only vehicular access to the development.

Flooding in the area is an existing problem – the development will not increase this risk. Peterborough City Council need to be made aware of the recent flooding problems and Thorney Parish Council will ask if developer can better the drainage facilities of the area. The drainage strategy for this site took into account the comments made by residents at the local exhibition.

Sewage disposal is still a major concern. The statutory bodies, AWA and Environment Agency, will be consulted, therefore, the more people that raise their concerns (this does not preclude every adult in the house writing separately), the more notice will be taken.

Conditions can be put in place for a financial contribution to a specific project and held until sufficient funds are available to complete the project.

Suggestion that a seating area with sustainable green areas be provided. More provision for the 9 – 16 year old age group.

Another public meeting will be held once the planning application has been received by Thorney Parish Council.

286/13-14 Matters for Information and Reports

1. Crime report – 27 calls of concern and 4 crimes (criminal damage, thefts, burglary). This is a noticeable increase on previous months.
2. Bedford Hall Management Committee – Regarding the merging of library and social centre to Bedford Hall Mr. Morris states that “there are no further updates, Peterborough City Council are still considering its option and the growth team are developing a detailed option appraisal for Thorney as a whole”. Councillor Bevington to ask Mr. Morris if Thorney Parish Council and the community should be involved in the appraisal.
3. Report from Parish Council Liaison – Neighbourhood Plan update – drafting of a village plan could attract funding of £7000 and Locality (professional body within Peterborough City Council can advise). Update of present village plan possible.

287/13-14 Report from City Councillors

CLF money for moving war memorial from Chapell. Councillor Sanders said, and was supported by Councillor McKean, that personally prefer a distribution benefiting a variety of good causes around Thorney after good communication with the village rather than one big lump to one cause. He concluded by saying that I support the wishes of Thorney parish Council members after submissions have been put forward.

288/13-14 Finance

1. To note income and approve Payments

Kent Memorials (March)	Memorial Mr. Wilson	£55.00	
Yorkshire Bank	Interest on term deposit	£528.00	
The following Cheques were drawn and signed:-			
Mr A E Hovell	Postage, travel, telephone	001940	£27.78
GD Services	Install cremated remains units	001941	£681.53
2. Monthly bank reconciliation – signed
3. HMR&C's introduction of Real Time Information (RTI) – alteration to pay procedures. HMR&C's introduction of Real Time Information (RTI) in April 2013 forced changes to the way payroll is processed. Under RTI the data HMR&C collects is more rigorous than before. Employers must provide an accurate pay-date, ensure they do not pay employees until the RTI submission has been made and the exact amounts submitted in the RTI must be paid to employees.

289/13-14 Planning Approvals and Refusals

- 13/00678 10A Whittlesey Road – change of use to residential - approved
13/00407 Park House, Wisbech Road – replacement vinery - approved

290/13-14 Planning Applications and other matters

1. Planning applications

13/00842 5 Toneham Cottages, Toneham Lane – demolition detached garage and construction new detached farm building of single garage, staff kitchen, staff room and farm office – no objections

13/00933 French Farm Wind Farm – Construction of four additional wind turbines to a maximum height of 100 metres (to vertical blade tip) with ancillary infrastructure including temporary construction compound, access tracks and crane hardstandings. There will be a further public exhibition of these proposals in the Bedford Hall on the 23 July

 1. We are opposed to the change of use from agricultural land to an industrial use.
 2. We agree with the National Trust who oppose wind farms as they believe they are ‘destroying the countryside’.
 3. The finest approach to the village and the one that shows it most favourably in a rural setting, is the approach northward from the direction of Whittlesey along the B 1040. This route arrives in the historic

centre of the village by the Green and the Abbey. This setting will be intruded upon and spoilt by the French Farm turbines which align with the axis of this route.

4. There are dwellings in the proximity of these turbines whose habitable rooms will have clear, uninterrupted views of the turbines and we consider this an unacceptable impairment of their amenities.

5. We are alarmed by how visible the wind turbines will be from parts of the Parish as shown in the developer's visuals. We consider that the high visibility of the turbines from both within and without the village demonstrates how inappropriately located they are. We find it difficult to believe that in any pre-application discussions the Planning Department could in anyway have considered this a suitable location for a wind farm.

6. In respect of the visuals we note that they take advantage of a summertime setting. At times when the trees are without foliage the turbines will be even more visible and unacceptable. There is some feeling that the visuals are not accurate in depicting the true height of the turbines. They are already unacceptably visible and this would mean they would be even more visible and obtrusive. We assume, but would like confirmation, that the City Council will check the accuracy of this important part of the application.

7. We do not consider this to be an appropriate location for a wind farm because this is an outstanding area of fenland countryside which should not be blighted by this intrusion on the landscape or skyline. We recognise that there is already permission for two turbines on this site but do not believe the situation should be worsened by any additional turbines.

8. The turbines are totally out of proportion to any existing natural feature or development in the area.

9. There is no way the visual impact of wind turbines can be reduced or screened by the planting which is often a planning requirement of other developments in a rural landscape. For example, the City Council's own proposals for a solar farm on Morris Fen in this Parish.

10. We believe the proposed development undermines the rural setting of the village. We absolutely reject any implication that the effect these turbines will have on this asset would be 'negligible'. We trust, but would like confirmation, that the Planning Department will consult with Jim Daley of the Conservation Department in their deliberations over this application.

11. We are of the opinion that this development leads to 'substantial' harm to heritage assets and that as this harm is not outweighed by any public benefit from the development it should, therefore, be refused consent.

12. We consider that the Environmental Assessment which forms part of the application can at best only be predictive. Can we be assured that this assessment will be reviewed by a team of experts rather than just regular planning officers?

13. In respect of birds and in particular owls we assume that the RSPB will be consulted about this application.

14. We would like to report that there is some concern amongst a number of Parishioners about noise and light flicker from these turbines and would like your reassurance that these issues will be properly addressed

15. We note that site access requires road alterations and the removal of signs in the vicinity of Falls Drove and would be grateful for notification of how this work is funded.

16. We do not feel this application can simply be judged on its own. It has to be considered in respect of the cumulative impact with other potential wind farms in the Parish (including the present application for Gores Farm). There is genuine concern that the village may eventually become surrounded by wind farms especially if they are dealt with on a piecemeal basis. What policy do the planners have in place to ensure that this does not happen?

17. We believe that the City Council's desire for residential growth in the village would be jeopardised if this wind farm is approved. It is known that wind farms can have an adverse effect on the value of property and the village would, therefore, be less attractive to potential developers.

18. We note the inclusion in the documents of the feedback from the public consultations the developer has held regarding this application. We very much appreciate the consultations that have taken place but confirm that we endorse the views expressed by the public who are opposed to this development.

18. Whatever other objections there may be to this project we believe the unacceptable visual impact of these turbines is more than sufficient reason for this application to be rejected by the City Council

19. In the event that planning officers recommend approval of this application, Thorney Parish Council request that it is referred to, and goes before, the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee.

20. We note that there are still low flying fighter planes in the area and understand that the MOD have raised concerns/objections to the Gores Farm Wind Farm proposals. We assume that these objections will also apply to French Farm unless a mitigation solution is proposed as part of the submission.

These notes raise a number of queries (nos.6,10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 20) to which the Parish Council would be grateful for the planning officers response.

2. Enforcement Notice at 84 Wisbech Road

Enforcement Officer visited the above premises last week and confirmed that the existing structure is permitted by virtue of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) as the height does not exceed the 2.5 metre limit.

3. Rear 148-154 Wisbech Road

There are complaints to the Parish Council about the use of a Duke of Bedford cottage garden which seems to be being converted into a place where people sleep overnight? The fence and sheds may be around 2.5m, but this is an unacceptable use of the garden, which is now part of the conservation area. Enforcement investigating

4. Changes to planning system

Government has just introduced changes to the planning system so that more development can take place without the need for planning permission (often referred to as permitted development). Some of these changes still require developers to go through an application process called 'prior approval'. It is important that you are aware that in introducing the changes, Government has restricted who we consult on these 'prior approval' applications and what factors can be considered in the determination of the prior approval applications.

House Extensions

If a home owner wishes to build a 3m-6m rear extension on an attached house or a 4m-8m rear extension on a detached house, the extension is no more than 4m in height and in all other respects complies with the other 'permitted development' rules, then they need to go through the 'prior approval' process. The Council can only consult those neighbours that share a common boundary with the application site. This means that we will not be consulting your organisation. If we receive no objections from the abutting neighbours then the Council cannot refuse the application. If we receive an objection, we can only consider if the proposal would have an unsatisfactory impact on the amenity of the neighbour. No other factors can be considered. If there is an unsatisfactory impact then 'prior approval' will be refused and the applicant has a right of appeal against the refusal.

The Council has 42 days to determine the application and failure to do so will grant automatic consent for the proposal

Changes of Use – Office to Residential

Planning permission is no longer required to change from an office to residential use but a prior approval application must be made. These prior approval applications are subject to public consultation in the same way as planning applications. However, the Council can only consider the proposal in terms of the following factors:

Contaminated land, Impact on a classified road, Flood risk

The Council has 56 days to determine the application and failure to do so will grant automatic consent for the proposal. If prior approval is refused then this can be appealed or a planning application can be made.

Impact of the Restricted Consultation Process and Time Limit for Deciding Prior Approval Applications

Because of the restrictions imposed (as outlined above) the City Council's constitution has been changed so that these applications will be determined by officers rather than the planning committee. This is because it is unlikely that we would be able to consistently determine applications within the required timescale because of the interplay between the length of the consultation period, the frequency of planning committee meetings and the requirements to publish reports in advance of the committee meetings. This means that we will not be able to call in any of these types of application for determination by the planning committee.

5. Planning Forum – Councillor Bevington gave a brief resume' and subjects covered were changes to the planning system (detailed in item 4), Neighbourhood Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Attached minutes from Peterborough City Council as appendix.

291/13-14 Burial Authority

Sanctum Cremated remains units installed.

292/13-14 Roads and Footpaths

293/13-14 Allotments

1. Best allotment judging has taken place and the winner is number 10, Mr M Spridgeon.
2. Allotment inspection actions. Some allotments have had herbicide applied (16, 17, 23, 31, 36). Roadside verges cut and hedge trimmed back

294/13-14 Village Matters

Memorial from Methodist Chapel - Peterborough City Councillors response (see under Report from Peterborough City Councillors). Donations for repositioning will come from several sources that Mr. VanDriessche is liaising with. Thorney Parish Council will underwrite the project.

295/13-14 Correspondence

296/13-14 Matters as agenda items for future consideration

Neighbourhood Plan update
Use of CLF money

297/13-14 Any other business

Tree removal in Churchyard – Councillor Bartlett to contact Councillor Ogden

298/13-14 Date of next meeting

Meeting of the Parish Council 2nd September 2013.
The meeting closed at 9.17 pm

Planning Service Customer Forum Meeting Tuesday 2 July 2013

Item 2 – Planning Policy Update

City Centre Plan DPD

- Current – Preparation of Proposed submission version
- Next stage – Autumn 2013 consideration by various council committees
- Pre Submission consultation 6 weeks – Jan/Feb 2014
- Submission April 2014

Neighbourhood Plans

- Nationally and locally momentum gathering
- Process set out in Peterborough Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)
- First step involves defining and designating a Neighbourhood Area
- Last month Peterborough City council designated 4 neighbourhood areas
 - Deeping gate
 - Glington
 - Northborough
 - Peakirk

Next step for each of the above areas is to prepare a neighbourhood development plan or order, if they wish.

Assisting Other Authorities with planning policy work

- Fenland
- Cambridge City

Item 3 - Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

What is CIL?

- A levy on development to support provision of infrastructure required to support growth.
- Councils have a choice as whether to introduce a levy
- Remains the government's preferred mechanism for funding local infrastructure provision
- CIL Reg 123 - limits the use of pooled planning obligations to **'five'** (£106's) for the funding or provision of an infrastructure 'project' or 'type'.

PCC Currently Preparation of Draft Charging Schedule (linked to Viability Study)
 Reviewing the £106 / CIL relationship
 Calculating the cost of planning contributions
 Reviewing the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule with Service Areas

PCC Next Stages –

Winter 2013 consideration by various council committees
February / March 2014 – Draft Charging Schedule published for representation (6 weeks)
Adoption in summer 2014

Nationally

Updated regulations (April 2013) made clear that 15% of CIL receipts for development within a parished area will be handed over to the parish council for spending on infrastructure or anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area. This

increases to 25% if the area has a Neighbourhood Plan in place. *If not spent within 5 years of receipt, the charging authority can recover the funds.*

DCLG Consultation on CIL Further Reforms (ended 28 May 2013). It included amongst it

- The role of the infrastructure list and procedures for review
- Extending transition period for limiting pooled use of planning obligations from April 2014 to April 2015
- Amending relationship between CIL and S278 (Transport) agreements
- Introducing relief from CIL for self- build homes
- Phasing of levy payments to recognise complex schemes