NYMPSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting held on Monday, 14th January, 2019 at 7.30pm at Nympsfield Village Hall

19/1: Present: Cllrs E. Sturgess (chair), D. Acton, S. Cowle (vice-chair), A. Hardy, C. Pittaway, two members of the public.

19/2: Apologies: Stroud District Cllr J. Dewey, locum clerk J. Barber.

19/3: Public questions/participation: A member of the public raised concerns about damage to the verge on both sides of Blackberry Lane near New Court Farm and asked the parish council if any condition(s) of the original planning consent were being breached and, if so, would enforcement action follow. NPC members agreed to look into the matter in liaison with both SDC and GCC highways.

19/4: Declarations of interest/dispensations: There were none.

19/5: Minutes: Minute of the last meeting on 12th November, 2018, were unavailable due to staffing issues and would be presented for signature at the next meeting.

19/6: County and district councillors' reports: Stroud District Cllr Dewey had submitted the SDC councillors' internal monthly report "SDC Matters" which it was agreed would be circulated to members after the meeting.

19/7: Appointment of Locum Clerk: It was proposed by Cllr Pittaway, seconded by Cllr Hardy and agreed that the locum clerk Jo Barber should be appointed following the illness of the council's last member of staff, and pending the appointment of a new permanent employee. Ms Barber was engaged on (old) SCP 34-38 at point 36 (from April 2019 on this is renamed new SCP 30). The council would be invoiced for this independent service.

Council further agreed to the appointment of PATA – the Preschool And Toddlers Association – to run a payroll service as used by many parish councils in Gloucestershire. PATA had also indicated they could assist with the £429.81 late filing penalty currently being demanded of NPC by HMRC. The estimated payroll cost for a normal month would be around £10 for a single future employee.

Cllr Acton had now enabled the locum clerk to access NPC's e-mails which were mostly circulars and which, unless urgent, would be listed under correspondence at future meetings to enable members to request forwarding of anything in which they were interested.

Lloyds Bank had been contacted and paperwork was due to update their contact name and address for the council from former clerk(s) to Ms Barber. This was in part to enable sight of previous bank statements to assist the above mentioned HMRC difficulty. The intention was to transfer NPC to a partly on-line account i.e. only sight of up to date position for clerk but no authorisation of expenditure/ other actions.

19/8: Consideration of 2019-20 budget and precept: A report from the locum clerk drew attention to likely additional, but one-off, future costs including the purchases of a clerk's laptop, printer and

mobile phone, and a Charles Arnold Baker essential law book. With previous grant monies already in hand towards the laptop it was agreed approx a further £500 in total could be taken from existing reserves for all these additional expenditures. The ongoing new PATA payroll cost was also a consideration, as was 2.5 per cent inflation on top of the 2018-19 precept of £7,642. The attached 2019-20 budget, and 2019-20 precept request of £7,833, was proposed by Cllr Acton, seconded by Cllr Hardy and unanimously approved.

19/9: Planning matters (detailed on SDC website):

a) S.18/2688, Erection of detached dwelling land adjacent to Barn Cottage, Tinkley Lane, Nympsfield - Nympsfield Parish Council strongly objected to the proposal. The application is contrary to Strategic Objective SO6: prioritising sites that lie outside of the Cotswold AONB. Whilst the application is only for 1 dwelling, the parish has seen an incremental increase in new dwellings which total 12 dwellings recently built or under construction. A circa 10% increase in dwelling numbers over the past few years and the Parish Council believes very strongly that this incremental growth has to stop as the impact on the AONB, conservation area and dynamic of the parish is significant. There should be a presumption against any further new housing within the parish. The NPPF requires Local Plans and policy to reflect a presumption of sustainable development, but development in Nympsfield is not in a sustainable location and if the purpose of planning is to achieve sustainable development then this incremental growth of housing in the parish is contrary to the NPPF. This area of Nympsfield is accessed via a former farm track which remains a private access road. It currently serves 3 occupied properties and a further 5 dwellings for which consent has already been obtained and which are under construction. This additional dwelling will increase this number to 9 in an area which was formerly used for agricultural purposes and which all dwellings are accessing in and out via a single track private track. There is no access for rubbish collection and no access for emergency services. The size of the plot is constrained with no garden area for the dwelling. It is an attempt to squeeze in a further house where it does not fit, but more importantly it is an overstretch of the number of dwellings at the end of this private track.

In accordance with the Local Plan Fourth Tier settlements of which Nympsfield is one will have development only that is required to help meet its housing needs and to improve employment, services and facilities. This development does not meet this requirement. Of the consented new housing all 6 properties at the Rose and Crown site remain completed but unsold and unoccupied and the 5 already consented at Arthurs Yard are in final construction and unoccupied. Development should be permitted only to meet specific identified needs of which the Parish Council have identified none.

The Local Plan also identifies at 3.35.9 that the principles are to conserve and enhance the areas assets and secure high quality distinctive design in keeping with local identity and character and with particular emphasis on the conservation areas. Although relatively small to other developments elsewhere within the District, this incremental expansion of development at the end of this private track is contrary to the Local Plan.

In addition the Parish Council is particularly concerned at the access and egress arrangements which currently exist for the existing 8 dwellings, but what would be 9 dwellings should be this application be successful. The Parish Council has reviewed the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (4th Edition) 2016 and note the following:

- SDC may require that the boundary between the private access and the highway is clearly marked – it is not and the application does not propose any such marking
- SDC should require that the private access is properly surfaced for at least 5 metres of its length from the highway – it is currently not and nothing is mentioned in the current application
- A gateway feature is likely to be required where the private access is served by a bell mouth and suitable levels of visibility between drivers exiting the development and pedestrians using the footways must be provided – the existing access area is large and similar to a bell mouth and visibility is poor and will deteriorate further in particular on days when there will be 9 wheelie bins and other recycling bins at Tinkley Lane waiting for collection
- There should be provision for turning areas to cater for emergency commercial or service vehicles – min width at least 5 m and fire vehicles should not have to reverse more than 20 metres – to ensure sufficient amenity for the 9 dwellings that will be at the end of the private access – none of this exists nor is proposed as part of the application
- Where the access services more than 2 dwellings all of the access should be constructed to an adoptable standard – the access is not constructed to adoptable standard, it is a farm track and there is nothing in the application to suggest that the private access will be upgraded accordingly.
- Figure 8.4 on page 90 identifies the design for a private access for more than 1 dwelling in a non-urban area and the current junction is not compliant
- An improvement to the point the private access joins Tinkley Lane (which the current application does not provide for in any event, but should it) will need a s.278 agreement to undertake works to the highway and before a s.278 agreement is entered into SDC will need to ensure that the site does not detrimentally affect the safety of other highway users – the Parish Council would argue that this access does have a detrimental effect as it sits between the traffic calming points along Tinkley Lane, and the 9 dwellings would generate significant movements per day into a space already in poor repair, with significant traffic flow at peak times from Nailsworth ; the access point is immediately adjacent the junction to Benton Court and at a point where children are crossing for play and to pass to and from the school;

b) S.18/2668FUL, Two bed dwelling, land at rear of 12 Tinkley Corner, Nympsfield:

Nympsfield Parish Council strongly objected to the application, believing it to be ill-considered, of detrimental impact upon the immediate properties and contrary to many of Stroud planning policies. The size of plot is very small being the former rear small garden of 12 Tinkley Corner (an SDC tenanted property). The tenant has suffered loss of amenity by having the garden excluded from the recently completed tenancy agreement. Loss of the garden constrains the full and proper use of 12 Tinkley Corner as a family residence and leaves this property significantly deficient of suitable garden area in a manner entirely inconsistent with the other properties in the immediate area.

The proposed new house is a compromise in design being a 2 bedroomed, 2 storey property which is not consistent in design with other properties in the immediate vicinity nor does it provide a suitable family property.

The application makes statements that are at best misleading, if not untrue. The open space immediately in front of the front door of the proposed dwelling is not owned or controlled by the applicant; there is no demonstrable way in which the owner of the new dwelling would not trespass upon this third party open space and the adjacent residents of Benton Court who have a right to enjoy the open space and who contribute to its maintenance would be denied the amenity for which they are paying. Any statement within the application that this area of open space could form part of the

curtilage of the new dwelling is without foundation and contrary to current ownership and open space arrangements.

The application provides for 2 off road parking spaces behind gates. The plans show the cars could pull in or reverse into the spaces but have no turning area within the property. They would have to reverse in or reverse out onto a narrow estate road that is regularly used by residents of Benton Court for access and egress to their properties; the road is of limited width and is already used by numerous cars for on road parking. The area is populated by families with children and the access and egress arrangements for this proposed new dwelling are a traffic safety issue.

The proposed new dwelling is entirely out of character with the immediate properties.

The impact of the dwelling on the immediate neighbouring property (11 Tinkley Corner) is significant and the plans supporting the application do not properly record the full extent of the existing adjoining property (with its extension) and therefore the proximity and impact upon that existing family property.

The plans supporting the application indicate a new boundary fence between the application area and 11 Tinkley Corner yet on site the boundary is a mature hedgerow which belongs to 11 Tinkley Corner. In order for the application to be fully implemented the hedge would need to be removed and this cannot be achieved without the consent of the neighbour and if it were removed would increase the impact upon 11 Tinkley Corner.

The application makes no reference to this new dwelling being an affordable unit. It is sited in the rear garden of an affordable housing dwelling and within Benton Court, an affordable housing (exceptions policy) development. It would be entirely inappropriate for anything other than an affordable dwelling to be sited in this location.

Relevant Policies to which this application is contrary include: (i) Policy 4.19 – development should be of good design and respect the character of the surroundings (ii) Policy 6.49 – the form, size and character of adjoining development will be taken into account and the means of access is to be both safe and convenient and should not adversely affect the amenities of existing residential properties; (iii) Policy 6.8 – infill residential development will be permitted in appropriate locations with new developments expected to compliment the character and amenity of the neighbouring developments and provide a high standard of layout and design to ensure adequate privacy (iv) Policy 6.11 – sensitive planning control is necessary to ensure the cumulative effects of development do not damage character and amenity of established residential areas; (v) Policy 6.7 – high standard of layout and design ensuring adequate privacy for occupations and adjacent properties.

Policies that support the refusal of this application include: Policy 6.2 – development will be permitted except where it would demonstrably harm the character or appearance of an area or amenities enjoyed by local residents.

NPC believe that this application is an attempt to squeeze a property into a space suitable as a garden but not as a separate plot and that such attempt is in breach of Policy 6.52.

19/10: Updates on: a) Installation of stile/gate: The Cotswold Wardens would be contacted by the clerk to move this project at The Glebe forward; **b) New notice board:** The board remained stored at

the chairman's address. It was agreed it would be installed as part of the village spring clean later in the year when it was hoped volunteer local resident Adam Reynold could be on hand to supervise; **c) Defibrillator:** The council noted that the agreement of Tony Sanders, owner of the Rose and Crown, to pay for the defibrillator had not yet been followed up and the council resolved to see if he continued to be willing to cover the initial cost so the defibrillator could be installed soon.

19/11: Payments: Settlement of an account submitted by Leopardpress was postponed pending investigation by both the clerk and the company after it initially appeared that some of the invoice(s) listed had been settled.

19/12: Councillors' items for future discussion: Church application for lawn mower grant; Date for village spring clean; Erection of pub car park sign on bus shelter side; Update from Cllr Cowle on memorial plaque; Future organisation of newsletter.

The meeting closed at 8.45pm.

Signed: ……. Date:…….