

Tysoe.org.uk
 Minutes of the Tysoe Parish Council Meeting
 Held on Monday 31st October 2016 at 7.15pm

Present: Cllrs Sinclair, Locke, Allen, Collier, Haines, Cressman & Littlewood
 In attendance: None
 Public: 16

	Action/ Date
<p>1. Welcome to the meeting given by the Chair, Cllr Sinclair.</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair welcomed all members of the public.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies - None</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of interest</p> <p>The Chair reminded councillors of the need to declare an interest in any of the agenda items. Cllr Cressman declared a non-pecuniary interest in Home Holdings, Lane End, and Land next to Church Farm Court. Cllr Locke declared a non-pecuniary interest in the planning application land off Lane End.</p>	
<p>4. Acceptance of previous Minutes</p> <p>Acceptance of the minutes from the meetings held on 12th September were agreed as a true and accurate record and were signed.</p>	
<p>5. Planning</p> <p>16/03203/VARY - Home Holdings Lane End Lower Tysoe CV35 0BZ Removal of condition 4 (plans) of planning application 14/03055/OUT - Outline planning application for the erection of two dwellings with garages (all matters reserved).</p> <p>The Clerk explained that she had spoken to the Planning Officer about this. Who had advised that there had been errors in the way that the initial outline planning permission had been granted. The Parish Councillors agreed unanimously to make no objection but that the red line on the application should be retained.</p> <p>16/03279/FUL - Land Off Lane End Lane End Lower Tysoe CV35 0BZ Erection of dwelling (revised design to dwelling approved under reference 14/02408/VARY)</p> <p>Having declared a non-pecuniary interest at the beginning of the meeting Cllr Locke took no part in this application.</p> <p>The Councillors looked at the application. The original permission had been for a bungalow. This had been revised to a chalet bungalow and the developer was now looking for a barn conversion type dwelling. Cllr Collier asked about the height of the building. The applicant stated that the height was the same as for the bungalow. Cllr Allen asked about the cladding and whether the property would be of similar in dimensions to the dwelling adjacent to the site? The applicant confirmed that it was smaller.</p>	

Cllr Allen proposed supporting the application. Cllr Littlewood and Collier agreed. It was noted that there were no flooding issues and they were happy with the design. The Parish Council agreed unanimously to support the application.

16/03171/LDE - Lindsey House Tysoe Road Tysoe CV35 0BS
Insertion of three dormer windows to rear elevation of dwelling

This application had arisen due to a confusion as to whether planning permission was necessary. The applicant had been advised by planning initially that it was not necessary. After the work had taken place they had been told that planning permission was needed. The Councillors agreed unanimously to support the application.

16/02684/FUL - Land Adjoining Church Farm Court and Main Road Main Street Tysoe
Proposed residential development for 10 dwellings

Having declared a non-pecuniary interest at the beginning of the meeting Cllr Cressman took no part in the debate on this application.

Cllr Sinclair asked if the developer or the owner wanted to say anything. The applicant stated that there was already permission for 9 houses. They thought the revised scheme was much better. Create a country lane which is more representative of what you get in Tysoe with traditional frontages. Mix of house sizes from 1 bedroom to 4 bedrooms. The houses at the front will not have cars fronting onto Main Street. Where possible the other cars are to the back or the side. Some of the houses have home offices. All houses have good size gardens. No affordable housing on site which is in accordance with Stratford District Council's wishes.

Cllr Littlewood said that you made quite a thing about hedges etc. and will there be a covenant that the new owners must maintain these? The applicant responded that subsequent owners would have to apply for planning permission to remove the hedges. Cllr Locke said that as a scheme he supported the Pendleton application and must endorse his comments and said that he would support this scheme.

Cllr Sinclair invited members of the public to speak. Member of the public said that this is the fourth application that the Parish Council had been asked to discuss on this site. Previously the PC voted either unanimously against or with one abstention to object to the applications. It is true that there is consent but that is made very explicit that it was to be for three houses to rent for local people. The applicant relies heavily on the previous reports. The reports state that the harm to the environment was outweighed because of the 3 social houses. Final point is what you must consider is do you want social housing to be built in Tysoe and if you do you need to turn down this scheme.

Cllr Sinclair read an email from a further resident who was unable to attend the meeting.

A member of the public said that she supported the comments about the lack of social housing and noted that this new proposal had gone further back into the site where there had previously been a balancing pond at the back of the site.

Cllr Littlewood stated that he had photographic evidence that if you look at Main Street it is generally under water for days when there is significant rain. Cllr Littlewood stated that he

was appalled by the fact that the provision of affordable housing is no longer required. One of the things that this village does need is affordable housing.

The developer responded stating that the site had been reduced. They had got rid of the pond altogether because it could be dangerous being near a school and public footpath. The water would only be dispersed at a normal run of rate. Cllr Sinclair asked if they have been in touch with Oxhill Parish Council about the problem that they would be pushing down to Oxhill.

Cllr Sinclair asked a member of the public who had previously been on the Parish Council and responsible for flood defences what their views were. They responded that the area around Church Farm Court down to the school is a well known flood hot spot. They went on to say that the problem of flooding from surface water run-off at this hot spot was acknowledged fully on page 7 of the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment. -The previous developer undertook to put a ditch/culvert along the northern edge of the site specifically to divert floodwater from the problem area but he could not see that this was included in the application although there is reference on pages 14 and 15 to a 600mm pipe elsewhere on the site for potential future use.

Cllr Littlewood said you are putting in hard standing and you are putting down roofs and this is bound to have a greater impact than was is there presently.

The applicant said that it is a condition of any development that any run off water is no worse after the development than before the development was in place.

Cllr Sinclair asked who will maintains the site when you have gone? The developer responded that there would be a modest management charge and the road will not be adopted by Warwickshire County Council.

Cllr Sinclair asked about the sewage when the existing system cannot cope. The developer responded that they were reducing the number of bedrooms.

Why do you consider it to be better to not have affordable housing? The applicant responded stating that it devalues the other houses. Our objective is to make money but not to make as much money as possible.

Member of the public said that it does look as if you are milking the site. Developer responded we are putting in a mix of houses. The applicant said that SDC said that they want the money not affordable houses. The applicant went on to say that SDC want us to give them £400,000.

Member of the public said that they objected to the applicant's assertion that if there were affordable houses on that site it would devalue the houses. I also believe that the balancing pond is more rural and children will cope with it.

Member of the public said they were very concerned that the road through the site appeared to give access to the agricultural field to the west and could this be a significant pointer to unwanted future development.

Member of the public said what must be clear is that ~~in~~ the consent that has been granted ~~is that~~ was on the basis that the damage that would be caused by development of this sensitive site is only outweighed by the inclusion of social housing.

Cllr Littlewood said that he would like to endorse that. Any development on this site is against the NPPF. It is admittedly a small-scale development. If you look at the early responses from the Neighbourhood Plan people are saying that they want small scale incremental developments over time. The road line presumes further development westward.

The applicant stated that they were advised to go with 5 large houses and this is not what we want to do.

Cllr Cressman asked what kind of prices they thought the houses would be? The developer could not say at this stage.

Cllr Collier said that the PC objected to the original application and I see no reason for there being more.

Cllr Sinclair asked about street lighting. The developer said that he would be happy to agree a scheme that eliminated as much light pollution as possible. This is also an opportunity for you to deal with flooding.

Cllr Sinclair called the Councillors together to debate what the application after hearing the views of all present.

Cllr Collier stated that he was opposed to the original scheme but that affordable housing was part of the social sustainability of the village.

Cllr Locke said that having listened to everyone's views he thinks it is a real missed opportunity about the social housing. Cllr Locke therefore felt he must go back on his opening comments earlier in the meeting and oppose the proposed scheme. Cllr Haines agreed with what Cllrs Locke and Collier had said and had concerns regarding flooding.

Cllr Allen stated that he did not want to see any houses on this site. It is the historical entrance to the village. Cllr Allen thought the previous scheme was a better scheme with the balancing pond.

Cllr Littlewood stated that he completely objects to this scheme. A lot of people have done a lot of hard work to get a Neighbourhood Plan together. There is a lot of feeling and a lot of awareness about how the village will develop. A lot of people have said that people want affordable housing. The planning officer stated that the harm caused by the 9 house scheme was on balance outweighed because of the social housing.

Councillors agreed unanimously to object to the application.

16/02293/FUL - Westcote House Tysoe Road Tysoe CV35 0BS

Insertion of door and window to existing building to the continued use as ancillary accommodation to Westcote House

Cllr Locke said that he supported the proposal but on the basis, that this was maintained as ancillary. The Parish Council debated the application and agreed unanimously that they would make no objection to the planning application on the basis that it is granted as ancillary accommodation and that this is noted in the planning permission.

16/03060/TREE – The Old Bakehouse, Shipston Road – No objection
16/02843/FUL – 34 Main Street, Tysoe – Permission granted

A letter had been received from Harlequin regarding the installation of a telephone mast by the sewage works. This was not a planning application but a letter advising that planning is going to be applied for. The Parish Council agreed to say nothing at this stage. They were however concerned about views from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It was agreed that the Clerk should try and ascertain what the rules and regulations are regarding telephone masts.

6. Closure of the meeting – 8.40pm