

Thurlby Parish Council
Minutes of the Special Meeting of Thurlby Parish Council (Min 15-10) held on Wednesday 10th February 2016 at 7.00 p.m. in the Lawrance Park Social Room, Thurlby

Present: **Councillors:** N Bradley, E Lunn, R Rose, B Sadler (presiding), Y Scott, S Samra, A Smith and A Thomas.

Residents: Stephen Holland, Mr & Mrs Goldsmith, Joyce Stevenson, K Cockerill, J Illett, M Cockerill, B Speirs, Jean Redding

Others: Bernard Champness – Clerk,

Not present: G Derbyshire

Open Forum

There were a number of residents present who wished to speak about the Planning Application relating to 23 The Green. Rather than to name them individually the comments were:

1. The application makes no mention of cars coming up from High Street as the drivers view is very restricted on the bend
2. There were questions about the comment that there were at least 3 large lorries attending every day. This just did not happen.
3. The extra evidence filed in support does not help the case. The prior application filed in July resulted in a decision being made that the use of a shop on the site was illegal. That being so the logic was that any movement of traffic was illegal and should have no bearing on the present application
4. Mrs Illett the neighbor never gave permission for shrubs to be removed from her land.
5. An additional 4 properties would only add to the problems with drainage and flow of water and sewerage.
6. Another neighbor confirmed that the comment that 6-12 vehicles came up the drive every day was an exaggeration.
7. There is no mention of bats living in the vicinity
8. Tress have already been felled

The meeting was formally opened at 19.30

187. Apologies for absence, acceptance of Apologies

187.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Dobson (work) Cllr Reece (work)

187.2 Resolved: that the apologies be accepted.

188. Declaration of Interest – To receive Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests, as set out in Chapter 7 of the Localism Act 2011 and the nature of those interests relating to any Agenda item

188.1 No one declared an interest on any item on the agenda.

189. Minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council held on the 3rd February 2016 (Min15-09)

189.1 Resolved: That the minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council held on the 3rd February 2016 be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

190. Planning applications: To Approve:

167.1 S15/1627 – erection of 5 no dwellings with associated private drive following demolition of existing dwelling and buildings at White House Nurseries, 23 The Green, Thurlby. **Response**

by 15th February 2016

167.2 The comments made in the Open Forum were taken into account and it was **resolved** that we would object to the present plan. The Clerk would resubmit the previous objections to reiterate what we had said before. The letter sent with the application from Brian Gilham of Status Design should be commented on to rebut what he had said. The comments and further objections are as follows:

1. Site Traffic Usage – Mr Gilham suggests that had the business continued then there was no reason why this traffic usage could still not exist today and the traffic flow to and from the proposed development will be no worse that had taken place in the past and could again today. Mr and Mrs Courton it now transpires never had a licence to run a shop from the premises. The Planning Officer said that there was insufficient evidence to make an order saying that it was ever a shop. On that basis the traffic flow is based on an illegal activity this should not be taken into account. If that argument is not accepted then it should be pointed out that when the business was being run the village was a great deal smaller and there were far fewer cars on the road.
2. Access Visibility – the drawing is misleading in that it does not show the traffic sign, in front of the property to the east of the site and does not show the garage and bungalow at that address. We understand that no permission has been given to remove any bushes from that land. If a car is to exit the site it needs to have the nose of the car out onto the highway so that the driver can see any on coming traffic.. They say the access road will be moved closer to the eastern boundary. What is the position then with regard to a footpath either side of the access road? The width of the road and the possible lack of a footpath clearly shows that this will not be built to an acceptable standard.
3. Refuse Storage/collection - This site is on a sharp bend and on a busy main road, School children catch a bus opposite and small children are attending the local primary school nearby. Likewise there is a busy Vets practice almost opposite and there is a local shop close by. If the bin lorry stops on the corner 5 bins will have to be emptied which will mean the road will be blocked for some time and making that area more dangerous.
4. Water Services - the comments made by Mr Gilham clearly shows that he knows very little about this situation. Yes development has taken place but the drains are all connected so any additional development will only add to a 60 year old system that is already used to full capacity. The plan says that each bungalow will have a patio so this will mean that the actual foot print of a bungalow is going to be larger than a detached four bed roomed house. This means that the rain water has to go somewhere as it has nowhere to drain. Swallow Hill is called this name because at the bottom of the hill just beyond the proposed development is an area call the Swallows. This is not because of the swallow birds but because it swallowed the water running off the hill which exits as springs. This is fully reported in the 2011 South Kesteven District Council water cycle report by Entec (page 45) Extra development will in our opinion only make the matter worse. When it rains, water runs across the road in front of No23 and 2A and this again will only be worse when 4 more properties are built.
5. Private Road Construction/Site Stability – we understand that the developer cannot say that the road will be adopted. This is a matter for the Highways to agree to. We would suggest a site visit so that any retaining walls can be inspected as we are not convinced that reducing the road level by one metre will make the adjoining property any safer. We believe that a road designed to an adoptable standard needs to ensure pedestrian safety and pavements.
6. Private Road Turning Facility – we have no comments
7. Boundaries/Site Levels/Trees/Shrubs – work has already begun on removing trees. As we said before the drawings are not a true reflection of the actual position.
8. Drainage – we can only repeat what we have said before.

If the application is granted permission we want to make a claim for Sec106 money of at

least £180,000.00 to pay for/contribute towards the crossing at Thurlby crossroads on the A15. We would also seek a full water cycle report by a professional engineering company to test the current water cycle impact on the village.

There being no other business the meeting was formally closed at 19.59

- 191. The date of the next meeting** – to be held on **Wednesday 2nd March 2016** at 7.30 p.m. in the Lawrance Park Social Room, Thurlby

DRAFT