

Minutes of a planning meeting held on 27th.September 2010 at 7.30pm in St. Margaret's Church, Church Street, Crick.

Present – J. Richards (Chairman), D. Tolfts (Vice Chairman), Miss A. Ward, R. Lowe, W. Simms, W. Fursman, Mrs G. Nisbet and Mrs M. Gibbins.

125 members of the public were present – the meeting originally to be held in the Old School but could not accommodate these numbers.

1. Apologies

J. Goodger (in London) and P. Dunkley (holiday)

2. Declaration of Interests.

Members did not declare any interests.

3. Planning.

DA/2010/0758 – an application by David Wilson Homes for the construction of 36 dwellings, roads, sewers and associated open space on land off Bury Dyke, Crick.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened the meeting to members of the public. The majority of the members of the public were opposed to the application. The grounds that members of the public were opposed to the proposals briefly were;

Loss of character in the village and the loss of enjoyment of the public open space (POS)

The encroachment of new build, backing onto the POS.

The setting of the church will be affected by any new build on the green space.

The developers are insensitive to the wishes of the residents; the proposals of mixed housing are totally out of character with the area and existing dwellings.

The proposals would generate extra traffic on a small road that is already a very busy junction during school times. The impact on the school by the proposed road, especially during construction of the site, does not bear thinking about. Fallowfields/Bury Dyke is a safe route to the school and this safe route will disappear.

36 dwellings will create about 100 people. There is no play area designated on the plans, where will children from the development play. 100 people will increase the burden on local services, shops, the Post Office and the surgery.

The open space in the centre of the village will be destroyed. The proposals are out of keeping with existing properties, the development shows only five detached properties, the remainder being affordable housing, flats, and terrace style properties.

Chris Heaton-Harris MP was present and he agreed to support the opposition of the proposals.

The public open meeting was closed by the Chairman at 8.10pm. The application was then considered by the Parish Council.

The Chairman informed the meeting that there was a Village Design Statement (VDS) and it is being updated and revisions are now with DDC. The additions were published 6 weeks ago and the consultation period ended at the end of August. The proposed amendments are as follows;

- a) Providing a fuller explanation of the importance of the Wells Hills area to the west of Crick.
- b) Identifying the setting of St. Margaret of Antioch Church as an important area.
- c) Identifying the setting of Vynters Manor as an important area.
- d) Identifying an area to the east of Drayson Lane as an important open space.
- e) Identifying a triangle of land bounded by the bypass, Yelvertoft Road and Barley Croft as an important open space with a potential pocket park.

The additions emphasised that it was important to preserve and enhance the setting of the church and the roofscape view from its churchyard. The skyline of taller mature trees partly masks some buildings. But these trees may not always be there, especially conifers, which have limited lives. Therefore any potential development of area Y should be set well back from the churchyard boundary and not impinge upon the existing skyline. In particular, their layout, shape and size (mass and form) should echo the surrounding buildings not those of modern suburban executive housing. Their design and building materials should also be in keeping with character of the old surrounding buildings.

The Chairman continued that local people should have affordable housing but the Parish Council believes there are grounds for objection to this application. He thanked the members of the public for their comments.

R. Lowe informed the meeting that there were inaccuracies in the application. DWH mention a conservation area, it is believed that there is not a conservation area in Crick. Also mentioned in the application is the use of a garden but in the rest of the documents, the term used for the land off Bury Dyke is agricultural land.

R. Lowe had identified the relevant planning reasons for objection to the development, based simply on the Daventry District Local Plan. Planning Policy HS11 – housing development in large villages – Crick is called a Limited Development Village, which means that some development is allowed but the criteria is very strict. It needs to be a small scale development which does not affect the open land which is of significance to the form and character of the village. In his view the proposal fails to meet either of these criteria. Judging the size of the development can only be made in the terms of the size of the settlement, in which it is to be put. 36 new houses may be a small development for Daventry Town, but would be a major development for Winwick or Ashby St. Ledger. In Crick this would be a significant development and cannot be called a small scale development. 36 houses represent a 5% increase in the housing in Crick. It cannot be a small scale development if it has to have a Section 106 Agreement or that it can be considered to help meet the Government's housing targets for the District. This fact automatically means that this application is a significant development and therefore not a small scale development.

In terms of the effect of the form and character of the village then it has clearly been identified in the VDS, which will be strengthened with the amendments, that the views across the fields from Oak Lane footpath to the church are very important views within the village. DWH proposals are that they meet the criteria by one view from one house, down a road where one can still see the church. The developers are totally destroying the view across the open space from 90% of the public footpath.

R. Lowe proposed that these are good and relevant reasons for objecting to the planning application. The Chairman seconded the proposal and this was agreed by those members present. He further identified other issues, increase in traffic, the effect on Crick Primary School, but these issues may not be considered relevant by the Planning Committee.

NCC Transport Officer has not chosen to make objection to the access road, off Bury Dyke, in terms of traffic movement (email on Transport Statement from Penny Mould, NCC, to Michael Avery, DWH) The proposed access road is across POS. If the development goes ahead it is more beneficial for the village overall but not for people living in and around Bury Dyke, if the access is off Bury Dyke rather than Church Street. The planning application states that the access road only goes over POS given as Phase 3 of DWH development. The fact is that it goes over POS which should be given to the Parish Council from Phases 2, 3 and 4. Only two of those have provisions in them which foresaw the access road, for way leave. None of this land has yet been given to the Parish Council because DWH and the Thomas family have not been in a position to offer the land to the Parish Council. The Parish Council is currently in negotiation, via DDC Solicitors, to try to obtain the land. R. Lowe had investigated this issue and found that Government Planning Policy Guidance 17, which is Planning for Open Space for sport and recreation. This states that when considering developments affecting POS, the Local Authority, i.e. DDC, should avoid any erosion of the recreational function that maintains and enhances the character of open spaces and more importantly they should ensure that open spaces do not suffer from increased over looking, traffic flows or encroachment.

R. Lowe further proposed that the Parish Council object on the grounds of the affect on POS as this against Government Planning Policy. DDC had not consulted with the Parish Council on this issue.

The proposals of Roger Lowe were seconded by D. Tolfts and Mrs G. Nisbet and both complemented him for preparing such a strong case against the proposed development. The Parish Council agreed the proposals and also that the open space area, off Bury Dyke, was vital to the village. Mrs G. Nisbet welcomed the support of members of the public and hoped the support will continue for future issues.

R. Lowe proposed to reverse a decision that the Parish Council took a few weeks ago. Before the application came into being, the Parish Council agreed not to argue with DDC and DWH about applying the covenants on the access on Phase 2, by taking phase 2 with phases 3 and 4 together. He further proposed to write to DDC Planning and their solicitors stating that the Parish Council has reversed this decision and each phase will be considered one by one, even if the Parish Council has to fund their own legal fees to take this course of action. The proposal were seconded and agreed.

3.

Mrs M. Gibbins reported that other affordable housing sites have been identified in the village and affordable housing is not necessary on the land off Bury Dyke.

R. Lowe proposed that if planning permission is granted for this development, then the Parish Council should have an input towards the spending of any funding of a Section 106 agreement. If affordable housing is built then a condition should be imposed that local people should have first option. The proposals were seconded by the Chairman and agreed.

The Chairman concluded the meeting by announcing that the Village had been highly commended in the Northamptonshire Village of the Year competition.

He thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 8.30pm.

Signed.

Chairman.

18.10.10.

4.

