

## AYNHO PARISH COUNCIL

### **Minutes of the Extra-ordinary Council Meeting held on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> July 2011 at 7.30 pm in the Village Hall**

Present                      Chair – Cllr Macklin

Councillors –Parkes, Burge, Mann, Brook, James, Hoddinott and Anderson

In Attendance: Sadie Patamia (Clerk), Amby Hitchcox (RFO) and 51 members of the public

The Chair began the meeting by welcoming the public and explaining how the meeting would be conducted. He stated that he would suspend standing orders to allow the public to speak and he requested the meeting was held in good humour. He explained that as APC have adopted the Code of Conduct Section 12(2), Cllr James would be allowed to take part in the meeting and make a statement but when the actual decision was made he would need to leave the room.

#### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were accepted from Cllr Belcher

#### **2. Declarations of Interest**

Cllr James declared an interest in the planning application as he lives immediately adjacent to the proposed site. He signed the declaration of interest book accordingly.

#### **3. S/2011/0874/MAF, The erection of a Working Heritage Centre and associated car parking to accommodate the storage restoration and study of plaster cast artefacts and heritage interior design and furniture studio, Land at Aynhoe Corner Aynho**

Cllr Brook stated that as the planning representatives he and Cllr Burge have visited the site, accompanied by other members of APC. Cllr Brook read out report SB/0874 which is attached to these minutes.

The Chair invited questions from APC.

Cllr Parkes asked about the extra road? He stated he could not see where the road was originally and why an additional one is necessary. Cllr Brook stated he did not know and has asked why a circuit around the development is necessary. Cllr James stated that after living there for 30 years he did not believe this road exists at all.

Cllr Hoddinott noted that given the plans state 60% for manufacture, does this not make it an industrial estate? Cllr Burge stated the application is indeed for B1 use.

Cllr Brook stated that James Perkins or a representative of GL50 had been invited to attend the meeting but was unable.

At this point the Chair suspended Standing Orders to allow a statement from Aynho Action Alliance.

A representative of the Aynho Action Alliance stated that this organisation had sent an open letter to the village (see attached to minutes). He stated that AAA object to the development as puts an industrial building on a green field site. He stated that other areas are available and that they considered this the thin end of wedge. He pointed out that if granted the use can change with permission.

At this point the Chair reinstated Standing Orders

Cllr Burge stated that it is green field but stringent restraints are required and do exist. Cllr James stated that the report from previous planning officer confirms it is green field.

The Chair checked there was nobody present from GL50 or anyone that would like to speak on behalf of them. There was not.

Cllr Anderson asked if it could be ensured that by this building being built James Perkins maintained the rest of the site as woodland for Aynho would that change AAA's view? The representative from AAA stated he could not answer that on behalf of the rest of the group.

The Chair stated that he was aware that no dialogue had taken place between AAA and GL50 and that there could be an opportunity for dialogue which may resolve issues. The Chair suggested a conversation should take place.

At this point the Chair suspended Standing Orders to hear from the public.

The following questions and responses were put forward.

It was commented on that the report from the previous planning officer mentioned significant number of objections from residents and English Heritage who called it, 'Unwarranted development outside confines' Possibility of precedence was raised.

The question of who paid for all the stamps that had been delivered to the village of the objection cards was raised? There were concerns that APC had used Council funds to do this. It was confirmed that this was not the case and that AAA had paid for them. The membership numbers of AAA were questioned and confirmed at about 12 families.

The Chair stated that the Clerk had received 3 phone calls and 7 emails and letters objecting to the application and 1 supporting it.

The question of what would happen to the land if the development did not go through was raised. Cllr Parkes confirmed the area was gated so no other people could move into it.

It was commented that the previous consent was before Rightracks and have the road improvements been taken into account?

The Chair stated that a full transport study has been done. Cllr Brook stated that the amount of traffic potentially generated was suggested to be minimal. He stated that the determinant will be Highways Department who will comment to SNC

Cllr Brook stated that there were worse plans a foot in Oxfordshire (houses in Bicester and Banbury) which would lead to a high increase in traffic through the village.

Cllr James asked if the transport study been updated since 2007. It was not believed it had

Cllr Anderson noted that the original application stated the centre was a museum. Cllr Brook stated this was no longer the case.

Clarification was asked for where the proposed entrance is. Cllr Brook confirmed it was through Ryelands House driveway.

The historical value and definition of 'Heritage Centre' was questioned. Cllr Brook read out the proposal (attached) which clarified the question.

The question of traffic on and off site was raised. The objection card as circulated by AAA stated that up to 64 vehicles a day could be visiting where the proposal estimates a far lower number. The Chair stated that the 64 vehicles is a standard description for a B1 building of this type.

The size of the building was questioned. This was confirmed at 1000m<sup>2</sup>.

It was asked if the police and road safety get involved in planning? Cllr Brook stated that Highways Authority will give a view and that APC could ask for new speed limits as a result of the development. The Chair confirmed that SNC will ask NCC Highways to make a view. He asked that the village write to John Spencer if they are concerned re. safety. APC have written to Police and OCC and NCC about the road safety and issues and the police have ensured they will be looking into this.

It was commented on that a limit should be put on the numbers of large vehicles permitted.

Light pollution was raised as an issue. Cllr Brook stated that no specific mention of lighting in plans. Given where the building is located there will be no pollution in the village as it is far away. You may see it from the road in winter, but in summer you will not see it at all. APC can mention lighting in recommendation.

Concerns were raised about biodiversity and disruption to the wood as there is very little woodland around Aynho.

It was generally felt that the existing road network providing potential provision for more parking implied the development would be bigger than suggested. The Chair reiterated that APC can only consider the plans as they are currently set out but can make constraints about traffic.

A comment was made that it was very disappointing that nobody has come to represent GL50. It was stated that James Perkins has done a lot for the village and is sad that we are at loggerheads. "It is also sad that we do not trust him." The area to be developed is viewed as a lovely field and a lovely site that was once the cricket pitch. It was stated that James Perkins is being deliberately provocative by putting his entrance through Cllr James' drive and surely a different entrance could be made. It was suggested that efforts should be made to work with the heritage centre and make it a nice area. It was suggested that the application should be rejected as he hasn't come along. It was suggested that APC should mediate.

Mention was made of James Perkins bigger plans for the site. The Chair stated once again that no matter what people suspected the application on the table was all that could be considered.

The hours of operating were questioned. The Chair stated that restrictions were put in place by SNC last time.

It was commented on that James Perkins' enthusiasm for plaster casts and their restoration was understandable as was his desire to have this workshop on his own land.

The question of security on site was raised. The Chair stated this was not a matter for APC.

Cllr Anderson asked what does everyone really feel? If it was accepted for a moment that the building is in keeping, efforts were put in place to have the walls repaired and trees listed and an effort was made to stop 'mission creep' would that satisfy AAA?

The representative from AAA stated that they would need to reconsider it. AAA are not luddites, we are not anti-progress and are fully in favour of the democratic process that is taking place. It is felt that SNC must listen to APC's opinions but that they can, of course be ignored. Cllr Anderson stated that it was true that feel impotent at times. We already have a building with B1 use on Portway. It had severe restrictions on it when it was approved which are regularly flouted. Cllr Townsend has assured APC that because of the strength of feeling at the time the feelings have greater power. The Chair stated that SNC are very aware of APC due to the vigour with which we operate.

It was requested that a show of hands was given to show who was for and against the development in the room. The Chair stated that this would not be representative as only 10% of the village were at the meeting. Nevertheless this was carried out. The results were In favour – 1, Not in favour – 46, Abstain 5. It was noted that of those against most lived close to the proposed development.

It was commented on that James Perkins is a property developer and that he will develop property.

The advantage of the scheme to the village was queried. The Chair stated this could not be answered.

At this point the Chair reinstated Standing Orders, closing the public part of the meeting

Cllr James was invited to make a statement which is attached to these minutes (JJ/280711).

The Chair asked if Cllr James would be willing to meet with James Perkins to discuss a resolution. Cllr James stated he would and that James Perkins had never phoned him at all.

At this point Cllr James left the meeting and took no further part.

The Chair stated he would now ask each councillor to state whether they were in favour of the supporting the proposal. The Chair will not vote unless there is a tie.

Each councillor stated their vote and the conditions they would like to see made. These make up the conditions listed.

The vote resulted in 5 votes for with conditions and 1 against.

This vote means the planning application will be supported with the following conditions.

- 1) That South Northamptonshire District Council must consider this application in front of the full planning committee.
- 2) That permission is granted for a Heritage Centre, and workshop only, and for no other purpose.
- 3) That the building should be for the sole use of Mr James Perkins and that if he decided to sell the land or building, to change the use of the building, or to sub-let it, that a new planning application must be submitted.
- 4) That this permission relates only to the proposed building and not to the general use of this whole site as shown by the red line detailed on the planning application.
- 5) That the parking spaces should be restricted to a total of four cars or small vans and parking is not allowed anywhere else on the site.
- 6) No overnight parking should be permitted.
- 7) No items should be permitted to be stored outside the building.
- 8) All utilities should be underground, so as not to impact upon the rural environment.
- 9) It is understood that there is a "dry pond" close to the site, on land that falls away towards neighbouring farmland. It is essential that steps are taken to ensure that no pollution from the building can leak into this pond.

- 10) No more than 25 vehicle movements to occur a day during the working week and should only occur between 8am and 6pm, Monday to Friday
- 11) That all the existing containers are removed from the site before commencement of building work.
- 12) Temporary planning permission must be sought for existing containers immediately
- 13) APC see no requirement for a circuit route to access the building and therefore the road to the west and centre of the site must be removed from the application. Please refer to the attached plan.
- 14) All the stone boundary walls to the site must be maintained in good repair and the area of the wall to the eastern boundary wall which is currently demolished must be rebuilt within 1 year of completion.
- 15) SNC should carry out a tree audit putting in place TPOs where appropriate.
- 16) There should be no floodlighting on the site and external lights should be sympathetic to the rural environment
- 17) Footpath between Aynhoe Lodge and entrance to Ryelands House should be maintained and repaired as part of 106 agreement

The Chair stated that he would mediate with the next two weeks and attempt to get all interested parties together.

#### **4 Authorisation of cheques**

It was proposed by Cllr Anderson, seconded by Cllr Parkes and agreed that cheques totalling would be signed. These will be listed on the September financial report.

#### **5 Any other business**

There was no other business

The meeting closed at 9.35pm