

## **Headon-cum-Upton, Grove & Stokeham Parish Council.**

**Minutes of the virtual Parish Council meeting held at 19:37hr on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020.**

**Present:** - Parish Councillors; John Mosley, Sean Whelan, Janet Askew, Nigel Greenhalgh, Ben Wielgus and Josh Burman.

**Chair:** - Parish Councillor Julia Harvey.

**Clerk and RFO:** - Jim Blaik.

**District Councillor:** - Anthony Coultate.

**County Councillor:** - Not in attendance

**Guests:** - None

**Members of the public:** - Four.

**Apologies:** - Parish Councillors Eric Briggs.

### **Commencement of the Parish Council meeting.**

#### **1. Welcome and introduction.**

Cllr Harvey opened the meeting welcoming everyone. Cllr Harvey informed the meeting that because of Covid19 no major problems in the parish had been reported in the previous ten weeks. Cllr Harvey informed the meeting that this was the first virtual Parish Council meeting using Zoom. Cllr Harvey will chair the meeting and Cllr Wielgus will run the technical side of Zoom. Cllr Wielgus stated that in line with Parish Council meeting protocol the public will only be allowed to speak at the public forum. The public can see and hear the full council meeting.

### **Cllr Harvey closed the Parish Council meeting and opened the Public Forum.**

#### **Public forum.**

The public forum focused upon the proposed single and two storey rear extension at The Old Blacksmith Shop. Main Street, Grove.

The site has previously been granted planning permission for phase 1 and phase 2. The current planning application relates to phase 3. Phase 1 has been constructed. Phase 2 has not yet been constructed.

A member of the public talked on behalf of the owners of the neighboring property, stating that the proposed application is contrary to the Neighborhood Plan and that the Highway Authority has not been consulted about the proposed development. The proposed development is causing substantial impact on the elderly owners of the adjacent property.

The owner of the property with the current planning application said that phase 2 would commence soon. They stated that they would look at amending the phase 2 plans however, this would involve a substantial cost in terms of new plans, resubmitting the plans, obtaining planning permission and delaying the build phase of the project. The owner of the property stated that they do not want to upset the neighbors. They further stated that phase 2 would go ahead and phase 3 is the current planning application.

### **Cllr Harvey closed the Public Forum and opened the Parish Council meeting.**

## **2.To receive apologies and approve reasons for absence.**

Apologies received from Cllr Briggs.

## **3.Declaration of interests.**

Resolved to note that there were no declarations of interests.

## **4.Minutes of Meeting held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2020.**

Resolved to note the minutes were passed as a true record proposed by Cllr Harvey, seconded by all councilors.

## **5.To receive information on the following matters and agree further action where necessary.**

### **6. Police report.**

Resolved to note that a police report had not been received. Cllr Harvey informed the meeting that PC Gareth Mitchell is the new police officer for the area.

### **7.District Councilors report.**

Resolved to note that Cllr Coultate positively reported on the response from the district council to the Covid19 pandemic and that the district council had demonstrated thorough and clear leadership.

Resolved to note that he informed us that the next district council meeting would be a virtual meeting. The district council will be carrying out a review of its capital spending program.

Resolved to note that Cllr Coultate will provide a response to the planning application for The Old Blacksmith Shop. Main Street, Grove via Bassetlaw DC planning portal.

### **8.County Councilors report.**

Resolved to note that County Councillor Ogle did not attend the meeting.

### **9.Defibrillator checks.**

Resolved to note that all checks have been carried out

## **10.Planning applications and any other planning issues.**

### **10.1**

<b>Consultation Date:</b>	<b>6 May 2020</b>
<b>Application No:</b>	<b>20/00446/HSE Planning Portal Ref: PP-08654466</b>
<b>Grid Ref:</b>	<b>E: 473906 N: 379629</b>
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Proposed Single and 2 Storey Rear Extension</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Land At The Old Blacksmith Shop Main Street Grove Nottinghamshire</b>

Resolved to note that the Parish Council carefully considered the submissions at the public forum and the planning application and submitted the following response to Bassetlaw DC.

This response is on behalf of Headon, Upton and Grove Parish Council, the Parish Council for the local area for this application. The response follows discussion of the application at the recent Parish Council meeting that had representations on behalf of the objectors and the supporters. It factors in consideration of the Neighborhood Plan and the Character Assessment. We recognise that this application has split opinion in the village and caused distress on both sides, and we have sought to resolve some of the conflicts arising by trying to find compromises between the two households primary affected - the applicants and the neighboring residents. We have sought to be impartial and listen to, acknowledge, and represent both sides of the discussion. We acknowledge that the Parish Council was full in support of Phase 1 of the development - the sympathetic conversion of the existing derelict building into a modern, affordable home that matches the need identified in the Neighborhood Plan for smaller homes for new starters or down sizers. We also acknowledge that the Parish Council provided a neutral submission to the application for phase 2 in late 2019. Whilst we were concerned that the materials choice was in not wholly in keeping with the Character Assessment in the Neighborhood Plan, we decided not to object as there was a degree of architectural merit and the materials were not used in locations that were highly visible from the roadside or other dwellings. They could also have been retrofitted at a later date without planning and therefore it wasn't a significant objection point. However, we observed that the scale of phase 2 was a significant multiplication of the existing building footprint. We had no notice of objections from residents, the extension was single story and out of sight of the main thoroughfares and so we made no objection although noted that it did take the home away from an affordable home identified as a need in the Neighborhood Plan. It has since come to light that nearby residents were unaware of the phase 2 application and there are now strong objections from the closest neighbors as well as about half of the other respondents from the village. The supporters, of which there appears to be a roughly equal number to the objectors, live further away and would be less impacted by the development. It's also worth noting that most supporters particularly highlight the development on aesthetic grounds rather than planning, development and amenity for the neighbors. As this new application appears to cover the already approved phase 2 plus the further addition of a second storey phase 3, the Council has taken advice and been told that it's appropriate to respond to the application as a whole i.e. phase 2 and 3 together rather than just the phase 3 which represents the additional element in this case.

### **Comments in support of the application**

1. We do recognise and appreciate that this old building, an eyesore in the past, has been brought back into use and appreciate the applicant's desire to remain in the village.
2. We appreciate that the development, as proposed, does not compromise the privacy of the neighbors with no overlook onto their property from windows.
3. For the most visible aspects of phase 1, materials in line with the Character Assessment for the village have been sympathetically chosen and used to a high standard.
4. We appreciate the applicant's willingness to seek a compromise with the neighbors and recognise that they have offered to consider two adjustments to phase 2 to lessen the impact on the adjacent neighbors' amenity (their primary concern). These might help lessen the substantial and potentially overpowering roofline to the South and West of the whole length of the neighboring garden.

They have proposed to consider:

- a. Reducing the roof pitch to lower the roof apex of the phase 2 building. This is particularly important where the roof 'steps up' as it heads away from the original development. The 'step up' may be an unnecessary decision and the building would be more sympathetic to its surroundings without this.

b. Utilise the slope of the land to lower the roof apex further by excavating one end of the build rather than building up the other end, thereby sinking the whole structure and having the new building on a different level to the older part of the property. Cumulatively we think this could make a substantial difference to the residential amenity, potentially reducing the visible roofline of phase 2 by 0.5-1.5m from the 2m above the party wall that it appears will be the case under current plans. We hope that Bassetlaw can consider this in their deliberations, and how expectations can be managed and delivered on both sides of the debate, potentially as a planning condition.

### **Objections to the application**

As this application is for the whole of phase 2 and phase 3, we include our concerns about phase 2 and well as phase 3.

5. We believe the development of Phase 2 in particular will materially impact the residential amenity of the neighbouring property, both from within the building and from the entirety of the garden. The roof line may be 1.5-2m above the party wall for a considerable distance (up to 4-5m high in total along an approximately 20m boundary). Featured in the South and West direction of the nearest property, this may not block light in summer but would represent an imposing structure and potentially reduce light levels in winter, particularly in the dwelling. We believe that Phase 3, whilst adding height to the building, is likely to be less impactful compared to phase 2 but may compound matters. The two together lead to a substantial loss of amenity to the immediate neighbours.

### **Neutral comments**

6. Whilst we do not feel that the materials choices are wholly in keeping with the Character Assessment for the area, we recognise that the windows and cladding applied for could be readily retrofitted on other buildings without planning permission and therefore we do leave the decision on materials to Bassetlaw Planners. We do suggest that a red pantile roof throughout, rather than slate as proposed on phase 2 and 3, may be more in keeping with the area. However, in general the material choices appear to have architectural merit.

7. We recognise that phase 3 may also make the building substantially more noticeable to other homes nearby and those using the adjacent public footpaths. We also believe that it will also be visible from the listed War Memorial, church and other developments. We are not sure if there are planning grounds to consider on this.

8. We note that an existing field gate into the adjacent field has been widened as a new access point to the property. This would reduce traffic flow that may have disturbed the immediate neighbours but we do note that this access route across fields to the property is new and may need to be considered by highways for safety as well as for sight lines. As this is a residence rather than an agricultural field, we can imagine that the usage of this access would increase substantially compared to its original use.

9. These extensions take the property from being the original 1-bedroom starter home as identified as needed by the Neighborhood Plan to a 4/5 bedroom executive home which was identified as less desirable in the plan. However, this may be perceived as an extension to an existing dwelling rather than newbuild and therefore we submit a neutral view on this.

We note that most objections are about the phase 2 development that has already been approved and we are seeking to try to find a satisfactory compromise between the parties which means that phase 2 is altered to reduce the impact on the residential amenity of nearby properties yet still allow local residents to develop and remain in the village. We believe that, if the roof height of phase 2 could be substantially reduced, a compromise may be found. We ask that Bassetlaw Planning explore ways in which this can be documented so that all parties know where they stand. The Council has sought to not take sides in this debate, trying to remain neutral and resolve the conflicts emerging. However, given the scale of sentiment from the most impacted neighbours, we feel that it is incumbent on us to object to the planning application with specific reference to the roof height of phase 2 and the loss of residential amenity for the adjacent properties. We recognise that phase 2 has already been approved for planning but it appears that substantial numbers of impacted individuals were unaware of the original application. We ask, and hope, that Bassetlaw planners can suggest a way of resolving the concern over phase 2 so that any development on the

site is done so in a way that satisfies both parties and, where possible, considers ways of supporting the adaptation of phase 2 to be of a significantly lower height.

## 10.2

**Consultation Date:** 27 May 2020  
**Application No:** 20/00539/FUL Planning Portal Ref: PP-08709268  
**Grid Ref:** E: 473444 N: 379077  
**Proposal:** Construction of New Residential Access and Improvements to Driveway  
**Site Address:** Six Oaks Grove Road Grove Retford

Resolved to note that the Parish Council carefully the planning application and submitted to following response to Bassetlaw DC.

Following a meeting of the Parish Council for this area, the Council has resolved to OBJECT to this planning application on two grounds:

**Safety** - As per the highway's response, traffic does travel rapidly down the roadway on which the proposed driveway will join. There are insufficient views from that driveway, and it introduces a second possible location where traffic is merging to the road within a short distance.

**Sustainability** - The driveway in question does not appear to serve the primary property and instead it serves a secondary building onsite that was recently extended (see previous planning applications). The planning application stated that this was for business purposes but we are concerned that this is opening up the site for conversion of that secondary building into another residence, outside of the village envelope (in a designated unsustainable village) and increasing the traffic flow to the site.

### **11.To consider highway related matters that have the potential to cause injury.**

Resolved to note that no issues raised.

### **12.To consider financial matters.**

**13.**Resolved to note that the balance of current account = £1,185.43.

**14.**Resolved to note that the balance of savings account = £16,830.95.

**15.**Resolved to note the following income, expenditure and money transfer.

DATE	ITEM	INCOME	EXPENDITURE	METHOD OF PAYMENT
30/05/2020	HMRC PAYMENT MAY		£37.40	BACS
30/05/2020	HMRC PAYMENT APRIL		£37.40	BACS
20/05/2020	MR B WIELGUS REFERENCE ZOOM PAYMENT FEE		£14.39	BACS
20/05/2020	ZURICH INSURANCE		£289.63	BACS
15/05/2020	SALARY CLERK MAY		£167.60	BACS
15/05/2020	SALARY LENGTHSMAN MAY		£74.87	BACS
12/05/2020	INTERNAL AUDITOR FEE MR D HARFORD		£25.00	BACS

11/05/2020	DARBYS PROCESSING OF SALARIES		£96.00	BACS
17/04/2020	PAPER FOR HEADS-UP PUBLICATION		£50.96	DEBIT CARD
16/04/2020	TRANSFER FROM CURRENT ACCOUNT TO SAVINGS ACCOUNT		£3,000.00	n/a
15/04/2020	SALARY CLERK APRIL		£167.60	BACS
15/04/2020	SALARY LENGTHSMAN APRIL		£71.15	BACS
15/04/2020	INFORMATION COMMISIONER YEARLY PAYMENT		£35.00	BACS
14/04/2020	PRECEPT FROM BASSETLAW DC	£4,769.00		n/a
04/04/2020	HEADON VILLAGE HALL HIRE 2019/20		£120.00	BACS
03/04/2020	MILAGE CLERK		£18.00	BACS
01/04/2020	NALC YEARLY FEES		£95.47	BACS

16.To notify the Clerk of matters for inclusion on the agenda for the next meeting.

Items for the next meeting.

- Future Parish Council meetings – face to face or virtual?
- Chitterbeck and Pinder Hill street naming – Cllr Harvey

17.To confirm the date and time of next meeting - **Monday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2020 at 19:30hr. Please note that the because of the restrictions imposed by the Corona virus the next meeting will a virtual meeting via Zoom. The agenda for the next meeting will provide the Zoom login details.**

18.Cllr Harvey thanked everyone for attending the meeting and the public meeting was closed at 20:22hr.

Signed: -

Chair

Dated: -