

Rushton Parish Council

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting, held on Tuesday, February 9 2016 at Rushton Methodist Church, Sugar Street, Rushton.

Chairman	Mr R Steele		
Vice Chairman	Mr D W Lovatt		
Councillors	Mrs S J Bostock Gibson Mr G R Betton	Mrs J Matravers	Mr R Bailey
Clerk	Mrs J Sherratt		

1. Apologies for absence
Mrs S Hughes, Mr D F Trueman, Mr L W Young

2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting held on January 26 2016
These had been circulated and were signed as correct by the Chairman.

3. Declaration of Interest
None.

4. Planning
 - 4.1 It was thought that the following Planning application has been withdrawn.

SMD/2015/0619	Outline planning permission with some matters reserved (except access and scale) for new agricultural worker's dwelling at Deepdale Farm, Beat Lane, Rushton Spencer
---------------	--

 - 4.2 SMD/2016/0015 Details of reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping and scale for residential development comprising 9 dwellings, including partial demolition of the existing cottage and garage pursuant to outline planning permission at land off Sugar Street, Rushton Spencer.

The Parish Council would like to object to the above planning application.

The Parish council was opposed to the outline application and remains concerned that the proposal clearly represents over-development of the site and that the layout is more akin to a suburban housing estate than a rural village on the edge of the Green Belt.

Drainage

We note that this does not form part of the current application. However, it is an outstanding condition on the outline consent which has yet to be addressed and as such remains a major concern for the residents of the properties along Sugar Street and Macclesfield Road whose existing drainage arrangements are at risk of damage/disruption. The Parish council does not believe that any meaningful engagement has yet been undertaken by the developer with the affected residents.

We would urge the Planning Department to consider carefully the potential impact of the proposed drainage scheme (when submitted), giving special regard to the sensitivity of existing arrangements for foul water management for the existing properties. The Parish is particularly concerned to avoid a repetition of the as yet unresolved situation that occurred with the development of 6 residential properties on the adjacent site on Macclesfield Road where foul water drainage systems that had functioned effectively for many decades have been damaged leading to sewerage flooding into residents' gardens. This appears indicative of drainage in this locality being particularly sensitive and needing extra attention to avoid costly, protracted and not to mention unsanitary consequences.

There are existing, long-established drains on the site with right of access. Have these matters been adequately addressed in view of the ongoing problems on the nearby Marsh Villa site?

In a letter dated 28 March 2012 British Waterways advised the applicant's agent that a commercial agreement for any discharges to the feeder channel would need to be obtained and that as British Waterways (now Canals and Rivers Trust CRT) are not a land drainage authority, they are not under any obligation to accept such discharges.

We understand from a third party that a recently negotiated commercial agreement to discharge water into the feeder channel has been on the basis of a 21 year agreement with several thousand pounds being payable in advance. May we request that should CRT accept discharges from the site that the commercial agreement be made by the developer and payment met by the developer in advance of the commencement of the development.

- *Appearance*

As mentioned previously, the Parish Council has strong reservation on the layout of the proposed scheme, with the creation of a suburban cul-de-sac that we understand does not conform to County highway standards and will not be adopted by the County Council.

Whilst we recognise that certain features on the submitted plans go some way to "mitigate the harm" we wish to object to the following aspects:

- *Materials*

The use of a uniformity of design and materials across all of the properties heightens the “housing estate” feel and appearance of the development. The village has grown organically over time and exhibits a broad range of house styles and materials giving an ad-hoc piecemeal character. With the exception of the two modern additions on Macclesfield Road which do little to enhance the character of the village, there are no large uniform groups of houses with shared styles/materials as proposed here within the village. This makes the appearance of the development incongruous to its setting and damaging to the character of Rushton.

We would urge that you consider the need for different materials/treatments across the scheme.

The use of stone and reclaimed bricks to better blend in and break up the scale of the development should be considered.

We are concerned about the use of 6 foot tall concrete post and panel fences throughout the site. The need for 6 foot tall fences is incongruous to the rural setting and if screening is required the use of more sympathetic boundary treatments appropriate to the rural location should be employed.

We support the use of dry stone walls throughout the site and would urge that these are conditioned to prevent them being lost through subsequent amendments as their presence is integral to ameliorating the detrimental impact of the development as a whole. Furthermore we would ask that their future retention is similarly conditioned to ensure they are not lost over time.

We note the presence of streetlights on the submitted plans and object to their inclusion on the grounds of light pollution.

We note the inclusion of two parking spaces per dwelling and the inclusion of detached double garages to the larger properties. If the garage spaces are required to meet the Council’s parking standards, their retention for parking should be considered.

We note the use of off-white upvc windows and approve this choice as pure white windows would not be in keeping.

- *Landscaping*

We welcome the retention of the three areas of open space as conditioned on the Outline application but have serious concerns about the lack of detail concerning their future upkeep and maintenance, particularly the need for the introduction of a management company to oversee maintenance of drainage/landscaping and the private road. The success of these arrangements will be dependent upon the ability and willingness of the occupiers of the new properties to adequately fund its upkeep.

The Parish council is concerned that it, and indeed Staffordshire Moorlands Council, will face calls to take on certain of these liabilities in the future should the proposed management arrangements prove inadequate.

We would urge the Council to ensure that any proposed management arrangements are bestowed a suitable up-front dowry from the developer to cover at least 10 years to ensure its chance of success.

- *Scale*

We have concerns regarding the overall scale of the development which is attempting to “shoehorn” too many units and too much floor-space into the site. Whilst this was agreed at outline stage, we feel that the uniform nature of the development adds to its perceived scale and inappropriateness.

We would urge that consideration be given to varying building styles, including amending some plots to 1 ½ stories (i.e. placing bedrooms in roof space) to reduce impact. Particular consideration should be given to the scale of the properties on plots 6, 7 and 9 and their relationship to existing properties. In particular, we note that Site Perspectives 1 shows plot 6 as being very domineering and would ask that the Council seeks appropriate amendments.

We further note that Plot 7 appears to orientate all its principal windows towards the nearest property on Macclesfield Road and would request the Council give consideration to the resultant impact and overlooking.

We note that “slab heights” are conditioned on the Outline and again would urge the Council to pay particular attention to the potential impact on the adjoining properties on Sugar Street and Macclesfield Road when discharging these conditions.

We trust that you will give due consideration to the above.

- | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|
| 4.3 | SMD/2016/0025 | <p>Proposed replacement farm building at Dingle Brook Farm, Dingle Lane, Rushton Spencer</p> <p><i>Members of Rushton Parish Council have no objections to this Planning Proposal, provided that it is built as a steel construction with stone cladding.</i></p> |
| 4.4 | DET/2016/0004 | <p>Demolition of single storey dutch barn at Brickyard Farm, Newtown Road, Newtown, Biddulph</p> <p><i>Members of Rushton Parish Council have no objections to this Planning Proposal.</i></p> |

- 4.5 SMD/2016/0042 Conversion of redundant farm buildings to two new dwellings, alterations to elevations including part demolition of existing building and alterations to the roof shape at Cloud Wood End Farm, Toft Green Lane, Cloud Side, Congleton

Members of Rushton Parish Council would support the conversion of 1 dwelling, but they feel that 2 dwellings would affect the visual impact, as well as overdevelopment and access issues on Toft Green Lane.

5. Matters arising from the Minutes

5.1 Highways

Pothole in middle of road outside Gablestones. Ref.No.

Blocked gully outside Long Edge Farm, Long Edge road. Ref. No.

Blocked gully outside Old Smithy Cottage, Beat Lane. Already on list to attend too. Previous Ref. No.

Road subsiding on Station Road, by the Staffordshire Way entrance.

Cllr. Bostock Gibson to liaise with Mr Wilshaw re a better visual view for traffic at Charles Knowles Lane.

5.2 Village Lengthsman Scheme

Nothing to report.

5.3 Amendment to website

As Cllr.Hughes was not present, this item deferred to the next meeting.

5.4 Dog Poo bins etc.

Deferred to next meeting.

5.5 Parish Precept

Unanimously agreed to Precept at £3,525. (Due to Parish Election expenses, extra to be added this year and next)

5.6 3 x Parish Council Applications for Neighbourhood Plan Area designation

Postcard received. Any volunteers to do a Plan for Rushton?

5.7 Parish Council Election expenses

Agreement has been reached with S.M.D.C. to pay half in this financial year and the other half in the financial year beginning April 1st 2016

Cheque needed for £8

6. Correspondence

S.C.C.

6.1 Staffordshire Parish Council's Association

Literature received.

S.M.D.C.

6.1 Temporary Road Traffic Regulation Order at Charles Knowles Lane, Rushton Spencer

TRO in place February 22 – April 5

6.2 Weekly List of Planning Applications

Filed

7. Finance

February

7.1 Raise a cheque for £20.00 for hire of room at Rushton Methodist Church

Cheque No. 634 Signed by Cllr. R Steele and Cllr.

7.2 Raise a cheque for £8 for half of Parish Election expenses to S.M.D.C.

Cheque No. 635 Signed by Cllr. r Steels and

After January Meeting

Co-op Bank 1,007.81

NatWest Bank

February

Rushton Methodist Church 20.00

S.M.D.C.

Co-op Bank 1,007.81

NatWest Bank

8. Open Forum

Barn Conversions

Letter to S.M.D.C., Local Development Framework Department

Members of Rushton Parish Council would like to know why barn conversions taking place within our Parish do not come off our allocation for new development dwellings.

An early reply would be appreciated.

Noticeboard

Mr Arthur Chappell to be asked if he would be willing to renovate the noticeboard on Station Lane.

Trip to London and Private Tour of Westminster

Invitation from Karen Bradley MP. Trip on Thursday, March 17th 2016

9. Date of next meeting

Wednesday, March 9 2016 at 7.30 pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.31pm

Signature _____

Date _____

379