

BURTON OVERY PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD – Thursday 14th October 2021 at 7.30pm

(Item 21/118a was dealt with at 8.30pm after the conclusion of all other business)

- Present:** Cllr Bob Warwick
Cllr Sarah Rankine
Cllr Dave Fletcher
Cllr Bob Pain
The Clerk (from 8.30pm onwards)
- 21/111 Apologies** – Cllr Nina Garner
- 21/112 Declarations of interest** – none
- 21/113 Approval of Minutes of the parish council meeting on 21.09.21** –
Approved and signed by Cllr Warwick.
- 21/114 Matters arising not on the current agenda / Minutes Action Update**
Updates on all current actions were noted.
Cllr Warwick yet to liaise with Village Hall Management Committee regarding the Queen’s Platinum Jubilee celebrations.
Cllr Rankine and clerk to liaise on possible submission of grant application regarding village planters.
Overgrown hedge on Beadswell Lane (obscuring street light) has been reported to LCC but not yet actioned.
- 21/115 Emergency Covid 19 information and measures arising between meetings** – None.
- 21/116 Council asset safety checks** – no adverse issues were reported. A review of responsibilities for routine checking of the assets would take place at the next meeting.
- 21/117 Finances** –
- a. The half-year budget position was noted as being in good shape and that the anticipated build-up of reserves at the year-end was looking promising. The bank reconciliation to 30th September was noted and agreed together with bank statements as at 30th September.
 - b. Payments (to be) made during October (See Annex A) were considered and endorsed / approved for payment.
- 21/118 Planning matters to consider** –

- a. 21/01671/FUL - Erection of five holiday lodges, Land off Carlton Lane, Burton Overy (resubmission) – See Addendum.
- b. 21/01729/TCA - Works to trees (fell), Kings Orchard, Scotland Lane, Burton Overy. This application was noted and the clerk asked to request whether the planning authority could require the planting of replacement trees in order to offset the loss of felled trees.

21/119 Planning decisions taken by HDC

Approval of the proposed telecommunications mast in highway land near the junction of Washbrook Lane and Oaks Road was noted.

21/120 Community Matters –

- a. The council noted that the defibrillator pads needed replacing during November.
- b. Cllr Warwick advised that the proposals to replace the current WhatsApp groups with a Village Forum ‘chat’ group and a Village Noticeboard had now been implemented.
- c. Cllr Pain updated the meeting on progress he was making on updating the village directory and expected this to be near complete by the next meeting.
- d. The proposed defibrillator training would be held on Saturday 27th November at 10.30am.

21/121 - Correspondence for discussion

None reported to the meeting.

21/122 - Correspondence for information

None reported to the meeting.

21/123 - Items for the next agenda – Village Directory Update / Defibrillator Training / Review of asset safety check allocations / Grant Applications / Scotland Thicket

21/124 - Date of next meeting – 16th November 2021

21/125 - Exclusion of the Public

No confidential matters were considered at the meeting.

The meeting was paused at 8.20pm in order to reconvene at 8.30pm for consideration of item 21/118a

No members of the public were present at the meeting between 7.30 and 8.30. 26 members of the public attended the meeting from 8.30pm for item 21/118a – issues raised in relation to this item are included as an addendum to these minutes.

Addendum – Consideration of agenda item 21/118a, Planning Application Ref 21/01671/FUL Erection of five holiday lodges, Land off Carlton Lane, (resubmission)

26 members of the public attended in relation to this item.

The chair began by presenting an overview of the application and the process for dealing with it and submitting comments to the planning authority (Harborough District Council, HDC). He invited members of the public to make any representations they had in relation to the application. The following is a precis of the comments: -

██████████ – the only benefit of the proposal to the community will be to the pub and the applicants. Concerned that the transport report does not fully represent that actual traffic flow circumstances along Carlton Lane, particularly around school times.

██████████ – the basis of the proposal is its benefits to tourism, but this is a dubious foundation given that Burton Overy is far from being seen as a tourism hot-spot and is a significant car drive from any such destination.

██████████ – will be objecting to the proposal as he can see no benefits in the proposal put forward – the negative aspects of the proposal far outweigh any claimed positive benefits.

██████████ – will be working with a group of fellow residents in the village to put in a strong objection. Acknowledges that changes have been made relative to the previous proposal but these still do not compensate for all the negative aspects. Would ask that the parish council give its support for the application to be “called-in” to be considered by the full planning committee of HDC and that a request be made to HDC for a full Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposal to be carried out.

██████████ – questioned some of the statements made in the supporting documents submitted with the application such as ‘the scheme will make a positive contribution to the local community’; ‘meets the needs of the local economy’; ‘the scheme will protect and enhance the appearance of the site’. How can these be true in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan and the fact that Burton Overy is not served with any public transport and any nearby attractions will need to be accessed by private car.

██████████ – understood why people are concerned about the proposal, especially those on Carlton Lane; accepts that the proposal is not fully in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan and that the perception of ‘mission creep’ might be in the minds of some residents. However, every consideration has been given to previous and recently expressed concerns, the current proposal has been well thought through and reminded people that Burton Overy as a village will continue to change as it has done historically.

██████████ – in addition to all the technical matters which have been pointed out at the meeting would like to add that the proposal, if approved, would create the first entrance to any property on the north side of Carlton Lane, all existing accesses to property are on the south side, thereby adding to existing traffic hazards.

██████████ – concerned that the site will clearly attract families with children who will naturally use the site for ball games, thereby creating a further potential hazard on the nearby road.

██████████ – concerned to ensure that this proposed development in the countryside should be resisted (as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Plan) in order to protect the village from future potential development which would compromise its unique character.

██████████ – concerned that although it is recognised that the applicant is a current resident of the village, this may not be the case in future – any future potential owner / operator of the site may be remote and may not manage the site with appropriate care and diligence.

██████████ – farms the three fields which surround the proposed site and, if the proposal goes ahead, will have difficulty in accessing the hedges and ditches which he has to maintain. This would generate further traffic hazards and may lead to spoiling of the natural hedgerows.

██████████ – concerned that the supporting photographs included in the application documents show the site in mid-summer when the hedges are fully leaved. All the hedgerows are deciduous and will be bare for up to 6 months of the year meaning that all the structures in the proposed development will be fully visible from Carlton Lane.

██████████ – also owns a hedgerow on the west side of the proposed development and would encounter similar difficulties as Keith Holman. He also expressed concern that the documents submitted with the application talk about a new barn in an adjoining field having been granted permission, setting a precedent for development. However, he clarified this stating that this was not a new barn, it was to replace an existing one.

██████████ – concerned that the revised scheme does not fully recognise its likely damaging impact to the historic ridge and furrow features on the site, particularly as the proposed revised lodges would not be on stilts.

██████████ – queried whether the application had been submitted by an individual (local resident) or by a company under the control of the applicant.

The chair then invited comments from the parish councillors.

Cllr Pain highlighted the significant investment which would be required to physically develop the site and wondered whether any business plan had taken account of or had provided any details on the anticipated length of occupation of the lodges during the year.

Cllr Fletcher queried how different the current application was from the one submitted during 2020. Only the external appearance of the lodges had been amended whilst all other fundamentals and the principle of use remained the same.

Cllr Rankine highlighted the additional traffic hazards which would be generated by people accessing and egressing the site. This would be compounded by pedestrians from the site walking down Carlton Lane towards the centre of the village. It was noted that at the junction with Main Street, Carlton Lane is only a single carriageway width.

The chair then summarised highlighting the following points –

The damaging impacts of the proposal need to be weighed against the perceived economic and other benefits. As it stands the benefits would seem to be heavily outweighed by a wide range of detrimental impacts, many of which had been highlighted by members of the public earlier. Albeit the lodges had been redesigned and some hedge infill was proposed, there were many remaining downsides to the proposal including impact on the

village character, impacts on the conservation area and the transition to the countryside, the impact on important views identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and the unsympathetic development of a non-designated heritage asset.

Does the loss of one field to development matter? Yes, of course it does, because it is the broad tapestry of ancient fields and hedgerows when travelling out of the village up Carlton Lane towards Carlton Curlieu, which makes the landscape so appealing to resident and visitors alike. Such a development would also set a terrible precedent for building in the open countryside, completely against the intentions of the Neighbourhood Plan and regional and national planning guidelines.

He also made the following observations –

- In the sustainable development hierarchy defined in the Harborough Local Plan, Burton Overy was listed in the lowest category of village;
- The scale of the proposal was excessive given the size of the community of Burton Overy.
- The nature and location of the site meant that many, and probably the majority, of the lodge visitors would rely totally on private car transport;
- The highway dangers outlined by Cllr Rankine were a concern for many in the village;
- The inherent noise disturbance and light pollution from the proposal did not appear to have been given much consideration in the submitted documents but were likely to be significant matters for nearby residents.

The chair then invited proposals from councillors.

Cllr Fletched proposed, on the basis of comments made at the meeting, that although some changes had been made to the application, these were not sufficient to outweigh the fundamental disbenefits of the scheme. On this basis the parish council should submit an objection to the proposal. This was seconded by Cllr Pain and unanimously agreed.

It was also agreed that the District Council representatives for Burton Overy be requested to ‘call-in’ the application for consideration by the full planning committee of HDC. The planning officer would also be asked to request a full environmental impact assessment or provide justification why this might not be considered appropriate.

Signed

Date

Annex A

October Payment Approvals

OCTOBER						EXPENDITURE			INCOME
Voucher No.	Description of item	Cost Centre	Cost Code	Date	Expenditure or Income	Net Amount	VAT	TOTAL	
45	Cloud IT Backup storage	Admin	1.7 - IT Backup	01.10.21	E	120.00	0.00	120.00	
46	Zoom	Admin	1.10 - Zoom	05.10.21	E	11.99	2.40	14.39	
47	Defib Pads	Community	2.2 - Defibrillator	07.10.21	E	68.99	13.00	81.99	
48	Interest received (Oct)	Income		11.10.21	I	0.08	0.00	0.05	0.08
49	Dog Waste Bin Emptying	Community	2.3 - Dog waste bins	20.10.21	E	90.51	18.10	108.61	
50	PAYE (Sept)	Staffing	3.2 - PAYE	22.10.21	E	130.00	0.00	130.00	
51	Clerk Salary (Sept)	Staffing	3.3 - Salaries	28.10.21	E	195.14	0.00	195.14	
52	Plusnet	Admin	1.2 - Broadband	29.10.21	E	25.00	5.00	30.00	