

POTTON TOWN COUNCIL
Minutes of a Meeting of the Town Council held on
Tuesday 7th April 2020, 7.10pm via Zoom

Present: Councillors Mr J. Day, Mr D. Ellison, Mr R. Harris, Mr J. Hobbs, Ms L. Kitchener, Mr J. Lean, Mrs C. Leggatt, Mr A. Macdonald (Chairman), Mr B. Massey, Mr J. Price Williams, Mr C. Temple and Mr A. Zerny.

Absent: Cllrs Mr A. Gibb and Mr L. Ivall.

Also Present: CBC Cllr Ms T. Wye, Helen Leach from Party on Potton, Town Clerk, Clerical Assistant, Administration Assistant and three members of the public.

Actions

1 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr A. Gibb and Mr L. Ivall.

2 Declaration of Interest

Councillors were reminded that they should declare an interest in any matter of personal or prejudicial interest to be discussed at this meeting. Information about this requirement had been on the table.

3 Public Participation Session

No questions from the public.

4 Reports from Central Bedfordshire Councillors

Cllr Wye advised about the following:
Have asked CBC to pause all planning applications.

Cllr Zerny advised about the following:
Update was sent out at the weekend, LATEST NEWS ON COVID-19 AFFECTING CENTRAL BEDS.

5 Potton Hall for All

It was noted that the next meeting of the steering group for Potton Hall for All is scheduled to take place on the 8th April @ 7pm via a Zoom meeting and it has been suggested that the town council should increase the number of members on the steering group by one, so that the number of Cllrs (currently three) is the same as the number of trustees (four).

It was noted that Cllrs Gibb, Kitchener and Macdonald are the current Cllrs on the Potton Hall for All Steering Group.

The Chairman asked for a volunteer to join the Potton Hall for All Steering Group.

Cllr Harris volunteered to join the Potton Hall for All Steering Group.

It was **resolved** that Cllr Harris is appointed to the Potton Hall for All Steering Group.

**Cllr
Harris**

6 Planning Applications

6.1 Planning applications considered by the Planning Committee on 17th March 2020 for recommendation at the next Town Council meeting.

Application No: CB/19/04308/RM

Location: Land at Mill Lane, Potton

Proposal: Reserved Matters: Following Outline application CB/16/04460/OUT (62 dwellings) approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/19/04308/RM>

Members noted that Central Bedfordshire Council's 5-year housing supply is currently at 5.75 years.

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend to object on the same grounds when previously considered at the meeting of the Town Council on Tuesday 4th February, which are detailed below:

- The issue of access along Mill Lane has not been fully addressed, particularly the following issues:-
 - o Dandara state that Mill Lane will be made up to adoptable standards, but CBC will not adopt it. Instead, it will be managed and maintained by a 'management company' without clarifying how this management company will be formed and where the money for maintaining the roads will come from.
 - o Since Mill Lane will not be adopted by CBC it will remain a Bridleway. As CBC Rights of Way Officer has already stated, 'Please can you ensure that the road patterning and works do not compromise bridle use'.
 - o We understand that a priority system of traffic management has been proposed at the pinch point to allow one-way traffic only with priority to vehicles exiting the development onto Mill Lane/Newtown junction. If the road is unadopted, signage cannot be erected to advise of this one-way system and cannot be controlled or policed.
 - o Dandara state that they have full and legal access rights across Mill Lane under a provision granted in 1775. No evidence of this legal right has been produced. CBC have also confirmed that the road in question is a private road and there is no evidence that the owner will allow access as required for this development.
 - o The 'pinch point' on Mill Lane is 3.95 metres wide and the footpath is 1.3 metres wide. In order to make the footpath 2 metres wide (Highways England CD 143 absolute minimum width

and Green Travel Plan paragraph 7.5) the carriageway would have to be reduced to 3.25 metres wide.

o The Green Travel Plan supplied as part of the Reserved Matters does not refer to Bridleway 6 on Mill Lane. It is merely a fairly generic document aimed to try to reduce the incidents of single occupancy car journeys and encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport. In this regard it ignores the fact that the bus service is wholly unsuitable for connection to Sandy Railway Station at commuter times.

- Paragraph 4.2 of the Planning Statement states that the Potton Neighbourhood Plan is a supporting document. This does not mean that the Neighbourhood Plan supports this development which was energetically resisted at the initial outline planning phase. The Potton Neighbourhood Plan merely records that the site has prior planning approval by CBC.

- Paragraph 4.4 states that Potton will allocate an indicative figure of 150-250 new dwellings. This figure has already been exceeded and therefore this proposed development is not required.

- Paragraph 4.5 shows a map from the Neighbourhood Plan with the site as 'Already Approved'. Again, this does not mean that the Neighbourhood Plan supports this development since the map was only prepared after the approval of the outline planning application. These comments are also relevant to paragraph 5.1.

- Paragraph 5.27 gives details of parking spaces per property. Do these parking spaces include garage space? Paragraph 5.29 seems to indicate that it does presume parking in a garage. If so, off-road parking will be an issue since garages are rarely used to park cars. On-road parking will therefore become the norm with associated access issues for refuse removal and emergency vehicles.

- It is our view that either the development between The Ridgeway and Sutton Mill Road OR the Mill Lane development should be allowed to proceed at this time – not both. This is because both developments would take the total amount of development to 555 dwellings which exceeds the supported development of up to 500 dwellings over the period of the Neighbourhood Plan. Additionally, in order to ensure that the developments are sustainable and community infrastructure can develop to cope with the increased population, whichever development is allowed to continue, construction should be deferred to much later in the Neighbourhood Plan period. This is in particular reference to medical services which are currently over-stretched.

In general, these issues are detailed in the Potton Neighbourhood Plan (<http://pottonneighbourhoodplan.co.uk/the-neighbourhood-plan/>) and in particular the Policies, the Design Guide (Annex E) and the Green Infrastructure Design Guide (Annex F).

Policy Concerns

Policy CI-2. Is there provision for easy and safe non-vehicular access to Potton Town Centre? In particular we would like to see provision of a cycle path along Mill Lane from Newtown up to the end of the site.

Policy HO-3. Is at least 5% of the development bungalows? There is a clearly identified shortage of this type of property in Potton. We would like to see at least 3 and ideally more of the properties to be bungalows.

(Dandara Response. No. 'The proposal does not include bungalows. Further consideration is being given as to how these may be incorporated into the scheme, but this will require further work which may not be completed within the deadline contained within the extant permission'.)

Policy HO-4. Does the development include properties that are designed to Lifetime Homes standards, making them suitable for frailer, elderly people?

(Dandara Response. The Design Compliance Addendum states that the scheme has achieved twelve 'Greens' on the Building for Life 12 Assessment.)

Policy EI-1. Does the proposed development include high-speed fibre broadband connections to all new residential and commercial properties?

Green Infrastructure Design Guide issues

1. We request that any new structural planting use native species of local provenance and located where, on reaching maturity, they enhance and do.
2. Please confirm that the development retains and enhance existing hedges and you will plant new hedges to link with those in the surrounding landscape (the species should be of local provenance and characteristic of the area, including elm and cherry plum in the mix).
3. Please confirm that the street and plot planting is balanced appropriately between native and non-native species and that ornamentals are of the highest wildlife value for pollinators. (See GI Design Guide appendix 1)
4. Please confirm that the development includes local heritage fruit trees in plot planting at an approximate ratio of 1:5 (trees:plots) across the development.
5. Have branches and brash been used discretely among structural planting to provide lying deadwood? These are of great

wildlife value for many species of invertebrate, mammal, bird, amphibian or reptile that may use them for breeding, shelter and basking. Brash, along with rubble, is also a primary material in the construction of reptile and amphibian hibernacula?

6. Please confirm that any new grassland is sown with an appropriate flower rich mix, even where regular mowing will be required under the conditions of management.
7. Please confirm that the development has avoided the use of invasive non-native species in formal planting schemes. (See GI Design Guide appendix 2)
8. Please confirm that, where restorative work has been undertaken as part of a tree protection plan or, as a last resort, a tree must be removed, all arisings, as far as is practically possible, remain and will be utilised on site, where they can have a number of multifunctional uses and benefits.
9. Has informally, dead or decaying timber been retained as standing deadwood? For example, where safe to do so, the butt of a tree can stand for many years, with any cut limbs being left as intact as possible beneath, where practical and safe to do so.
10. Have any standing or lying deadwood features been incorporated into a nectar rich planting? They may also be a sculptured art feature or used to provide natural play.
11. Has any consideration been taken regarding lighting impacts on wildlife corridors? Directional lights with no spillage should be used.
12. Has the development included hibernacula primarily for reptiles? On the free-draining substrates typical of Potton, the bulk of the fill would be sited in an excavated depression. They should always be positioned in suitable terrestrial habitat. Follow guidance set out in the Reptile Management Handbook.
13. Have only supplementary nests for birds in need of conservation action been provided, such as swift, house sparrow, house martin and starling? Other common species can still access these if they so wish.
14. Have house martin cups been located beneath suitable eaves and gables, avoiding placing above doors or windows and in direct heat of the sun? In Potton they seem to prefer west and easterly aspects.
15. Where suitable, have mature trees adjacent to open grassland been used for starling boxes? These should be sited facing any easterly aspect, out of direct heat and prevailing weather conditions. Where there are several trees a number of boxes can be used.

16. Have integral bat bricks been located away from doors, windows, street or security lighting? They should be located as close as possible to existing mature wooded cover and hedges or to landscape that will be suitable once mature. Bricks must be in groups of three to face south, south west and west. This might be on a single house or spread between two or three adjacent houses.

17. Have 13 x 13 cm holes been provided in garden boundaries to enable hedgehogs, reptiles and amphibians movement around and through the site?

It was **resolved** no further comment.

**Clerical
Assistant**

Application No: CB/20/00548/LB

Location: 12 Sun Street, Potton, Sandy SG19 2LR

Proposal: Listed Building: Proposed removal of ground floor kitchen chimney breast.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/00548/LB>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend no objection.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

**Clerical
Assistant**

Application No: CB/20/00706/FULL

Location: Land adjacent to 1 King Street, Potton, Sandy SG19 2QT

Proposal: Re-submission of planning permission

CB/19/03780/FULL Demolition of single storey building and development of 5 flats and 168 m² [approx.] of retail space within a conservation area.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/00706/FULL>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend that the Town Council in principle supports the proposed development for the following reasons.

- The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) supports residential and/or commercial development on this site. (Refer to relevant Site Assessment report in the Neighbourhood Plan).
- The proposed dwellings (1 and 2 bed) support the NP survey findings that Potton is short of properties of this size.
- The proposed development is on a brownfield site.
- The development is not considered to be 'over development' as it is small in terms of occupancy and provides ample off-street parking for all residents in as well as additional on-street parking for use by the public.

The development meets the Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide and Green Infrastructure Design Guide guidelines for the following specific reasons.

1. Parking provision of one space per bedroom meets the NP design guide.
2. The design is in keeping with other properties in the area.
3. The development provides two additional retail/office spaces.
4. Encourages ease of movement.
5. Close to community facilities such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs and cafes.
6. Access to safe streets, parks and public spaces.
7. Good access to bus stops.
8. Replaces an existing business which would be better suited to an out of town location.

The following recommendations would enhance the proposal.

1. Provision of a lift as well as stairs in the block containing the 2-bed properties to make them suitable for occupancy by older people and/or those with mobility issues.
2. Replace the south facing elevation cladding (currently black timber weatherboarding), which can be seen from the market square, with a red brick mix or similar, to blend in with existing buildings in the market square.
3. Ensure that there is adequate turning space in the parking area so that vehicles can exit onto King Street without having to reverse onto the street.
4. The bin storage location should be closer to where they will be emptied.
5. Outside bicycle storage should be provided.
6. Provision of 10 integral Swift nest bricks on the east elevation.
7. Provision of 4 integral Habitat Bat Bricks on the west elevation.
8. Solar (PV) panels should be provided where appropriate on south facing roof pitch.
9. Run-off from the roofs should be directed through grated rills into a landscape feature at southern end of development and/or the grassed areas to each side of the parking entrance which should be designed as rain gardens.
10. Where possible, the landscape area needs to attenuate and temporarily store excess roof run-off. It should be designed as a drought garden with low growing nectar rich shrubs and herbaceous plants, culturally reflecting local sandstone landscape.
11. The parking bays and lay-byes should be constructed of permeable materials.
12. Though the town council welcomes electric charging points, the parking bays area is currently highway pavement, vehicles parked in this location will block visibility for motorists.

A recorded vote was requested:

FOR: Cllrs Mr J. Day, Mr D. Ellison, Mr J. Hobbs, Mr J. Lean, Mr A. Macdonald, Mr J. Price Williams and Mr C. Temple.

AGAINST: Cllrs Mr R. Harris, Ms L. Kitchener, Mrs C. Leggatt, Mr B. Massey and Mr A. Zerny.

ABSTENTION: None.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

**Clerical
Assistant**

A long discussion about planning application CB/20/00706/FULL took place.

Application No: CB/20/00744/FULL

Location: The Royal Oak, 4 Biggleswade road, Pottton, Sandy SG19 2LU

Proposal: Provision of new bifold doors to existing opening (boarded up) and new hard standing area to patio, using indian stone slabs.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/00744/FULL>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend no objection.

The Chairman mentioned correspondence he had received from a member of the public.

It was **resolved** no objection, with the following comments:
If considering a change of use of the building from storage facility to function room, appropriate changes are made for sound proofing to protect neighbours from noise disturbance. The room needs to be made fit for purpose.

**Clerical
Assistant**

Application No: CB/TCA/20/00087

Location: 16 Bull Street, Pottton, Sandy SG19 2NR

Proposal: Works to Trees within a Conservation Area: Removal of 1x dead Sycamore Tree (T1), reduce height of 2x Sycamore Tree (T2 and T3) and removal of 1x Sycamore Tree (T4).

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/TCA/20/00087>

The Planning Committee resolved no objection, subject to the approval of the Tree & Landscape Officer.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

**Clerical
Assistant**

6.2 Planning applications considered by the Planning Committee on 7th April 2020 for recommendation at the next Town Council meeting.

Application No: CB/20/00719/RM

Location: 37 Biggleswade Road, Pottton, Sandy SG19 2LU

Proposal: Reserved Matters (following Outline Application CB/16/01223/OUT)

Demolition of existing shop and fuel canopy, Proposed new service station shop and 9 residential flats to the rear) Access, layout, scale, appearance, landscaping including boundary treatments.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/00719/RM>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend to continue to support the application subject to the roof line of the proposed new build being the same height as all other properties in the vicinity and taking the additional ecological and landscaping comments, which follow, in to consideration:

Requests by the Planning Committee made in the last application do not appear to have been fully taken into consideration with regard to landscape, biodiversity and SuDS.

It is welcome to see in sections 2.20 and in 3.1 Condition 3 the reference to 'swift boxes' being installed.

However, it is of concern this implies the external RSPB wooden boxes. These are suitable perhaps for retrofitting to existing houses, but not for use in new developments such as this where the preferred method is the use of integral nest bricks built into the fabric of the building.

This is supported by the advisory article published by Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and can be found here: <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/9.pdf>

Several makes of brick are available and can be viewed in this document here:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1csJo1uFEnKvqWH4gEi9tSsTJj8XqN4jF/view?usp=sharing>. The most cost effective of these are currently: the CJ Cambridge Swift Box system (page 6 of the above), the Manthorpe brick (page 11) and the S Brick (page 12).

It is also noted just 3 are proposed. There is actually space available on the gabled west and east elevations to fit 3 integral bricks on each. Depending on which side of the box the entrance holes are, these should ideally be as close as possible to the left or right hand roof lines. It is worth noting that 6 Manthorpe bricks will cost a similar price to 3 wooden RSPB boxes. They will also last the lifetime of the building.

Hard and soft landscape are discussed in Section 2.5 but with little detail, referring to it being a requirement of a future planning condition. While in section 3, Planning Condition 2 refers to 392.02,

03, 05 Rev C, 06 Rev B, 07 Rev B, 08 Rev B, 09 Rev B, 10 Rev B, 11 Rev B, 20 Rev B, 21 Rev B & 22 Rev B. However, the drawing number referred to does not appear to be available in the case documents. Drawing 392_02 Proposed Block Plan Rev A 09.03.2020 shows just scant landscape detail.

In the absence of landscape detail concern is expressed to ensure the use of permeable block and tarmac hard surfaces. Avoid the selection of plants unsuitable for pollinators and amenity grass that does not contain a flowering lawn turf or seed mix. The construction of the retaining wall should maximise biodiversity opportunities by having climbers growing up it or if a stone wall pockets for nectar rich plants and bee bricks.

Acknowledging as it does in 2.5 of the design statement a lack of landscape opportunity suggests this has not been thought about too carefully in how what exists can be better utilised. For example the use of green walls which not only provide added landscape value but help absorb pollutants, and thermally insulate the building in all seasons.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

**Clerical
Assistant**

7 Party on Potton

The Chairman welcomed Helen Leach from Party on Potton and invited Helen to speak.

Helen advised that Party on Potton have a meeting on the 16th April 2020 to discuss Big Weekend and will provide the town council an update after the meeting. Party on Potton are concerned about affecting local businesses if they proceed and whether volunteers will be available. Currently no financial risk to individuals for the Big Weekend. Income which partly pays for the Big Weekend has ceased as not able to carry out mobile bars.

The town council advised that they would be willing to offer Party on Potton financial support.

The Chairman thanked Helen Leach from Party on Potton.

8 COVID-19

1. Correspondence from Prime Minister
Correspondence was noted.

2. Public Information

Correspondence from Cllr Hobbs and Right Click Creative were noted.

It was **resolved (i)** that the town council arrange for the designing and printing of an eight-page newsletter at a cost of £850. **(ii)** that the publication is to be available for collection by the Potton Community Help (PCH) group on Friday 17th April 2020, subject to Cllr Hobbs confirming that

**Town
Council
Town
Council**

Potton Community Help Group want the publication on this date. **(iii)** Cllr Leggatt provides a list of critical businesses in Potton for the publication.

(iv) Dr Craig writes an article for the publication.

(v) Content for the publication to be discussed at the Potton Community Help (PCH) group meeting on the 8th April 2020.

**Cllr
Leggatt
Dr Craig
Cllr
Hobbs**

3. The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020
Correspondence was noted.
4. NALC L01-20 | THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND POLICE AND CRIME PANELS (CORONAVIRUS) (FLEXIBILITY OF LOCAL AUTHORITY AND POLICE AND CRIME PANEL MEETINGS) (ENGLAND AND WALES) REGULATIONS 2020
Correspondence was noted.
5. NALC – Holding Remote Meetings Publication
Publication was noted.
6. NALC – Audit Update
Correspondence was noted.
7. CBC – Cemetery
Correspondence was noted.
8. Potton Community Help Group - Community Fund
Correspondence was noted.

9 Co-option of a Town Councillor

The Chairman welcomed the three candidates

One by one the three candidates presented themselves.

Following candidate presentations, it was proposed, seconded and **resolved** that all three candidates were nominated and put through to the voting round.

The Chairman thanked the candidates for attending the meeting and the candidates left the meeting.

The Clerk stated as twelve Cllrs are present that a majority of seven votes was required for a candidate to be co-opted. Should no candidate receive a majority of votes in the first round the candidate with the least number of votes would be eliminated and a second round of voting would take place until one candidate had secured the required number of votes.

Following voting by Members, the Chairman announced that Vaughan Watson had the required majority of votes and he was therefore co-opted onto the Council, subject to his acceptance.

It was **resolved (i)** to co-opt Vaughan Watson as a member of Potton Town Council, subject to his acceptance. **(ii)** to ask the other two candidates if they would be interested in becoming involved in some of the town council's committee projects as this would give them knowledge and experience of how the town council works.

Town Clerk

10 Date of the Next Meeting

Tuesday 5th May 2020.

The meeting closed at 8.30pm.

Signed.....ChairmanDate

Mission Statement

The aim of Potton Town Council is to serve the people of this town to the best of its ability.