

POTTON TOWN COUNCIL
Minutes of a Meeting of the Town Council held on
Tuesday 3rd November 2020, 7.28pm via Zoom.

Present: Councillors Mr A. Gibb, Mr R. Harris, Mr J. Hobbs, Mr L. Ivall, Ms L. Kitchener, Mr J. Lean (Chairman), Mrs C. Leggatt, Mr A. Macdonald, Mr J. Price Williams, Mr V. Watson and Mr A. Zerny.

Absent: Councillor Mr J. Day.

Also Present: CBC Cllr Ms T. Wye, CBC Cllr Ms T. Wye, Mr C. Higgins - Development Director for Dandara Ltd, Liz Smith Chairman of Trustees Potton Hall for All, Kim Gutteridge Trustee Potton Hall for All, the Town Clerk, Clerical Assistant, Admin Assistant and five members of the public.

1. Apologies for absence

Councillor Mr J. Day.

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.

The Chairman advised he was going to alter the order of the agenda as members of the public are present and would arrange for various items to be considered in the public participation session to allow members of the public to speak.

3. Public Participation Session

The Chairman advised he was going to move (item 7.2) Dandara Ltd – Copsewood Development, Mill Lane, Potton (CB/16/04460/OUT and CB/19/04308/RM) into the public participation session.

7.2 Dandara Ltd – Copsewood Development, Mill Lane, Potton (CB/16/04460/OUT and CB/19/04308/RM)

Mr Higgins and the Chairman spoke about an incident which had been raised earlier today with regards to a lorry driving over a verge.

A member of the council raised a question with regards to why this piece of land is being discussed now.

Mr Higgins explained that the open space for the land is on the left-hand side (west) and that is prescribed within the Section 106 agreement in accordance with the planning permission for sixty-two dwellings. The piece of land for potential additional units on the southern boundary does not have a designation within the planning permission.

The same member of the council advised it is shame, that bungalows were not part of the sixty-two dwellings, will the additional units be bungalows.

Mr Higgins advised that five of the additional units will be bungalows. It was never our intention (Dandara) it was marry up of requirement for additional funds (for projects) for Potton Town Council.

A member of the council advised about a bottle neck due to two lorries and cars parked on the side of the road.

Mr Higgins advised that the production team deal with site matters and due to the car parked on the road, this made it difficult for access and egress for the lorries. The site team are supposed to be diligent and to be sympathetic to the neighbourhood and if they are not, I want to hear about it. Some days are busier for the number of vehicles compared to others.

A member of the council asked about the additional funds (for projects) which is mentioned in correspondence between Cllr Zerny and Mr Higgins, when would Dandara's view on the funds being released to the town. Would it be at the end of the main build prior to the building of the additional units?

Mr Higgins advised that would be £10,000 for each additional unit, 8 additional units £80,000 for a Section 106 payment and an addition £172,000 for local projects. Drawdown of the monies can be discussed with Adam (Cllr Zerny) and town cllrs as and when required, though it would not be before planning permission is granted for the 8 additional units. Timing of drawdown can be discussed at the next stage if the town council wants to proceed.

The Chairman thanked Mr Higgins for attending.

Mr Higgins thanked the town council.

The Chairman advised he was going to move (item 12) Proposed change to Luton airport flight path and (item 14) Potton Hall for All into the public participation session.

12 Proposed change to Luton airport flight path

The Chairman asked the member of the public to speak.

The member of the public advised he had three questions.

Question 1

Has the council been informed by Luton Airport on these proposed changes to the air space which will involve flights over flying Potton?

Answer from Town Council.

No.

Member of the public advised as part of its public consultation it (Luton Airport) hasn't informed Potton, on its own website it shows Potton being directly under the flight path for decent into London Luton airport, under its proposed changes.

Chairman advised that we know about it because Adam Zerny has publicised it on his Facebook page.

Question 2

Has the council formed any view on the proposed changes?

Answer from Town Council.

No. Because we have not discussed it.

Member of the public advised that answers my third question.

Question 3

Has the council responded in any way to London Luton airports request or invitation to consultation?

Answer from Town Council.

No. Because we have not received an invitation, as far as I am aware.

The member of the public summarised what they say on their website, that they want to split what is a shared stack with Stanstead airport as part of their expansion plans, in future from 2022 they want 70% of the aircraft landing in Luton to circle over an area with a western boundary of Gratham Water, fly over Abbotsley and Potton before landing at Luton. Passenger numbers have been historically 11,000,000 a year up to 18,000,000 and then up to 38,000,000 and 70% of those passengers will be overflying Potton. 26,000,000 passengers a year and assuming they fly 365 days a year, that is 72,827 passengers a day or twenty planes an hour at about 6,000 feet over Potton. The planes will be about 60 – 65 decibels, every three minutes from 7am to 11pm and may also night flights for cargo. Noise and environmental consequences for this change.

A member asked how you would get a level of impact from 60 – 65 decibels will have on people?

The member of the public advised the only way to experience this directly is to go to the landing part of an airport which flies Boeing 727 and 737 or Airbus 220.

A member advised that a dustbin has 89 decibels marked on a bin.

A member advised thank you for the information debate this at a future council meeting.

The member of the public advised that the consultation has two options, one with a wide decent area about six miles wide which would mean Potton is flown over some of the time and their preferred option is an area one mile wide and this will mean Potton is flown over all of the time.

A member advised that an aeroplane goes over every night between 11pm and midnight and that is quite loud.

The member of the public advised that is about 6,000 feet.

A member advised that is the Stanstead to Belfast flight.

Another member advised we need to debate this at a future council meeting.

A member advised a response is needed by February 2021.

A member advised a Zoom call is taking place tomorrow evening to discuss the proposed change to Luton airport flight path.

The Chairman advised about proposed change to Luton airport flight path is an agenda item for the December town council meeting.

A member reminded those present about the Zoom call taking place tomorrow evening to discuss the proposed change to Luton airport flight path and if they want to attend, please advise.

10 Ridgeway / Oak Crescent Footpath

The Chairman asked the member of the public to speak.

The member of the public advised that Cllr Zerny had asked that the member of public speak at this meeting.

The member of the public advised he had suffered a vehicle break-in on the 3rd October at 3am in the morning and some video footage was provided from one of our neighbours and it shows that the offender comes through from the walkway from Oak Crescent and attempted to gain access to a series of vehicles and the individual was in my car for about five minutes and then left the area via Ridgeway. A police report has been filed and no further action has been taken.

The member of the public is certain that the same individual who visited the Ridgeway last November (2019), video footage was sent to the Police and again no further action taken. A few years ago, a house in Ridgeway suffered a burglary and a vehicle has been stolen by a gang. I am in the fortunate position to be able to purchase cameras and have spent £650 on camera equipment. The member of the public is concerned that the crime is nudged on to the more vulnerable member who can't afford such devices.

The member of the public advised he had put to Cllr Zerny what are our elected representatives proposing to do about these issues. Series of security problems in the Ridgeway. The video footage shows they leave or arrive via the walkway between Ridgeway and Oak Crescent. Cllr Zerny had asked the member of the public whether other members of the public in the area supported closure of the walkway. The member of the public carried out a survey via SurveyMonkey and he has passed on the results to Cllr Zerny. The over whelming majority want to keep the walkway open. The member of the public wanted to know what are you (Potton Town Council) going to keep the public safe.

The Chairman thanked the member of the public.

A member asked if the Police had given any feedback why they can't use the video footage.

The member of the public advised that the footage does not clearly identify the individual.

The Chairman made a comment what can we do as a council apart from writing to the Police.

A member thanked the member of the public and he shared his frustration, results of the survey interesting, want more policing but not prepared to pay for it, people want to keep the walkway open and people don't want to pay for CCTV. It was suggested to write to Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC).

A member suggested about asking the appropriate authority to install temporarily a moveable camera.

The Chairman suggested that is a point we can make in correspondence to CBC.

A member advised he would provide the member of the public with Chief Superintendent David Boyle's phone number at Bedfordshire Police.

A member commented that there is no better deterrent than Police personnel wandering around the town.

The member of the public agreed with the council member and still wanted to know what are you (Potton Town Council) going to do about it.

The Chairman advised that he would a member would send the member of the public of the phone number of Chief Superintendent David Boyle and the town council will write a letter to Central Bedfordshire Council expressing concern about this spate of regular break-ins of cars and demand action.

A member advised the need to report every incident to the Police.

The Chairman asked if anymore questions from the public.

A member of the public indicated that they had a question.

The Chairman invited the member of the public to speak.

The member of the public advised he had been tackled a number of times by people asking when, where, what the agenda for the Tommies. I know they have gone up to the station, if the council can put where they are going, when they are going, a big following behind them.

The Chairman asked the Town Clerk to answer.

The Town Clerk advised that he had delivered eight Tommies yesterday (2nd November) to the Railway Station and two are in St Mary's Church. One of the Tommies from the Railway Station has been delivered by Cllr Leggatt and her husband to Tysoe's in the Market Square to be displayed in the shop window. It is planned for later this week that some of the Tommies will remain at the Railway Station, so that people who are unable to view the Tommies during the week can view them at the weekend whilst they are out for a walk. One Tommie will be placed near the war memorial in advance of the weekend and a few will be placed in the Market Square. The Tommies will be on display until after Armistice Day.

A member advised he was approached by lady about Sutton wanting to use a Tommie.

The member of the public advised that another member of the public had spoken to him to request a Tommie for Sutton for the day on Sunday and he had been advised it was no longer required.

The Chairman advised that Potton Hall for All would be the next item.

14 Potton Hall for All

The Chairman outlined the item.

Liz Smith the Chairman of Trustees for Potton Hall for All advised following the consultation the response, is that the majority of people responding that they would like the town council to support the hall to point where they are prepared to support taking the loan and paying an increase in council tax. We encourage you to put the resolution in the correct form so that you can go to the MHCLG Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for permission to go for a loan.

A member of the public asked about the extension from CBC (Central Bedfordshire Council) and the condition for plan B if finances are not obtained. Are we working to a plan B, do we have an end date by which the project needs to be scuppered and go to a plan B?

A member advised at a meeting yesterday of the Potton Hall for All Steering Group, the decision was taken that at the next meeting with CBC, that the trustees will advise that plans for Plan B would commence in January 2021 and interim funding streams would be investigated to obtain full funding.

The town council were advised by Central Bedfordshire Council on Friday 30th October 2020 that Potton Town Council's tax base for 2021-22 will be 2217. The increase to the tax base means that the precept increase will remain the same, but the increase to a band D household is now lower than was specified in the Community Consultation which took place between the 19th September to 23rd October 2020.

It was **resolved** to seek the approval of the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to apply for a Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) loan of £500,000 over the borrowing term of 15 years for the part funding of Potton Hall for All project. The council tax precept has been increased by £52,271.00 (17.8%) for the purpose of the loan repayments and increases in the costs of the other services with effect from 2021/22: this is the equivalent of £17.26 per band D household (12.4%) (of which £12.88 (9.3%) for loan repayments and £4.38 (3.1%) for other services). The town council consulted on pursuing a PWLB loan and the associated precept increase prior to making the decision to apply for a PWLB loan.

The Chairman of Trustees for Potton Hall for All advised she would welcome other people helping us and some people may have a specific interest in working on plan B.

Kim Gutteridge Trustee of Potton Hall for All had a question for the Town Clerk, following the resolution this evening when and where will the share the information so that we can make sure their consistency of the message going to residents.

The Town Clerk advised this is a public meeting and Potton Hall for All like anyone else can publicise the resolution at any time on Facebook.

Kim Gutteridge Trustee of Potton Hall for All asked when do anticipate, Potton Town Council sharing the information.

The Town Clerk advised based on the time of the evening and various items still be considered this evening, the earliest I would envisage would be tomorrow.

Kim Gutteridge Trustee of Potton Hall for All asked could you share the exact wording.

The Town Clerk advised he would share the wording.

A member advised that he had been in discussions with Beverley Hutchinson at Bartram Timber and she has made an offer of help.

4. Minutes of Potton Town Council

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 6th October 2020, which were previously circulated, were approved.

5. Reports from Central Bedfordshire Councillors

Cllr Wye advised that Central Bedfordshire Council will be releasing information within the next few days for businesses with regards to Covid-19. Potton Community Help Group will be meeting later this week to discuss the lock-down with regards to assisting those who are vulnerable and / or self-isolating.

6. COVID-19

No update.

7. Development in Potton

7.1 Planning application considered by the Planning Committee on 6th October 2020 for recommendation at the next Town Council meeting.

Application No: CB/20/03779/FULL

Location: 24 Royston Street, Potton, Sandy SG19 2LP

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/03779/FULL>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend no objection.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

Application No: CB/20/03780/LB

Location: 24 Royston Street, Potton, Sandy SG19 2LP

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/03780/LB>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend no objection.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

Application No: CB/20/03782/LB

Location: 19 Market Square, Potton, Sandy SG19 2NP

Proposal: Listed Building: Repairs to roof and addition of insulation. **Weblink:**
<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/03782/LB>

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend to support the application.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

Application No: CB/20/02161/RM

Location: Land to West of Everton Road, Potton SG19 2PD

Proposal: Reserved Matters: following outline application CB/18/01424/OUT Residential development with all matters reserved except access erection of up to 30 dwellings including an access road, landscaping and associated ancillary work for appearance landscaping layout & scale.

Weblink:

<http://cbstor.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/publicportalviewer/publicViewer.html?caseID=CB/20/02161/RM> 4

The Planning Committee resolved to recommend to object on the same grounds when CB/18/01424/OUT was considered at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 5th June 2018 and with additional new comments, as detailed below:

1. Restricted access;
2. Unsuitable due to infrastructure available in Potton;
3. Not in line with the Adopted Neighbourhood Plan;
4. Not in line with the Draft Local Plan;
5. Increased vehicle movements on narrow roads near to Potton Federation;
6. Parking near to Potton Federation.

No opportunity for any vehicle passing along the whole road length within the development, when fire and refuse (delivery lorry) vehicles visit the site. 18020-1007B - Parking, Fire & Refuse Collection Plan 09.07.2020.

Potton Town Council supports these comments / requirements made by CBC Officers during consultation:

1. **Tim Hoyle** Head of Service - Meeting the Accommodation Needs of Older People Team Social Care, Health and Housing

The requirement for new housing development to meet the needs of older people is set out in Policy H3 of the Local Plan 2015-2035.

'We consider that not less than five (5) of the proposed dwellings should be of a design and layout that makes them suitable for older people'.

Potton Neighbourhood Plan Policy HO-3 supports the inclusion of bungalows (at least 2 in this development) and 1/2-bedroom houses, flats, or apartments to suit the needs of retired people.

2. **Monika Marczevska** – Sustainable Growth Officer

No information has been submitted regarding requirements of Condition 21.

- How will 10% energy demand of the development be delivered?
- How will water efficiency achieve water standard of 110 litres per person per

day?

Potton Neighbourhood Plan policy EV-2 – how does the development incorporate measures to provide mitigation, adaptation, and resilience to the impacts of climate change?

3. Siobhan Vincent – Technical & Specialist Team Leader

- No information for sustainability provided with the application.
- Planting should be more representative of the local area and its setting within the Greensand. There is also an opportunity to include a local sandstone wall feature which again, would represent and reflect local character.
- Further information is required with regards to the drainage basin, heights/depths etc, and how it will be incorporated sympathetically within the site.
- No evidence or intent to deliver net gain for this site in the latest RM documents. The outline application places a requirement for ecological enhancements, and it would be prudent to include these with the RM application.
- The area of public open space could be sown with an acid grassland mix as the likelihood of it holding water and being able to sustain the proposed wet meadow mix for the bottom of the detention basin is minimal.
- The landscaping scheme should include nectar rich planting will help contribute toward net gain as Potton sits within a B-Line. • Bat and bird box provision should be included at a 1:1 ratio of swift bricks, this could be achieved with 10 houses each supporting three bricks in a gable, to deliver the 30 brick 1:1 ratio.
- Hedgehog highways should also be included to link all gardens.

4. Guy Quint – Pollution Officer

Cannot find a scheme to protect human health and residential amenity.

- Potential noise impacts from the proposed access road on the neighbouring bungalow. A noise barrier or other suitable scheme is required to protect the existing dwelling.

Potton Neighbourhood Plan environmental issues

Potton Town Council have several concerns in respect of the environmental policies of its Neighbourhood Plan: Policies HO5; EV1; EV2; EV5; EV6, in conjunction with Annex E Design Guide and Annex F Green Infrastructure Design Guide.

Ecology

- The 'Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Land off Everton Road Potton Bedfordshire NGR TL21749 49686' hereafter referred to as 'Habitat Survey', published with CB/18/01424/OUT, acknowledges one County Wildlife Site (CWS) within 1km of the development proposal, when there are two. The table in 2.4 p9, confuses these two sites. It mis-names Carthagena Bridleway and then gives a site description instead for the Sandy-Potton disused railway line CWS.
- We see no evidence or intent to deliver net gain for this site in the latest Reserve Matters (RM) documents. The original ecology report is very dismissive 3.3 p17 'Opportunities': '....limited opportunity for ecological enhancement'.
- There is a large open space on the soft landscape plan (ERP01), housing a detention basin. This and the grassland surrounding the basin provides the opportunity of contributing toward net gain by sowing with an acid grassland mix (eg: Emorsgate EM7). Currently it is specified for amenity rye grass and an Emorsgate EM8 wet meadow mix for the bottom of the detention basin. Given the free draining nature of the soil here, the basin is hardly likely to hold water.

It is important this area is NOT top soiled prior to seeding as that will compromise the establishment of the target plant community and fail to deliver the net gain required.

- The 'Habitat Survey' is dismissive of the development's invertebrate potential. It fails to acknowledge the opportunity to create net gain habitat to provide beneficial links for the diverse local invertebrate fauna (64 NERC listed species we are currently aware of). There is nothing in the RM documentation that seeks to address this. The following are some suggestions, not exhaustive, of measure that could be made to address this and contribute toward net gain:

- Appropriate areas in the open space should be identified to vary the topography to provide habitat for acculeates, further contributing to net gain.

- Ensure the overall landscape scheme comprises nectar rich planting (avoiding the use of invasive ornamentals) may also contribute toward net gain and especially to target local priority invertebrates.

- In acknowledging existence of the Carthage CWS, the 'Habitat Survey' fails to recommend subsequent landscaping of the Everton Road site includes the food plant (Wych elm, *Ulmus glabra*) of the CWS sites' two priority species. Therefore, missing the chance to create a permeable landscape that will enable these species to colonise new areas.

- The 'Habitat Survey' is dismissive of and fails to acknowledge the areas potential for reptiles, specifically Common lizard, *Zootoca vivipara*. We find it hard to believe the claim of only two historic records for Potton in 1980.

- Is it sufficient for the 'Habitat Survey' to assume there are no individuals using the site? The numbers recently found nearby at Mill Lane, suggests their presence should not be ruled out. Therefore, we believe a reptile survey would be advisable in the first instance. Secondly the landscape plans use the opportunity to create a suitable habitat mosaic that future proofs for them.

- The 'Habitat Survey' is also unspecific about bat and bird nest brick provision 3.3 p17 'Opportunities': 'recommended.....include permanent bat boxes and bird boxes within the fabric of any building constructed.'

- We ask for a 1:1 ratio of swift bricks in clusters of 2-4 on gables. For this 30-unit development, that would equate to 10 houses, each supporting three bricks in a gable, to deliver the 30 brick 1:1 ratio.

- For bat bricks, in addition to facing the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) recommended aspects of south-east through to south-west, BCT also advises location is informed by the site lighting plan to avoid anywhere where street lighting could have a negative effect on occupation. We find no indication or recommendation for any 'dark areas' within the development which we suggest should be around the retained perimeter hedging, adjacent houses to which this should be the targeted area for bat bricks.

- There is no reference to hedgehog highways. These must be included to link all gardens and ensure the development facilitates their movement through the area.

- We cannot find any indication either to address concerns expressed by RSPB in the outline planning application, regarding the additional recreational pressure this places on its reserve around Deepdale, particularly from the increasing number of dogs.

Landscape

- We are concerned at the large quantity of cotoneaster specified in the Landscape Plan (ERP01). Many are listed on either or both Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 9 and the Natural England Horizon scanning list. Those that are not must still be treated as a potential risk of being invasive. While cotoneaster is good for pollinators and the berries for birds, there are plenty of other ornamental shrubs of high pollinator value that must be used as

an alternative. Lists of acceptable pollinator friendly plants and potentially invasive plants to avoid in the scheme are provided in Annex F of the Potton Neighbourhood Plan.

- Increasing the proportion of high nectar value plants and avoiding invasive nonnative species, would help create better habitat opportunity for pollinators and may contribute toward biodiversity net gain.
- The landscape plan schedule of native shrub mix does not include Cherry Plum, *Prunus cerasifera* or Wych elm, *Ulmus glabra*, which are characteristic of the landscape in the immediate area to the west of Potton. The planting schedule lists Blackthorn, *Prunus spinosa* and Guelder rose, *Viburnum opulus*, neither prevalent here. As an alternative, and in addition to *P. cerasifera* and *U. glabra*, we would rather see Holly, *Ilex aquifolium*, Wayfaring, *Viburnum lantana*, Field maple, *Acer campestre* and Alder buckthorn, *Frangula alnus* in the native shrub mix.
- The attenuation basin specifies Emorsgate EM8 wet meadow mix. Given the basin is unlikely to hold any water or if so for a very short time, we would like to see specified instead an Emorsgate EM7 acid grass mix for the basin and surrounding amenity grass. It is imperative this area is NOT topsoiled prior to seeding. This would compromise establishment of the target habitat and biodiversity net gain.
- Other landscape-ecology recommendations have been made above in respect of measures to increase habitat suitability for invertebrates by incorporating a varying topography into the landscape
- We do not believe the grated tree pit guards are suitable for any tree planted in those locations. Our experience suggests the pit will be inadequate in size and not provide the trees with long-term suitable growing conditions that would otherwise be provided by a Green Blue Urban or Stockholm Tree Pit System. Both systems of which will act also as a Sustainable Drainage Feature.

NB: With reference made by Guy Quint, to provide noise barriers, biodiverse barriers are now available. These provide additional habitat for pollinating solitary bees. Email grassroofcompany@gmail.com for details.

SuDS

- Annex F of the Potton Neighbourhood Plan GI guide requests the use of permeable surfaces, including paving, bitumen and concrete, in all developments. The Reserve Matters application for this development does not indicate use of permeable surfacing. Increasingly local authorities are adopting such surfaces. Why is there inertia within CBC highways not to make a step change in mindset and adopt all types of permeable surface materials?
- The permeable surfaces must be used in conjunction with other SuDS management train features to maximise the environmental and amenity benefit. The RM application does not demonstrate any effort to do so. We can see no attempt to design into the highways any rain gardens or conveyance features that along with permeable surfacing will facilitate source control as per Annex F of the Potton Neighbourhood Plan and similarly referenced in the Governments NPPF National Design Guide.
- Many developments in Potton, this being no exception, are on free draining sand which facilitate infiltration through a combination of appropriate source control SuDS features. The lack of adequate source control for this development leaves us once again with the prospect of yet another uninspiring pipe to detention basin of no amenity or environmental value.
- It is noted two roadside tree pits are specified in the Landscape Plan (ERP01). It is proposed each tree is protected from soil compaction by a 1m x 1m tree grill. This will be inadequate at achieving its objective.

- We would suggest this presents an obvious opportunity for use of combining SuDS source control with a more efficient and effective Green Blue Urban or Stockholm tree pit system that will allow any tree the root space it needs.
- While not strictly a SuDS feature, water butts can offer a degree of run-off attenuation. We cannot see any reference in the documentation for each dwelling to be fitted with a water butt. With the whole of southern England in severe water deficit, water butts should be included in every development to discourage households from wasting valuable potable water on the garden.

Further additional comments:

- Contractors must note the nine tonne weight limit on the old railway road bridge on Everton Road (near the junction with Willow Road). Large construction vehicles (HGVs) must access the site from an alternate direction.
- There is concern from local residents regarding the data used from the noise impact survey which states the road servicing the 30 houses will have a “negligible” impact on surrounding adjacent properties to the development.
- The proposed installation post and rail fencing will not offer any sound and privacy protection. A solid fence should be installed to counteract the noise and privacy issues.
- Lighting impact only seems to apply to the lighting affecting the development’s properties and not those adjacent to the development, which could impact on privacy and quality of life.

It was **resolved** no further comment.

7.2 Dandara Ltd – Copsewood Development, Mill Lane, Potton (CB/16/04460/OUT and CB/19/04308/RM)

Item covered in the public participation session.

7.3 Gamlingay Road – DLP/Bartram Timber

The Chairman spoke about the item, reminding members of the previous resolution from a meeting of the town council in March 2020, he advised he had spoken to James Bartram of Bartram Timber. The Chairman made various points to the council and suggested the letter which he had composed based on the reasons he understood that the cllrs of the town council had made be sent to DLP/Bartram Timber. The Chairman explained that a brief letter would be discourteous at best and rather rude at worse and a letter which is more explanatory is required, though it is ultimately the town council’s decision on what letter is to be sent to DLP / Bartram Timber. The Chairman reminded members the letter from DLP was two months ago.

A member suggested that the alternative letter from Cllr Gibb is sent instead, with an additional letter for explanatory clarification.

The Chairman queried why it is necessary to have two letters, when one letter would give the full response.

A discussion about whether two letters should be sent took place.

A member advised they support the letter from the Chairman as it far more explanatory than the alternatives.

A discussion about the plans which had been provided took place.

A discussion about the telephone conversation the Chairman had with James Bartram.

A member queried about why are we engaging with Dandara if we will no longer engage with DLP / Bartram Timber and that we need to treat them all the same.

Cllr Macdonald asked the Town Clerk to make a note that he is making a personal and pecuniary interest with regards to Dandara, as it backs on to property owned by his wife.

A member advised they support the letter from Cllr Gibb.

Members discussed at length about Dandara and DLP/Bartram Timber.

A member discussed about the proposed Kier development for The Ridgeway.

A member mentioned will Dandara and DLP/Bartram Timber deliver what they promise, especially as DLP/Bartram Timber will sell this on to a developer.

The Chairman advised that James Bartram has verbally advised that they would sell the development on with a legal agreement, with the design of the houses, the layout of the houses, the number and type of houses would be fixed. The chairman advised principally advised that Bartram Timber want to supply the timber frames for the development.

Members discussed about Section 106.

It was **resolved** that the letter prepared by Cllr Gibb is sent to DLP/Bartram Timber.

8. Street Naming

The town council considered the name proposed by the developer, which was the developers name for CB/SN/20/0246, land to the west of Everton Road, Potton, Sandy, SG19 2PD.

Various road names were suggested.

It was **resolved** that the town council would like to put forward Goodship for the road name.

9. Minutes of Town Council Committees and groups where Cllr(s) is(are) appointed by the town council

The Town Council accepted and adopted the following minutes and all recommendations contained from the Town Council Committee:

- Neighbourhood Plan – 29th September 2020.
- Planning Committee – 6th October 2020 and 20th October 2020.

Cllr Zerny spoke about the planning application development proposed for The Ridgeway.

- Public Meeting – 19th October 2020.

10. Ridgeway / Oak Crescent Footpath

Item covered in the public participation session.

11. Proposed stopping up of Footpath 4 in Potton

Correspondence received from Central Bedfordshire Council with regards to the Proposed Stopping up of Part of Public Footpath 4, Land south of 83 Sutton Mill Road SG19 2QG was noted.

Members made various comments:

- Oppose the stopping up of any Public Right of Way.
- Likely they will then want to develop the land.
- This one is in the middle of open fields when the other route is through trees and you cannot see people.
- Footpath currently blocked for development.
- Want the footpath unblocked so that the footpath can be used.
- The plans for the development are that the footpath will be reinstated after the development has been completed.

It was **resolved** to oppose the stopping up of Footpath 4 in Potton based on the comments by members.

12. Proposed change to Luton airport flight path

Item covered in the public participation session.

13. Councillor Vacancies

The Chairman suggested the co-option for the two councillor vacancies is delayed and is carried out for all three councillor vacancies at the same time.

It was **resolved** that the co-option of the councillor vacancies is not progressed until a decision from Central Bedfordshire Council on the third vacancy on whether an election is required.

Cllr Kitchener gave a verbal report and advised this is our chance to spread the word and try and get diversity in the council by increasing the number of candidates by attracting for example female and younger candidates. Treatment of new councillors, email sent to all councillors and welcomed the positive comments. Suggested a mentoring or budding system especially as the council is meeting by Zoom.

A member commented social media has recently discussed about councillors due to the recent consultation. It is difficult to attract candidates, though we do need to try. We have recently lost our youngest councillor. We need to be open and honest with people about the time commitment, it is not just coming to one or two meetings a month if you want to be an effective councillor for the town.

The Chairman agreed it would be a good idea to support new councillors.

A member suggested the need to support new councillors.

14. Potton Hall for All

Item covered in the public participation session.

15. To note the date of the Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Town Council has been arranged for Tuesday 1st December 2020.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm.

Signed: Date:
Chairman

Mission Statement

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