

## **ATTACHMENT 1 relating to Minute Reference 127/11/14**

### **Report of the briefing meeting on 'Parish Council Recruiting' on 24 November 2014**

#### **NCALC offices, Litchborough**

A multi-university research team was running the "Giving Time" project aimed at identifying, contacting and encouraging potential volunteers to serve various national organisations. As one element of this, the research team had piloted its ideas in several parish councils with the assistance of NALC and with the ultimate objective not only of increasing the number of residents putting themselves forward for election to their parish council but also of widening their representative (democratic) make-up. The speaker, Professor Peter John, gave examples of possible approaches – such as through social media, giving "pep-talks" to meetings of community groups or clubs or perhaps having conversations with people outside schools or supermarkets.

He was also looking for parish councils in our county to take part in setting up and assessing the effectiveness of these or any other approaches, during the election period prior to 7 May 2015, to improve the 'democratic representativeness' of residents on their parish council.

My impression from the meeting, including the general discussion sessions, was that Paulerspury Parish Council made an acceptable decision, at its October 2014 meeting, in declining to take part in the project.

John Barnes

**ATTACHMENT 2 relating to Minute Reference 127/11/14 (last item)**

Mr Batten was informed that, in submitting written information to South Northamptonshire Council's on-line planning register in relation to a planning application,

1. anything (subject to a maximum of 1000 characters) typed into the 'Comments' box, would be scanned and put into the public domain exactly as typed, as would an uploaded attachment exceeding the 1000 character limit but
2. any text sent in an attachment to an email to the designated address ( currently development.management @ southnorthants.gov.uk), would be redacted in respect of personal details such as phone numbers, email addresses or signatures. This route could be subject to delay in the information being considered by SNC and it is not guaranteed always to be redacted in every respect.

Useful information about making comments on SNC's website can be found at:-

<http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/Servicepage485-3.htm>

District Councillor Mrs Barnes offered to follow-up this issue with SNC.

### **ATTACHMENT 3 relating to Minute Reference 129/11/14a)**

**SNC Planning Application No S/2014/2025/MAF** Towcester Racecourse  
Company Ltd. Towcester Racecourse London Road Towcester

Variation of conditions 12 and 14 (S/2012/0544/MAF) to allow the use of the approved greyhound race track and associated lighting for racing up to three times in any calendar week (at least one of which will be Saturday) between the hours of 6:00pm to 11:30pm to between the hours of 10:30am and 11:30pm.

Paulerspury Parish Council OBJECTED to this application to extend the operating hours of the greyhound race track earlier in the day than 6 p.m. for the following reasons.

1. SNC (LPA reference S/2012/0544/MAF) restricted the operating times to evenings only (6:00 pm - 11:30 pm) in order to protect the amenities of nearby residents and to comply with Policy G3 of the Local Plan (the 1997 Plan). As Policy G3 is a Saved Policy, Paulerspury Parish Council would ask that you continue to uphold this opinion for this application also.
2. Traffic counts have been carried out by residents of Heathencote on the Shutlanger Road. Traffic numbers recorded (the total in both directions) between the hours of 17:00 and 18:00 were 271 on 20 November 2014 and 294 on 21 November 2014. It was therefore a matter of great concern to Paulerspury Parish Council that all the race traffic would enter and leave the greyhound race track via the Shutlanger road. This extra traffic added to the observed early evening peak period flow, would put an unacceptable traffic load onto this very narrow and winding road, further inconveniencing Heathencote residents.
3. Paulerspury Parish Council had recently completed working with Northamptonshire County Council to gain a 40 mph speed limit, such were the already existing concerns for this road. Residents of Heathencote inform us that, given the nature of the bends on the stretch of road between the A5 and the race course entrance, many car incidents required a local farmer to haul out the unfortunate driver's car from his field boundaries. Frequently the fences were broken resulting in animals roaming freely on the road.
4. Noise from the Tannoy system during horse-race meetings was an existing irritant for residents in Heathencote. If this sound system was to be used during the greyhound race meetings, there would be noise intrusion not only during the currently approved evening period but also extended throughout the day (including the Saturday in every racing week), potentially from 10.30 a.m. This was a further reason for objection to the applied-for extensions of track opening hours.

## **ATTACHMENT 4 relating to Minute Reference 127/11/14 c) i)**

### **129/11/14/c) SNC Planning Application No. S/2014/2138/FUL Former Builder's Yard, Plumpton End, Paulerspury**

Paulerspury Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application, essentially in respect of the proposal for Plot 1, for the following reasons:-

1. The position and associated geometry of the 2-storey part of the Plot 1 dwelling due south of the rear of the adjacent property, Woodstock, would appear to compromise the current amenity enjoyed by Woodstock. In particular, there would seem likely to be substantial loss of light, for a considerable daily time period, to Woodstock's conservatory and general rear aspect.

There are two recent local precedents, on similar grounds, for refusal to permit such development. The relevant planning references for these are:-

- a) S/2010/0767/OUT. Reason 2 for refusal includes the statement "In this instance the proposed layout would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of the adjacent dwelling at Hillcrest by reason of loss of light to the principal front windows".
- b) S/2013/1012/FUL. Reason 3 for refusal states that "By reason of the orientation, proximity, siting and mass of the proposed property (as seen from the side) the development would have a detrimental overshadowing and overbearing impact to the rear facing windows and the most utilised portion rear garden (closest to the property) of 32 High Street. As such the development results in a poor standard of amenity to the occupiers of the adjacent building and land at 32 High Street. Thereby the development is contrary to policy G3 [D] of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (1997) and the Core Principles (point 4) of the NPPF".

Notwithstanding the similarity of these precedents to the present proposal for building on Plot 1, it is curious that the Planning Policy Statement accompanying the application states in its paragraph 2.4, bullet point 4 (with reference to Policy G3, criterion d), that "the development will not harm the amenities of any neighbouring properties in view of the distances between the proposed buildings and existing buildings and the design which ensures that there will be no overlooking or loss of sunlight or daylight as a result of the development". That is a matter of opinion rather than fact with which the Parish Council does not agree.

2. South Northamptonshire Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled "BACKLAND AND TANDEM DEVELOPMENT IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS", dated March 2004, states in paragraph 1.4 that "Tandem development is not permitted by the Local Plan.....". Figure 2 of that document shows what is meant by tandem development.

Although the dwelling on Plot 1 does not as yet exist, logic suggests that, were the proposal approved as currently applied for, the net effect would be the same as allowing the kind of tandem development expressly ruled out by paragraph 1.4 and the accompanying Figure 2.

3. The scale of the application's PROPOSED MASTER PLAN and its sketched HGV turning swept path does not permit definitive statements, but it would appear that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for emergency and refuse vehicles to turn between Plots 1 and 2 if one, or two, vehicles were parked outside the front of the double garage on Plot 1 – as may well be the case.

The Parish Council is not opposed to residential development on this site but feels, for the foregoing reasons, that a less ambitious design might be better suited to the features of the site and of those adjacent to it.

5 December 2014