

Emberton Parish Council
Minutes of Virtual Extra Ordinary Meeting
Tuesday 11th August 2020 at 7pm

Present:

Councillor Vicki McLean - Chairman
 Councillor Steve Gibson
 Councillor Paul Flowers
 Councillor Fred Markland

Ward Councillor Keith McLean

Mrs Karen Goss – Clerk and RFO

Apologies for Absence – Apologies for absence were received from Ward Councillors Peter Geary and David Hosking.

Declarations of Interest in items on the Agenda – Councillor V McLean Declared an Interest in item 4.277 and 4.278 as a family friend of the applicant.

1.2 **Public questions** – There were no members of the public in attendance.

2.1.82 **Residents parking scheme – Hulton Drive & Olney Road** – Councillor Gibson reported that two residents had put together a petition to introduce a residents' parking scheme in Hulton Drive and the service road of Olney Road. MKC required evidence that a permit scheme was desired by at least 70% of affected residents. Residents would have to buy a permit at a cost of £25 per vehicle to park outside their property and a visitor permit could be purchased on line for £1 for a 24 hour period. Councillor Gibson confirmed that both petitions had now been submitted to MKC. Councillor Flowers commented that he would support the scheme if this is what the residents wanted. Councillor Markland asked whether the scheme had a timescale, was it permanent or a trial? Councillor Gibson responded that if it was implemented, it would be permanent. The parking officer for MKC came out and gave examples of where it had been implemented in MKC and stated that it was very successful. The parking officer also stated that the scheme was appropriate for Hulton Drive and Olney Road (service road). Councillor Markland asked if there was an opt out should the scheme not work. Ward Councillor McLean responded that there would be an option to remove it but he was unaware of this ever happening.

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

New applications

4.277 **20/01626/FUL** – Replacement pitched roof to main outbuildings, widening of smaller outbuilding, internal reconfigurations, window and door alterations and new services installation at West Lane House, West Lane. Councillor Markland stated that he had concerns regarding the level of detail that had been submitted with the application and the protection of a key listed building in the conservation area. He also stated that a more senior member of the

conservation team should be looking at the planning application given the number of concerns raised by residents. Cllr V McLean responded that this was a valid point and asked fellow councillors whether they would endorse the comment made by Councillor Markland. Councillor Flowers stated that he would endorse the comment. Councillor Flowers made reference to the sewing room and questioned whether this would generate traffic. It was noted from the application that clients would be seen at home and would not be visiting the property. However, it was pointed out that highways had not been consulted on this planning application. Councillor Markland had previously put together a draft response on behalf of the parish council as below:

“Clearly this scheme affects one of the most visible historic properties in the village and more particularly, located at the heart of the village conservation area. The accompanying heritage statement for the proposed interventions goes some way towards acknowledging this fact.

The repairs and alterations to the main grade II listed house, both internally and externally, one would expect to be dealt with by the appropriate level of conditions in order to establish and control the heritage asset and the impact of any planned interventions.

The element of the proposals that does raise concern, however, is the proposal for a ‘replacement pitched roof to the main outbuildings and widening of the smaller outbuilding’. The outbuildings and associated structures are of course listed as curtilage structures and the proposals have not clearly set out the heritage value and significance of the assets or for that matter dealt sufficiently with establishing the historical development of the built form of the site in question.

In terms of the heritage asset value to the conservation area, the stone boundary walls in this instance are categorised as ‘important’ when utilising the 1997 conservation character statement as supplementary planning guidance. On that basis alone, one would assume that the intrinsic value of them be evaluated and mitigated against proportionately with any proposed intervention.

The heritage statement, as submitted with the scheme, states quite comfortably that the site of the current mono pitched roof building (That is to be altered to form a two-storey building), was historically of a greater form and therefore justifies the proposals to rebuild it in that manner.

From the image offered in the statement it is impossible to establish the above fact as correct. There are, however, better images available and from the same period as that shown, which clearly show a stone boundary wall and much smaller lean-to structure in this location and not a two-storey building. One such image can be accessed from the Kitchener archive held at the City Discovery Centre in Milton Keynes. Others may be available from the village archive held by the history society.

Whilst the current single storey, cement fibre sheeted roof building has the appearance of a temporary structure, it is at least understated and doesn’t attempt to dominate the listed stone boundary wall, as it actually sits inside of it and from a contrasting material, brick as opposed to stone. This in many ways works, as an almost honest intervention and very much in keeping with the need to expand in an ungentrified manner as pastoral needs dictated.

There may in fact have been a structure historically in the location of the proposed garage as both this and the garden boundary wall can be seen quite clearly in both the 1881 & the 1925

OS map of the village. The latter map is included within the 1997 conservation area character statement.

With regards to evaluating the proposed new two storey structure (Replacing the current mono-pitched roof low barn) and the impact on the surrounding area, one further aspect to consider is that of the churchyard lych-gate directly opposite the site, as this is in fact grade II listed in its own right. This point is not acknowledged in the supporting heritage statement. Any attempts to build the proposed two-storey structure in this location would not only potentially jeopardise the existing historic stone boundary wall, but would create a building whose scale and massing would dominate the area and therefore impact upon the setting of the lightweight timber structure and much lesser scale of the grade II listed lych-gate opposite.”

It was noted that the conservation officer had objected to the internal alterations. It was agreed that the clerk would draft a response to this application based on the statement produced by Councillor Markland and request that a senior member of the conservation team reassesses the application and that highways be given the opportunity to make comment.

Action: KG

- 4.278 **20/01627/LBC** – Listed building consent for replacement pitched roof to main outbuildings, widening of smaller outbuilding, internal reconfigurations, window and door alterations and new services installation at West Lane House, West Lane. Response as above application.
- 4.279 **20/01752/TCA** – Notification of intention to – 7 x Lime T1-T7 reduce height by 8m and all sides by 3m (branches on all 7 lime trees to be cut back to old pollard points) at Manor House, Olney Road. It was noted that there was little information submitted with the application. However, the parish council would be in agreement with the recommendations made by MKC’s tree officer with regard to the application. **Action: KG**

5. ACCOUNTS

- 5.1 **To receive the RFO’s Report for the 11th August and approve payments.** A discussion took place regarding the ring fenced fund for Emberton Cares and it was agreed to keep this in place in case there was a second wave of Covid 19. It was proposed by Cllr Gibson and seconded by Cllr Markland that the payments be approved as per the RFO’s Report. Cllr Gibson to approve the payments online. **Action: SG**

7.2 Councillors’ concerns

Cllr Markland commented that MKC were working on the Character Statement revision and questioned whether the 1997 document still held as SPG. Ward Councillor McLean stated that he was happy to support the clerk sending this to the conservation team, copying it to the Ward Councillors. **Action: KG**

Cllr V McLean stated that Soo Hall and the clerk were monitors for the defibrillator. Councillor V McLean stated that she was willing to be a monitor and would ask Sandy Palmer as well. The clerk commented the pads expired in September 2020 and that she would arrange for these to be replaced. **Action: VMc/KG**

8. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** – confirmed as Tuesday 1st September 2020 at 7pm to be held virtually

The meeting closed at 7.35pm