

BYFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL held on THURSDAY 10th OCTOBER 2019 in BYFIELD VILLAGE HALL at 7.30pm

PRESENT - Cllrs J Gillic (Chairman), Mrs S Boddington, M Buckley, S Crowshaw, Mrs C Davis, L Clark, Mrs B Ridyard, S Shepherd and M Taylor.

Also present – 30 parishioners plus Mrs Rymer from Byfield Medical Centre and the Chairman of Woodford Halse PC.

DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST – None

ACCEPTANCE OF APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were accepted from – none. All present. District Cllr Frost had sent apologies for not being able to attend.

1. PLANNING

a) APPLICATIONS

i) DA/2017/0826 amended – outline application for new medical centre and residential development on land south of Woodford Road, Byfield.

The Chairman opened the meeting by reminding all that this was a meeting in public but not a public meeting. All points should be raised through the Chairman and anyone wishing to speak must give their name and address or who they are representing. The Councils Standing Orders limit each comment to 3 minutes and he would aim to abide by this.

He advised that the main changes to the initial outline applications is to reduce the number of houses from 90 to 78 of which 10% would be affordable homes. The initial application offered no affordable homes. The initial second access to the development site off Church Street had been removed with the only access being off Woodford Road. The applicants were offering to fund a chicane on Woodford Road to reduce traffic speed, to create a bus lay-by on the south side to alleviate traffic congestion and if there was a need to remove the brick built bus shelter owned by the Parish Council to build another one on a like-for-like basis and also to fund traffic lights for the 5 roads converging on the Fiveways junction to assist with traffic flow and possibly to help with pedestrians crossing busy roads.

The Chairman closed the meeting for comments from parishioners –

1. A resident of Woodford Road expressed concern about the only access being off Woodford Road which is already a very busy road with the increase in housing development in Woodford Halse. She was also concerned that the chicane might present a problem for larger vehicles and also that construction traffic to the site would add to the existing problems for residents of the area crossing the Woodford Road near to the junction with the A361.

2. A resident of Fessey Road raised issue with the validity of various supporting documents. He noted that reference was made to a fatality on Woodford Road not involving a bus. A bus was involved and he was there to try to assist the person knocked down. He also noted that the safety audit was carried out during the school summer holiday and between 12.45 and 13.45 and 1400 and 1500 – the less busy times of day for traffic through the village. The projected traffic figures seemed to him to be based on very limited traffic movements. The Swept Pass Analysis was based on a single deck service bus and did not take account of the larger double deck buses used for school transport.

3. A resident of Knightley Close noted that DDC Planning Policy HS22 designated Byfield as a restricted infill village and also that the application site is outside the confines of the village.

4. A resident of Woodford Road expressed concern that a large development on the field would change the character of the village. He felt that the traffic flow on Woodford Road had almost doubled in recent years with the increase in housing in that village and that nothing had been done with the infra-structure to deal with such an increase in the amount of traffic. He felt the application was mainly about commercial gain.

5. A resident of Boddington Road felt that there is a need to retain a medical centre for Byfield and surrounding villages.

6. A resident of Woodford Road felt there should have been more forethought in the expanding of Woodford Halse and possibly created a relief road from north of the Fiveways junction through to the Woodford Road.

7. A Byfield resident asked why a new medical centre could not be built in Woodford Halse which is where the bulk of patients registered with the practice live.

Mrs Rymer, the practice manager, replied that this would not be practical.

She also advised that it was the Highway Authority which had concerns about an access to the site off Church Street and also the DDC Conservation Officers wished to see the complete length of the Church Street stone wall retained as a feature of the village.

8. A resident of Knightley Close stated that he understood that the practice had been offered land in Woodford Halse for a new medical centre and he wondered why this had not been taken up.

Mrs Rymer replied that it had to be remembered that the practice is a private business with two partners and a move to Woodford Halse would have meant a complete loss of income from dispensing, as there is a dispensing pharmacist in Woodford.

9. A resident of Woodford Road said she felt the proposed site for the chicane is not ideal and she also wondered if the development could fund a Pelican crossing on Woodford Road.

Mrs Rymer advised it was the Highway Authority which suggested a bus lay-by.

10. Unknown person asked why Highways did not want there to be an access off Church Street.

Mrs Rymer advised that this was because local people had objected.

It was pointed out that there had also been objections as the lay of the land might have brought about flooding onto Church Street down the access road.

11. A resident of Church Street said he could sympathise with the residents of Woodford Road but pointed out that there is often anti-social parking in Church Street by patients for the medical centre. He asked if planning permission is granted if a new medical centre would be built first before any houses might go in.

Mrs Rymer advised they have the agreement of the land owner to fund his promised gift of £1.25M towards any new medical centre once the land had been sold.

The resident said he felt the medical centre was being used as a ransom to obtain planning permission for more houses.

12. Mrs Coles, Chairman of Woodford Halse PC told the meeting that WHPC was totally in favour of the planning application. The practice has 8,000+ patients and she understood if there is no housing allowed on the site then the medical centre will close. She confirmed there cannot be a medical centre in Woodford Halse because of the existing dispensing pharmacist.

13. A resident of The Twistle advised he had previously lived in Becketts Close. He felt that if the medical centre is lost it will be inconvenient for all. He said the field had not been used for food production for many years and that lots of villages in the area were having housing developments put upon them. He also felt there should be some access off Church Street.

14. A resident of Church Street pointed out that Church Street is in part a single carriageway for quite some distance because of vehicles parked outside householder's homes, excluding those who park to go to the medical centre. He could not see why the partners had not taken up the offer of land in Woodford Halse and he asked why the surgery would have to close if no new one is built.

Mrs Rymer replied that it is not physically possible to expand the existing premises and the NHS had rejected an application for funding for a new centre. There would not have been the offer of £1.25M towards building costs on a site in Woodford Halse.

15. A parishioner asked if the CQC (Care and Quality Commission) would close the medical centre? Mrs Rymer said the two remaining partners were at breaking point.

16. A parishioner stated he felt that parking around the medical centre is an issue.

17. A resident of Woodford Road advised it is already very difficult to access and exit their drive because of the volume of traffic on this road. The proposed location for traffic lights on Woodford Road for the Fiveways junctions was not thought to be at all ideal.

18. A resident of Becketts Close who works at the medical centre advised that the CQC inspection had occupied one day. She personally felt the present building is not fit for the number of patients on the register.

19. Another resident felt that the threat of loss of a medical centre for the area was being used to push through a housing development scheme and felt the issue was becoming political.

There being no further questions or points of view the Chairman closed the open section of the meeting at 8.36pm. There was then a slight recess so that those who wished to leave could do so before the Council went back into session.

Council meeting re-opened at 8.45pm.

The Chairman asked Mrs Rymer if she could confirm that any new medical centre would always remain as that as the existing partners could decide to close the practice in due course. Mrs Rymer advised that Daventry DC could place a covenant on the land/building so that it remains as a medical centre for the area. She also advised that the size of any medical centre is determined by the NHS.

The Chairman sought views of councillors –

Cllr Clark felt any access point on Woodford Road should be further to the east i.e. nearer to Curgenvin Close and also that there should be consideration for a right turn filter for vehicles coming off the A361 Cllr Crowshaw pointed out that the site access on the plans are only indicative at present.

He also noted that a Transport Assessment had not yet been agreed, nor is there an Environmental Impact Assessment or any detailed plans.

Cllr Buckley felt it essential that a covenant be put in place for any new medical centre to always be retained as such and not sold off for possible development.

Cllr Gillic asked who would own and maintain the long stone wall on Church Street. At present it is the responsibility of the land owner.

There being no further comments the Chairman proposed that Council OBJECT to this amendment as per the original application. He noted the following for inclusion in the submission to Daventry DC Planning Officer –

- a) Transport Assessment is not a good document and knowingly incorrect in places.
- b) Residents of Woodford Road very concerned about an increase in the number of traffic movements and the possible 'urbanisation' of the area by the introduction of traffic lights at the Fiveways junction.

His proposal was seconded by Cllr Ridyard and agreed by all. The Chairman would draft a reply to Daventry DC.

JG

ii) DA/2019/0802 - 10 Westhorpe Lane for installation of second floor gable end window.

Cllr Ridyard advised she had visited the site and there should be no more overlooking of neighbouring properties than already exists. She proposed Council support the application as the additional window would improve the quality of life for the residents. Agreed by all.

iii) DA/2019/0814 – 51 Church Street for work on a tree with a preservation order.

Cllr Ridyard advised the tree is a yew which does need some remedial work. She proposed that Council accept the views of the DDC Tree Preservation officer who has already been consulted by the applicant. Agreed by all.

b) APPROVAL(S)

i) DA/2019/0676 - 40 Banbury Lane for demolition of part of a single storey extension and construction of single storey rear extension and new rear dormer window.

c) REFUSAL(S) None received

d) Any urgent planning matters to be brought to the attention of the Council, arising after publication of the agenda. None.

2. FINANCIAL MATTERS

a) Financial state The Clerk reported that at 28 September Council had total liquid assets of £113,620.95. The balance of the precept having been received.

b) Internal control The Chairman and Cllr Davis had undertaken a light inspection. All in order.

c) Poppy wreath Cllr Shepherd proposed a donation of £50.00 be made under the power of s137 of the LGA 1972 to the Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal for a wreath for Remembrance Sunday. Seconded by Cllr Boddington and agreed by all.

d) Donations to Warks and Northants Air Ambulance Cllr Boddington proposed that Council continue to support this local charity but to raise the annual donation from £200 to £250 and that this be the donation for this and the next 3 financial years. Seconded by Cllr Davis and agreed by all.

e) Audit for 2018-19 The external auditors (JKF Littlejohn LLP) had found no issues which needed to be brought to the attention of the Council. Item closed. The Clerk would advertise the closure of the audit in the usual way.

f) Banked INCOME since last meeting

Lloyds Bank BIA a/c	Interest for August	£2.40
Humphris Funerals	Burial fee – Mrs J Lilley	£305.00
Ditto	Burial fee – Mrs J Goddard (ashes)	£121.00
Daventry DC	Balance of precept	£33,833.00
Brightwell Recreation Ground Association	Transfer of grant for play equipment	£10,190.00

g) ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT – listed at end of minutes- page 431

Cllr Boddington proposed that the accounts be paid; seconded by Cllr Shepherd and agreed by all.

h) Budget for 2020-21 The Chairman asked councillors to give some initial thoughts to expenditure for the next financial year and, possibly, to come with suggestions for the next meeting in 2 weeks' time.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting.

Chairman

November 2019

=====

**Date of next meeting(s) – Thursday 24th October for all regular agenda items not possible to cover on 10th October, plus any urgent planning matters.
Regular meeting – Thursday 14th November.**

Items for the November agenda

- 1st draft of budget for 2020-21
- Set date for Annual Parish Meeting 2020
- Review of Standing Orders and Financial Regulations

