

TEMPLE GUITING PARISH COUNCIL

Serving the residents of Barton, Farmcote, Ford, Kineton and Temple Guiting
also Bemborough, Jackdaws Castle, Pinnock and Trafalgar.

Minutes of Temple Guiting Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting

Held on Thursday 29th February 2024 at 6.00 p.m. in the village hall.

Councillors present: Sam Baber-Scovell, Lorna Eayrs, Jayne Ewart-Perks, Michael Krier, Kate Mather (Chairman)

Public: 33 members of the public attended.

Representatives from McKenzie-Miller Homes (Applicant and developer), Guiting Grange Estates (Freeholder), Morgan Elliot (Planning consultant), Bioregional Sustainable Development (Biodiversity and sustainability consultant), A2 Architecture.

1. **Apologies for absence:** Received from Cllr Gower in advance.
2. **Declarations of interest in items on the Agenda (Localism Act 2011):** None.
3. **Points from the floor:** Several members of the public requested to speak at item 4 (c)
4. **Planning application [24/00066/FUL](#)** Conversion of a traditional barn to residential use and the erection of five new-build residential dwellings, the provision of landscaping, demolition of six existing agricultural barns and associated works at New Barn Farm, Temple Guiting.
 - a) **Presentations from the planning and architectural consultants.** The applicant had mounted large plans around the hall for residents to review before and after the meeting. The Chairman invited the applicant to describe the application to the public. The focus of the development was to restore the large barn which was in very poor condition. The five new homes would support the restoration programme. The current plans were the result of two years studying the site and discussing options with Cotswold District Council, who had introduced the idea of the two smaller semi-detached homes into the site.
 - b) **Q&A – Councillors.** Councillors asked for further information about biodiversity measures, proximity to the school, the management company for the site, access, future proofing and ‘green’ credentials, surface water drainage and foul water, pricing, construction damage, and whether the developer was confident that CDC would permit the current proposal.
 - c) **Q&A – Members of the public.** Members of the public asked questions relating to biodiversity, land ownership, proximity of the boundary to the school, impact of setting houses down below the current level of the land on energy consumption, contributions from the developer/freeholder, lack of solar panels, covenants to ensure owners are local and not 2nd homers, lack of affordable housing, pricing, S.106 and CIL and other contributions to the village infrastructure, duration of the works and when ground would be broken.

Responses

As some subjects were included in both councillor and public questions, responses from both are shown below listed by subject, not questioner.

Contact templeguitingparishcouncil@yahoo.co.uk

TEMPLE GUITING PARISH COUNCIL

Serving the residents of Barton, Farmcote, Ford, Kineton and Temple Guiting also Bemborough, Jackdaws Castle, Pinnock and Trafalgar.

Biodiversity. Increasing biodiversity is very high on the planning agenda. A new statutory requirement to increase biodiversity by 10% has been introduced this year, and this must be maintained for the next 30 years. The biodiversity measures included in the plan deliver 118% increase in habitat units and 109% increase in hedgerow units. A new native hedgerow will be planted around the boundaries of the site, along with new Cotswold stone walls. New trees will be planted and, as two apple trees would be lost from the site, similar replacement trees would be included. Developers recognised the loss of significant habitat caused by demolishing the old barns. The planning consultancy agreed to forward Biodiversity Net Gain data (since done).

Land ownership. The developers currently have an option to purchase the land once planning permission has been granted. Land which appeared to be marked on the plans as in the ownership of the school, is part of the Guiting Estate and not part of the development.

Once sold, the communal parts of the estate will be managed by a Management Company specially set up for the purpose. Residents will be trustees. Covenants will be in place to ensure that residents do not reduce the Biodiversity Net Gain (e.g. cutting down trees). Other covenants will specify that no changes can be made to the buildings or the landscaping for 30 years. A sinking fund will be set up to fund maintenance. There is a large budget for landscaping as this is essential for the site. The Management Plan will determine exactly what the Management Company will be required to do.

Proximity to the school and light blocking. The developers have considered the aspects of safeguarding the school and pupils throughout the two year development discussions. The new homes have been designed so that there are no windows overlooking the school. There is a 3 metre gap between the boundary of the estate and that of the school, there is also a car port between the house and the boundary creating a 6m space between the school grounds and the nearest house.. The boundary nearest the school will be planted with native hedging and small trees. Residents were concerned that this planting could block light from the new school building.

Access. The plans show two driveways, one solely for the restored barn and one for the other homes, leading off Mill Lane. GCC Highways has examined the plans and has passed them as satisfactory for all users. Residents were concerned for the safety of all users, including walkers and riders as well as residents, as these driveways are close to each other and to the main road.

Access to field to north of development. Plans show a gate to a field on the school side of the development. Residents were concerned that this might be access to the school and through to the recreation field. The developer stated that this was purely for maintenance such as topping of the grass in the field and, as there was no other entrance, farm machinery would be using this driveway occasionally.

Future proofing and green credentials. Councillors and residents noted the lack of PV panels, although charging points for electric vehicles are included and air source pumps are planned to be installed for heating. The homes are designed to have a high EPC rating, although this will be harder with the renovated barn. The developers stated that the

TEMPLE GUITING PARISH COUNCIL

Serving the residents of Barton, Farmcote, Ford, Kineton and Temple Guiting also Bemborough, Jackdaws Castle, Pinnock and Trafalgar.

materials they would use – including local Cotswold stone – were naturally all good insulators.

The developers have not included PV panels in the application as they believe them to be relatively ineffective, especially in winter, as well as being intrusive in this sensitive environment. One resident stated that in her experience, PV panels were fully capable of charging her car and providing energy for her home. Developers could also install new PV technology which blends with tiling without affecting the aesthetics of the site. Ground source heat pumps – either per house or one large shared system – had not been considered appropriate. The sustainability consultant commented that air source heat pumps can be expensive to run. The aim is to deliver sustainability for the next 30 – 40 years.

Impact of setting buildings lower than the current level. The reason for setting the new houses at a lower level than the current level is because the CDC Conservation Officer was concerned about their visibility in the landscape and that for design reasons they needed to be subservient to the main barn. In addition, the roofs have a high pitch to comply with the agricultural Cotswold vernacular (as described in the Cotswold Design Code). This means that they would have interrupted views and been more visible if the houses were not set lower.

However, the Planning Officer had commented that some of the houses were too low and faced north, so would be expensive to heat. The developers had to balance both these comments.

Drainage. The SuDS (Sustainable Drainage System) to be located under the hard surfacing has a capacity of 140% of expected run off, with the extra 40% being allowed for future climate change. The plans did not include consideration of the regular flooding at the junction with Mill Lane, which would affect new residents entering and leaving the site.

Foul sewage: Developers said that Cotswold District Council had approved the arrangements for foul sewage, however, councillors questioned whether a central treatment plant rather than individual septic tanks would be preferable.

Absence of affordable housing: The developers stated that the two 2-bedroomed semi-detached homes would be more affordable than the detached homes but that prices were not available. Residents stated that those homes would almost definitely not be affordable for local workers, and asked that covenants be put in place to ensure local workers lived there, rather than second homers.

Contributions to the village infrastructure, including CIL and s.106. Several residents asked whether there were plans to include a condition that the developers/freeholder replace the village hall or make a contribution towards repairs or rebuilding. Developers were not aware of any plans.

The homes would be subject to CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) contributions to CDC, a proportion (determined by CDC) of which is passed to the parish council for investment in infrastructure projects in the parish. The impact of the development would not be large enough

TEMPLE GUITING PARISH COUNCIL

Serving the residents of Barton, Farmcote, Ford, Kineton and Temple Guiting
also Bemborough, Jackdaws Castle, Pinnock and Trafalgar.

to trigger s.106 contributions – also known as planning obligations, aimed at mitigating the impact of a development proposal.

Construction damage. After planning permission has been granted, the developers will prepare a Construction Management Plan which can specify that construction traffic may only use certain routes. However, the roads around the site are all single lane meaning that HGVs travelling to and from the site were likely to block the roads for other users and/or cause serious damage to the verges. On other sites the developers have specified that all deliveries must be made by smaller vehicles, which might be appropriate for this site. Councillors noted that the use of local Cotswold stone is likely to involve deliveries using large vehicles not generally permitted on local roads.

Start date and length of construction period. The developers expected the building works to take 12 – 13 months with a period of 4 months between planning being granted and ground being broken. Other factors affecting timing were that they wanted the buildings to be w2tertight before Christmas and that they hoped that the majority of the digging would take place during the long school holidays.

Likelihood of permission being granted. The developers felt that they had addressed successive iterations of changes requested by the CDC Conservation Officer over the past 2 years. However, the Officer still had concerns about the design of the buildings. They wanted to see single storey homes, but also wanted the barn to be restored. The officer had suggested flat green roofs, but the developers felt this did not comply with the Cotswold Design Code nor were they typical of the Temple Guiting area. The cluster of homes proposed for the site reflected the typical Cotswold landscape, with small groups of buildings such as farm yards and hamlets.

d) Councillors to agree the PCs comments to be posted to the CDC planning portal.

Due to the nature and size of the meeting it was not possible for councillors to agree details of their comments at this meeting. Draft comments will be reviewed at the PC meeting on 6th March, as CDC had approved an extension to the deadline for comment.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.20 p.m.

Signed
Chairman

6th March 2023