

Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall Parish Council

Planning Committee; Cllrs. Ibbotson, Mould, Sharma, Vimalachandran

Committee Report, November 2020

The following applications have been discussed by the Planning Committee;

20/02889/FUL. Tilstone Lodge, Nantwich Road, CW6 9HS. Installation of ground heat pump, new ground loop and associated works.

No objections were raised.

20/03302/FUL . The Willows, Huxley Lane, Tiverton, CW6 9NB. Erection of detached single garage.

No objections were raised.

20/03317/FUL. Tiverton Hall Farm. Huxley Lane, Tiverton, CW6 9NF. Single storey rear extension.

This is rather grander than it sounds, incorporating a rear courtyard covered by a large canopy roof. After discussion the following was submitted to Planning Department; *“The Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that it does not exceed the current guidelines on increase in overall size and building style.*

20/03380/LBC. Tilstone Lodge, Nantwich Road, CW6 9HS. Demolition of east service wing, erection of single storey extension with swimming pool and partial conversion of west wing service wing to form annexe.

This is the listed buildings application, the details of which we discussed in detail and approved last year. No comment.

20/03493/OUT Beeston Reclamation Yard, Whitchurch Road, Beeston, CW6 9NJ. Erection of up to 25 residential dwellings and associated infrastructure works.

Cllr. Ibbotson’s proposed response (attached) is to be discussed at the Parish Council meeting on Tuesday 10th November.

Cllr. Gordon Ibbotson.

8/11/2020

On Tue, 3 Nov 2020 at 11:45, gordon ibbotson <ibbot43@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi everyone,

Given the flexibility on timing for our formal response, as negotiated by Carol, I assume that we will discuss our proposed response with the full Parish Council next Tuesday.

After a second detailed reading of the documents, plus your initial comments, here are my conclusions;

1. The main issues are the same as we and Beeston PC raised in relation to the previously-approved applications for the Beeston Castle pub and the auction site developments, as well as the early sounding of opinion on this one, namely over-burdening of local amenities (schools, medical, shopping/parking), poor public transport, pedestrian and vehicular road safety given proximity to the railway bridge. Unfortunately, the two previous developments were approved despite all these considerations and without substantive requirements from CWaC for improvement of local amenities. The precedents are strong and this is a relatively small development on a brown-field site, delivering more housing for CWaC, so it will be approved, though it does nothing for the existing local communities (except affordable housing).
2. The provision of 11 (45%) affordable dwellings is welcome, provided it is adhered to. The maximum provision for other infrastructure contributions should also be sought.
3. I find it difficult to assess the implications of and the overall impact of the 3 developments on the size and centre of gravity of Beeston PC, which is, of course, largely for them to consider. The recently-completed housing at Beeston Brook does not seem to have affected our parish very much (has it?).
4. The documents seriously under-estimate the dangers of this section of the A49, for road users and pedestrians, based purely on the absence of recent fatalities. Given the physical constraints of the site access point and the width of the railway bridge itself the only solution would seem to be traffic lights. This would also hopefully reduce vehicle speeds generally. In a combined development access via the auction site would have been preferable, but that is now out of the question.

How does this read as the basis for our response to the application? Should I circulate it to our fellow councillors in advance of the meeting, with or without any modifications?

Regards,
Gordon