

**MINUTES OF THE KINGSDON PLANNING MEETING HELD ON  
Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2017 IN THE VALLAGE HALL, straight after the monthly meeting**

**Present:** Mr D.Beswick (chairman) Mr B.Paine (Vice-Chairman), Mr Wally Elliott, Mr P.Waters, Mr I.Dibben (Parish Councillors), Mrs K Hatt and 3 parishioners.

**1. Apologies:** Mrs S Mackay and Mr G. Osborne.

**2. Declarations of Interest:** None

**3. Previous minutes**

The minutes of the last planning meeting were read, approved and signed. This was proposed by W.Elliott, seconded by B.Paine, all were in favour.

**4. Determination of Planning applications**

17/01994/lbc, installation of 4 cctv cameras, listed building consent granted.

17/01763/ful, replacement windows, permission granted.

17/01320/out, demolition of barn and dwelling erection, permission granted.

**5. Planning applications**

17/02416/ful, change use of land and building to form dwelling house and erection of car port, Barns at Bondip Farm, Kingsdon estate.

It is now a smaller proposal than the previous one.

As far the council is concerned there is no comment.

17/02683/ful, installation of 3 CCTV cameras, Lattice Cottage, Mr and Mrs Lockhart.

The permission for listed building has now been granted but they now have to look for planning permission.

The application is now for 3.

All councillors have seen comments from neighbours.

D.Beswick read out the response we gave last time:

*Kingsdon Parish Council have a number of concerns.*

*Given the very low crime rate in Kingsdon, it is difficult to see the need for CCTV. Furthermore, the presence of such cameras in a conservation area is considered to be most inappropriate and would set an unwelcome precedent. It is also understood that cameras are not permitted on listed buildings. The application specifies 4 cameras but only 3 are shown on the plans. No indication of the field of view of each camera is provided and one in particular overlooks the neighbouring garden which is believed to be illegal. Two others overlook the street in front of the house and the owners would be legally responsible for providing footage of any film taken that identifies people passing by. The council is very concerned about rights to privacy of both neighbours and other villagers.*

*Once again it would appear that no consultation has been taken with the neighbours and the installation seems to be an unnecessary escalation of a boundary dispute arising from a previous planning application.*

*Finally, we are led to believe that the neighbours were also not informed of the application by the planning office. The first they heard was an email from ourselves about the parish council planning meeting.*

*Kingsdon Parish Council, strongly object to the application being granted.*

D.Beswick explained that it went to the ward member which then approved the listed building consent.

It has now gone for full planning permission.

One parishioner has contacted the police about the legal aspect.

Tim Russell, pcso, has suggested he would be prepared to talk to the Lockharts.

D.Beswick feels this would be a good idea, so he can make them very much aware of the legal side.

The lockharts are not present again this evening.

I.Dibben asked if there was an incident which has happened to make them want cctv?

D.Beswick explained there is a reported incident that Mr Simpson verbally abused Mrs Lockhart.

We don't have any idea what the level of abuse was; it was to do with the boundary issue.

They should have immediately contact the police if they were that concerned, rather than proceed with cctv applications.

The councillors still feel that the cctv is completely unnecessary. It is a wrong reason to put on cctv. It is not a precedent to set.

A parishioner said that they would then have proof.

D.Beswick said however this is a one off incident, not a series of events of repeated vandalism where cctv would be warranted.

Another parishioner also pointed out there would be no sound.

Maybe they want protection for the wife. However these are assumptions as they are constantly not present at the planning meetings to put their views and reasons forward.

We need to focus on the facts.

Do we want cctv on private houses in the village?

No.

There have been no recommendation from police for this.

W.Elliott read a section from the design and access statement:

*The purpose of the cctv system is for security purposes when the applicants are not in the property, to protect from burglary, petty theft and trespass on site. The applicant has proof in the form of eye witness of trespass incidents (during their absent from site), and also experienced minor theft of garden equipment in recent months. This has not been reported to the police, however the installation of these camera will provide much needed reassurance and protection for the applicant to prevent any further incidents occurring. The applicant has had a number of incidents on their property in relation to trespassing and theft escalating in recent times. These events are unable to be proven as no cctv evidence has been available.*

What have they done about it if it has been escalating – not contacted police, parish council or neighbourhood watch.

These points need to be in our letter of objection.

P.Waters – they may feel vulnerable and this is why they want the cameras. But this is all hearsay, and they haven't contacted anyone, so haven't helped themselves.

W.Elliott said there is also a technicality, town and country planning say they are not permitted to have cameras which are less than 10 meters apart, but two are much closer than this.

D.Beswick will draft a reply and then circulate to all councillors.

**ACTION: D.Beswick to contact Tim Russell, and draft a reply to planning to circulate to all counsellors.**

**K Hatt to email the final draft to the planning inspector.**

**Meeting closed at 9.00pm.**