

Tysoe.org.uk
 Minutes of the Tysoe Parish Council Meeting
 Held on Monday 2nd October 2017 at 7.15pm

Present: Cllrs Sinclair (Chair), Locke, Allen, Collier, Haines, Littlewood & Tongue
 In attendance: DC Feilding, David Roache (Chair of the NPG) & the Clerk
 Public: 7

	Action/ Date
<p>1. Welcome to the meeting given by the Chair, Cllr Sinclair.</p> <p>The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed all Councillors and members of the public.</p>	
<p>2. Apologies – Cllr Cressman.</p>	
<p>3. Declaration of Interests</p> <p>The Chair, reminded councillors of the need to declare interests in any of the agenda items. Cllr Sinclair declared a pecuniary interest in item 7 the payment to Frank Mann Farmers and an item in correspondence the rent view of Breech Furlong by Sheldon Bosley Knight.</p>	
<p>4. Acceptance of Minutes</p> <p>All Councillors agreed the minutes of the meetings held on the Monday 4th & 18th September and these were duly signed.</p>	
<p>5. Informal Public Participation (Chair read out the statement about public participation)</p> <p>Members of the public asked to speak during the Kendrick Homes debate.</p> <p>Member of the public has heard that Warwickshire County Council (WCC) is seeking to develop Herberts Farm. The Chair asked all councillors and the Clerk if a Dale Partridge had contacted any member of the PC regarding this site. All Councillors present stated that they had not had any contact with Dale Partridge on this matter. The Clerk was asked to check with Cllr Cressman</p> <p>David Roche said that not only have WCC not spoken to the PC they have not spoken to the NPG. There had been communication with CC Cockburn during the early drafts of the NP and said the NPG had advised that they were minded including Herberts Farm as a reserve strategic site. CC Cockburn had responded that they did not have any plans, but they would consider this. No further contact had been made.</p> <p>In the next draft of the Neighbourhood Plan Herbert’s Farm will be removed as a strategic reserve site. There were two reasons for this; access to the site is extremely difficult and the site did not get tremendous support from residents.</p> <p>Member of the public stated that they had real concerns that WCC are not able to ride rough shod over the whole NP process.</p> <p>It was stated that when the new farm house built and owned by WCC came forward the PC were not consulted.</p> <p>The Herbert’s Farm site had been put forward as a SHHLA site.</p>	

<p>DC Feilding said there is a difference regarding a development for several houses rather than a single dwelling.</p> <p>The Parish Council will write a letter to Dale Partridge and his line manager regarding this matter, stating that there is a democratic process that is being undertaken and that they cannot run amok in this way, copies to be sent to CCs Williams, Cockburn, Seccombe and Graham Sidaway, the acting line manager of Dale Partridge.</p> <p>Member of the public said that they had an issue to raise regarding the NP. The Chair agreed that this could be raised under the Neighbourhood Plan section of the meeting.</p>	<p>Cllr Sinclair</p>
<p>6. Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>David Roache (DR) advised that the process of redrafting continues albeit slowly because of the number of comments that had been received. The NPG were also writing a couple of new policies. Some better maps and separating some of the issues to make things clearer were also being undertaken.</p> <p>Revisiting the assessments to ensure that the green spaces are as robust as possible. Neil Pearce has been asked to look at the site assessments that are being carried forward into the next draft and he will commence work on this as soon as possible.</p> <p>SDC have identified the plan as needing to be reviewed under a strategic environment assessment. The NPG have asked SDC to hold the need for a strategic environment assessment in the hope that the next draft of the plan will remove the need for this to be done.</p> <p>The next meeting of the NPG will be on 31st October in the village hall, and all members of the public are welcome to attend.</p> <p>Member of the public stated that there is a dereliction of duty by the NPG and the PC because his note expressing these serious concerns had received no response whatsoever.</p> <p>I wish to raise my concerns regarding the lack of transparency and consultation with the public and like to know what the PC intend to do to restore public confidence.</p> <p>David Roache responded that the member of the public had not been singled out amongst the other two hundred responses we received. The NPG are working to respond to everyone. David Roache said that he did apologise if the member of the public felt that they had been ignored.</p> <p>As for wasting public resources David Roache was not sure what the member of the public meant.</p> <p>David Roache said that he did not know where the resident's comments were coming from but that he and the NPG would not be ignoring them. These would be responded to, but they wanted to get on and get this NP delivered.</p> <p>Another member of the public said that on the NPG a little bit concerned that we have gone down a rabbit hole regarding allocation of housing numbers. Their main concern was that the NPG are sticking to the idea that we have an allocation of housing whereas SDC do not think that this must be achieved.</p> <p>DR stated that in terms of the allocation they had moved away from that. The NPG had asked a very specific question of SDC and they are very clear not to couch this as a target. Our second draft of the NP will use it only in terms of information and it will not be hide bound to find 84 houses.</p> <p>Member of the public said they were rather concerned when the NP went to identifying single sites. If the PC allocate those sites, the developer will tie your hands. Very difficult not to give planning permission for a site that you have allocated.</p> <p>DR responded to this by saying that the NPG were drawing a very tightly defined boundary and identifying sites where development could take place.</p>	

7. Financial Matters

The following payments were proposed by Cllr Locke and seconded by Cllr Collier. All Councillors agreed payments:

Date	Payee (Expenditure)	Particulars of Payment	Amount
01/09/2017	Timberlyte Ltd	Two picnic tables	373.20
08/09/2017	Grant Thornton	External Audit	360.00
30/09/2017	Paul Pitts	Playing field September 2017	52.00
02/10/2017	David Roache	Reimbursement for legal advice sort re SDC Planning Decisions	23.40
02/10/2017	David Roache	Reimbursements for map printing for NP	360.00
27/09/2017	Thomas Fox Landscaping & Maintenance	Mowing verges 04/09/17 and 18/09/17	585.60
04/09/2017	Sue Haines	Reimbursement for printing of welcome packs	32.00

All Councillors were asked to advise the Clerk of any items in this year's budget which they no longer felt needed to be budgeted for and to advise the Clerk of any items that they want to add to the budget for 2018/19. Both these pieces of information should be with the Clerk by 27 October 2017.

General meeting on the 6th November and the following Monday 13th a budget meeting. Clerk asked to send an email to confirm the date.

8. Planning

17/02443/VARY – Lower Ground, Tysoe – DC Feilding had spoken to Planning who did not like proposed gated entrance to the new development. DC Feilding confirmed that he had objected.

Cllr Tongue asked if the PC could give an opinion. The Clerk advised that the official time had now ended but that comments could still be entered, and these would be included if it went to Planning Committee.

Cllr Tongue stated that the design was not right, and it could lead to a bank of letter boxes and with home deliveries etc. there will be delivery lorries turning around in the gateway.

One of the Councillors felt that the only reason to have this as a gated community was to drive up the house prices and no other reason.

Cllr Tongue felt that the PC should still register the PC's opinion particularly as WCC Highways had offered no objection.

A question was raised about why the PC did not meet to discuss this. The Clerk advised that she had tried to call a meeting but had insufficient response. Cllr Collier said that if this kind of thing happens again the PC should meet.

All Councillors agreed that the PC should object for the following reasons: gated development not suitable in a rural village location and it would create health and safety issues on the highway.

Update on Kendrick Homes – At the PC’s behest DR had instructed Chambers in Birmingham regarding this matter. The advice had been circulated to the PC. In summary they had said that unfortunately because of the time that had elapsed there was very little you could. In making that comment they did make one or two pertinent points.

- Development in sensitive location. Surprised that local planning authority did not require an actual sample of the materials to be used.
- Given that they did not insist on a sample it would be very difficult to challenge the decision on a computer-generated image

Whilst it is damning of the District Council it does not appear that a great deal can be done, and I do not think spending any more public money on this is advisable.

There had also been a response from a member of the Planning Committee saying that they could not comment on a planning application and they had suggested that comments were referred to DC Feilding. DC Feilding said that he had not seen the Planning Committee yet but that he would on Wednesday and he would discuss this with them then.

Cllr Littlewood said that it is the Chair of the Planning Committee that needs to respond in writing to the five questions. Cllr Allen said that there are a lot of things coming out that do not seem correct and right now DC Feilding was not getting the responses the PC and village need. Cllr Allen said that DC Feilding was not representing Tysoe. Cllr Allen said that it is not Kendrick Homes that are at fault and that he was fed up with the responses the PC were getting. It just keeps going around and round. We do not want to know what is happening at Gaydon, we want to know what you are doing for Tysoe.

Member of the public said you cannot go for a judicial review and therefore we can only go for what the legal advice said, and we need to get Kendrick Homes to change their decision on this. The Planner misinformed the Planning Committee about this. How do we get the Planning Committee to accept that they were misled regarding this application? If you ask them they need to explain their decision and if they do not, they should be reported to the Monitoring officer.

Member of the public went on to say that the local government ombudsman had indicated that he would take this up but that he needed someone that is nearer to the site to raise this issue and he suggested the Clerk lived near to the site. The Clerk stated that she did not feel comfortable with this as it could be a conflict.

Member of the public stated that the front of the first plot is being constructed of Fortecrete and it looked terrible. The Planning Committee are not responding at all. He would like the Planning Committee to visit the site particularly Cllr Barnes and Cllr Kettle to see what a horrendous entrance this now makes to an historic village. Cllr Littlewood added his endorsement to what had been said. This is complete dereliction and you do have to wonder what the reasons are that allow these things to slip. I strongly urge that we get this addressed

Cllr tongue said that he had urged DC Feilding to ask the Planning committee to come out before this went to planning committee for a decision. If we feel that things are not correct we could ask the

The Clerk

<p>Police Commissioner to investigate this matter. Cllr Littlewood asked that DC Feilding take up all these issues with SDC.</p> <p>Cllr Collier agreed with the comments and has concerns that this is now allowed to create a precedent.</p> <p>It was agreed that a letter should be sent to the Monitoring officer, Phil Grafton regarding this matter and the code of conduct.</p> <p>Robert Weeks had said that asking for actual samples was now in place. The planning officer seems to have breached their own rules.</p> <p>17/02897/TREE – Dinsdale House, Baldwins Lane – Tree committee will report back.</p>	
<p>9. Actions from Previous Minutes</p> <p>Parking on village greens & grass verges – Cllr Allen had ordered the sign today. Cllr Littlewood said that in Ettington they had placed “no parking signs” by the school. It was felt that all the parking by the school was creating a safety issue in Tysoe. The clerk was asked to speak with the Clerk in Ettington and the Ettington School secretary regarding the signs.</p> <p>Cllr Allen said that regarding the matter that Cllr Haines had raised asking people not to park on the grass verges he did not know how this could be controlled. Cllr Haines said why not just place a couple of no parking signs to see if it has any affect. After some debate regarding creating off road parking rather than allow the grass to become worn it was agreed that all Councillors think about creating some car parking spaces. Cllr Collier offered to meet with DC Feilding to see how this had been addressed in Radway and could be applied to Tysoe.</p> <p>Speeding – Cllr Cressman wanted an update from DC Feilding. DC Feilding had spoken to the police commissioner and raised the point about speeding and a vague answer was given. The Clerk was asked to write to the Police Crime Commissioner.</p> <p>SDC Legal Agreement regarding affordable Homes – DC Feilding had spoken to Sarah Brook Taylor at Affordable Housing and John Gordon. Trying to sit down with the Chair of SDC but he had been in China and he was now in Manchester. DC Feilding was asked when the next Cabinet meeting was. He responded that it was on Monday, but this matter was not on the agenda? Cllr Littlewood said that we must call for a meeting with SDC about all these matters. A letter to Phil Grafton, Head of Legal cc to Chris Saint.</p> <p>Freedom of information request – Cllr Littlewood stated that he had spoken to the Clerk about this, the Friday before the Clerk was due to go on holiday and that she had said that she would deal with this. The Clerk could not recall that this was how the matter had been left and so asked Cllr Littlewood to send a copy of the email and to provide her with the exact date and rough time of this telephone call.</p>	<p>The Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Collier</p> <p>The Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair</p> <p>Cllr Littlewood</p>
<p>10. New Matters</p> <p>None</p>	
<p>11. Correspondence</p> <p>There were three pieces of correspondence one from a resident regarding the two developments by Church Farm Court and Main Street. They were forwarding the response they had received from SDC. The second was a letter from Sheldon Bosley Knight regarding the rent review at Breech Furlong. The recommendation was not to conduct a review.</p>	<p>The Clerk</p>

<p>The third piece was from the Women’s Institute asking the PC if they would like to take part in their Christmas tree decoration event in the Church in December. All Councillors agreed that this was a nice idea, but that Councillors did not really have the time. The Clerk was asked to send a letter.</p>	
<p>12. DC Feilding (5 Minutes)</p> <p>DC Feilding gave an update on the following issues:</p> <p>Horton Hospital BAD Kineton</p>	
<p>13. CC Williams</p> <p>CC Williams was not present but had sent an update by email which had been circulated to all Councillors. The update including information regarding WCC finances, Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service & and health and wellbeing in the district.</p>	
<p>14. Councillors Reports and items for future agenda</p> <p>Cllr Tongue had seen the gentleman regarding the creating of a driveway in Old Tree Lane. Cllr Tongue had suggested that the resident submits a small plan to SDC to see if he needs planning permission. The PC has no objection to allowing vehicles to pass over the green.</p> <p>Hedge outside the Elms on Sandpits Lane and Cllr Locke was going to look at this. Cllr Locke reported that he had and that he thought the hedge was ok, but he agreed to look at this again.</p> <p>Cllr Allen said that the two new picnic tables had arrived. He asked if Cllr Sinclair could check that the hedges are going to be trimmed before too long.</p> <p>Cllr Locke advised that the bench in memory of absent friends had now been placed on the playing field.</p> <p>Cllr Locke also advised that the sign showing the car park opening hours was now in place. Cllr Locke also reported that the two businesses operating out of the Old Fire Station now have evening clients and the clients were getting locked in. Keycode was proposed by Cllr Locke and seconded by Cllr Allen all councillors voted in favour.</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair asked if the firework display was happening this year. Cllr Allen reported that this was not yet certain. All Councillors did agree that if the Sports Pavilion want to hold the firework display they would have no objection subject to the usual conditions, regarding insurance etc.</p>	<p>Cllr Locke</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair</p> <p>Cllr Locke</p>
<p>15. Closure of the meeting to the public and press – 21.00pm</p>	