**Meeting Type** Ordinary

**Date** January 10th 2022

**Time**  19.15

**Venue**  Tysoe Village Hall, Main Street, Tysoe

**Councillors Present** David Roache (Chairman), Jacqui Sinclair (Vice-Chairman), Jane Millward, Littlewood, Matt Jarvis-Cleaver, John Tongue, Alison Cross

**Apologies**  James Bardy (Absent)

**In Attendance** Cllr Chris Mills (WCC) Cllr John Feilding (SDC), Charmaine Swift (Parish Clerk & RFO)

**Members of the Public**  29 + 2 attendees on behalf of Cameron Homes development - David Onions, Pegasus Group, Planning Consultant, Kate Tait, Land and Planning Consultant)

**146. WELCOME and APOLOGIES**

Cllr Roache introduced the meeting and welcomed all present.

Cllr Roache introduced Kate Tait and David Onions, representatives of the Cameron Homes development in the village, who were present to answer questions from the public and Parish Councillors about the planning application that would be discussed later in the meeting. He also said that as this item on the agenda was likely to take some time to cover he would be changing the order of the agenda to allow any members of the public present who have questions but might need to get home, could leave earlier. With this in mind, Cllr Roache asked if anyone present wished to raise any points other than those concerning the Cameron Homes Development during the Public Forum.

James Bardy - Absent

**147. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None declared.

**148. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

i. The Council confirmed the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of December 13th 2021 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Proposed Cllr Littlewood Seconded Cllr Jarvis-Cleaver **All in Favour**

Cllr Roache signed the minutes.

**149. PUBLIC FORUM – 15 MINS ONLY**

Members of the public will have the opportunity to speak about the Cameron Homes Development later, any other issues may be raised now. One member raised a question regarding the postal vote for the referendum. Cllr Roache said that he would be happy to deal with this under the NDP point. No further questions were raised.

**150. WARD MEMBERS UPDATE**

1. CC Chris Mills. Cllrs acknowledged receipt of a report from Cllr Mills sent that day. Cllr Mills

Highlighted the salient points:

i) Retired teachers are being encouraged to return to teaching.

ii) Scams

iii) Local bus travel - Consultation

iv) Young People with Special Educational Needs

v) Conflict resolution

vi) The Voice of Warwickshire

vii) The New Year’s Honours List

This report can be viewed on the website. No questions were raised from the Councillors.

b) Cllr Fielding gave no written report as he felt there was very little to offer. He did however give a short verbal report.

 The amalgamation debate went ahead, we are now waiting for the Minister of State to confirm that Stratford District and Warwick District Council can join forces.

As a matter of interest, I attended a presentation on the budget. The total Council Tax will bring in budget for Warwickshire is £114m of which Stratford District Council get 7.5% The rest of the monies go to the County Council, Police and 3.3% is for local precept.

Listed Buildings are the responsibility of the Conservation Officer – Home Farm got planning permission in 2017 and it has been held up and they were finally given permission, although not full, last year. Various conversations have been had and Cllr Feilding is hopeful that this will result in a shake of the pile of applications that are there.

Cllr Feilding has also had conversations regarding people not receiving correspondence back when they have made comments on the Stratford Planning Platform. Cllr Roache said that this subject would be discussed shortly and invited Cllr Feilding to make his points then. Cllr Feilding agreed to do so.

No questions raised of Cllr Feilding.

154. iii) Neighbourhood Development Plan – Update – Cllr Roache

The question on the referendum ballot paper – **Do you want Stratford District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Tysoe to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?** This may seem an odd question to ask on a referendum on a Neighbourhood Plan. In common with most of the people in this room, I had expected the Referendum to simply say, “Do you approve of the Neighbourhood Plan.” Yes or No. I should say right at the beginning that the Referendum is organised entirely by Stratford District Council and Tysoe Parish Council has no dealings with it whatsoever. I can only assume that the question on the ballot paper is the standard question that is there for all neighbourhood plans.

It is very simple, if you vote “NO” to the question you are effectively saying that Stratford District Council can make planning decisions in the future in a vacuum ignoring everything that residents of Tysoe have said over the last 7 or 8 years in consultations and in submissions and come to conclusions without reference to the preferences and to the safeguards expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. If, however you vote “YES” that you do want Stratford to take into consideration the views of residents in the Neighbourhood Plan when determining planning applications. Then what you are saying is that in future you want Stratford to take note of all of the preferences, all of the safeguards all of the policies which apply to the entire parish of Tysoe, in any future the Neighbourhood Development Plan in any future planning applications. So,if you say no, you don’t have a neighbourhood plan, you don’t have a bit of it, you don’t have an inkling of it, you don’t have a few paragraphs or clauses. You don’t have a neighbourhood plan and therefore Stratford will make decisions for you. If you vote yes, then the Neighbourhood Plan, as it stands is the document that Stratford will refer to in future on the style of houses, where they’re build, whether they have an impact on heritage assets in the village, whether they have an impact on the views, if they have an impact on the rural aspect of the village or anything else that is contained in the plan. Some of the discussions you are going to hear in a short while about Cameron Homes is because we have got a plan that is nearly made so we can exert some influence over the decision that is going to be made on planning applications. Especially those as large as the Cameron Homes one because we have a nearly made plan. If that plan were to be voted down it ceases to become nearly made it just vanishes off the statute book, so that is my statement. I would implore everyone to vote on Thursday week. Clearly the more people that vote, the larger the tun out the more democratic authority the plan has. The facts are that there is no minimum turnout, and the result will be by a simple majority, so if 3 people turn up and two vote for it and one votes against, then the plan is passed at referendum.

I will not make any comments about what has been said on Facebook, a lot of you may follow that and there is a lot of misinformation, a lot of misunderstanding and a lot of commentary from people who haven’t even bothered to read the plan. It is unfortunate, there is nothing we can do about it, nothing we will do about, but please read the plan and understand it for yourselves. Don’t take for gospel what is being said on Facebook.

We will move on now to the application or discussion of the revisions of application 20/03658/FUL

154. iv **Planning – Cllrs Tongue, Millward, Littlewood - Planning Committee**

20/03658/FUL Land of Sandpits Road. Cameron Homes Development

Cllr Roache informed everyone that this application had been totally messed up by Stratford District Council. We have been notified rather late of changes. We had assumed that those who had made comments on the original application would be notified that revisions had been made. Clearly that is not the case as many of you have found out and earlier today, one resident who I applaud, took the trouble to chase SDC, The Planning Officer in Stratford District Council is off and so he spoke to his boss. Cllr Roache read out a couple of paragraphs from the reply email from Stratford District Council.

“Now that we are aware of our mistakes, and we will put it right.

1. We omitted to reconsult neighbours; we would normally and should have consulted neighbours, so we will arrange for that consultation to be carried out. It will allow a reasonable time for response, probably 10 days. But as I advised earlier any responses received before we make the decision will be taken into account.

2. We gave the incorrect date for the Parish Council to respond, we will therefore reconsult the PC giving them a further period to respond. Probably 10 days. We will do all of this tomorrow. (The email is dated 13.1.22).

I am sorry that this exercise was not carried out correctly and confirm that we will ensure that all previous consultees and respondents are consulted on the changes.”

The PC had previously, some few days ago, chased the Planning Officer when we realised that they had not consulted with residents on this, and we got a response which Cllr Millward had and read out the pertinent bit of information.

Cllr Millward read “In my experience I would say that with all planning applications undergo some form of amendment prior to determination to improve the layout, design or overcome technical issues. I am sorry that local residents are disappointed, but we do not have the capacity to reconsult residents on all amendments. As I said, the information is on the public website, and I will continue to accept comments up to the determination. Actually, SDC do far more than is required by the regulations. This amendment involves changes to the layout rather than fundamental changes hence does not require a new application.”

Both emails conflict one another. Cllr Roache apologised on behalf of the District Council. Cllr Feilding was asked for his comments on this issue. To which he said that part of the discussions he had last month were with the new head of Planning, Adrian Harding, I am trying to get to him before he becomes engrossed in the District Council’s approach to how planning should be. We have got to do something about the planning system, as we have got to do something about the conservation side. Cllr Feilding asked for copies of both emails as he wished to take them up with the new Planning Officer. Cllr Roache said they would be taking the matter up themselves, most probably with David Buckland

Cllr Roache pointed out that this issue was not of Cameron Homes doing.

Cllr Roache detailed how the next part of the meeting would run:

1. Cameron Homes to respond to the original objections that the Parish Council made on the application.

2. Open for Parish Councillors to ask questions

3. Open to the public for questions & comments.

With the number of people attending, we will try and limit times so that we do not go on until midnight! But I would like to give everyone the opportunity to speak.

Cllr Mills then requested his leave of the meeting as being on the SDC Planning Committee he felt he should not be present for these discussions. Cllr Roache agreed, Cllr Mills left the meeting.

**Cameron Homes**

David Onions – Cameron Homes response

Ref: Paper 1

David Onions listed the Parish Council’s previous comments and noted the changes and comments made by Cameron Homes he also reported that lots of small changes had been made to the proposal in order to comply with the Parish Council’s requests and was now hopeful that the proposal will be accepted by the Tysoe Parish Council and Stratford District Council.

David Onions noted that the density has not changed. The scheme has changed quite a lot.

Integration of affordable homes – the plan for affordable homes has changed radically with 11 homes being integrated across the site.

Some comments about traffic. Particularly traffic using Sandpits Road. Another key change in the layout since the original comments is that the access previously proposed on Sandpits Road has now gone. That’s been replaced by solely pedestrian and cycle access, so all vehicle access will be going via the site’s main access adjacent to Heritage Field. In itself that has not removed the traffic from Sandpits Road. I know that the Parish Council have raised the potential about Sandpits Road being one-way and I know that has been passed on to the Highways Authority. The Highways Authority have not objected to the amount of traffic associated with the proposal nor have they objected to utilising potentially Sandpits Road or any other road in Tysoe.

Flood/run-off mitigation/Suds provision - we have produced a revised provision assessment and drainage strategy, which has now been passed on to the Environment Agency and Water Authority.

Sustainable Energy – The Neighbourhood requires us to look at sustainable energy. The fundamental change to the plan is that whereas it involved the use of LPG for heating etc, that has now been dropped from the proposal and Cameron are now proposing that heat and water will be supplied by an air source heat pump. Details of that have been passed on to the Council and I know that the Parish Council have received it as well.

Home working spaces – another policy of the Neighbourhood Plan which states that it supports space provision for homeworking. 27 of the homes have more than 1 bedroom which facilitates potential homeworking. Each home will have broadband etc.

Poor provision of off-street parking. – Parking provision has been increased with the use of tandem parking which has the advantage of avoiding all frontages being dominated by parked cars and allows for more landscaping.

Pedestrian Access – The pedestrian footpath has been rerouted to provide a direct route to Sandpits Road away from the historic stone benches set in the wall.

We have gone a long way to meet the principal aspirations of the Parish Council, and made a lot of changes, we hope now that we are not far away from the plan being supported by the Parish Council hopefully by the planning officers in Stratford.

**Councillors’ questions or comments**

Cllr Millward expressed concerns about traffic on Sandpits Road. As it is not wide, and cars are getting bigger, if you watch two cars trying to pass one another on that road, they do not have much room to pass. I still do have a big concern about that. But in terms of the housing and sustainability of the site the mix and layout are much better.

Cllr Sinclair said that if you come by the Cemetery and were to turn left into Sandpits Rd opposite there is a rough piece of hedge, trees and a ditch, when looking at the plan I could not decipher who is going to end up with the responsibility of that she wanted to know who would be responsible for that area. It was said that the hedge belonged to the field behind it. I want to clarify that because in 5 years’ time somebody will come back to the Parish Council and say it’s your responsibility and the ditch.

Cllr Roach asked if he could comment on that, as there is a proposal, and maybe you could clarify it – that there are 3 options regarding the amenity land at the north end of the site, the hedge down the western side of the site and some of the landscaping within the site. One of the proposals is that the Parish Council adopt that and become responsible for its maintenance and that Cameron would put a sum of money aside which would be the discounted value of looking after that in perpetuity. I think that is something that we would certainly look at and it would cover the piece of land that Cllr Sinclair was speaking of as well, I think. It is something that the Parish Council would look at, but it is a slightly separate discussion from this, and we’ll get down to a negotiation about how much money is enough to look after that land in perpetuity, and what we would be expected to do to maintain it. But the Parish Council is not about taking on unlimited liabilities for these sorts of things, but may be in the best position to maintain it to the satisfaction of residents.

**Cameron Homes reply**

From our perspective there will not be a gap leaving a piece of land untended. It is anticipated that as Stratford no longer accept the setting up of Management Companies, those areas of land would be adopted by Tysoe Parish Council under a Section 106 agreement. There is still a Management Company intended for this site because the road is private. The larger area at the top we would intend to be adopted by the Parish Council, whether or not that includes the frontage bit from Tysoe to Sandpits Rd, there would not be a gap, it would not be left in “no man’s land” it will either be part of the development, or it would be Highways. Cllr Roach said that he felt it was important that if this development does get granted permission that the landscaping around is put in good hands so that the whole thing maintains a quality appearance in perpetuity.

Kate Tait said that could be covered in the Section 106 agreement either that it be maintained as part of the management company and it will have a plan very similar to the one you have been looking at with a definition of each area of whose responsibility it is and a figure for the amount of community involvement.

Cllr Roache asked if there were any further questions from Councillors? There were none.

**Questions from the public to**

**Kate Tait – Cameron Homes**

Q Was there a flood risk on the proposed development?

A No.

Q What evidence is there to support there is no risk, as in the past this has been an issue?

What has been changed so dramatically that this has enabled Cameron Homes to put “No” in answer to this question.

A The Environment Agency have designated this area as a Flood Zone 1 – which is very low risk to flooding. Zone 3 is a flood plain.

If Cameron Homes cannot demonstrate to the Environment Agency and the Local Authority is not a flood risk, then we are not entitled to planning permission. It is for the Environment Agency, Warwickshire CC and Stratford DC to evaluate the flood risk assessment and our drainage strategy on this application. Together with Severn Trent they critique our data.

The environment Agency together with Stratford DC and Severn Trent would look at this issue before agreeing any planning application. Cameron Homes are aware that standing water is an issue on this site which is why they have put in a retention pond that the standing water would drain into, and this then would slowly empty into the main sewer.

The principal is that when you develop a site you plan to do better than what would normally happen. In this case the “green field” site would hold water. This will not happen now.

Q Do we know that Severn Trent did the work on the main sewer which was supposed to be upgraded previously and was agreed several years ago?

A I don’t know but can find out. We would not get planning permission if all of our strategies and plans do not meet requirements. I can’t tell you where we are with this with regard to all of the consultations because I don’t know.

 Q There is the question of suspected contamination. Has the site been tested for contamination?

 A Yes

Q So there is no contamination?

 A No.

Q Has a tree survey been conducted? Of all the trees including those at the west end of the estate?

A Yes, and the revised plans have had the trees marked up to show all those that need to have work done.

 Statement from a member of the public –

Density is still in question; it is not as the Neighbourhood Development Plan has stated, the village said we need just affordable homes and bungalows we do not need large 4 bedroomed homes, and this land is not fit for 31 homes and therefore the Parish Council should not support this application and create a president for future developers.

Cllr Roache thanked the member of the public.

Kate Tait – in response

“What the Inspector said in response to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan was that there shouldn’t be an actual number put into the allocation of the site. The number of dwellings to be accommodated on the site should depend on how you address the development policies. Which is a set of policies that the district council uses when looking at planning applications and covers things like proportion of affordable housing, parking standards, garden depth, mix standards etc. We believe that notwithstanding what the village might have first anticipated from a development perspective, once land is identified for development it should be used for its optimum basis otherwise you bring pressure to use more land for developing from elsewhere. So, if you’ve got a site that is capable of meeting all those standards and providing the 11 affordable homes as required by the Neighbourhood Plan, if you have a site that ticks all the boxes with regard to requirements on site then the number of dwellings on site should not be a concern.”

Cllr Roache thanked Kate and said that was one perspective.

Q Has a further contamination test been carried out since the original test in 2020

A NO but I don’t think there was any need to carry out a further test.

Q So 6 bores the size of a tea saucer is enough to convince you that there is not any contamination in that field?

A It is for the purpose of planning permission, once you start to build you are under the jurisdiction of building regulations, and we will have a raft of conditions attached to that planning permission that in the event that we are excavating the site to put in foundations we come across contamination then there will be environmental regulations that come into play. And you are bound in any event, so notwithstanding that we believe we have done enough work to satisfy ourselves and the planning authority in terms of the planning application, the planning is only one aspect of it, we have also got building regulations, systems and environmental regulations which provide additional layers of protection once you start to develop the site. Then of course, if we find contamination once you start with a JCB on site then all those systems come into play and the responsible developer is subject to inspections from both the House Building Federation the Board of Regulations Team come out and do regular inspections in the same way that the buildings regulations team will come out and inspect the foundations.

Cllr Roache asked what was the particular concern about land contamination?

The member of the public said that when he bought his house the builder had previously built a house where there was an asbestos barn which was smashed up and it was spread over my acres. The NHBC would not issue me with a certificate until they had done a full soil inspection in my garden. My garden is very small. They didn’t find Asbestos, which they were looking for, because previous to my house there was an asbestos barn, that asbestos magically disappeared, there was no company employed to remove it or transport it or dispense with it, it just disappeared. The NHBC find elevated levels of arsenic in the soil, and the soil had to be removed to a depth of half a metre. The whole of our garden had to be cleared down by half a metre. That was transported to a new site that the builder was building on and had it dumped there in Colnbrook. That is why I am not happy.

Kate Tait

“All I can say is that Cameron Homes is a responsible builder, and we are guided by the NHBC and by all of the regulations and regulators. Cameron Homes is a responsible builder and if we find any contamination then we will deal with it in a responsible manner.

Member of the public the said that the asbestos physically disappeared, and the builder then went bankrupt 2 days before he retired, and the only place that the asbestos that was from the barn has disappeared and could very possibly be in that field.

Kate Tait said that if it was in that field then we will have to deal with it.

Cllr Roache asked that we move on. The member of the public said he had one more point to make, which was that of density. The Neighbourhood Plan says 15 houses and therefore Cameron Homes plan does not give the appropriate density of housing, which is not keeping Tysoe Special, and parking space is not good enough. The Parish Council need to support the Neighbourhood Plan.”

Cllr Roache stated that the two sites did not include amenity land and are slightly different, he would argue that the plan for this site is not high density.

**Further questions from the public**

Q Thank you for changing from LPG to Heat Pumps, are we going to have solar Panels?

A It is possible; it depends on technology.

Q Will there be water storage in the garden to catch rainwater for re-use in the toilets etc.

A No, not at the moment, but technology changes all the time.

Q There is an issue with parking on this site, and the land that Cllr Sinclair referred to gives access to the front doors of affordable homes. What is there to encourage people to park appropriately? I am very concerned about this proposal.

Cllr John Feilding pointed out that with regard to flooding, the County Council had worked hard with other construction companies, and they could be brought in to assist. He also said that during the construction period the District Council would have a list of constraints to enforce appropriate parking. Cllr Roache said that this was about after construction, looking at the possibility of a one-way road and how we stop people parking inappropriately if the application is passed.

Q With reference to flooding and the safety of a retention pond, there is no mention in terms of adhering to any regulations. The pond is steep, and is the ultimate drain off into the main sewer?

A If Cameron Homes’ plan does not comply with building regulations and all checks, we do not get planning permission. There will be fencing around the pond, and parents have to be responsible for their own children.

Q Everyone wants the Neighbourhood Plan to succeed. If it doesn’t succeed, can we still contest the application?

A Yes

Q What is the height of the boundary between the Cameron Homes Development and Heritage Field?

A A garden fence 1.8m high.

No further questions requested.

Cllr Roache asked all Cllrs to respond to the planning application.

All Councillors supported the application with various comments including concerns around parking, the possibility of a one-way system on Sandpits Road, the spread of affordable housing, the use of Air Source Heat Pumps, photovoltaic panels, and also the possibility of grey-water collection and reuse for toilet flushing, and cultivation. Concern was laso raised with regards to Seven Trent’s assertion as to the capability of the main sewer to cope with run-off fro the site’s SUDS in case of a 100-year precipitation event.

Cllr Roache stated that this was not a perfect development, but it had moved significantly since Cameron Homes first application. Severn trent have an obligation to provide water and sewage management.

No further development sites would be supported by Tysoe Parish Council as per the Neighbourhood Development plan and supporting this application did not set a precedent for further applications and the provision of affordable homes is vital. He recognised the concern over Sandpits Road and the Parish Council would look into this and make their conditions known to Stratford District Council.

Cllr roach supported the application.

A proposal was put forward for the Parish Council to support the Cameron Homes Planning application:

Proposed: Cllr Littlewood Seconded: Cllr Cross **All in favour**

**b) 21/03738/FUL Old Lodge Farm, Sugarswell Lane, Edgehill, Banbury, OX15 6HP**

Erection of single storey extension.

Cllr Millward said that this was a simple single storey extension and proposed no representation.

Proposed: Cllr Millward Seconded: Cllr Cross **All in favour**

**155 CORRESPONDENCE – none received**

**156. FINANCIAL REPORT December 2021 – Parish Clerk**

1. The Council received and approved the Finance Report for December 2021

Proposed: Cllr Millward Seconded: Cllr Jarvis-Cleaver **All in favour**

1. The Council approved the following payments already paid by the authority of the Annual Payments List or awaiting payment:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Voucher | Supplier | Services | Total |
|  | Cllr Roache –  | Signage for NDP | £56.47 |
|  | Caring for the Cotswold | Map | £460 |
|  | Village Hall | TPC room rental for 2021 | £102 |
|  | Green Energy | Street lighting | £284.14 |
|  | Charmaine Swift | Salary | £312.41 |
|  | Charmaine Swift | WFH Allowance | £26 |
|  | HMRC |  | £78.20 |
|  | Warwickshire CC | Traffic Survey | £1178.40 |
|  | Tysoe Children’s Group | Printing for referendum | £100 |

Proposed: Cllr Jarvis-Cleaver Seconded: Cllr Cross **All in Favour**

1. The Council received and approved the bank statements and bank reconciliation for the period. Cllr Roache checked and signed the bank statements and the bank reconciliation.

Proposed: Cllr Sinclair Seconded: Cllr Millward **All in Favour**

1. Budget 2022

Cllr Cross asked if there were funds available to look at other parking issues?

Cllr Cross confirmed there were funds available. He also stated that there would be Section 106 funds from the Cameron Homes development if it goes through which could be directed to these projects.

Cllr Roache spoke to the Budget from which the precept was set, as discussed.

A proposal to set the Precept at £34,345 was received. Ref: Document

Proposed: Cllr Littlewood Seconded: Cllr Tongue **All in favour**

**157. PARISH CLERKS UPDATE – No update**

**158. AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY**

**i. Employment/HR - No update**

**ii.** **Infrastructure & Environment – Cllr Cross**

**Street lighting**

Cllr Cross asked if it would be necessary to go for approval for every quote ?

There are 8 lights out in the village – all of which are obsolete. 1 replacement light is in progress and 2 more are not required, 1 at Badgers Lane, the second at Hopkin House (in the hedge).

1 light on Windmill Rd (unit 2) These will cost between £300 to £400 each to remove.

To receive and approve the removal of 3 street lights.

Proposed : Cllr Cross Seconded : Cllr Millward **All in favour**

**Action : Cllr Cross is to consider other lights and bring a proposal to the February Meeting.**

**Iv Playground & Playing Field – no update**

**vii. Road Safety – Traffic Survey Cllr Littlewood**

Action: Cllr Littlewood to prepare a report from data received and speak to it at February meeting. The report is to be published on the TPC website.

**viii. Trees & Green Space**

To receive and approve the quote for £200 given by Thomas Fox to cut the tree and bushes on Jeffs Close. Proposed: Cllr Sinclair Seconded: Cllr Millford **All in favour**

**ix. Welfare –**

**Happy to chat Bench – Cllr Cross**

The suggestion was a 1.2m bench made from recycled plastic, which it was agreed was not big enough and also not wooden as the other benches in the village. All of which are wooden.

A larger wooden bench would be more expensive, but it would be in the heart of the village.

The wooden bench could cost around £1200, the Playgroup have £400 towards the bench. It would mean the Parish Council would have to find £800. Cllr Jarvis-Cleaver said that he had sold the Apple Mac for £240 which could be used towards the bench.

To receive and approve the proposal to spend £800 including £240 from the sale of the Apple Mac, towards a 1.8m wooden Happy to Chat bench.

Proposed: Cllr Cross Seconded: Cllr Sinclair **All in favour**

**x. Affordable Homes Committee – no update**

**xi. Making Space for Nature – no update**

**159. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN – no update**

**160. DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS**

 a) 14th February 2022

 b) 14TH March 2022

 c) 11th April 2022

 d) 9th May 2022

 e) 13th June 2022

 f) 11th July 2022

 g) 12th September 2022

 h) 10th October 2022

 i) 14th November 2022

 j) 12th December 2022

**161. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & MATTERS ARISING**

a) Peacock Lane Parking

Cllr Littlewood had a conversation with PCSO Emma Turner regarding her conversation with a man at the entrance to Peacock Lane. The PCSO has given permission for the man to park in front of the stone seats and well.

Action: Cllr Littlewood to draft a letter to be sent to PCSO Emma Turner.

Action: Clerk to find previous correspondence to the Police regarding the issue of parking on Peacock Lane.

b) To receive and approve a donation of £75 to RSPB in respect of Paul Pitts

Proposed: Cllr Millward Seconded: Cllr Jarvis-Cleaver **All in favour**

c) It has been brought to the Parish Council’s notice that Lodge Farm has lighting that is not in keeping with the Dark Skies Policy set out in the Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan.

Action: Clerk to write a letter to the owners of Lodge Farm to advise them of the Policy.

**Future Agenda Items**

JS to get a quote for Copper Beach, commissioned seat and tree guard.

Street Lighting

Traffic Survey

Jubilee Arrangements –

The WI are to form a working party

(A Page is going into the Tysoe Record asking for groups to take part in the Jubilee BBQ celebrations.)

Tree planting

Open Gardens & Windmill run

TADA

School involvement – Cllr Littlewood

**162. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC AND PRESS**

Cllr Roache closed the meeting

**163. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL**

 **-**