**Meeting Type** Extra Ordinary

**Date**  November 7th 2022

**Time**  19.15

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

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

**Apologies**  None

**In Attendance** Cllr John Feilding, Charmaine Swift (Parish Clerk & RFO)

**Members of the Public**  22

**95. WELCOME and APOLOGIES**

Cllr Roache introduced the meeting and welcomed everyone to the Extra Ordinary meeting which was called primarily to deal with 3 planning applications that needed decisions before the meeting of November 14th.

**96. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Cllr Littlewood declared non-pecuniary interests in Planning items A & C.

**97. Planning**

a) 22/02981/FUL Chamfered End, Saddledon Street, Tysoe.

The recommendation was to support this application as it makes the property more appropriate for modern living and a general update, also correcting renovations that were not in-keeping with the property’s design and history.

Proposed Cllr Millward Seconded Cllr Tongue 7 in Favour 1 abstention

b) 22/02910/FUL Lower Grounds, Main Street, Middle Tysoe.

Cllr Littlewood spoke of this application stating that it was the latest in a series of applications for this and one other site both of which fall within the protected settlement gap under Policy 6 of the SDC Planning rules.

Steve Taylor, the developer of this project attended to firstly talk about this application and secondly answer any questions about it.

Mr Taylor said that outline planning permission was applied for 3 months ago in order to understand the reasons why planning permission would not be granted. He appreciated that the property is sited in the settlement gap and has tried to meet all the regulations of the stable block in order that the application would be approved. This building is a self-sustainable dwelling, it recycles rain water, takes heat from a ground source and power from PVA cells and stores it in batteries. It has virtually no impact on views of the AONB (Area of outstanding beauty,) and he feels the site has overcome all previous objections.

Cllr Cross commented that she understood that is a green building but with all the hard work having gone into the Neighbourhood Development Plan she could not support it.

Cllr Sinclair commented that the building sounded a fantastic idea but the community voted in the NDP not to allow this sort of development and as representatives of the neighbourhood therefore he could not support this application.

Cllr Tongue commented that there had been 12 other sites in the village that had claimed the same as Mr Taylor and were “self-build” dwellings. He could not support this application.
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Cllr Littlewood commented that this application breaks the BUAP and natural environment Policy 6 and read a short excerpt from Tysoe’s NDP and said it did not cover new builds and could not support the application.

Cllr Roache asked if there were any further comments or questions, of which there were none.

The recommendation was proposed that councillors object to the planning application.

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

c) 22/02764/VARY ,Old School Room, Main Street, Tysoe.

This property already has permission granted under application 20/02887/FUL and this variation is simply the moving of an internal wall.

The recommendation was to make no representation.

Proposed: Cllr Mills Seconded: Cllr Cross 7 in favour 1abstention

d) 22/02935/FUL, Construction of an anaerobic digestion facility, comprising silage clamps, digester tanks, lagoons, administrative buildings, landscaping and access.

Cllr Roache spoke to those present describing how this plant worked, what feed it uses, and how much transportation of feed to the project and gas and effluents from it. It is basically a large industrial gas plant bringing lots of traffic to the area and would be plainly visible from AONB. He stated that it was an unwelcome and very opportunistic application. The application was submitted 3 or 4 weeks ago and is now up on SDC’s Planning website. People now have until November 21st to make comments on the application and that Tysoe Parish Council are working with neighbouring Parish Councils who will be affected by the development to fight it.

Cllr Cross said that the development although is described at “green” it spoils the view from an AONB and will bring a large amount of traffic which will cause pollution.

Cllr Littlewood addressed the “green” issue. Saying that the government supported AD’s originally as a way of cutting household waste.

AD’s produce Methane, CO2 Hydrogen Sulphide, Nitrous Oxide and other gases. 20% of the Methane gas produced is used to power the plant the rest is transported to Banbury and injected into the national pipeline. It also produces liquid and solid digestate. And the CO2 is sold off.

The original criteria for these developments was they needed to do more for the greater national good than local harm. The traffic to and from this development will use the A422 and part of the Tysoe Road, it will go through Pillerton Priors. For all the above reasons Cllr Littlewood could not support the application.

Cllr Sinclair asked if the pipework on the development would be buried underground, she was advised that it would not.

Cllr Tongue stated that the land that would be used for this development was farmland which would become an industrial site.

Cllr Bardey noted that from what he had read about this development it had both a minor and major negative effect on the village, he also pointed out that the tree survey carried out did not cover all of the site of the development.

Cllr Feilding said that he had now been contacted by Acorn, but they had still not spoken to AONB. He also said that he did not believe that Acorn would not be carrying out flaring off. He stated that there would be real traffic problems and had asked for a list of the farmers who had been approved for contracts. To date he had heard nothing.

Cllr Roache told those present that they needed to spread the word to villagers to go onto the Planning Portal and could copy and past DCllr Feilding’s comments, but their own words would be better. The main reasons for objecting to the application are:
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Impact on the landscape

The traffic impact – Pollution

Damage to roads

Congestion

Danger

A member of the public asked if the Simon White study had been looked at with regard to “Landscape sensitivity?”

Cllr Roache said that Acorn had not behaved well or professionally. It is a start up company backed by Spanish money.

Cllr Littlewood said that Acorn’s traffic survey had only looked at 1km of the A422 and Tysoe Road when considering Accidents and carrying out a traffic survey in March of this year.

When asked about the MOD facility close by, Cllr Feilding stated that they were aware of what was going on. Cllr Roache said that they did not wish to engage with Tysoe Parish Council.

A proposal was received to object to this planning application.

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

**99.** **Stansgate Consultants**

With regard to engaging Consultants to assist with the objection to the AD. It was proposed that Tysoe Parish Council pay the first £500 of fees to Stansgate.

Proposed: Cllr Littlewood Seconded: Cllr Tongue All in favour

**Correspondence**

1. Letter from Lodders

A letter has been received from Lodders, solicitors to Mr & Mrs Forrester.

Cllr Roache had previously circulated the letter to all Councillors and said that there were 2 courses of action that could be taken:

1. To apologise
2. Not to apologise as it was felt Councillors had nothing to apologise for.

Cllr Cross stated that she had received a telephone call from Mr Forrester recently and that she had tried to help. It was felt that Councillors had become involved in this problem in order to help resolve the issue, but had made matters worse.

After further discussion, all agreed that Cllr Roache should seek legal advice before any action be taken, and that he could consult a local professional who deals with conflict resolution.

The proposal was received that TPC seek professional advice on how to resolve this issue amicably with no further legal action.

Proposed: Cllr Sinclair Seconded; Cllr Cross All in favour

**100 Street Naming**

With respect to the new development and its name. Several ideas had been put forward over previous days. These were put to a vote, and the winning name was Templar’s Close.

Proposal to accept the name of Templar’s Close as the name for the new development at The Orchards, due to the village’s connection with Knights Templar.

Proposed: Cllr Cross Seconded: Cllr Millward All in favour

**Action: Clerk to communicate this name to Street Naming Dept at SDC. Actioned 9.11.22**

**101 Next meeting – November 14th 2022 at Tysoe Primary Schook**

**102 Cllr Roache closed the meeting at 8.50pm**
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