

Minutes of the Tysoe Parish Council Meeting  
Held on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016 at 7.15pm

Present: Cllrs Sinclair, Collier, Cressman, Locke, Risk  
In attendance: None  
Public: 9

1. Welcome to the meeting given by the Chair, Cllr Allen.	Action/Date
Cllr Sinclair welcomed all members of the public.	
2. Apologies – Cllrs Allen and Littlewood	
<p>3. Declaration of interest</p> <p>The Deputy Chair, Cllr Sinclair reminded councillors of the need to declare any interests in any of the agenda items. None declared</p>	
<p>4. Planning – 16/01038/VARY – Barns at Oxhill</p> <p>Councillors asked the Clerk to speak to the Planning Officer to query why this was sent to Tysoe Parish Council as this proposal is within the Oxhill Parish.</p> <p>5. Neighbourhood Planning Update</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair asked for an update. Cllr Risk said that he had received notice from two of the working group that they are no longer able to participate.</p> <p>That has brought the 9 members down to 7 but Cllr Risk had since heard that another person had volunteered. Shirley Cherry is willing to be a volunteer. Cllr Risk proposed that Shirley’s offer be accepted. All Parish Councillors agreed.</p> <p>Cllr Risk said that this still however leaves us one short and we have provisionally arranged an informal briefing meeting on Tuesday next. Cllr Risk proposed that even though we do not have the required numbers the briefing should go ahead and discuss the terms of reference and get their agreement and answer any questions that they may have. It will get them familiar with what we are talking about and ask any questions they may have. Cllr Risk then suggested the other volunteer/s could be briefed as they come onboard. Cllr Risk asked for the Councillors agreement to that informal briefing. The briefing meeting will be attended by Cllr Sinclair, Collier and Risk. All Councillors thought this was a good idea and all agreed.</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair then started to go through the various items that had come out of the April meetings in relation to the NP.</p> <p>Firstly it was suggested that the old Neighbourhood Planning Group should be asked if they would like to support the new working group. Cllr Risk said that if they wanted to join then perhaps they could be considered, as members of the working groups. Cllr Sinclair proposed that they could be invited along to the meeting on Tuesday to potentially join the new working groups.</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair asked what the other councillors thought about the invite. Cllr</p>	

Cressman asked for clarification. Cllr Collier and Cressman and said that yes they thought this was a good idea.

Cllr Sinclair said that things had not been pleasant in the village and it would be good to move forward as one village and put personal things behind us.

Cllr Cressman said that whoever does want to be involved has to put the past behind them.

Cllr Locke said that he would like to throw out a few thoughts that might appear negative but are important to the village. These were:

- If the NP can go forward as we all wish it to go forward that would be marvellous but there are other thoughts around the village which question just how important is the NP and do we really want to give it this level of importance or should the Parish Council be concentrating on other issues that matter more to people.
- Not sure that people have still not really got their minds around on what the NP is all about.
- Secondly there is an issue undoubtedly with the length of time it has taken people to volunteer it shows that there is a degree of apathy.
- There does appear to be a small minority within the village who appear not to want to work with the PC. The last public meeting was an example of that we had half truths misrepresentations. We could have a possibility of months of unpleasant meetings. My real concern is that this is pulling the village apart and not together.
- A member of the public made a comment and then left the meeting. Cllr Locke said that is the kind of attitude that is not helping to take this forward.
- Cllr Locke continued. There were calls for Cllr risk to resign I don't think that members of the public realise how much effort Cllr Risk has put into the NP.
- The meeting itself was not as the meeting should have been conducting. It was primarily the views of people against a development.
- Comment on the precept £5k of that was on the NP can we really substantiate spending that money on a project that may not be successful. We are spending lots of public money. I have had comments that the £5k should go towards things that people can see like mending the pot holes.

Cllr Collier said that what Cllr Locke has had to say is absolutely right. Whether we should have a vote having explained what the NP is all about whilst at the same time going ahead with the working groups. If the village then says no we can leave it but if they say yes we are already underway. We all want the same thing but it seems that at the moment there are very much two groups.

Cllr Cressman said that in the meeting next week if the village decides the NP is a good thing then could we come up with an independent person to look at the NP?

Cllr Risk said that this was mentioned at the previous meeting. We said that we certainly would look at independent consultants. The difficulty with that is we put ourselves with an independent consultant rather than do it ourselves, and at potentially considerable cost. He felt that this might need to be considered, but perhaps not at this stage.

Cllr Collier said that the a vote on whether the village wants an NP is a particularly important before any independent consultant is engaged.

Cllr Cressman said that what an NP is needs to be made very clear. Cllr Cressman thought people had been misled; an NP cannot block development and people need to be given very clear pros and cons about what the NP is and isn't.

Cllr Risk said if the two developments that have already been put forward, one for 30 houses and the other for 40 houses, were to be approved go we need to consider through what may be the purposes of doing an NP would be.

Cllr Sinclair asked said do you want a survey? Cllr Risk said that we need to be clear on whether the village is sufficiently informed as to make a judgement. A paper produced could be regarding the pros and cons of a questionnaire.

Cllr Sinclair asked whether a Consultation evening in the village hall might be a good idea.

Cllr Cressman asked whether the question had ever been asked.

Cllr Risk said what response rate we would need to achieve to be able to accept the result. and take it as a yes to go ahead or no to stop. Cllr Collier said that we could take advice from SDC about this.

Cllr Risk put forward the suggestion that the working group meetings etc go ahead; and the question of the whether a survey goes ahead or not be undertaken in parallel. This was then proposed by Cllr Collier and seconded by Cllr Locke. All Councillors agreed.

The Clerk was asked to send an email to the former NPG members to ask if they would like to join the working groups, agreeing to the new terms of reference, and on that basis come along to the meeting on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> April.

Cllr Sinclair asked if any members of the public had any comments.

Member of the public said that the PC is right and we cannot go on like this. We do elect you to make decisions on our behalf if we don't like what you we can vote you out next time.

The NP is not just about the village it is the whole Parish and all the some 300 fields that surround the parish.

The mapping programme which provides much of the data for the NP has been

lodged with Warwickshire County Council. Every single planning application that comes in has to refer to this data.

On third draft when Cllr Risk said that there needed to be more consultation. There is nothing in the PC minutes to say whether any further consultation has ever taken place. All I have heard tonight is more dithering and little action. Do we really need more working groups or questionnaires? Today the House of Lords have looked at legislation that would give planning permission without the need to refer to local authorities.

If you do not have a NP you will have ribbon development all around the village. The longer we stay without a NP the worse it will be for this village. We cannot procrastinate any longer.

Another member of the public stood and said that there were several things that she felt very strongly about. The individual thought that the Neighbourhood had already voted that they did want a NP because of the very high response rate that had been achieved on the questionnaire. Like Cllr Locke I do not want to go back over things. How disrespectful this was of the public. I heard nothing about why the NPG had stood down I have just today looked up about the responsibility of the Councillors and honesty and openness is just not there. If you say to people things need to be done they will come forward to get things done.

The reasons given for Cllr Howles standing down are untrue. I have heard that Chris Butchart was visited by Cllr Risk and sworn and shouted at. And that a Councillor's wife had sworn and shouted at Cllr Howles. Shouldn't Cllr Risk resign after all the trouble he has caused? How can you spend £7k on the NP?

Member of the public asked why all the documentation had been taken off the website. Cllr Risk said that the Parish and Community website had a link through to the NP website and it was that website that was taken down.

Member of the public then asked why the old NP Planning website was taken down. The Clerk responded that this site was hosted by the NPG and not the PC. The Clerk had put some of the documents onto the Parish website but some were too large. The Clerk would speak to SDC about getting the larger files loaded.

Member of the public then asked about the fact that the parish had said that they preferred a series of small developments on the outskirts of the village and demanded that Cllr Risk answer this question? Cllr Cressman asked what the point of this was. We are trying to move out of this negativity.

Cllr Cressman said that there was a question from a member of the public at the meeting about transparency and honesty of the Parish Council and she could not think why anybody would say such a thing. If members of the public say anything it is simply their opinion and nothing to do with anybody on the PC.

Member of the public said that the springboard for going forward is the second draft of the NP that has been prepared and there is not a lot more work to do. I am sorry to say that the only way to move forward is for Cllr Risk to step to one side.

<p>Cllr Cressman said that there was a question about transparency and honesty and I cannot think why anybody would say such a thing. If members of the public say anything it is simply their opinion.</p> <p>Cllr Cressman said that we all make mistakes and I am fed up with the personal comments that are being.</p> <p>Cllr Collier said that it is correct that there were to be small developments. There was a fundamental problem in that it said NDO and the PC wanted to go with Site Allocation. The level of consultation was not I believe sufficient that would be acceptable to the inspector.</p> <p>Cllr Risk said that there is a little bit more to do than Prof Hunter is suggesting.</p> <p>Cllr Sinclair closed this section of the meeting</p>	
<p><b>6. Financial Administration -</b> The following payment was advised:</p> <p>Npower Electricity supply from 01/01/16 to 31/03/16    £536.76</p> <p>Proposed by Cllr Locke seconded by Cllr Cressman.</p>	
<p><b>7. Councillors' reports and items for future agenda</b></p> <p>Cllr Risk said that two large applications have been put forwarded. One, The Manor Oak proposal, is pre application and one a full outline planning application. Should the council put forward any comments or questions in relation to that pre application consultation? He recommended for the next PC meeting.</p>	
<p><b>8. Closure of the meeting – 20.15 pm</b></p> <p>The next PC meeting on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2016 at 7.15pm. Agenda items to the Clerk by 27<sup>th</sup> April</p>	