

BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting 14 February 2022 at 7.30pm

Present

Cllr Dugmore (Chairman) Cllr Christian-Carter Cllr Gates Cllr Kettle
Cllr M Mann Cllr Thomas Cllr Tressler

Absent

3 Vacant seats

In Attendance

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

Public

6

Following the conversations that took place at last week's public meeting, Cllr Dugmore advised that a point was raised regarding the status of the community centre and its future use and availability. A statement was made that it could be taken away at any minute and be built on as the owners are just fund managers. Cllr Dugmore advised that this is not strictly a correct statement and clarified there is a lease being arranged on the building currently that will secure it for a number of years and there are several projects that the owners have been involved in around the village and have been constructive and supportive of our use of the building.

22/28 Apologies

Andrew Maliphant – Project Officer

22/29 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Mann declared a pecuniary interest in item 6.3.

22/30 Dispensations

None.

22/31 Minutes

i. Ordinary Parish Council meeting held on 10 January 2022.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council meeting held on 10 January 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Mann, all in favour).

ii. Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on 24 January 2022.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the extraordinary parish council meeting held on 24 January 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour except for Cllr Tressler who was absent from this meeting).

- iii. Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on 7 February 2022
It was pointed out that there were at least three members of the public present at the meeting and therefore the minutes need to be amended to reflect this.

It was **RESOLVED**, with the inclusion of the above amendment, to approve the minutes of the extraordinary parish council meeting held on 7 February 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Mann, all in favour).

22/32 Public Forum

- i. Sarah Morgan requested clarification regarding land behind Old Road and its inclusion in the Local Plan. She was advised that there is a brief update contained in the District Council Update. If the information is not adequate/appropriate, then Cllr Dugmore advised her to contact him directly to discuss the matter further.
- ii. Matt Ridley raised the issue of the playground and that his daughter and her friends (aged 11/12 years) would like to be involved in the project working group rather than just participating in Facebook polls. Cllr Thomas advised that he had received a copy of Mr Ridley's email and will be addressing this at the next working group meeting (15 February 2022). Matt advised that he has a background in the street furniture industry, has landscape architect contacts and would be happy to contribute as appropriate.
- iii. The question of when the Q&A update from last week's public meeting will be available. Cllr Dugmore advised that this will be published on the parish council website. The Business Plan is still to be discussed.

22/33 Planning Matters

- i. **22/00258/FUL**
10 St Michaels Close, Bishop's Itchington – Side extension to create bedroom and wet room facilities.

It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council's response to this planning application would be 'No Representations.' (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

- ii. **22/00201/FUL**
Mill Pit Farm, Hambridge Road – Proposed replacement of dilapidated stables with new stables and associated tack room with storage.

It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council's response to this planning application would be 'No Representations.' (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

iii **To receive feedback from Properties and Environment Group on Pre-planning Meeting with Terra regarding Plough Lane**

Cllr Mann removed himself from the meeting whilst this item was discussed. This item is to provide feedback on the meeting held with Terra and the notes of the meeting have been circulated.

It was clarified that the Clerk will advise Terra of the wording within the current BINDP (Reg 16) version regarding housing developments on community land as they have used at an old version of the plan.

The notes of the pre-planning meeting will be attached to the minutes of this meeting (Appendix C).

22/34 County, District & Parish Liaison

SDC/WCC

Cllr Kettle had circulated notes appertaining to the District Council prior to the meeting.

- Review of the sites within the Local Plan: Cllr Kettle advised that local government is required by law to have a Local Plan in place. Following a change of rules and regulations in 2011, a 'Local Strategy' was compiled for the period 2011 – 2031. There is a requirement to review the strategy approximately 10 years into the plan. Due to the proposed merger of Stratford DC and Warwick DC, the view was taken to review the plan for a longer period. A joint South Warwickshire plan will be prepared. As part of this, the 'call for sites' has gone out. This is the starting point of the process together with a question to residents and businesses regarding what the focus of future development should be within seven identified categories. 550 responses have been received identifying possible development sites across the two districts although the decision on the land chosen is a long way off and will depend on the overall strategy chosen. Sites Bish A (site next to the surgery at the top of Ladbroke Road) and Bish B (strip of land behind houses on Old Road) have been included in the Sites Allocation Plan. In terms of the Local Plan, we will not know if they have been included until public consultation and a public enquiry have been completed (approximately 2025). Prior to the new plan, the Sites Allocation Plan is progressing as a further 20% of housing area needs to be identified. This has gone through several public consultations, but the process is yet to be completed and whether sites Bish A and Bish B become 'real sites' will depend on the outcome of this. Currently, Bishop's Itchington new housing has delivered 180% of what is required of it within the Core Strategy that runs until 2031. If the site behind Old Road is currently being surveyed, we will only know why when a planning application is submitted by the landowner. Any planning application will have to be considered against the principles and planning policies in place at the time and the parish council and residents will have the

opportunity to record any objections they may have to the planning application.

It was clarified that if Stratford DC and Warwick DC merge, any existing plans will be superseded by the new joint Local Plan when it is adopted.

County Council:

- The budget process has been completed resulting in a Council Tax increase for the financial year 2022/23 of 3.75%
- There will be a focus on Children Services/Children with Educational Needs to enhance and improve services provided to children across the entire district.
- Police and Crime Panel review of the increase in Council Tax for the Police and Crime Commissioner resulted in an increase of £9.75. This amount was below the amount originally requested and the commissioner was advised that he will have to demonstrate to the panel the efficiency and performance improvements he is delivering throughout the year.

22/35 Finance

1 Monthly Financial Report

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the Monthly Finance Report ending 31 January 2022 (Appendix A). (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Kettle, all in favour).

2 Bank Reconciliation Report for January 2022

The bank reconciliation report for January 2022 had been completed by the Clerk. Cllr Gates has checked it and is happy with it.

3 Accounts for Payment

It was **RESOLVED** that the Accounts Payable on 14 February 2022 be authorised for payment by Cllrs Thomas and Cllr Gates (Appendix B). (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Gates, all in favour).

4 To carry out annual review of the following documents:

i. Financial Regulations:

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Financial Regulations for the forthcoming financial year to be reviewed February 2023 (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour)

ii. Risk Management

It was pointed out that the Risk Register and Asset Register go 'hand-in-hand' and it appears that, although insurance is in place, there is a high risk in the short term as some areas may be underinsured. An amendment to the first line of the document is therefore required so that the impact goes from 'medium; to 'high' risk until a revaluation of the assets is undertaken.

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Risk Management document following the amendment of the first line to change the impact from medium risk to high risk until the insurance values on the Pavilion, Chapel and Play Equipment is

reviewed. The Risk Register to be reviewed February 2023. (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour)

iii. Assets Register:

It was **RESOLVED** that, except for reviewing the insurance valuations for the Pavilion, Chapel and Play Equipment, the Asset Register is approved and adopted, to be reviewed February 2023. (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour)

22/36 Plans for Queens Platinum Jubilee

Emails have been received from Warwickshire DC and Bishop's Itchington Women's Institute asking, what, if any, celebrations the parish council is considering/organising to celebrate the Queens Platinum Jubilee.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the Clerk will canvass local organisations to see what plans they have, what support they require and therefore, what help we can give/direct them to.

22/37 Code of Conduct for Councillors

Following discussion, it was resolved to adopt the Code of Conduct for Councillors. (Proposed by Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, five in favour and two abstentions (Cllrs Gates and Tressler)

22/38 20's Plenty for Warwickshire Campaign

- i. To consider approach from 20's Plenty and their request to pass a motion regarding 20 mph speed limits "where people live, work and play"
This was initially circulated verbatim by WALC and read as a campaign group telling councils that we want you to pass a motion saying the above without the necessary consideration as to whether the motion is appropriate. Cllr Dugmore explained that he had requested this be included as two separate items on the agenda as there is merit in the point they are raising, however we may not be minded to do this for the reasons they have asked us to do it. It was suggested that the problem with introducing a 20mph zone is enforcing it the 20mph speed limit although, it may encourage some drivers to reduce their speed.

The proposal was put forward to Warwickshire CC and although making 20mph mandatory was rejected, WCC agreed to hold a public consultation to establish the appetite for 20mph limits in towns and villages across the district and working group has been established to look at how this could be implemented.

It was **RESOLVED** that we do not do a 'cut and paste' of the text that has been requested however, we will move to item 11 ii, and consider 20mph as

an option. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour)

- ii. To consider requesting 20 mph speed limits in Bishop's Itchington:
The following were raised in discussion:
- It was suggested that some roads in the village would benefit from a 20mph speed limit,
 - No speed surveys have been undertaken in the village for some time,
 - It was noted that a traffic survey is currently being undertaken near 3 Gaydon Road,
 - There are numerous parts of the village where it is not possible or appropriate to exceed 20mph
 - Would we want a 20mph limit on the main road or is it better to allow traffic to flow freely?
 - That a Road Safety Working Group be established to look at suitable roads for a 20mph speed limit, promote speed watch and look at other road safety related items

It was **RESOLVED** to the Warwickshire CC Working Group write to advise them of the parish council thoughts on introducing 20mph zones and in parallel, canvas local opinion to gauge public support. (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

22/39 Climate Emergency:

Cllr Thomas attended a 'Climate Action' training day. The purpose of the day was to reinforce and communicate to local/parish councils what tools and what tools and actions are available to promote climate emergency.

It was suggested that a tab be included on the parish council's website for climate action that is populated with useful information for the community to enable the community to take actions and measures to reduce their carbon footprint to help fight climate change. He advised that one parish council has purchased a heat imaging camera that residents can borrow to ascertain where heat loss is occurring in their property.

It was suggested that:

- the scope of the challenge would need to be agreed i.e., is it the council, the village or whole parish.
- Agreed targets would have to be identified.
- Are we looking at wider issues?
- Raising awareness of the issues should be the first step.
- Need to get residents/businesses onboard.

It was **RESOLVED** to incorporate a tab entitled 'Climate Action' on the parish council website and subsequently start to populate the tab with information regarding climate action and useful information associated with this subject. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).

22/40 Environment & Properties

1. Children's Playground:

Working Group Update: The playground requires refurbishment and, as of last week, it was agreed to remove the funding/fund raising for the playground away from the Recreational Facility Project. This means that the Playground Working Group now face the task of raising approximately £150,000 to refurbish the playground. Matt Ridley agreed to join the working group which will be meeting tomorrow (15 February) to focus on:

- Consulting with the community as to what they would like in the playground,
- To raise funding to cover the cost of the agreed scheme – the group does have access to a professional fund raiser,
- How to involve children/young people in the design of the scheme,
- Inclusion of an outdoor gym,
- Provision of a youth shelter/meeting place.

2. BINDP:

This is still progressing through the system. Updates have been provided as requested. Matthew Neal at SDC has been replaced with yet another SDC Officer. Following successfully passing this stage, the plan goes out for to referendum and if a positive vote is received the plan is adopted.

Cllr Tressler requested that it be recorded that, if it had not been for Cllr Thomas's persistence and his absolute desire to get this 'over the line', then the plan would not have got to this point. He has picked up the mantle and needs to be credited for the patience he has shown and the amount of hard work he has put into it.

3. Recreational Community Facility Project (RCFP):

i. Feedback from public meeting and to decide if another should be held:

All councillors were present at the public meeting. There was quite a lot of vociferous feedback/constructive feedback and Cllr Dugmore reiterated his thanks to those who contributed to this. It was agreed that the general feedback was:

- More information is required,
- Specific, detailed information requested i.e., putting the council tax bands on the website, making the business plan available etc.

It was stated that the start of the meeting was disgraceful, and Cllr Dugmore was praised for his handling of the situation, but this 'coloured' the whole meeting although there was some constructive comments coming forward.

The public made it clear that they needed more information before they felt able to make an informed judgement on the project.

It was suggested that there had been a lack of preparation by the parish council to present a tangible offer to the public.

Although it was agreed that the public urgently needed additional information in response to the questions raised, opinion was divided as to whether this should be another public meeting or via another vehicle.

It was **RESOLVED** that a second public meeting is not to be held but, the parish council absolutely commits to getting the information out using as many avenues as possible and allowing the public the opportunity to ask further questions through the established channels. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

ii. To review revised business plan:

Several points were raised in discussion including:

- Costs/revenues – assumptions behind how these figures were reached,
- Will the parish council need to supplement the running costs and if so by how much and for how long?
- Gaps in the finances – what is missing? Requires work before the plan is made public.
- Risk assessment is meaningless,
- Concern regarding the numerous references to BISA and its involvement in running the facility.
- BISA will not be responsible for managing any shortfalls in running costs.
- Requires a robust and tested model of what the likely cost is going to be for the council taxpayer.
- A dedicated management is likely to be required.
- Beccy Mc Daid has volunteered to manage the facility.
- There is a finite period to get the business plan out to residents
- Any elements of the business plan subject to material change should be focused on.

Cllr Kettle agreed to put a structure together that Andrew Maliphant can then populate, and it was suggested that this should then be checked by an independent professional.

A discussion ensued as to whether to stop the printing/delivery of the survey form. It was raised that any delays could jeopardise funding opportunities and each day would add additional costs to the build. Due to time constraints the discussion was curtailed, and it was agreed that Cllrs Dugmore, Gates, and Kettle would, outside of the meeting, get the business plan to a position as by which it can be presented to the village presenting the full implications of a credible worse-case scenario. Due to the timescales involved, delegated approvals may need to be used and it was advised that this would need to be included as a report item on the next ordinary meeting of the parish council.

Due to time constraints the remaining agenda items are to be held over until the next ordinary meeting of the parish council.

22/41 Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council is scheduled to take place on Monday, 14 March 2022 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

Meeting closed at 22:10

Signed.....Chairman Date.....

APPENDIX A

Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/21 and 12/02/22 inclusive. Includes due and unpaid transactions.

Excludes transactions with an invoice date prior to 01/04/21

| | Budget 2021/2022 | Reserve Movements | Actual Net | Balance | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| INCOME | | | | | |
| Bishops Itchington Parish Council | | | | | |
| 10 | Precept | £90,000.00 | £0.00 | £90,000.00 | £0.00 |
| 20 | Council Tax Support Grant | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 |
| 30 | Burials | £2,000.00 | £0.00 | £2,880.00 | £880.00 |
| 40 | Sec 136 & Other Reimbursements | £1,300.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | -£1,300.00 |
| 50 | Playing Field | £400.00 | £0.00 | £9.98 | -£390.02 |
| 60 | Interest | £100.00 | £0.00 | £14.41 | -£85.59 |
| 70 | Grants | £0.00 | £0.00 | £7,395.00 | £7,395.00 |
| 80 | Misc | £250.00 | £0.00 | £60.00 | -£190.00 |
| 90 | VAT Refund | £0.00 | £0.00 | £9,732.12 | £9,732.12 |
| 100 | Pavilion Fund | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 |
| Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council | | £94,050.00 | £0.00 | £110,091.51 | £16,041.51 |
| Total Income | | £94,050.00 | £0.00 | £110,091.51 | £16,041.51 |
| EXPENDITURE | | | | | |
| Bishops Itchington Parish Council | | | | | |
| 200 | Salaries & Expenses | £30,047.00 | £0.00 | £21,611.19 | £8,435.81 |
| 210 | Councillor Allowances | £500.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £500.00 |
| 220 | Administration | £7,320.00 | £0.00 | £7,802.13 | -£482.13 |
| 230 | Grounds Maintenance | £21,914.00 | £0.00 | £19,641.33 | £2,272.67 |
| 240 | Cemetery & Churchyard | £5,340.00 | £0.00 | £1,087.31 | £4,252.69 |
| 250 | Playing Field | £10,692.00 | £0.00 | £2,491.05 | £8,200.95 |
| 260 | Grants | £7,500.00 | £0.00 | £6,894.80 | £605.20 |
| 270 | Neighbourhood Plan | £2,500.00 | £0.00 | £2,450.00 | £50.00 |
| 280 | Other Expenditure | £1,000.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £1,000.00 |
| 290 | VAT | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 |
| 300 | Contingency | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 |
| 310 | Parish Office | £5,290.00 | £0.00 | £4,116.70 | £1,173.30 |
| 320 | Pavilion Project | £5,000.00 | £0.00 | £12,280.50 | -£7,280.50 |
| Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council | | £97,103.00 | £0.00 | £78,375.01 | £18,727.99 |
| Total Expenditure | | £97,103.00 | £0.00 | £78,375.01 | £18,727.99 |
| Total Income | | £94,050.00 | £0.00 | £110,091.51 | £16,041.51 |
| Total Expenditure | | £97,103.00 | £0.00 | £78,375.01 | £18,727.99 |
| Total Net Balance | | -£3,053.00 | | £31,716.50 | |

APPENDIX B

| Bishop's Itchington Parish Council | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Accounts Payable 14 February 2022 | | | | | |
| To Whom Payable | Ref No | Ex Vat | Vat Payable | Totals | |
| <i>Urgent accounts paid since last meeting requiring the formal approval of the council</i> | | | | | |
| E Biddle (office rent 01/02/22) | s/order | £ 411.67 | £ - | £ | 411.67 |
| Onecom (phone & b/band 31/01/22) | d/debit | £ 63.73 | £ 12.75 | £ | 76.48 |
| Three Business (Mobile Sim 24/01/22) | d/debit | £ 4.17 | £ 0.83 | £ | 5.00 |
| E-ON (Pavilion Electricity 20/01/22) | d/debit | £ 149.35 | £ 7.47 | £ | 156.82 |
| | Sub-total | £ 628.92 | £ 21.05 | £ | 649.97 |
| <i>Accounts for payment on 14 February 2022</i> | | | | | |
| J Kirton (Salary) | 220201 | £ 47.70 | £ - | £ | 47.70 |
| V Powell (Salary) | 220202 | £ 76.16 | £ - | £ | 76.16 |
| K Stevens (Salary) | 220203 | £ 1,374.49 | £ - | £ | 1,374.49 |
| HRMC (PAYE) | 220204 | £ 337.32 | £ - | £ | 337.32 |
| WWC Pension Fund (January) | 220205 | £ 429.86 | £ - | £ | 429.86 |
| AT Architects (Printing) | 220206 | £ 30.00 | £ 6.00 | £ | 36.00 |
| Community Project Ltd (Room Hire) | 220207 | £ 70.00 | £ - | £ | 70.00 |
| DOR-2-DOR Warwick (Distribution of Survey Forms) | 220208 | £ 180.00 | £ 36.00 | £ | 216.00 |
| V Powell (Expenses - phone cable) | 220209 | £ 10.00 | | £ | 10.00 |
| V Powell (Expenses - phone top up) | 220210 | £ 20.00 | | £ | 20.00 |
| PWC (Bus Shelter) | 220211 | £ 45.00 | | £ | 45.00 |
| Royal Mail (Response Plus Licence) | 220212 | £ 99.70 | £ 19.94 | £ | 119.64 |
| Russell Pike (Leaflet Printing) | 220213 | £ 199.00 | £ 39.80 | £ | 238.80 |
| Thomas Fox Ltd (Shrub Borders/Leaf Collection)) | 220214 | £ 233.46 | £ 46.69 | £ | 280.15 |
| Waterplus (Pavilion Water) | 220215 | £ 19.62 | 0 | £ | 19.62 |
| | Sub-total | £ 3,172.31 | £ 148.43 | £ | 3,320.74 |
| | TOTAL | £ 3,801.23 | £ 169.48 | £ | 3,970.71 |

Appendix C

Notes of Pre-Planning Meeting with Terra - Land at Plough Lane Via Zoom Platform 17 January 2022

Present: Cllrs Adam Dugmore, Judith Christian-Carter and Norman Thomas,
Karen Stevens – Clerk to the Council
Jordan Langdon-Bates – Land and Development Director
Richard Pitt – Strategic Planning Director
Tamsin Almeida – Planner

The representatives from Terra were advised that, due to transparency, notes will be taken from the meeting and will be circulated with the minutes from the next parish council meeting.

- Terra's land interest is land off Plough Lane that is currently agricultural land,
- Terra company background:
 - Small development company formed six years ago,
 - Was birthed originally out of Banner Homes
 - Primarily a land motion company although work alongside two-house building businesses and technically their sister businesses, essentially the four owners of Terra own Hayfield Homes and Living Space Housing,
 - Hayfield Homes is a developer of high-class homes and locally they recently completed a development of 51 houses in Southam,
 - Living Space Housing is primarily a deliverer of affordable housing associated with registered providers to bring forward sites that meet local needs to ensure residents have affordable housing mainly in villages but also in larger locations. The closest site to Bishop's Itchington that Living Space Housing will be delivering on is part of a project in Gaydon providing 35 units of affordable housing,
- Terra have been involved in the land at Plough Lane for approximately two years and are slowly looking at the technical constraints the site has,
- The development would be contained within the area marked by the red line although their land holding interest with the landowner is slightly larger,
- Focus is delivering something more in keeping with village and of scale but also meets registered demand and is not going to be too overwhelming in terms of a more affordable scheme,
- Freedom of Information request made in 2021 to SDC and it identified a shortfall of local properties – 190 people on the housing waiting list identified Bishop's Itchington as their preferred location,
- A further FOI question gave a breakdown as to the type of accommodation most people were seeking, it was and it was overwhelming weighted towards one and two bedroomed properties,
- Submitted a pre-application request to SDC and had various meetings including ones with the Rural Housing Enabling Officer (Sarah Brooke-Taylor),
- Expressed to DSC that they wanted to bring this site forward and looked at the policy context under which they could do this CS.15 Distribution of Development, G. Local Needs Scheme and AS.10 Countryside and Villages, Community a.

- Propose 30 properties of which 100% will be affordable housing. Eight of these will be bungalows
- Site is contained within itself with a good relationship with the adjacent Persimmon site. Frontage is not too overbearing, and the site retains the pond and as many trees as possible. Will take advantage of the public footpaths that are around site and through the Persimmon development to give connectivity,
- Access point is indicative as they have not yet had any formal input from Highways,
- This site has been included in the Site Allocations Plan and the Issues and Options consultation for the South Warwickshire Local Plan,
- Policy (DP 2) is also included in the BI NDP that was submitted November 2021,
- Housing Needs Survey 2016 is considered out of date therefore one of the reasons for wanting to meet is to discuss the Housing Needs Survey, to determine if a new survey is to be undertaken and discuss progress on the NDP,
- Positive benefits:
 - i. Provision of 100% affordable housing,
 - ii. Additional bungalows for the village,
 - iii. Financial contributions to local schemes.

Questions and Answers:

Q. To confirm that the whole site will be affordable housing.

A. Yes, all 30 dwelling will be.

Q. The housing mix table, clarification needed of the top two rows.

A. They are maisonettes – two x one bed and two x two bed.

Q. Referred to a FOI request, what was the scope of that – district level or parish level request?

A. It was to the local planning authority.

Q. What was the scope of the response? Did they respond in terms of numbers for the district or the parish?

A. Both. The district as a whole and then specifically Bishop's Itchington were they indicated a shortfall.

Q. What was the scale of the shortfall that they indicated within the parish?

A. They did not have the information for the parish.

Q. 190 people said they would like to live in Bishop's Itchington, how many of those 190 would qualify for housing in Bishop's Itchington i.e., do they meet one of the five criteria of local need?

A. SDC did not give them that information hence they have asked about the Housing Needs Survey to help.

Q. What is a preference and what is a local connection? Following the last question/answer it is understood that it is not information that was shared by SDC. One the things we are looking at is the existing community and how it helps them. You talked about contributions to

local schemes and thinking from a whole community of 2,500 residents, what does having this development on their doorstep bring them?

A. In terms of a financial contribution (s106), We would engage with the Parish/residents to determine how best that money could be allocated. As a company we have been involved in a lot of different schemes which benefit residents. A prime example locally is Hayfields Terra undertook a scheme on the edge of Stratford to deliver 35 houses alongside the regeneration of the Guardhouse to be used as a community building. We always look to deliver on site community benefits or improvements to other local facilities and it is something we are proud of by leaving our mark in the local area as a legacy.

The comment was made that s106 is a liability that Terra cannot avoid so the parish, we would have to consider what other contributions are likely to be considered i.e., looking at the projects that are ongoing.

Q. Relationship with the Persimmon site whereby you talked about current footpaths and public rights of way. Something that did stand out on the pdf that was previously circulated, the pdf did not highlight the actual public right of way that is the footpath but had highlighted a path through the privately maintained Chapple Hyam estate which is a 'dead end' terminating at a fence. What solutions do you have in mind for resolving that and making it a continuous footway?

Also, if you logically follow that footpath laid in the Persimmon estate you end up on the Gaydon Road and therefore a quite a long way from the village.

A. We are here to look at the options of movements and hopefully the opportunity will exist at some point to provide a further connection into the Persimmon scheme and the public footpath to give people a choice of movements.

Q. The southern side of Plough Lane has a longstanding ongoing drainage issue. There is a ditch and there is a dispute over the ownership of the ditch and as a result a resident further down Plough Lane gets his lounge flooded on a far too frequent basis. The red line on the map has been carefully drawn so as not to incorporate it but at the very least we need to make sure there is no exasperation of that problem and ideally, we would like to see some resolution to it.

A. If development is to come forward, access would need to be considered and any drainage matters would, at that point, need to be looked at. Essentially, any scheme that came forward would not be allowed to exasperate it and if we can deliver a scheme that improves it, that is what we would do.

Q. At the point where you are proposing access, there is a culvert under the road, so it switches from the north side to the south. There is a French drain on the north, a culvert under the road and a ditch on the south and that ditch carries down a lot of silt that causes a lot of flooding issues which must not be exasperated.

A. If we are intending to put in an access, we would be looking to put in a whole new drainage system, it would hopefully improve that and ensure that anything at that point is then maintained as we would look to have all highways adopted.

Q. In terms of the building types and materials, in the terms of the way energy costs are moving therefore what are we looking at in terms of materials to maximise the efficiency of the buildings, provision for renewable energy and, ensuring come 2030, we will not be buying petrol cars so do all of these have provision for charging of electric vehicles generating their own energy where possible and retaining as much as they can.

A. This is certainly something we will be providing on site as this is something Hayfield and Living Space already do on developments. Every house comes with an electric charging

point (proper charging point, not just a connection) and from a Hayfield perspective every property come with an air source heat pump. We are already looking at the requirements in the 2025 Building Regulations for efficiency.

A. In response to a previous question about the needs specifically about Bishop's Itchington, although we do not have that data, we have feedback on another question that gives more context which was percentage of affordable homes against the net provision since 2011 and that found 623 homes have been built of which 72 affordable homes (including Bishop's Hill).

Q. Housing Needs Survey can the parish council expand as to what your intentions are in relation to that – will one be undertaken to support the Neighbourhood Plan. Until a housing needs survey is completed it is difficult to know exactly what the level of need is for the parish.

A. Neighbourhood Plan is at Reg. 16 Consultation. We are aware that we now need, after the gap of five years, a new Housing Needs Survey and that is something we will have to discuss as a full parish council this year. Your ideas and proposed plans are predicated on the basis that we do the Housing Needs Survey and that it comes back positive in terms of there is several people over and above that we knew in 2016 who require affordable housing in the village and who lives or has a connection with the village hence meeting the five local needs criteria. If this happens, this is the only way this plan is ever going to 'see the light of day' because as you have clearly stated from the core strategy that any further development particularly that outside BUAB must be community lead. When a Housing Needs Survey does go out, it will be our survey, compiled by the parish council using open questions seeking what needs exist rather than what was run previously a leading question proposing a solution and asking for views on it. It is unlikely to be the company used in 2016. We are aware of the need of a new survey and are in the process of compiling the survey and it is likely to be spring/early summer.

Q. The whole field is 100% ridge and furrow . It is not clear if you have taken this onboard or how you are going to get around it, but the parish council has already set the very important precedent on the Bovis Homes development off Knightcote Road in insisting that the developer did not build any of their 84 homes on the part that was ridge and furrow. The precedent has therefore been set as the parish council is serious about retaining any form of medieval history we have in the village and ridge and furrow falls into this category.

A. We understand and recognise this, and we have dealt with ridge and furrow in other locations and it is not absolute to preventing developments depending on the quality and quantity of ridge and furrow that in the exists in the vicinity and a survey would need to be undertaken to better understand the quality of what we have here.

Q. If the site is built out, what do you foresee or intend the situation to be regarding ongoing maintenance as we have found management companies and service charges to be very divisive in what we would like to be an inclusive and cohesive community particularly as you have a suds basin included and the maintenance of a suds basin puts some disproportionate liabilities onto the likes of a parish council in their maintenance. What would you be looking at as a solution to that?

A. Housing associations tend not to like having private managements if they can avoid it due to the potential add on costs for their tenants. At this stage, we would have to have a discussion as to what we think would be the best approach for everyone.

Q. The Sites Allocation Plan has been mentioned and the two sites that are currently identified. The one that is the most northern one is particularly challenging in terms of topography, and we have not been able to find much in terms of submissions, whether they are being actively promoted etc. What is the parish council's vision on these sites?

A. Both sites have been allocated by SDC and are not promoted by the parish council and SDC deemed both to be deliverable sites. The context is if you look in the most recent Sites Allocation Plan, SDC have tiered all the potential deliverable sites. The bottom tier, tier 7, contains all settlements that are deemed to have significantly over-delivered. Bishop's Itchington is identified as one that has significantly over-delivered.