BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

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

Present

Cllr Dugmore (Chairman) Cllr Christian-Carter Cllr Gates Cllr Kettle

Cllr Thomas Cllr Tressler

Absent

4 Vacant seats

In Attendance

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

Public

6

Cllr Dugmore advised that Councillor Michael Mann has submitted his resignation with immediate effect.

22/49 Apologies

None

22/50 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Dugmore advised that as a payee in section 8.2 he will declare a pecuniary interest. It was agreed that Cllr Dugmore would leave the room for this item leaving Cllr Christian-Carter to chair the meeting.

22/51 <u>Dispensations</u>

None.

22/52 Minutes

Ordinary Parish Council meeting held on 14 February 2022.

A minor observation was raised in that there appears to be a missing word in one of the paragraphs whereby it should read 'write to Warwick DC'.

It was **RESOLVED** that, with the above amendment to approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council meeting held on 14 February 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Gates, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Tressler).

ii. Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on 28 February 2022.

It was advised that, in 22/45 Public Forum v., the correct spelling of Darren's surname is Windrum. Also, in 22/45 Public Forum i. It was actually David Howatson speaking, and in 22/45 Public Forum vii it was Matthew Horsman who raise the point regarding modular options.

It was **RESOLVED** that, with the above amendments, to approve the minutes of the extraordinary parish council meeting held on 28 February 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Tressler)).

22/53 Public Forum

A member of the public advised that she was attending to see what happens so that she can decide if she wants to become a member of the council.

22/54 Planning Matters

i. **22/00449/PVN**

E Bates, Gaydon Road, Bishop's Itchington – Installation of approximately 205kWp of Q-cell solar panels on existing roofs.

It was **RESOLVED** to support application 22/00449/PVN as it is a good example of sustainable development but a useful and appropriate scaled microgeneration in the right place. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

ii. **21/03378/FUL**

Nemo Raceway, Knightcote Bottom, Knightcote – Regularisation of site layout, including structures, and proposed GrassRoad of internal access route.

Cllr Dugmore advised that the parish council has previously objected to this planning application on numerous grounds. There are several documents relating to this application and the other Nemo Racing planning application (21/03162/VARY see below), that have significant portions of the documents redacted. Without knowing what is in them, we do not know what information is being withheld, whether it relates to something we would object to, it may even be something the parish council may want to support, and whether it affects the planning balance. Cllr Dugmore posed the question to Cllr Kettle and he is grateful for Cllr Kettle for taking it further with Stratford DC planning to ask why this was the case.

The Head of Planning is going to investigate a number of different issues, one of which is their redaction policy as we now have a document from the applicant on which a considerable amount has already been redacted by Stratford District Council (SDC).

It was explained that everyone knows that, when they submit evidence whether for or against a planning application or the planning application itself,

this information is known to be in the public realm. Therefore, if they are sending it in themselves, they cannot object to that information being published. A planning officer can redact information if it they determine the evidence to be inaccurate or inappropriate and if it gets to Committee, it is then for the planning officer to explain why that information should not be considered.

A further issue was raised regarding SDC's 'Redaction Guidance' as the parish council is not aware of this guidance. If the parish council does not know what this guidance is, it is very hard to make an informed response. The Head of Planning has said that due to the concerns raised, the initial deadline of two weeks for receiving responses will not be imposed until the matters have been properly resolved.

Following discussion, it was agreed that we can not change the parish councils existing objection because there is insufficient evidence/information to make an informed response hence the initial objection should remain. It was pointed out that in the case of this application, 'regularisation' equates to 'formalise and grant retropective permission for the changes' that Nemo Racing have made.

It was **RESOLVED** to continue with the parish councils orginal objection to this application as lodged and to reiterate the reasons for this. (Proposed Cllr Tressler, seconded Cllr Gates, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

iii. 21/03162/VARY

Nemo Raceway, Knightcote Bottom, Knightcote – Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 09/00675/FUL dated 17 June 2009 to allow a camping use associated with existing Radio-Controlled Model Car facility. Original description of development: Permenant use of land forming part of field as radio controlled model car racing hobby club. (Upgrade of temporary to permanent permission).

This application is for the same site and is for a variation of an existing condition to allow camping associated with the model car facility. Again, there has been considerable/heavy redaction in the associated papers making it very difficult to make any comment and again, there was an objection submitted previously.

It was **RESOLVED** to continue with the parish councils orginal objection to this application as lodged and to reiterate the reasons for this. (Proposed Cllr Tressler, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

iv. To receive feedback from Planning Group on pre-planning meeting regarding TK Fisheries, Knightcote Road.

The notes of the pre-planning meeting have been circulated and are attached to the minutes of this meeting (Appendix C).

22/55 County, District & Parish Liaison

SDC/WCC

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

County Council:

- The budget has been approved as 2% rise for Adult Social Care and 1.75% general everyday services,
- Police and Crime Commissioner rise will be £9.75 per Band D household. He
 has been advised that just increasing the number of police officers is not good
 enough and there needs to be a reduction in crime and an increase in
 convictions.
- £10.2 million of savings have been identified this year together with reengineering of how services are delivered,
- £17.6 million of new money identified for the year that will be allocated specifically towards children's services,
- Covid levels are decreasing and are at their lowest levels since Christmas,
- Highway's the blocked culvert in Plough Lane has been cleared by Cllr Kettle. The bigger problem is the sand trap going up into the Persimmon estate, which, was completely blocked, and the pit was full of water. Again, Cllr Kettle cleared this,
- Seven Trent are undertaking repairs at numerous locations, of which some are unnecessary.
- County Council Grant Fund an application from Bishop's Itchington has been approved for the current financial year. The Grant Fund has been increased across the district for 2022/23 from £6,000 to £8,000
- Harbury Lane/Fosse Way traffic lights work is due to start in March,
- Hambridge Road a resident has reported damage to parked cars and a telegraph pole. Cllr Gates to email the information to Cllr Kettle.

District Council:

- Merger still working towards this. The proposal has been sent to the Secretary of State for consideration,
- South Warwickshire Local Plan is progressing with the focus currently on the anomaly of custom and self-build projects,
- Climate Change an action plan is in place and a budget has been made available. SDC is looking at how advice and support can be rolled out across the district.
- Investigating the possibility of using solar canopies on leisure centre car parks to generate energy,
- Garden Waste there is no 'early bird' discount this year,
- Looking to deliver 'food caddies' at the start of the new financial year and these will be emptied weekly,
- Council Tax increase will be £5.00 (up from £149 to £154).
- Revenue and Benefits £150 government refund for council tax bands A-D is unlikely to be paid until September at the earliest as the appropriate software package is not yet been made available,
- Social Housing Domestic Homicide Review has just been published,
- Council Tax bills must be sent out before 1 April. A Band D council tax bill for Bishop's Itchington will be £2,099.

22/56 Finance

1 Monthly Financial Report

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the Monthly Finance Report ending 28 February 2022 (Appendix A). (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Thomas, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Tressler)).

2 Bank Reconciliation Report for February 2022

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

3 Accounts for Payment

Cllr Dugmore left the room whilst this item was discussed.

The Clerk advised that the survey distribution invoice was paid in February. The invoice relating to the survey to be paid this month is for the printing of the survey and envelopes.

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

Cllr Dugmore re-joined the meeting.

Door-2-Door Invoice for distribution of the village survey. The company conceded that they had not delivered to the outlying farms, and this was a mistake but they have not charged for these. Inadequate maps had been provided to them and hence the new estates had not received deliveries. There were also some issues with some individual properties not receiving a survey but unfortunately there is no means of checking back as to what was/was not delivered. It was suggested that if we need to distribute leaflets again, the electoral roll should be used as the basis for the circulation.

4 To approve the appointment of the Internal Auditor for the financial year 2021/22:

It was **RESOLVED** to appoint Trevor Gill as the internal auditor for 2021/22 at a cost of £390.00. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Gates, all in favour).

22/57 Meeting Calendar 2022/23

It was **RESOLVED** to agree the proposed calendar of meetings for the year 2022/23. (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

22/58 **BISA**

Andrew Maliphant has emailed to say that there is currently a half day left of his time and he feels this will be adequate to complete the charity application.

22/59 Bishop's Itchington Parish Council Policies

- The Sickness Policy can be discussed at a later meeting as the review date is July 2022.
- It was raised that the Community Engagement Strategy does not mention social media.
- Equality and Diversity Policy it needs to refer to the nine protective characteristics within the Equality Act. It makes mention of rehabilitation of offenders so it should follow the direction of the act. There are sections in which they list characteristics and these need to be exhaustive or sufficiently general to accommodate all categories,
- It was agreed to postpone this item until the April meeting. In the meantime,
- Cllr Dugmore will put all the policies on the shared drive so that Councillors have access, and everyone can see all comments/suggestions/recommendations before the next meeting.

22/60 New 123+ Waste:

- Weekly food caddy collection (no. 1),
- A fortnightly recycling collection (no. 2),
- Every three weeks a general rubbish collection (no. 3),
- Add on is garden bin (+),
- The advice given is that all organic waste should be double bagged before being placed in the general rubbish bin,
- The question was raised as to whether additional waste put in black bags next to the general rubbish bin would be collected,
- Additional bins can be requested if the household meet certain criteria,
- Questions were raised regarding the smells that would be coming from the bins after three weeks especially in the summer months.

22/61 Environment & Properties

1. Children's Playground:

i. Working Group Update:

A couple of meetings have recently taken place and as a result it was agreed to request approval to release funds to replace the ariel runway/zip wire. In any plan for the new playground, this particular space lends itself to a zip wire and this is a desirable piece of equipment that will be well used.

Three quotes have been obtained and each company quoted on a like for like product in terms of length, construction, use, steel, matting, grass, installation etc. Based on a like for like product, it is the case of going for the cheapest, most cost-effective option. Anticipated lifespan of the steel equipment is 20-25 years. In terms of lead time, Proludic/RPM was eight weeks, Wicksteed is 16 and the other company failed to advise us. Warranty/guarantee are the same in each quote

It was **RESOLVED** to take option one at £12,710 (Proludic product and installed by RPM with a lead time of eight weeks) unless in the next seven days the option three figure comes back in as something better. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).

It was agreed that this decision needs to be publicised on social media. It was advised that a Facebook page specifically for the playground group has been created and the idea was to publicise this.

2. BINDP:

- Regulation 16 Public consultation commenced on Thursday 10 March 2022 and will close 5pm on Friday 22 April
 - Poster to this effect have been put up on the village notice boards and details are on the website
 - Representations are to be made to SDC using the on-line form although some paper copies are available from the office
 - During this time, an external examiner will be sought –
 CV's will be sent to SDC, but the parish council chooses
 the examiner. We can specify if there are any particular
 areas, we would like them to cover and therefore
 specialise in
 - The examiner will undertake their work following the close of the consultation period. They will submit their recommendations to SDC. If they do not approve the NDP, the plan has to be revised/re-written, and the consultation process begins again
 - If approved, it goes to referendum. 28 days' notice is given and then a polling station is set up in the village where the electors will be asked yes or no
 - If yes, the plan goes to full council at SDC
 - If no, we start all over again

3. Recreational Community Facility Project (RCFP):

- i. Feedback from village survey. 320 responses have been received.
 - Recognition that a replacement of some sort is required
 - Of the responses currently inputted, 75 in favour and 193 against
 Michael Mann has formally resigned. The parish council requested that a
 note of thanks be minuted to Michael for all the effort he put in to get the
 project through to where it was and also the members of the group that
 supported him.

22/62 Reports and Questions

- Styles Cllr Kettle advised that a style had broken for the third time allowing his sheep to escape. Several suggestions have been made that the style should be converted to a dog friendly style. The is no onus on the landowner to do this and he does have 20 styles on his land and quite a few must be fenced for sheep but are all perfectly accessible for their intended purpose. Several styles around the village have been completely demolished whilst others have been damaged to allow dogs through. Some time ago there was a parish council group called Parish Paths Partnership. Wondered whether there might be a proposal in the future to consider whether the parish council might be interested in converting styles to enable dog walkers to use them. It was agreed that this should be a future agenda item,
- Platinum Jubilee local groups are to be canvassed to establish if they are doing anything and whether they require funding,
- Police representatives use to attend parish council meetings. A regular invite to the parish council meetings to be sent (Cllr Dugmore to forward police contact list to the Clerk),
- International Women's Day Thanks to Cllr Gates for his creativity and bright ideas on the Facebook post made regarding International Women's Day and tying it in with the Petticoat Council/involvement in the parish council. Several suggestions have been made about more frequent interaction and engagement on there advertising meetings that are happening.

22/63 Exclusion of Public & Press

It was **RESOLVED** to discuss the item regarding salaries under Section 100A and exclude the public and press. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

1. Salaries:

- It was RESOLVED to increase the Clerks hours from 21 per week to 22 per week from 1 April 2022. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).
- ii. It was **RESOLVED** to pay the annual National Joint Council pay agreement once it is announced to be backdated to 1 April 2022. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).
- iii. It was **RESOLVED** to increase the hourly pay rate for the Cemetery Manager by 3% and to increase the hours paid from 2 hours per week to 3 hours per week. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).
- iv. It was **RESOLVED** to increase the hourly pay rate for the Play Area Inspector by 3%. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).
- v. It was **RESOLVED** to accept that the proposed increases, that have now been agreed, be implement from 1 April 2022. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).

| 22/64 | Date of Next Meeting |
|-------|---|
| | The next ordinary meeting of the parish council is scheduled to take place on |
| | Monday, 11 April 2022 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre. Cllr Thomas tendered |
| | his apologies for this meeting. |
| | |

| Meeting closed at 21:18 | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|------|------|
| | | | |
| Signed | Chairman | Date | |

APPENDIX A

Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/21 and 12/03/22 inclusive. Includes due and unpaid transactions.

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

| Exoludo | s ransactions with all invoice date pile | Budget 2021/2022 | Reserve Movements | Actual Net | Balance |
|-----------|--|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| INCOME | E | | | | |
| 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 | £2,940.00 | £940.00 |
| 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 | £28.38 | -£71.62 |
| 70 | Grants | £0.00 | £0.00 | £7,395.00 | £7,395.00 |
| 80 | Misc | £250.00 | £0.00 | £143,908.46 | £143,658.46 |
| 90 | VAT Refund | £0.00 | £0.00 | £9,732.12 | £9,732.12 |
| 100 | Pavilion Fund | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 |
| | | £94,050.00 | £0.00 | £254,013.94 | £159,963.94 |
| Total Inc | shops Itchington Parish Council | £94,050.00 | £0.00 | £254,013.94 £254,013.94 | £159,963.94 £159,963.94 |
| | | 201,000.00 | 20.00 | 220 1,0 10.0 1 | 2100,000.01 |
| EXPEN | DITURE | | | | |
| Bishops | Itchington Parish Council | | | | |
| 200 | Salaries & Expenses | £30,047.00 | £0.00 | £23,876.72 | £6,170.28 |
| 210 | Councillor Allowances | £500.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £500.00 |
| 220 | Administration | £7,320.00 | £0.00 | £8,448.73 | -£1,128.73 |
| 230 | Grounds Maintenance | £21,914.00 | £0.00 | £19,919.79 | £1,994.21 |
| 240 | Cemetery & Churchyard | £5,340.00 | £0.00 | £1,087.31 | £4,252.69 |
| 250 | Playing Field | £10,692.00 | £0.00 | £2,701.05 | £7,990.95 |
| 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 | £4,528.37 | £761.63 |
| 320 | Pavilion Project | £5,000.00 | £0.00 | £12,310.50 | -£7,310.50 |
| Total Bi | shops Itchington Parish Council | £97,103.00 | £0.00 | £82,217.27 | £14,885.73 |
| Total Ex | penditure | £97,103.00 | £0.00 | £82,217.27 | £14,885.73 |
| Total Inc | ome | £94,050.00 | £0.00 | £254,013.94 | £159,963.94 |
| Total Ex | penditure | £97,103.00 | £0.00 | £82,217.27 | £14,885.73 |
| Total Ne | et Balance | -£3,053.00 | | £171,796.67 | |

12/03/22 05:46 PM Vs: 8.70.

Bishop's Itchington Parish Council

Page 1

APPENDIX B

| t t t t 1 2 3 4 5 5 6 6 | | Ex Vat Incil 411.67 63.73 4.17 190.38 669.95 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 271.05 | £ £ £ £ £ £ | - 12.75 0.83 9.52 23.10 | £££££ | Totals 411.67 76.48 5.00 199.90 693.05 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| of the er t t t t t 1 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 | £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ | 411.67 63.73 4.17 190.38 669.95 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ £ £ £ | - 12.75 0.83 9.52 23.10 | £ £ £ £ £ | 411.67 76.48 5.00 199.90 693.05 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| of the er t t t t t 1 2 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 | £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ £ | 411.67 63.73 4.17 190.38 669.95 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ £ £ £ | - 12.75 0.83 9.52 23.10 | £ £ £ £ £ | 411.67 76.48 5.00 199.90 693.08 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 6 | £ £ £ £ £ £ | 411.67 63.73 4.17 190.38 669.95 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ £ £ | 12.75 0.83 9.52 23.10 | £ £ £ £ £ | 76.48 5.00 199.90 693.0 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | £ £ £ £ | 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ £ £ | 0.83 9.52 23.10 | £££££££ | 5.00 199.90 693.0 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | £ £ £ £ £ | 190.38 669.95 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ £ £ | 9.52 23.10 | £ £ £ £ £ | 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | £ £ £ £ £ | 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ £ | - - - - | £££££ | 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | ££££ | 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | ££££ | - - - - | £££££ | 47.50 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | £ £ £ | 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ | - - - | £ £ £ | 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | £ £ £ | 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ | - - - | £ £ £ | 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | £ £ £ | 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ £ £ | - - - | £ £ £ | 75.96 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 3 4 5 6 | £ | 1,322.96 280.12 429.86 | £ | - - - | £ | 1,322.96 280.12 |
| 4 5 6 | £ | 280.12 429.86 | £ | - | £ | 280.12 |
| 5 6 | £ | 429.86 | £ | - | £ | |
| 6 | | | | | | 429.86 |
| - | £ | 271.05 | _ | | | |
| 7 | | _, | £ | 54.21 | £ | 325.26 |
| | £ | 169.00 | £ | - | £ | 169.00 |
| 8 | £ | 500.00 | | | £ | 500.00 |
| 9 | £ | 42.00 | £ | 8.40 | £ | 50.40 |
| 0 | £ | 108.00 | | | £ | 108.00 |
| 1 | £ | 45.00 | | | £ | 45.00 |
| 2 | £ | 0.67 | £ | 0.13 | £ | 0.80 |
| 3 | £ | 1,900.00 | £ | 380.00 | £ | 2,280.00 |
| 4 | £ | 1,811.99 | £ | 362.40 | £ | 2,174.39 |
| | £ | 675.00 | | | £ | 675.00 |
| 6 | £ | 320.00 | £ | 25.80 | £ | 345.80 |
| | £ | 7,999.11 | £ | 830.94 | £ | 8,830.05 |
| 1 1 1 | 13 14 15 16 | 14 £ 15 £ 16 £ | 14 £ 1,811.99 15 £ 675.00 16 £ 320.00 | 14 £ 1,811.99 £ 15 £ 675.00 16 £ 320.00 £ | 14 £ 1,811.99 £ 362.40 15 £ 675.00 16 £ 320.00 £ 25.80 | 14 £ 1,811.99 £ 362.40 £ 15 £ 675.00 £ 25.80 £ |

Appendix C

Notes of Pre-Planning Meeting regarding the Proposed Building of a Dwelling at TK Fisheries Monday 7 March 2022

Present: Cllrs Dugmore, Christian-Carter and Thomas, Karen Stevens (Clerk), Tom Keogh and Roy Hammond.

Cllr Christian-Carter advised that back in 2016, Peter Bones who had drawn up the plans, asked if she could step in and help with this extremely complex planning application. In 2019, unforeseen circumstances meant that TK Fisheries had to be de-registered from Companies House and therefore, everything stopped as to get a rural worker dwelling a viable registered company is required. In 2021, Tom contacted her to ask if she could take this on again. She advised him that it was in his best interests, because of her situation with the parish council and the fact that they meet severe objections from two residents both known to her, that he would be best to work with an experienced, qualified planning consultant and hence Roy Hammond took over the case. Cllr Christian-Carter then handed over all the documents and files and since that moment has had nothing to do with the scheme. If a planning application is submitted, then she may well declare a personal interest that would mean that she would not vote but would have the opportunity to correct any false statements that may be made.

Roy Hammond and Tom Keogh advised that they had received a copy of the preplanning meeting protocol and are aware that notes will be taken, that they will form part of the minutes of the next meeting and for transparency purposes this will be made public.

Roy Hammond stated that their objectives tonight were to:

- Introduce the Proposal,
- Talk a little about it,
- From the parish council perspective, we would like to see where we go from here as they would like to get the council on board.
- They appreciate that the parish council cannot say much if anything until a formal planning application is submitted to Stratford DC.

Roy Hammond advised:

- He had come to the project with a completely open mind and a fresh set of eyes. He did not immediately commit to represent Tom as he wanted to find out more about the project as he did not want to take on something that he thought lacked planning merit.
- Having met Tom, viewed the fishery, and learnt about Toms circumstances and needs and having regard for planning policy, he felt there was enough merit to take it forward and act for Tom.
- There are certain key tests that must be made all around the general principal that there needs to be a reason for that accommodation to be out in the

- countryside. There are two tests, the functional needs to actually be on site and then the financial side to make sure the business is viable and that there is enough there to sustain what is proposed,
- The proposal is primarily for a rural worker dwelling. The previous application that was submitted included a café, welfare building partly replacing the payment hut on site and together with exploring caravan pitches on site as well. The application is primarily to get Tom a dwelling on site because of his individual personal circumstances and because of these circumstances the need he can best operate the business functionally with being on site. Tom currently lives away from site travelling backwards and forwards a couple of times a day with his full-time carer. Roy can see the merit that sets Tom apart from other people who have approached him in the past. Tom's needs together with the needs of the fishery cannot be separated as they are interrelated to enable Tom to live on site to run the fishery business properly and to reduce the stress of travel and the constant worry about the site.
- When Tom approached him, he was aware that TK Fisheries had been deregistered. Roy needed to be confident that from a planning perspective and to be able to support it that there was enough financial information there. Part of the reason for the delay was to gather the financial information to ensure the fishery is viable,
- The request is for a modest dwelling house fully adapted for Tom's specific needs for lifetime living,
- None of the plans are currently 'set in stone' although Tom has some preferences, for example the proposed location is tucked away,
- If there are any concerns regarding locations etc, then conversations could be had,
- The drawings date back to 2016 but they have not really changed much. They
 were submitted to SDC and the planning officer at that time was coming round
 to accepting the principle that the dwelling was needed but it was at that time
 Tom's circumstances changed and the application had to be pulled,
- The proposal is for a house, a very modest café building incorporating a small room for a tackle shop/storage together with a new welfare building,
- The welfare building is already 'kitted out' with a room, kitchenette, and shower. The proposal is to bring it nearer to the lake and to rent it out to fishermen over the weekend in a similar way as to the cabin that is already on site,
- The caravan pitches are not to be included due to a previous highway's objection due to access to the site,
- The access as it currently stands would not be acceptable as half of it is physically shut off enabling you to access with a car, but you would be unable to tow a caravan down there. WCC would probably want better visibility splays and then this becomes a question of who owns the land either side,
- It is a question of focusing on what Tom's primary need is. If this is for a rural worker dwelling and the tackle shop and café will help to support it as a

- business income wise, then that is the focus he should go for. Adding in caravan pitches would cause no end of problems. Plans including the caravan pitches were withdrawn in late 2017 due to the objections. The plans were then re-submitted, minus the caravan pitches in 2018,
- The situation with the accessway is that from the gate exiting his property to the road is owned by David Webb but Tom has a legal right of access 365 days per year,
- The Environmental Agency will need to be convinced of the location of the dwelling and therefore a further flood risk survey has been undertaken,
- Tom was advised that questions are likely to be raised regarding the deregistration of the business and therefore he will need to be able to respond to these,
- He was asked what has changed in terms of the viability of the business since
 then because it was all predicated on a worker dwelling and therefore a viable
 business The parish council are also aware that Tom had a near miss with a
 compulsory strike off in October, what has changed to make it viable. Tom
 explained that the reason for this was him being a guarantor for a family
 member for whom things went badly wrong and therefore he had to pay for
 their debt,
- It was suggested that a viability assessment to support that be undertaken to be able to dispel those kinds of concerns in case local people have them,
- Tom has provided financial details/accounts to Roy who is convinced the business is on a sound financial footing although getting a rural surveyor in to check the figures may be helpful,
- Tom was asked that should they require it as a condition, would he be open to any condition of tying the dwelling to the business. The answer to this being yes and it is their expectation that this would happen as a matter of course anyway as it does with most agricultural dwellings. There is an expectation of an occupancy condition tying the occupation of the dwelling to somebody who is employed within the fishery business hence preventing the dwelling from being sold or let separately from the business,
- There is currently a two-bedroomed log cabin on site that is let out and provides another source of income,
- The proposed buildings are all wooden constructions and are off grid using solar panels and hydro power/water turbine. The dwelling is raised above ground to avoid possible flooding issues. He was advised to lean on the sustainability and therefore Roy will look at providing a sustainability report to support the application,
- Roy advised that the steps for him now will be to take away tonight's feedback, and then they will start to put an application together and would then be happy to come back to the parish council. Roy was advised that each parish council meeting has a public forum whereby members of the public can speak for three minutes regarding an item on the agenda,

| • | Roy was asked that, when he submits the application to SDC, a copy of the planning statement and financial data be sent to the Clerk |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | 172 |