

# BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting 8 July 2024

### Present:

Cllr Kettle (Chairman)    Cllr Coulson    Cllr Dugmore    Cllr Horsman    Cllr Howatson  
Cllr Lamont                Cllr Tagg-Wilkinson    Cllr Thomas    Cllr Tressler

### In Attendance:

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council  
Val Powell – Cemetery Manager  
Cllr Rock – District Councillor

### Public:

9

### 24/131 Apologies:

Cllr Ogden due to work commitments  
Cllr Gist due to being unwell  
Apologies were accepted.

### 24/132 Declarations of Interest:

None

### 24/133 Dispensations:

None

### 24/134 Public Forum:

Karin Young advised that in terms of tonight's meeting that she wants to reiterate Steve Young's comments, my brother-in-law, from what he said last week about the complaints committee and that Cliff and I agree that any councillor who was involved in the actions taken at the cemetery on 14 and 17 May should declare a conflict of interest and not be considered for election to the complaints committee, It's just reiterating what Steve has already said.

Mrs Parsons spoke regarding the planning application for St Michael's Close. She is pleased to see a reduction in properties from the last planning application. The concerns that she would like taken into consideration are still the implications of using the close for the construction and delivery vehicles – the close is very narrow, used for parking by residents therefore the continuous use of the close will be hazardous and disruptive. She would therefore appreciate the parish council asking for a construction management plan be set up with the existing residents prior to and not as a condition of. She would like it minuted as well that she is disappointed that following the last meeting held on this issue of St Michael's Close that none of the parish councillors have had the decency to come up and speak to the residents personally, we only have three minutes at this meeting to discuss issues that we have – you know all our concerns from the last meeting but no one has had the decency to come up to us and speak personally so your website states the parish council is elected to serve the local community and endeavour to provide a good

service and she thinks the parish council missed an opportunity to do that with this second application.

Steve Young advised that he would like to say what he said at the last meeting, that the people who have a direct interest, then it is a conflict of interest and they should not be allowed to be on the complaints committee and further more they should not be allowed to vote as per the parish councils standing orders. His second point is that he posed a number of questions to the chairman last Monday. The Chairman would not answer them in the meeting although Mr Young knows he had the answers to hand. The Chairman said you would come back to Mr S Young but to date, no contact has been made. He would like to know when he is going to get a response to the questions he raised.

Cllr Kettle advised that he and the Vice Chairman are happy to meet with him to discuss these.

Cliff Young advised that he would just like to say, that you kept saying last week and you actually voted on this that WALC is not an independent body and you keep saying it is although their website says it isn't so why do you keep saying that WALC are independent – you took legal advice from them, you did not inform us that you were taking legal advice, you just went ahead and did it. You said at one meeting “we sent off your informal request for information 24 hours after we got it, I actually said 48 but you did change it to 24. At the end of the day then after that, subsequently at the next meeting you voted for WALC to be involved so how can you vote on something you had already instigated. I just don't understand it so were all the other councillors not involved and took legal advice from before you voted on it. Did you do it off your own back. WALC is not independent and Cllr Gist has confirmed that WALC is not independent so why can't you admit it – you are actually using public tax payers money to work against us, surely the council should be working with us. We have asked you simple questions but you do not answer them, no communication and this is two months after you laid my sons headstone down without authority and then you reinstated it in my opinion you had no authority to touch it again for a second time. I had no problem with you looking at it to see if it was safe and that.

Steven Young asked in reference to the quotes that you put in as a private conversation, what reason have you put that in a private conversation element of the meeting at this meeting and previous meetings.

He was advised that were there are quotes between competing companies, the parish council does not discuss these in public because of the competitive nature of the quotes and the possibility of competitive advantage a business could gain by knowing rival companies figures

Ms Harkins said that regarding the cemetery and other people finding out about the gravestones, would it be best maybe to get in touch with local villages as well because there are probably lots of people from local villages that don't know. Other local villages like Harbury or Southam as they might have people buried here and they might not know about the gravestones so maybe you need to take this on board and put posts on Facebook groups used by the surrounding villages

A member of the public asked wouldn't it be good if someone got in touch with Wendy Buckley who has considerable local knowledge?

She was advised that unfortunately, due to data protections people cannot pass on other people's information unless they agree to it (GDPR).

#### **24/135 Formal Complaint:**

Following discussion, it was **RESOLVED** that the complaints committee would be formed of Cllrs Coulson, Horsman and Howatson. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, Seconded Cllr Tagg-Wilkinson and all in favour.

It was agreed that the three councillors would agree a date to meet at which they will decide who will chair the complaints committee and propose a number of dates for the complaints committee to meet and for Mr and Mrs Young to select the most convenient for them.

#### **24/136 Planning Matters:**

**i. 24/01558/FUL**

The Old Grain Barn, Mill Pit Farm, Hambridge Road, Bishops Itchington - Proposed Link Extension

Cllr Dugmore advised that he cannot see anything to make a representation on this application but deferred to Cllr Tagg-Wilkinson regarding the net bio-diversity gain. There are actions but they have not done the process but they have done something.

It was **RESOLVED** to respond to planning application 24/01558/FUL as no representations. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Lamont, all in favour

**ii. 24/01474/FUL**

Land Off St Michaels Close , And Manor Road, Bishops Itchington - Demolition of no's 9-12 St Michael's Close and garages and erection of 7 no. affordable housing units and associated development

A member of the public raised an issue regarding Cllr Kettle being involved in the discussion and subsequent vote on this application. Cllr Kettle therefore advised that he would not take part in the debate/vote on this item and handed the chair to Cllr Thomas for this item.

Cllr Dugmore advised:

- Back end of 2023 we had an application for the same location that was for a high number of dwellings (12). We did respond with no representations but made some specific comments. He believes these are still relevant and we should reinforce those and potentially add to them.
- The principle of the development area is broadly the same , the demolition of aged housing stock replacement with a slightly increased number of new build houses which are of greater thermal energy efficiency
- Looking through items that have been raised on there, I am aware from colleagues that a resident mentioned asking if Warwickshire Fire and Rescue could do a site visit, it is worth noting that as a statutory consultee they have already reviewed the plans and have no objections so we can consider that matter dealt with
- There were also concerns raised about parking. There are a couple of points here. Surprising that Orbit are providing the bare minimum of one parking space for a one bed property although there is space for more than one
- They have reduced the number of visitor bays, again this in line with the requirements under the SPD but the exact same location on the prior application had 4 or 5 spaces so it seems somewhat churlish not to include those bays when it would benefit residents who are there

- We also raised that the existing maisonettes number 13 to 19 are effectively marooned by this development, and we did ask that the developer to look at the opportunities to help the residents of the properties that will be marooned by the development (maisonettes numbers 13 to 19) to ensure they have allocated parking spaces made available to them. Obviously, the loss of the garage block where one of the new properties is to be built does remove the possibility for some of those residents to rent garage space or access parking so it could be argued there is a loss of amenity so wonder if we could extend that to see if they could consider a permit scheme in those extra bays we would like them to place there
- There are five properties whose roofs are south/southeast facing and it would be a big miss if they were not designed and built to take advantage of solar p v storage. Even some of the smaller rig 3.6kw (would need a G98 that would be much easier to get) but something of that size would help considerably with power generation. Complete waste if they do not include this. Made this point last time and we should make it again
- His suggestion based on what we did last time, based on the level of variants to it we submit no representation but we make those points really clear and add points about parking capacity from the original design in that it is no longer there, but space still exists for it so an increase in parking spaces should be considered
- Is it no reps or an objection
- Was there a rotation of demolition then replacement – it is not accounted for in the applications as each has been submitted separately
- Bio-diversity – can not see anything where they say they will commit to a bio-diversity plan. Found a biodiversity matrix
- Holding objection subject to those things being attributed and include them in the response and if you then get them included you could withdraw the objection
- No mention of green technology
- No mention of solar panels
- No mention of air source or ground source heat pumps
- Welcome the fact they have reduced the number of homes
- Have said they will try and provide gigabit connections where available

It was **RESOLVED** to submit an objection to planning 24/01474/FUL based on the previous comments and together with the additional comments raised above. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tagg-Wilkinson, eight in favour and one abstention

**24/137 A motion was passed for the Exclusion of Public and Press under Section 100A of Local Government Act 1972 (5 in favour and one objection from Cllr Dugmore):**

1. **Quotes to undertake work to the cemetery headstones/memorials**
  - i. It was **RESOLVED** that, due to exceptional circumstances, the parish council will, on this occasion only, offer to reinstate all the affected headstones. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Kettle, seven in favour, two against and therefore the motion was carried

- ii. It was **RESOLVED** to accept the quote from Stephen Hill Memorials to undertake the work. Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr Dugmore, seven in favour, two abstentions and therefore the motion was carried

**24/138 Date of Next Meeting**

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Monday 2 September 2024 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

**Meeting closed at 21:22**

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