

BARFORD SHERBOURNE & WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Joint Parish Council held at Wasperton Village Hall
on Mon 14 Nov 16

Present:	Cll, J V Murphy (Chairman) Cllr: Mrs W Barlow, R Clay, Mrs A Gordon, J M Hawkesford, T Merrygold, M J Metcalfe, Mrs R Newsome, A B Rhead, N F J Thurley,
Apologies:	Cllr: S Morgan, Mrs K E Thomson,
In Attendance:	Cllr L Caborn (WCC)

Opening

152 The meeting opened at 7:30 pm

153 No members of the public were present.

Declarations of Disclosable Interests

154 None was declared.

Public Participation

155 There was none.

Minutes of the Meeting of Council 10 Oct 16

156 The minutes were approved as a true record.

Matters arising

157 Minute 124. Cllr Merrygold gave a summary of the proceedings of the meeting in Sherbourne Village Hall which Mr M Pilkington (the tenant of Church Farm in Sherbourne) had been invited to attend to discuss residents' concerns about the effect of increasing the present herd with regards to the environmental and other impacts.

158 Minute 126. The Chairman had had a meeting with the landowner who had given an assurance that the contractor had accepted responsibility for removing the spoil from the ditch beside Fulbrook Lane running from the Dairy out of the village.

159 Minute 129. At the last JPC meeting, Cllr Metcalfe had reported that the Forge Cottage footpath was still blocked. He now informed the meeting that sufficient work had been done to enable self-help completion of the process.

160 Minute 147. The subject of speed limits was once again discussed. Cllr Caborn confirmed that there were no blanket 20mph limits operating in Warwickshire. The Chairman suggested that perhaps the only way to create impetus for this demand would be to enlist the support of other parish councils and, to that end, said he would bring it to the Warwick Rural West Community Forum and perhaps WALC (Warwick). If that failed then the JPC would be thrown back onto its own resources, in which case Cllr Caborn would help financially as far as he is able in the next financial year.

161 Minute 149. Cllr Rhead recalled at the last meeting that when Chairman of the WDC Planning Committee dealing with the planning application for the Taylor Wimpey building project in Barford Nursery Meadows, he had insisted upon a condition that the Section 106 (Highways) monies arising would be spent exclusively on the reconfiguration of the northern Barford exit from the bypass. He asked what progress had been achieved. Neither the Chairman nor Cllr Caborn were aware of such an arrangement and the latter had asked for further details to enable him to investigate. That confirmation was now forthcoming.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 31 Oct 16

- 162 Following a challenge on the validity of the meeting, by virtue of Cllr Merrygold substituting for Cllr Gadsden (which was defeated on a vote), the minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Cash Book Balances as at 31 Oct 16

- 163 The JPC took note of the following cash balances
- HSBC (1) £117,068.19
 - HSBC (2) £398.10
 - Santander £51,277.36

Receipts and Payments

- 164 The JPC endorsed the following:

Date	Payee/er	Category	Total
4 Oct 16	Countryside Services	War Memorial Wasperton	(25.00)
5 Oct 16	Stopped Cheque	Bank Charges	(10.00)
5 Oct 16	Western Power Distribution	Wayleave	4.87
6 Oct 16	Santander	Bank Interest	21.71
6 Oct 16	Rotherham & Company	Rectory Paddock: Legal Fees	(40.00)
6 Oct 16	Frank Mann Farmers	BLIS	(1,308.00)
7 Oct 16	Streetmaster	BLIS	(49.20)
9 Oct 16	MAG Consultancy	BLIS (BSC)	(33.06)
9 Oct 16	BCC	BLIS	1,050.00
10 Oct 16	HMRC	Employment Expenses	(630.69)
11 Oct 16	Murley Agricultural	BLIS (SE Eqpt)	(306.00)
14 Oct 16	H T Williams	Open Spaces Maintenance	(40.00)
15 Oct 16	MH Goals	BLIS (SE Eqpt)	(2,304.00)
15 Oct 16	J V Murphy (BLIS)	BLIS (SE Eqpt)	(23.97)
18 Oct 16	Godfrey-Payton	Rectory Paddock: Rent	(250.00)
31 Oct 16	Administration	Office Accommodation	(59.92)
31 Oct 16	Salaries	Employment Expenses	(806.39)

Barford Leisure Improvement Scheme

- 165 The Chairman reported:
- Usage had reduced because of poor weather and shorter days.
 - Smiths were working on the snagging list and installing bases for extra benches
 - All the necessary legal agreements for the installation of an improved electrical supply were at last in place. The timescale for the work is 8-12 weeks.
 - The water supply will be connected soon.
 - There are drainage problems in the play area which Miracle has been tasked to solve by way of remedial action.
 - The need for lighting on site for tennis, hockey, keep fit and the like has been raised. Currently this is forbidden in the byelaws and alternatives are being investigated. This may be revisited if the demand is established.
 - The Rectory Paddock has been mown (several more mowings are necessary before it is suitable for use). The path and gate will be installed soon. Financial help had been given by the Barford Community Charity.

Warwickshire Minerals Plan

- 166 Further to the JPC's decision to convene a working party to formulate its response to the WCC's proposals (vide Minute 142 of the JPC Minutes of 10 Oct 16); the Working Party met on 20 Oct 16 and again on 2 Nov 16 and its submission is at Annex A.

Barford Relief In Need Charity (BRINC)

- 167 RESOLVED: The Mr Rob Mulgrue and Mr Phillip Swallow be reappointed as Nominative Trustees of the Barford Relief in Need Charity for a further term of four years from 15th November 2016.

Barford Youth and Community Centre (aka The Scout Hut)

- 168 An update from Cllr Mrs Barlow

UPDATE FOR JPC - 14th November 2016

Main Building

5 quotes for updated specification – 3 are credible but too high.
We need to simplify the building and cut the cloth to suit the pocket

Storage Building

This will be built first and we have located a suitable local supplier (Warwick Buildings of Southam) – They are suppliers of garages, garden rooms, garden offices etc. They have asked us to sketch out our requirements and they will give us a cost
Typical prices are from £6,000 - £10,000

Lease

Draft Lease from the Diocese received – (last week). No significant problems from our viewpoint but we have a couple of areas to investigate (Public Liability insurance and hiring out). At last some significant progress on this point.

Planning Permission

Pre-Application meeting identified a few points that WDC were investigating – Change of personnel at WDC has interrupted this but now communications are restored.
Need 'final' plans to proceed further.

Local Fund – Raising

This is almost out of control!
Pamper Evening last week will have made £250
Quiz Night – last Saturday will have made over £500.
Christmas Market planned for December
Assistance with Santa Floats in December – will raise c £200
Balance in Fund raising account is about £23,000

Grant Applications

POST CODE LOTTERY – Application made to a very tight deadline – Unsuccessful.
RUCIS (WDC building grant) – Draft application made – very constructive response from Jon Dawson. - We need to review and re-submit later in the year / next year.
Grants / Pledges so far - £3,000

Business Plan

This needs a review in the light of the comments from the RUCIS application.

Summary

Our local support is fantastic – but cannot deliver the large amounts of finance we require. We need to formulate a strategy to target relevant grant giving bodies. Applications will not be feasible until we have a secure lease and a final design. We need to continue to collate the information we have into sections which we can then tailor to suit. The first Application is always the hardest.

Any Other Business

- 169 The Chairman drew attention to the severe traffic problems created by pumpkin sales at Wasperton Farm. This had been reported to the Land Agent and the client had been appropriately advised.

Closure

170 There being no other business the meeting closed at 8:22pm

Date of Next Meeting

171 The next meeting of the JPC is on Mon 9 Jan 17 at 7:30 pm in Barford Memorial Hall.

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council

The Council has considered whether the **Minerals Local Plan (Publication)** is legally compliant, meets the tests of soundness and complies with the duty to cooperate.

The Council considers this to be an **unsound plan** which it would like to see significantly amended. The Minerals Local Plan Publication document fails to address the issues raised during previous consultations and the Council therefore considers it is not in conformity with national planning policy and is inadequately underpinned by technical evidence.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para.182 sets out that in order to be 'sound' a Local Plan should pass the following four tests:

- **Be positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.
- **Be justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.
- **Be effective** – plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.
- **Be consistent with national policy** – plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Matters which have led the Council to its conclusion include:

1. We find many of the responses to consultation comments to be stock, inadequate and dismissive. This is particularly the case in regard to sites 4 and 5 with which we are most closely involved.
2. Specifically, with regard to Site 4 the traffic comments are simplistic in the extreme. Aggregate lorries pulling out onto the A429 cannot be other than a hazard – a fact well demonstrated by the chaos caused by seasonal pumpkin sales from the same site which recently brought traffic to a standstill and has caused several minor RTCs.
3. The move to a 350m separation zone is welcomed compared to the earlier 100m version however nearby residents will still be significantly impacted and 350m should be considered the minimum separation from all residential properties, including those within the site and those situated on adjacent land south of the site (ie Glebe Fm and Seven Elms properties). The statement that *“a standoff of 250m cannot be justified”* is unacceptable and will render such properties practically uninhabitable. An assurance that “100m is likely to provide adequate protection” is contrary to most authorities’ working practices where separations of at least 200m pertain.
4. The dismissive comments about “blight” are unacceptable. The blight factor is already operating and property values and prospects have already been significantly damaged.
5. The statement that “there is unlikely to be irreversible or permanent loss of BMV land” patently cannot be substantiated. It is widely recognised that land cannot be restored to its former quality even if sufficient inert waste were to be available. A review of the “restored” Charlecote workings, immediately across the A429 would provide a clear example of just how poorly gravel extraction sites are left. The developers should be actively challenged to demonstrate that sites can actually be reinstated to the same levels, both in terms of height and quality.
6. Previous applications on Site 4 failed on initial application and on appeal failed at law based largely on the loss of BMV agricultural land and failure to identify other more suitable sites.
7. The assurance that *“a properly managed site is unlikely to have significant impacts on rural locations”* cannot be justified given that it will destroy most of the landscape, degrade views and be restored to a different topography. Such development must *cause “material harm to the visual appearance of the locality”*.
8. The earlier Court of Appeal decision and evidence therein casts considerable doubt on the alternative restoration proposals, particularly relating to any water based features.
9. The Council believes that there should be more transparency concerning the presumptions and parameters employed when establishing the “need” for minerals, particularly given that much aggregate use is being replaced by recycled materials and crushed rock products.
10. The Council has concerns that the WCC has a significant “conflict of interest” as the owner of Site 5 and the interdependency of sites 4 and 5. The Council is concerned that WCC may therefore be “inclined to favour” Site 4 to facilitate the exploitation of Site 5?

11. The Council is concerned that some, often more appropriate, alternative sites on less than BMV land seem to have been eliminated from consideration in favour of promoting Site 4.
12. The Council is most concerned at the proposed loss of Glebe Farm as a WCC agricultural holding, which allows small/young farmers to get started and also helps to meet home-grown food production, which with rising costs of food, increasing population numbers and post-Brexit is likely to become even more important.