

AMPNEY CRUCIS PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 13 JANUARY 2014 IN THE VILLAGE HALL, AMPNEY CRUCIS.

Present: Councillors Barry Dent, David Vessey, Gerald Gaden, Adrian Grazebrook, Alan Lewis, Simon Holt and Rosanna Armitage

Presiding: Councillor Barry Dent

Clerk: Jayne Webster

Also present: District Councillor Sir Edward Horsfall and 35 members of the public

| | ACTION |
|---|-----------|
| <p>The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that the proposal to build 8 houses on the parcel of land along School Lane would be dealt with under item 5, Questions from the Public.</p> | |
| <p>1. Apologies for absence None.</p> | |
| <p>2. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2013</p> <p>Resolution 01/14 <i>The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2013, be signed and adopted.</i></p> | |
| <p>3. Matters arising from the meeting held on 11 November 2013</p> <p>3.1 Bromford Housing has advised they no longer maintain either the grass verge or the roadside face of the hedge at the entrance to The Pleydells. The Council are currently liaising with Bromford Housing, CDC and GCC to establish who owns the land and is responsible for its maintenance.</p> <p>3.2 Dead trees along Church Walk – A letter was sent to Ms Lomas at Fitzhamon House.</p> <p>3.3 Hedge along Riding Lane – this has now been cut back. The hedge is under a two year Stewardship Scheme.</p> <p>3.4 Letter of thanks was sent to Tony Williams for replacing and repairing the posts and chain around the War Memorial garden.</p> <p>3.5 Councillor Armitage has returned her Register of Interest's form to CDC and signed the Undertaking to observe members code of conduct.</p> | JW |
| <p>4. Reports from County and District Councillors</p> <p>District Councillor Sir Edward Horsfall reported that Council Tax would remain at the same level as last year. He also reiterated that he still has funds available for Youth Services and if anyone has any suggestions they should contact either himself or Councillor Holt.</p> | |
| <p>5. Questions from the Public</p> <p>Mr Wakefield (agent for the developers) started the session by asking what benefits the Parish Council thought the proposed development would bring to the village. The Chairman explained this session was for the public to air their views and the Parish Council's position would be explained later in the meeting.</p> <p>Mr Arnold (Ampney Crucis resident) raised the issue of congestion. He advised that living close to the school, there was already lots of traffic around the school and he felt that the new development would only add to the congestion problems. The traffic survey was discussed and the Chairman confirmed that the survey was carried out in August 2013.</p> <p>Mr S Lafford said he thought that new residents would walk to school.</p> <p>Mrs Lafford said that currently a lot of the cars causing the congestion around the school were from outside the village and that new houses would provide more children which would keep the school open.</p> <p>Mr Tanner (AC resident) commented that the planning application made provision for 20 car spaces and School Lane was single track and could not cope with the current number of cars</p> | |

and any additional cars would make the situation worse.

Mr Taylor (AC resident) reiterated that traffic and pedestrian access was a problem. He advised that CDC had identified 4 sites in the village for potential development and wanted to know how this would affect the Parish Council's decision.

Mr Crook (AC resident) felt that the sewage system would need to be enhanced to cope with the new development. He also felt that the proposed houses should be in line with the existing properties along School Lane. Finally, he felt the issue of pedestrian access needed to be looked at and maybe School Lane should be made one-way.

Mr Nixon (AC resident) asked the Parish Council to take into account the planning guidance provided by the government namely the need for and the sustainability of any development and that priority should be given to brown field sites.

Mr Stevens (AC resident) said it was a brown field site (the old sewage works). He felt that if the traffic issues could be resolved he did not see a problem with the new development.

Mr Wain said that affordable housing in a village had a positive impact on a village and brought in young professionals, he felt it was very important to keep children and grand children in villages.

Mrs Nixon (AC resident) asked what the definition of sustainable was.

The Chairman confirmed this needed to be clarified and advised that Bromford Housing had experienced problems filling their properties.

Mrs Lafford advised that the properties in The Pleydells were not family homes and the affordable properties on the new development would be for families.

Mr Bullock (AC resident) believed that traffic was a serious issue and there would be opposition to making School Lane one-way. He also felt that if the scheme did go ahead it would set a precedent for future development.

District Councillor Horsfall advised that CDC needed to provide 6,000 houses in the next 20 years. He is in favour of limited development in villages. However, felt that this development was against the current Local Plan. He would support the proposal but has some reservations and felt the application should go before the Planning Committee.

Mr Wain said in view of this if Ampney Crucis supported the scheme the village would be helping to meet CDC's target.

Mr White (AC resident) commented that the bus service in Ampney Crucis is very poor.

Mr Wakefield said that the National Planning Document, paragraph 8, gave greater flexibility for rural developments where residents would be dependent upon cars. He felt that families would walk to school and anyone travelling to Cirencester would not travel through the village. He raised the point that the school needed to fill places especially in view of the proposed Kinghill development.

Mrs Dent (AC resident) asked whether the school was under threat.

Mr Lazenby (AC resident and Chair of the School Governors) advised the school currently has a full intake with a third of children from the village, a third from surrounding villages and a third from Cirencester and is one of the highest performing primary schools in Gloucestershire. The school is worried that extra houses would add to the existing congestion problems and is also very aware that the local residents have to put up with a lot of traffic at certain times of the day: they would not want to add to this inconvenience. He ended by saying that the school is always keen to have more children from the village.

Mr Wakefield confirmed that provision have been made for 24 extra cars.

A villager stated that it was very difficult driving through the village at school drop off and pick up times and felt that residents in the new houses would be unable to access their properties at these times.

Mr White commented that he was worried about access to and from the proposed site.

Mr Stevens advised that similar issues were raised when the development at Dudley Farm was built but feels those houses have positively contributed to the village and believes that the proposed scheme will also enhance the village.

6. Planning matters

6.1 Outstanding applications

The Council decided to discuss the outstanding applications first so that Councillor Vessey's presentation regarding the School Lane development (ACPC621) followed the public debate.

612 13/03573/FUL

Old House

No comment

| | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------------------|------------|
| 613 | 13/03617/LBC | Old House | No comment |
| 621 | 13/05034/FUL | Land parcel at School Lane | Object |
| 622 | 13/05196/LBC | Hilcot House | No comment |

ACPC 621 - Councillor Vessey gave a detailed presentation regarding the application. Firstly, he explained that Policy 19 of the Local Plan was no longer applicable and decisions were based on 5 year housing supply figures. CDC is currently short by 234 houses. In addition, there is no longer a Development Boundary for Ampney Crucis. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) takes priority unless there are material considerations that need to be taken into account and outweigh the benefits of any development scheme. The scheme needs to be sustainable which is very objective and a decision which will be made by the Planning Officer at CDC. The material considerations include infrastructure. Councillor Vessey explained that Ampney Crucis does not have a shop, the bus service is poor, there is a poor road infrastructure and the site is difficult to access. Affordable housing – across a range of villages in the area only 9 people expressed a need for affordable housing. Ampney Crucis has 41 properties which can be classed as affordable which is 22% of the total properties in the village. In addition, Bromford Housing has experienced difficulty trying to fill houses due to the lack of a shop and the poor bus service. Landscape – most of the village lies outside the AONB, however, the central part of the village does get specific mention for protection. In addition, the school has been mentioned as under threat from the proposed new primary school at the Kingshill site. The school and governors did not express concern over this and the new school will replace the existing Watermoor primary school. Ampney Crucis primary school is very successful and well supported. Councillor Vessey concluded by advising that in view of the material considerations the Parish Council should not support the scheme on the grounds that the village is not sustainable, there is no need for open market housing or affordable housing, the central landscape is protected and the village has no need for a development to guarantee its future viability.

Councillor Vessey advised that the Planning Officer at CDC had received 16 letters of support (from non-residents) and 43 letters of objection (from villagers).

Councillor Holt asked when the Development Boundary had been removed. This was in 1998 when the shop closed.

Councillor Grazebrook wanted to clarify why the school had a policy of accepting a third of the intake in Reception from Ampney Crucis, a third from Cirencester and a third from surrounding villages. Mr Lazenby, Chair of Governors confirmed that this was not policy but simply how it had worked out over the past few years.

Councillor Gaden wished to confirm that there was a footpath along School Lane.

Councillor Armitage wondered what the implications would be for future sites. The Chairman confirmed that this was unknown at the moment, although they could only refer to Down Ampney.

Councillor Vessey explained that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was a moment in time and currently there are 4 sites in Ampney Crucis. However, only the Butcher's Arms Lane site is regarded as suitable for development within the next 6 – 10 years.

Mr Guy Wakefield, agent for the developer, advised that sustainability was not only about accessibility. It was very relevant to consider the size of the scheme and how close the site is to other developments with jobs and shops. He reiterated that people in School Lane would walk to school and he had calculated that the new development would generate one extra vehicle every 10 minutes and most people leaving the development would not drive through Ampney Crucis.

A couple of villagers wanted to confirm that at certain times during the day ie school drop off and pick up times it was currently very difficult to get through the village and that congestion

around the School Lane t-junction was a serious issue.

The Council then took a vote on the application. Councillor Vessey had already advised the Council to oppose the application. Councillor Grazebrook said that ultimately CDC would decide, however, the Council's considerations have the same weight as individuals and he felt that the important issue was whether the locality was sustainable. He also felt that the development could open the way for future developments and therefore would oppose the application. Councillor Lewis agreed with Councillor Grazebrook's comments and also opposed. Councillor Holt agreed with the sustainability issue and opposed the application. Councillor Armitage thought it would be better to invest in The Pleydells and opposed. The Chairman opposed the application on the grounds of sustainability. Councillor Gaden supported the application.

BD
DV

DV

Resolution 02/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved by a majority of 6 -1 to oppose planning application, 13/05034/FUL, to develop the land parcel in School Lane. The objection was based on the considered view that Ampney Crucis is not a 'sustainable' village and that, in addition, there are important material considerations that outweigh the NPPF presumption for planning approval: these relate to infrastructure, environmental and affordable housing demand issues.*

Resolution 03/14 *The Parish Council understands the difficulties being faced by planning officers in the current environment with 5 year housing figures and other planning matters under constant review. The Parish Council therefore suggests that any decision to permit this development should be taken by the full Planning Committee. This will ensure that the sensitive planning issues surrounding this application, which breach Policy 19 of the Local Plan in respect of open-market housing outside a Development Boundary, can be fully debated in public.*

BD
RA

In the event that CDC refuses the Planning Application, District Councillor Horsfall wanted to know whether the Council would wish him to support the refusal or suggest that the application should go before the Planning Committee. Councillor Grazebrook felt that the application should go before the Planning Committee whatever decision CDC takes. All other Councillors agreed with the Chairman that if CDC refused the application then District Councillor Horsfall should support the refusal.

Resolution 04/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved that in view that the task of writing the report on decisions made at this meeting and contained in the formal resolutions above need to be completed and delivered to CDC by midday on Tuesday 14th January, this should be delegated to the Chairman and Vice Chairman.*

A copy of the letter will appear on p.1164 of the minutes and will be posted on the village notice boards and the website.

6.2 Decisions

| | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| 614 | 13/03656/FUL | Crucis Park Farm | CDC permit |
| 615 | 13/04053/FUL | High Meadow | CDC permit |
| 616 | 13/04182/FUL | Land behind AC burial ground | Withdrawn |
| 618 | 13/04504/FUL | Glebe Farm Cottage | CDC permit |

ACPC 614 - The agents, Smiths Gore, responded to the issues raised by the Council, in particular, the concerns regarding noise, security fencing and screening have been taken into consideration. The Chairman confirmed that the Community Benefit is ongoing and the final sum would depend on when the scheme is completed. Both the Chairman and Councillor Armitage are continuing to work on a Village Trust.

DV

ACPC 616 – The planning application for change of use has been withdrawn and if resubmitted within a year (i.e. by 30 September 2014) no extra fee is charged. Councillor Vessey explained that he has agreed with the Tree Officer that the Council has the choice of two routes into the new extension, for which, there are basic costs of excavation and stone

removal.

The first is on the school side of the burial ground but there will be additional costs as some trees will have to be removed and disposed of.

The second, more central route, will also incur some expense as the Council will need to have a trained tree person on hand when excavation takes place.

The Council agreed to opt for the first route.

A landscaping plan will need to be submitted for the hedging but Councillor Vessey believes that the Landscaping Officer will reduce her demands from five plants to the metre to four. National guidelines require the Council to define the species and percentages. The plan does not have to be implemented until the area is brought into use.

In addition, the Council needs to comply with the Environment Agency's (EA) requirements. Firstly, they asked for a Tier 1 assessment to be carried out. This is likely to cost in the region of £1,000, and Councillor Vessey asked for three consultants to prepare quotes. However, in a subsequent letter, the EA has expressed concern over the original need for the field drain and has asked for a water table assessment as well. Councillor Vessey asked the three consultants to quote for this additional requirement. In view of the figures already received (£3,000 upwards), Councillor Vessey has challenged the need for this assessment and has supplied the EA with some photographs.

JW

JW

The Council agreed that if the EA insisted on a water table assessment then the proposed extension to the burial ground could not continue. Councillor Grazebrook felt the Council could not make a decision without a fully costed scheme. A discussion followed and the Council agreed that if the need for a water table assessment was withdrawn by the EA then the Council would continue with the Tier 1 assessment and would go ahead with the quote from WPA Consultants Ltd.

JW

Councillor Vessey left the meeting at 9.30pm.

6.3 Tree works

For information only

| | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 619 | 13/04712/TCONR | Hunts Hill | No objection (County) |
| 620 | 13/04732/TCONR | The Old Post House | No Objection (County) |
| 623 | 13/05400/TCONR | The Lodge | Pending |
| 624 | 14/00043/TCONR | Mead House | Pending |

7. Financial matters

7.1 Current financial position

Resolution 05 /14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved that the financial statements prepared by the Responsible Financial Officer should be adopted by the Council as an accurate reflection of the Council's financial position on 28 December 2013.*

The clerk advised that NALC have notified Councils that there may be changes to vat; one area under scrutiny is Cemeteries.

The Council agreed to take both the overpayment for the village hall hire and the grass cutting out of the general contingency fund.

7.2 Agreement of payments

Clerk's expenses (£10.72) and D Vessey (paper and ink cartridge £12.50)

ESE direct (£107.58) and GH Knight (£532.00) were both paid for prior to the meeting.

Resolution 06/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved that the above amounts, totalling £23.22, be paid.*

7.3 Grass Cutting Contract

One tender was received. The Council agreed to take the extra cost of strimming the grass verge at The Pleydells from reserves.

Resolution 07/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved that the grass cutting contract from 1 April 2014 – 31 March 2017 be awarded to Cottage Garden Services.*

7.4 Gates for Burial Ground

The new gates need special hinges and it was agreed by the Council that Mr Stevens should spend up to £100 in the hinges.

7.5 Draft Budget 2014/15

CDC have advised that Cabinet decided on 7th November to continue to provide Local Council Tax Support Grant funding to Town and Parish Councils applying the following principles to allocate the grant to Town and Parish Councils for 2014/15:

- Natural growth in the Council Tax base will replace the need for Local Council Tax Support Grant to Town and Parish Councils over time
- Local Council Tax Support Grant will be available to any Town or Parish Council that meets the criteria for an award of grant subject to the following conditions a) growth of Town or Parish Council Budget Requirement (ie precept) is limited to 2% per annum b) where a Budget Requirement increases by more than 2%, the value of Local Council Tax Support available will be reduced.

Last year's precept was £6888, so a 2% increase is £7026.

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Staff Costs | Salary | 3916 |
| | Expenses | 100 |
| Grass Cutting | | 1476 |
| Burial Ground | | 0 |
| Ampney Times | | 77 |
| Admin | GAPTC | 137 |
| | Village Hall Hire | 40 |
| | Insurance | 725 |
| | Misc. & postage | 180 |
| Playground | Sinking Fund | 0 |
| | Replacement | 0 |
| | Insurance | 210 |
| War Memorial Fund | | 0 |
| Other | Grants/Donations | 9 |
| | Audit | 155 |
| | Ciren. Band (bugle) | 0 |
| | | 7025 |

Resolution 08/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved that the above budget be adopted and that a precept request of £7025.00 is sent to Cotswold District Council.*

7.6 Review of clerk's remuneration

Resolution 09/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved to increase the clerk's salary to £10.040 per hour from April 2014.*

8. Burial Ground matters

JW

JW

JW

SH

BD

RA

Review of Conditions and Fees – The Council agreed to increase the charges by 10% which will come into effect from 1st April 2014. It was also agreed to revise the wording regarding the reservation of a burial plot.

Resolution 10/14 *The Chairman proposed and the Council resolved to accept the revised Burial Ground Conditions and Fees as shown on p. 1165 of the minutes.*

AL

9. Village Update

9.1 Playground

Councillor Holt provided the Council with a ‘to do list’ for the playground. The recommendations included adjusting the gate, replacing the rubber buffer and relocating the gate hinge, repairing the chain link fence, possibly rewording the sign, tightening the 3 way springer, lifting and relaying the mats under the swings, attempting to repair the wetpour and other damaged areas on the slide and monitor further deterioration of the concrete fun box. The bin has been replaced and the other recommendations will be worked through with the Playground Committee. In addition, Councillor Holt is hoping to purchase some football goals.

JW

9.2 Ampney Times

The Chairman raised the matter of postage. The Council agreed that the Chairman should continue to liaise with the editorial team and the PCC to come to some arrangement for future postage.

9.3 Footpaths

A further letter was sent to Smiths Gore regarding the footpaths on Crucis Park Farm land. They advised that they will continue the work on the footpaths during the winter.

From April 2014 there will be changes to the way GCC will deliver Public Rights of Way (PROW) functions. The new contract will include the current functions of the PROW team, with the maintenance of footpaths and bridleways being bought together with other highway assets, including carriageways footways, bridges, drainage systems and street furniture. GCC have said that the level of service across the highway network (including PROW) will not decrease and the change in delivery will have no impact on how volunteers engage with GCC. It is intended that existing PROW staff will transfer to the new contractor. Also the Lead Public Right of Way officer will remain a GCC post and be responsible for the overall strategy, including the principle point of contact for the voluntary sector. GCC will not pay the contractor for works carried out by volunteers. It will pay the contractor for a core specification, which is in line with that currently delivered by GCC.

9.4 Queen’s Diamond Jubilee Legacy

Copies have been printed and distributed. Councillor Grazebrook thanked Councillor Vessey for all his hard work in producing the Diamond Jubilee Legacy book. Councillor Armitage suggested that a copy of the book should be at the Village Fete for further orders.

9.5 Solar Farm

See item 6.2

9.6 Village Clear Up

Councillor Lewis suggested that a date should be set. It was agreed Saturday 8 March.

10. Highways

The grit bin at Hilcot End has been installed and filled with grit.

A417 – the traffic survey took place just before Christmas, the results will be discussed at the March meeting.

GCC have ordered the yellow backed, double bend sign and the lining will be carried out in the spring/summer 2014. The Council needs to design an emblem for the entrance sign.

11. Community Emergency Plan

The clerk had circulated a revised form prior to the meeting, the Chairman had one suggestion.

12. Correspondence received

None

13. Matters outstanding

14. Date, time and place of next meeting

Monday, 10 March 2014

The meeting closed at 10.20pm