

**MINUTES OF THE MONTHLY MEETING OF BOURTON PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 7.00 P.M. ON MONDAY, 25<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2016**

**PRESENT:** S Firbank (Chairman), M Withers, G Miller, J Morgan, T Heaton, A Miller, M Martin, P Williams and I McVie (Clerk).

**APOLOGIES:** L Jones, PCSO Vicki Levy (Police)

**ATTENDING:** Andrew Cattaway (County & District Councillor), 12 members of the public.

**16.1 OPEN FORUM**

A member of the public asked whether there was more that the parish council could do concerning the continued issues of anti-social behaviour in the parish that includes dropping litter, removing council signs and failing to clean up dog mess or throwing plastic bags of dog mess into hedgerows or in some cases into private gardens. A resident present supported this and stated that at their property on the junction of Bridge Street and the main road people are continually throwing plastic bags of dog excrement into their property. SF confirmed that this information along with anti-social cycling on pavements had been passed to the local officer and PCSO Levy had the respective locations as part of her patrol plan.

A member of the public asked if the parish council would consider purchasing and placing a bus stop for bus users at the stop on the green at Breach Close. Following a discussion the parish council both at this point and subsequently at 'Transport' in the agenda decided that they would not pursue this request as the green is not owned by the parish council and would also be an unsuitable structure on or in front of the green and that to move the bus stop left or right would put any shelter in front of private houses. SF thanked the member of the public for raising this.

A member of the public informed the meeting that the Wildlife and Habitat Group would be visiting Down Farm, Sixpenny Handley and that residents would be most welcome to join them for an informative and enjoyable day out.

A member of the public reminded the meeting of his previous requests for a new flood risk assessment (FRA) to be completed at the bridge and parapet in Bridge Street. He reminded the meeting of the information he had previously provided and that the Environment Agency had declined to act as it is a responsibility of the public body who owns the location, in this case the county council. The clerk confirmed this was the case and that the county council had been informed of the residents' concerns and request. AC stated this was correct and confirmed that he had spoken to the Director of Environment who along with the Bridge Structures Officer will review all historical correspondence in relation to this and complete a site visit examination of the structure. They will then report back their findings, whether the existing FRA is adequate, the impact of the bridge and its dam effect and any action that will be taken. The member of the public pointed out that in his opinion the forthcoming planning meeting by the district council (26/4/16) should not consider the amended planning application for the mill site until this is resolved. MW pointed out that the proposed planning amendments would not increase the risk. The member of the public stated it would as if there was excessive flooding such as in 1917 then there would be more debris that would further block the escape route of excess water at the bridge point. MW pointed out that the proposed new dwellings would be replacing the existing factory site therefore the issues of additional debris would not be applicable. PW pointed out that outline planning permission for 29 dwellings has already been granted and that the amended application is to replace the existing outline permission of work units and a village hall with six additional dwellings. The member of the public then stated that much of the content of the independent assessment done by JPA Consulting for the district council was incorrect and should be challenged and addressed at the planning committee meeting tomorrow. He also stated that the district council had failed to complete a new sequential test that was originally fundamental to the case for the agreed outline planning permission. SF confirmed that the member of the public had made these representations to the district council and the member of the public stated he was hoping to attend the planning meeting at NDDC tomorrow to make his representations in person. A further member of the public expressed their worry, as a neighbour to the proposed development, concerning the impact of the proposals on flooding and the effectiveness of the flood defences. PW pointed out that in relation to the flood risk, the developer has to return to NDDC with detailed plans for flood mitigation when he seeks full planning consent as he only has outline consent thus far). Within the conditions that are being imposed upon the developer following tomorrow's hearing - if consent for the variation is granted - are the following, which are relevant to flooding:

1. Prior to the construction of any foundations on site including those for roads, buildings and car parks, but permitting demolition and site clearance works, and prior to construction of any part of the flood risk management scheme, flood risk mitigation measures and dam works, a detailed design for repair and hydraulic/structural improvements of Bourton Dam shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. Any such scheme shall have been validated by a suitably qualified Panel Engineer and the works subsequently carried out in full and approved by a qualified Panel Engineer to the satisfaction and in writing of the Local Planning Authority. This is to **ensure that the development is subject to a minimum risk of flooding.**
2. Prior to the construction of any foundations on site including those for roads, buildings and car parks, but permitting demolition and site clearance works and prior to construction of any part of the permitting development, flood risk management scheme, flood risk mitigation measures and dam works, a detailed flood path analysis, utilising the flows and velocities calculated in the dam breach analysis, and details of the final building designs, taking into account structural loading criteria, shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within the Flood Risk Assessment by Fairhurst in October 2011. The final scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority with the development according with the approved details. This is to **ensure the development is adequately designed to resist structural damage in the event of a catastrophic flood such as that resulting from a partial collapse of an upstream dam.**

PW stated that this should reassure residents that this is not some rushed issue. It is been very considered carefully by NDDC Officers and by Members of the Development Management Committee. AC pointed out that people must remember that outline planning permission has already been granted and that this is an amendment to this. Therefore there will be a further detailed planning application or applications where residents can further raise concerns and work such as investigation of the bridge and parapet can be completed and in turn provide information that may be of use and influence on the final plans. PW additionally pointed out that the sequential test issue has been examined by the district council and officers are satisfied with the position. A member of the public asked how many dwellings there is now proposed. PW confirmed this is 35 in total and six affordable houses off site at a future date. A member of the public asked if surrounding lanes were to be widened during the construction phase and in future. SF stated that the developer should agree a highways plan with the county but there would be no widening of roads. PW concluded by reminding everyone that the existing outline planning cannot be overturned and that the proposed development is the only way to resolve the dilapidated, dangerous and ugly mill site that has been an issue for many years.

## **16.2 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

MW declared a non-pecuniary interest and personal interest within the New Village Hall agenda item as he is a next door neighbour to one of the potential sites for the new village hall.

SF declared a non-pecuniary interest and personal interest within the Bourton Mill agenda item as he is an adjacent landowner to the site. He confirmed though that he would not vote on any resolution if one was proposed.

AM and GM declared a pecuniary interest in the planning applications relating to Holly Home.

## **16.3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The March minutes were then agreed as an accurate record and were signed by the Chairman.

## **16.4 ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

SF confirmed that the four actions from the last meeting were as follows:-

P.56—SF arrange councillor to attend NDDC Planning Meeting for Rugby Cottage—Completed.

P.57—Clerk to inform NDDC & applicant re affordable housing for Mill Site—Completed.

P.58 – Clerk to inform CWG of decision – Completed and discharged.

P.59 – DAPTC Councillor training session at Bourton – Date set completed and discharge.

## **16.5 REPORTS BY THE DISTRICT AND/OR COUNTY COUNCILLOR**

AC on behalf of the County Council provided an update concerning the Local Government Reform that he had referred to at the last meeting. He informed the meeting that following a change of leadership at East Dorset Council all 9 authorities now agree to work together and find a way forward. He anticipated that there would be a county wide consultation as early as mid-summer and confirmed he would keep everyone updated as this progresses.

PW stated that there were no updates at this time from North Dorset District Council (NDDC).

## **16.6 PLANNING MATTERS**

### **16.6.1 Applications received – Three**

16/0344 – Build in part of garden of 1 Breach Close a new dwelling in existing land.

16/0313 - Holly Home Blackwater Lane - Extension to existing property.

16/0314 - Holly Home Blackwater Lane - Rear Extension to existing property.

MW confirmed that the Planning Sub Group had reviewed all three applications and that both applications for Holly Home were supported. MW stated though that the Breach Close application had been carefully reviewed and that this application was not supported due to the proposal requesting a new build within the garden of an existing property that would result in an inappropriate dwelling being effectively squeezed into a totally unsuitable and inappropriate site. The proposed dwelling would be in front of the existing building lines of both Main Road and Breach Close, thereby going against the recommendations in the Village Design Statement. There were no further observations made by any councillors present and the clerk confirmed that the district council had been informed of these decisions as per the parish council policy.

#### **16.6.2 Applications granted – None**

#### **16.6.3 Applications withdrawn - None**

**All applications can be viewed on dorsetforyou planning portal or via the village website.**

#### **16.6.4 Bourton Mill**

PW informed the meeting that the NDDC Development Management Committee have been provided with a detailed 45 page report that recommends the variations be accepted, but with 42 conditions placed upon the developer. PW stressed that the accusation by a few residents that the developer cannot be trusted because he has amended the plan is inappropriate. He reminded the meeting that the removal of the proposed village hall was as a result of the village hall management committee recommendation that the site was not suitable for a hall, something further supported by the neighbourhood planning group on behalf of the parish council. He also pointed out that the amendments concerning the affordable housing were driven by the fact that residents on the proposed development will have to form a company or similar to manage the communal requirements within the private estate, something that housing associations do not wish to be a part of, hence the agreement to affordable housing units being off site elsewhere within the district. PW also pointed out that one of the drivers to amend the business units to houses has been that there is insufficient evidence that supports the units ever being utilised and could lead to these units remaining empty. PW pointed out that things do change and the owner has had to adapt to this hence the proposed amendments. PW confirmed that all the recommendations and conditions will be discussed by the district council and that the officers of the district council have exhaustively considered all the information provided from statutory consultees, specialists and members of the public. PW stated that the parish council understands the concerns, however, there are wider issues at stake here. PW pointed out that unless the proposed development goes ahead the dangerous and contaminated mill site would not be resolved. If the developer abandoned the project, no one would come along and restore the site to its natural pre circa-1700 state. Also, the dam will be left to fend for itself increasing the risk of flooding. He stated that this development should resolve what has become a death-trap, in the form of a heavily contaminated derelict industrial site, and will provide us with some certainty that the dam will receive structural maintenance. Hopefully, this will reassure everyone that this is not some rushed issue and that it is in the best interests of the whole village. All councillors present agreed with the points made by PW and agreed that a parish councillor should attend the Development Management Committee meeting to provide the view of the parish council. Due to councillor commitments it was agreed that this should be the Chairman and that the Chairman should provide the agreed update written by the clerk reflecting the parish council view. (Copy is on the website as an appendix to the minutes).

**Proposed by MW, seconded by MM and agreed by all councillors.**

**Please note SF did not vote as voluntarily agreed by him at this and previous meetings.**

#### **16.6.5 Solar/Wind/Photovoltaic Sites**

PW confirmed there was no additional information although he noted that the work on the Cucklington site had seemed to stop. The clerk agreed to informally ask Cucklington Parish Council the present position then in inform councillors by e mail.

### **16.7 FINANCE**

#### **16.7.1Accounts to be paid – Two**

Mr J Mann – Reimbursement of costs for web domain 2015 - £ 44.93

Elite Playground – Annual Inspection 2016/2017 - £ 90.00

**Proposed by MW, seconded by JM and agreed by all councillors.**

### **16.7.2 Accounts received – Two.**

Dorset County Council – Grant for Queen Oak sign -	£600.00
HMRC – VAT Reclaim 2015/2016 year -	£4165.52

The clerk confirmed that the first half precept payment had now been received but this would be accounted for in the May Meeting.

### **16.7.3 Grants and Donations. None.**

## **16.8 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP**

MW stated that the last month had been spent largely on thoroughly reviewing and suggesting amendments to the SEA report, draft Neighbourhood Plan and the Site Selection Report. All of these are quite long technical documents and reviewing and correcting them had taken many hours of painstaking work by the NPG. He added that it is hoped that when these documents are revised they will be ready to submit to the parish council as part of the pre-public consultation package, along with the Basic Conditions and Consultation Statements. This will either be for the May or June parish council meetings. There were no questions from the council. SF thanked the NPG for all their hard work and patience.

## **16.9 NEW VILLAGE HALL**

PW stated that the VHMC had not met since the last parish council meeting but they were progressing a Business Case with Mike Chapman leading this work for them. He further reminded the meeting that the VHMC would be requesting a donation to cover the cost of the structural engineer who would be examining the existing building. MM informed the meeting that since the last meeting there was some inaccurate rumour in the village that the proposal for a new village hall had been shelved. MM stated it was important to reaffirm that the decision to complete a structural review of the current hall was needed as part of the business plan to confirm that all potential alternatives for an improved hall and village amenities had been explored, including the viability or not of the existing hall. TH reminded the meeting that this point was made at the last meeting and that the options for a new hall had to include whether or not the existing hall is viable and if not why not. SF confirmed that this work did not mean that the options of a new hall have been dismissed and that the neighbourhood plan will reflect both new options as potential sites.

## **16.10 TRAINING**

SF confirmed that DAPTC had agreed to provide a one off training session for all councillors using the village hall on Wednesday 27/4/16 commencing 6pm.

## **16.11 FOOTPATHS**

**PLEASE NOTE Any member of the public can contact DCC on the dorsetforyou website, footpaths section and report a problem on line.**

### **16.11.1 Mile markers and posts.**

SF confirmed the two markers were being progressed by the W&HG, DCC & Mere Fabricating.

### **16.11.2 Anti-social behaviour by dog walkers and litter**

TH stated that there must be more the parish council could do and that the use of warning signs did not seem to work as in the case of the continually damaged or stolen sign in Kites Nest Lane. He also pointed out that recently a member of the public had actually found a dumped bag of rubbish with potential identification of the offender in it. When this was reported to police the 101 number and process was appalling and eventually when the resident did get hold of someone they were not interested. The clerk pointed out that if the public inform the Dorset Waste Partnership they will tidy up the litter and also look to prosecute offenders. TH suggested that the landowners where footpaths cross do have a responsibility to ensure dog walkers behave responsibly, but he acknowledged that the actions they could take were limited as they are for the parish council. MM suggested that there is a need for the minority who do not collect their dog mess or throw plastic bags over bushes need to be held to account by other dog walkers as it is more likely they will know who these people are or on occasions actually see the illegal activity taking place. PW pointed out that the village have four dog mess bins in close proximity to each other but other parts of the village seem to lack this facility. It was agreed that a councillor would review the location of all such bins with the view to recommending new locations to the Dorset Waste Partnership.

**ACTION:** TH to progress and report back at the next meeting.

**The Bourton Parish Council would ask that the inconsiderate minority of dog walkers clean up their pet's mess and place the waste in suitable bins within the village. The parish council would also urge the vast majority of law abiding residents to report incidents of anti-social behaviour to the police and incidents of litter or fly-tipping to the Dorset Waste Partnership. The parish council will always support the prosecution of such offenders.**

## **16.12 HIGHWAYS**

JM stated that there were no further updates at this time.

### **16.12.1 Naming of roads and road name signs**

The clerk reminded the meeting of the work being conducted by NDDC to review road names and signs within the district. He informed the meeting that residents had asked whether the parish council could progress having three roads named in the village with road signs placed. These are the main road through the village (referred to as 'Main Road' or 'New Road', the stretch of road at the crossroads that goes from the village towards Gillingham and eventually joins Fantley Lane and the entrance road to the village hall. The clerk pointed out that to have a road named would cost £113.00 plus VAT per road. Following a discussion the council agreed to ask residents through the minutes for any thoughts or views on doing this and any proposed road names for the three locations identified. **If members of the public do have any suggestions could they be forwarded to the clerk by e mail on [parishclerk@bourtondorset.org](mailto:parishclerk@bourtondorset.org)**

**ACTION:** Clerk to report back to the May Meeting.

## **16.13 TRANSPORT**

SF stated there were no updates at this time. Please note the request for a bus stop was discussed and is reflected in the open forum section where the original question was raised.

## **16.14 COMMUNITY SAFETY**

SF confirmed that the final draft of a letter from Dorset Police concerning individual 'home watch' or 'police alert' where each household could be informed of information by the police and provide information to the police will be going to each house in the next month. He urged all residents to sign up to this as it would improve how residents are made aware of incidents or police requests for information and would be a good way of directly reporting issues excluding those that require immediate police attendance which should be done using the 999 system.

## 16.15 CORRESPONDENCE

08/03/2016	DAPTC	Clinical Commissioning consultation – Website& n/boards
15/03/2016	NDDC	Planning Info16/1827 - Rugby Cottage – All councillors
15/03/2016	NDDC	Planning App 16/0244 - House Silton Rd - PSG & website
08/03/2016	NDDC	Planning App 16/0206 - Holly Cottage - PSG and website
08/03/2016	VHMC	Copy of latest minutes - To all councillors
18/03/2016	DAPTC	Information for clerk on S137 Funding - Noted and filed
18/03/2016	DAPTC	Information for parishes along Jurassic coast - Filed NFA
18/03/2016	Mr Sullivan	Information concerning flood zone mapping - Councillors
18/03/2016	Mr Curry	Enquiry NDDC precept setting - Reply done copy to DC.
18/03/2016	Brimble Lea	E Mail re village hall selection-Reply done & all Councillors
18/03/2016	NDDC	PCC Election posters - Noticeboards and website
18/03/2016	Mr Sullivan	Email village bank, neighbours and ownership – Email reply

PW reminded the meeting that the clerk had circulated a paper from NDDC concerning a request to hear the Rugby Cottage (10 dwelling) Planning Application (Item 2 above) under the 'delegated powers' rather than at a full meeting of the Development Management Committee. PW reminded the meeting of the representations made by the parish council and how the applicant had responded to these and in particular the move to 50% of the dwellings being two bed roomed and the re-alignment of the houses that were too close to existing neighbours and the pre conditions concerning the access and egress points to the site. The clerk reaffirmed the observations made by the NDDC Tree Officer concerning the existing trees under preservation orders. MW suggested that the school should write to the district council and applicant to ensure the points made about construction traffic movements are followed up.

**ACTION:** MM to draw the attention of the Head Teacher to this matter.

MM stated it was important that the parish council adopted a balanced and appropriate response and took into account the response of the applicant to the parish council's original concerns and objections. The parish council agreed to the proposal that this now be a matter dealt with under the delegated powers for planning by the district council.

**Proposed by MW, seconded by TH and agreed by all councillors.**

**ACTION:** The Clerk to inform NDDC, Hannah Smith (Note: Done by e mail on 26/4/16)

## 16.16 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

MM informed the meeting that on Friday 6<sup>th</sup> May 2016 there would be an event held at St. Martins Church, Zeals to debate the EU Referendum with speakers Paddy Ashdown (In) and Andrew Murrison (Out). All are welcome and if people wish to raise a question to the speakers they can do this on night or in advance by e mail to Revd Graham Perryman, even if they cannot attend the event.

GM asked if the Annual Parish Meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> May could be moved to the same date as the Annual General Meeting and the May Meeting on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016. The clerk confirmed this could be done. Following a discussion this was agreed by all present. This was proposed by GM and seconded by MW but as it is an AOB item the request is noted and agreed.

**ACTION:** IM to arrange that APM, AGM and May Meeting take place at 1900 Monday 23/5/16.

SF asked that councillors consider nominations for the 2015/16 Tom Mitchell Salver.

**ACTION:** All Councillors send any proposals to the Clerk for the May Meeting.

16.17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING - MONDAY 23<sup>RD</sup> MAY 2016 AT 7PM.

**NOTE: ANNUAL PARISH MEETING followed by the ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING followed by the MONTHLY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

Chairman: S.Firbank

Date: 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016

**Note: The minutes will be reviewed and formally ratified by the BPC on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016**