

MINUTES OF THE MONTHLY MEETING OF BOURTON PARISH COUNCIL

HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 7.00 P.M. ON MONDAY, 26TH SEPTEMBER 2016

- PRESENT:** S Firbank (Chairman), M Withers, G Miller, J Morgan, T Heaton, M Martin, A Miller, Mike Chapman and I McVie (Clerk).
- APOLOGIES:** P Williams (Parish & District Councillor). Andrew Cattaway (County & District Councillor)
- ATTENDING:** PCSO Vicki Levy (Police) and 13 members of the public, including Mr D Carpendale from Brimble Lea (for a planning item on the agenda).

16.88 OPEN FORUM

SF reminded all present that the open forum is an opportunity for residents to inform the parish council of issues or bring appropriate matters to the council's attention. SF reminded everyone that they should contact parish councillors between meetings to raise matters or report faults or issues on highways, footpaths and litter directly via the dorsetforyou website.

PCSO Levy updated the meeting and confirmed that there had been no reported crimes since the last parish meeting. She informed the meeting that the police were continuing to patrol the old mill site and she visits the site at least once during her individual shifts which includes late evenings. PCSO Levy stated that surprisingly the majority of individuals found in the site are in their twenties and are taking photographs of the buildings. PCSO Levy pointed out that Halloween will see trick or treat visits and left leaflets (now in the garage) giving advice to residents should they be worried. MM informed the meeting that a rough sleeper had recently been found in the church grounds and that when police had been contacted via 101 the advice given was to move them on and that police do not attend such matters, which was slightly disappointing and worrying. PCSO Levy stated this should be something police would assign a resource to although it would not be treated as an emergency, she would provide feedback to the control room. There were no other questions.

A member of the public informed the meeting that he had sent an e mail to the Chairman concerning some outstanding tree work on the banks managed by the wildlife group and the condition of some road signs. The clerk confirmed that he was due to speak to the contractor to chase this up (Note: This has been done and works will be completed in October). SF confirmed that regardless of the current and future funding levels of the county council where road signs are damaged, obscured or unreadable this should be reported via dorsetforyou. (Note: The two road name signs at Bridge Street and Breach Close had been reported and await repair). The member of the public asked that the parish council challenges the continual cuts in service being made by the county council as part of their budget cuts. The clerk pointed out that the parish council have done this and will continue to do so. SF reminded the meeting that individuals should also write or email the county council concerning this and pointed out that the parish council, as recorded in previous minutes, is looking at areas of non-essential work, through our current contractor, that the parish can do to maintain existing signs and surfaces on highways and paths. A member of the public pointed out that the reality of reduced centrally funded budgets means that local communities will have to do more for themselves. This includes the parish council looking at ways it can complete non-essential work and for residents to do more in their village and parish. She continued by providing an example of local residents cleaning road signs in the village, litter picking and the work being undertaken by the parish council. SF thanked her for the supportive comments.

A member of the public reminded the meeting that the village website was available and contains a lot of local information that includes council minutes, finances, planning and up to date local news from a variety of sources. Visit the website at <http://www.bourtondorset.org>

A member of the public asked if the parish council will be making representations about the likely closure of the ward and beds at the Shaftesbury Hospital. SF confirmed the council had and would be continuing to do this and encourages all residents to oppose this move which is currently in the consultation phase. SF confirmed he would give a further update as this was an agenda item.

The Speed Watch Coordinator confirmed that the speed watch group were continuing with regular checks which have seen improved driving and reduced speeds. While there are still the odd one or two negative comments, the majority of people have been very supportive of the group's efforts. The speed detection device is back fully operational and the group are looking at whether there is a possibility of getting a second device and working to have a 20mph speed limit around the school during school opening and closing times. SF thanked the group for their efforts.

A member of the public informed the meeting that he had attended the district council planning meeting at Blandford where the decision to allow the planning application for the mill site was agreed. He confirmed he had made representations opposing the application and that another member of the public spoke in favour of it and that the parish council chairman had also spoken. He stated he was disappointed to see that the three minute representations made were reduced to about twenty seconds worth in the subsequent district council minutes. SF said this should be taken this up with the district council as these are not parish council minutes. The member of the public reminded the meeting about previous concerns he had raised in relation to the flood risk under the bridge and that to date he still had not had a satisfactory response from the county council. He confirmed the Environment Agency had responded with three pages of what he considered to be 'rubbish and politically motivated'. He stated he had found a design document written by DCC that proves the culvert is too small and he was hoping to have taken this up with the county councillor this evening. SF asked if this last item of information had been passed to the district council. The member of the public stated it had not as was a highways issue. SF pointed out that residents can always contact all councillors, including the county councillor, between meetings and by doing this and raising concerns responses would usually come quicker. SF stated that the parish council noted the points raised and would leave them with the resident to progress.

16.89 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

SF declared a non-pecuniary interest and personal interest within the Bourton Mill agenda item as he is an adjacent landowner to the site.

GM and AM declared an interest in the Holly Home agenda item if it is to be discussed.

The clerk informed the meeting that Councillor Chapman had raised whether he needed to claim any form of interest in relation to the agenda item on the planning application for land adjacent to Sandways Farm. The clerk stated that MC did not need to do so as the plan drawings are incorrect and his private land does not border the land for the planning application.

16.90 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

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

16.91 ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

P.17 16.69. SF to update on telephone kiosk and defibrillator. SF confirmed that he had received a report in relation to this item and would circulate it to all. Action rolled over to the following meeting. **Item ongoing.**

P. 20 16.74 The clerk to arrange a joint advert for a first aid response co-ordinator and volunteers should be arranged with Zeals to establish if there is sufficient support. The Zeals Parish Council agreed this at their September meeting and a joint advert will appear in the November parish magazines. **Item discharged**

P. 23 16.69 Advert for parish clerk. SF confirmed this had been placed and there had been good interest with interviews being arranged for week commencing 10/10/16. **Item discharged.**

16.92 REPORTS by the DISTRICT and/or COUNTY COUNCILLOR

SF confirmed that there was no update for this meeting on behalf of the County or District Council.

SF confirmed that the parish council had attended the consultation session on 20/9/16 at The Blandford School. The clerk reminded the meeting that the three options all see there being two unitary authorities for Dorset, one being URBAN for the Bournemouth/Poole conurbation, possibly with Christchurch and/or East Dorset and one being RURAL for the rest of Dorset. PW stated that the reality is that whatever the position North Dorset will be in the rural unitary authority. The clerk confirmed all information received was being placed on the website and where suitable the noticeboards. SF stated residents should ensure they have their say and select one of the three options. Following a discussion the parish council agreed that they supported the third option which is an URBAN unitary authority for Bournemouth and Poole and a RURAL unitary authority for the rest of Dorset. This would ensure that the rural authority has as much say as to how the whole of Dorset is run as the levels of population would be greater in the rural unitary authority which potentially impacts on levels of funding, availability of resources and services to the rural areas.

Proposed by MW, Seconded by JM and agreed by all.

ACTION: Clerk to reply to www.opinionresearch.co.uk/DorsetTC (Note: Action completed 28/9/16)

16.93 PLANNING MATTERS

16.93.1 Applications received – Six

Land adjacent to Sandways Farm 1227/16- Housing & land for village hall & amenities.

Land adjacent to Rugby Cottage 1273/16- Amendment to previously granted layout

Holly Home 1216/16- Remove existing kitchen and carry out associated works

2 Orchard Cottage 1303/16- Erect single storey rear extension

12 New Close 1390/16- Erect two storey extension and single storey extension

1 Old Red Lion Yard 1115/16 Erection of a blue historical plaque on house wall

MW confirmed that the planning sub group had considered the Holly Home, 2 Orchard Cottage, 12

New Close and 1 Old Red Lion Yard applications and were satisfied that they complied with

current planning legislation and policy and supported the applications. All councillors present

agreed, excluding GM and AM in relation to Holly Home who took no part in this item.

Proposed by MW, Seconded by JM and agreed by all councillors

MW confirmed that the planning sub group had reviewed the land adjacent to Rugby cottage

application and disappointingly the applicant is proposing to return the northern most property to

the original location which the council had previously objected to. All councillors agreed that this

was disappointing. GM asked if the issues over tree preservation orders and tree removal had

been resolved. The clerk confirmed they had based on the Tree Preservation Officer reports.

Following a discussion it was agreed that the council should object to the amendment due to the

re-siting of the northern most property and its proximity to existing houses and neighbours.

Proposed by MW, Seconded by JM and agreed by all councillors

Note: All of the above planning decisions have been notified to NDDC on 26/9/16

SF confirmed that all councillors had received copies of the outline planning application made by Brimble Lea on behalf of the owners of land adjacent to Sandways Farm. He reminded all present that this application is one for housing with the enabling provision of land for a village hall and outside amenities. SF also made the point that the application as with all applications can be accessed by anyone through the dorsetforyou website and then the planning portal. The clerk also confirmed as usual the information and link to the planning portal is also on the village website within the parish council section of the site. SF stated that given the interest in this application and its significance the council had invited Mr Carpendale (DC) from Brimble Lea to the meeting and he invited him to make any representations he wished on behalf of the applicant and to be available to answer any questions the council may have. Mr Carpendale thanked the council for the opportunity and briefly presented the application as per the written submissions made by Brimble Lea to North Dorset District Council (NDDC) on behalf of the applicant. DC stressed that the proposal was an outline application and is not seeking specific approval for such matters as the types and sizes of individual properties. He also stressed that any transfer of land for the village hall and amenities would be dealt with through any subsequent Section 106 agreement. DC confirmed the view of Brimble Lea concerning the significance of the Neighbourhood Plan in considering this application, again confirming the detail contained within the application. SF thanked DC for his presentation.

TH confirmed that DC was representing the land owner and DC informed the meeting that architects and builders had not yet been identified as this is an outline planning application. SF confirmed that the parish council had asked the Neighbourhood Plan Group to provide a view on the application as quite rightly the applicant has referred to the neighbourhood plan (NP) process, content and their view of its significance in considering a planning application at this time. He asked MW to provide any comments or questions. MW stated there are a number of issues concerning this application at this time. MW pointed out that, at this relatively early stage of the NP validation process only little planning "weight" can be given to the draft NP when considering development applications, as suggested by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Annex 1. It is not known at this stage the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the emerging NP. Also, no independent examination or referendum has taken place on the draft NP as it has not yet reached that stage. Therefore the PC should not assume the conclusion of the NP

process. DC stated that there is no intention to undermine the process and the application has been made at this time because the NP process is likely to take some time to be finally concluded and we had to 'dip our toe in the water'. The clerk further reminded the meeting that his understanding is that the NP must be a material consideration but the weighting given to it must take into account the stage the process is at, which is that the plan has to go to NDDC who then manage a further public consultation and a referendum for all residents and if the plan is supported it has to go to an independent Planning Inspector to finally agree. Therefore the plan is still at a stage where it has limited standing so the council do have to consider this application against current legislation and policy including the NDDC adopted 'Local Plan' which clearly would say this proposed development lies outside the existing settlement boundary.

GM stated that he was in favour of supporting this application as the village have been looking to progress a new hall for many years and this, in his view, presents the best opportunity for delivering a new hall. DC pointed out that an application can be approved that is outside the settlement boundary where there is provision for such things as a village hall. MW stated that the settlement boundary and the restrictions on new housing should be considered carefully by the council. MW further added that the timing of the submission of the application is not helpful given the stage the NP is at and that it is disappointing the planning statement made by Brimble Lea seems to try to discredit the alternative site and contains some erroneous comments including where it has been stated that "it is uncertain whether there would be any support from the Village Hall Management Committee (VHMC) should the Jubilee Field site be selected...", which is totally false. Following an informal presentation of the two alternative sites the VHMC wrote to the NPG and copied to the parish council that it was content with either site and that it was very pleased to have two excellent potential sites identified by the NP process.

JM pointed out her concerns about the mix of houses. She stated that in accordance with the views expressed by the community on any new residential development in the village, there is a clear preference for a small number of small family-sized homes of a total number of 4-6, not the 9 shown on the application. The expressed view in the two NPG questionnaire responses was for small family homes and not 4-bedroomed properties. The application proposes 4 of these, almost 45% of the total. MW also pointed out that the housing element of the development and the split accesses leading to it will impact greatly on existing adjoining properties, especially Acacia Cottage.

JM stated she was not convinced this is the type of housing the village now wants given the other developments in the village. TH pointed out this includes the about to start development on the old mill site for 35 dwellings and the agreed development near Rugby Cottage for 10 houses, albeit there is an amended application submitted. TH pointed out the village now has agreed planning for an additional 50 houses therefore the need, type, size and affordability is something the council must take into consideration with this and any further applications. DC stated that the application was outline only therefore the detail of the size and types of property would be a consideration in the future. He stated that the application was for two sets of 2/3 bed semi-detached houses (four dwellings), 2 slightly larger properties and 3 slightly larger 3/4 bed properties. JM stated she was sceptical of what any future number and size of houses would actually be on the site if this outline application was successful. GM pointed out that this was an in principal application in terms of numbers and types of houses so, in his view is irrelevant.

SF asked MC for any views and in particular from the village hall perspective. MC pointed out that the council must consider this within the context of planning including the neighbourhood planning process. He reminded the meeting that the draft NP contains two potential sites and that the next stage of a second consultation and referendum will give further insight into any preferences the village may have and is a chance for individuals to express their views. He stated that the conclusion of the NP is only a few months away and on that basis he stated that the parish council should wait and therefore not support this application at this time. AM stated he agreed with this and also had concerns about the type, mix and size of the houses. DC confirmed that the application contains provision for nine houses in total and the application is to try and advance the process and get things rolling. AM stated he was concerned that by agreeing this proposal the impact on the future is too uncertain given the timing of this application. JM asked if the council do not support this application at this time will it set back the village hall process. MC stated it would not as there is still a large amount of work to do to get to the production of a meaningful business case that can deliver a new hall that is appropriate, affordable and will be used. MC stressed that having the option of two possible sites is a wonderful opportunity and that is why the NP should be finalised prior to any planning application being supported in relation to either to potential site. MW stated that the hope is for the NP to be finalised in the first quarter of the new-year. Both he and JM stated this is not therefore a great deal of time to wait and have certainty over the final agreed and supported neighbourhood plan. TH said he would not support the view of GM and in particular

has concerns over the amount of larger new homes already agreed for building, the lack of smaller affordable family homes and while grateful for the offer made in the outline planning application he could not support this. GM stated that the outline application before the council would be subject to conditions and any final agreed housing would need further detailed planning applications to progress. GM proposed that the parish council support the application. No other councillors were prepared to second this proposal. MW proposed that the application should not be supported due to the concerns raised by the parish councillors who should base their consideration of this application on the established development plan of NDDC, national planning policy and any other material considerations. It is current NDDC policy that private residential development should not be undertaken outside of the Settlement Boundary in Bourton. Plus the concerns raised about the type of proposed housing taking into account the current number of agreed new houses to be built in the parish and the views expressed by current residents as to the type of housing needed. MW also pointed out the need to consider the extent to which the outline proposal could affect adjoining properties including Acacia Cottage, Sandways Farm and a listed property in Brickyard Lane. This proposal was seconded by JM. 6 councillors in total voted not to support the application, GM voted against and SF abstained from voting. Therefore the motion to not support was agreed. SF thanked DC for attending and he left the meeting at the conclusion of this agenda item.

Proposed by MW, Seconded by JM agreed by 6 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

Note: NDDC informed in writing via the planning portal on 26/9/16 prior to midnight.

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

16.93.2 Bourton Mill

SF informed the meeting that subject to the work to re-house the bats the developer is looking to commence work on site sometime in October. SF confirmed that whilst asbestos had previously been removed from the site it is for the developer now to ensure that if any asbestos is discovered it is removed safely and as per legislation. JM stated that as the parish council single point of contact, she would be keeping a close eye on this and the conditions included in the Section 106 agreement, as would NDDC as the planning and enforcement authority. SF informed the meeting that he had received an email from the Wildlife and Habitat Group concerning the use of the IOWA piece of land by the builder during the building phase, this was in the email referred to earlier in the open forum session. SF confirmed that the planning permission had been granted with conditions in the Section 106 that included the temporary use of the IOWA land by the builder who as a condition would have to return it to its original state.

16.93.3 Solar/Wind/Photovoltaic Sites

SF confirmed there were no new updates.

16.94 FINANCE

16.94.1 Accounts to be paid – Seven

P Cowell	September cemetery and verge cuts	£ 472.80
IJ McVie	Reimburse for expenses and back pay, after PAYE	£ 361.00
Dales of Thirsk	Second half and final payment for Queen Oak stone.	£ 487.68
P Cowell	Additional works DCC non-essential task.	£ 708.00
BDO.	2015/16 External Audit	£ 240.00
VHMC.	Rental of hall by BPC 2015/16	£40.00
S. Firbank.	Mileage 2015/16	£123.00

The clerk confirmed that the external audit was successfully concluded and the appropriate notices posted on the noticeboards. He also confirmed the extent of the non-essential work carried out by P Cowell which indicated that £500 a year would be needed to complete one section of verge and path re cutting and over three years this would be completed. He confirmed this month would be kerbside weed killing and clearing vegetation and cleaning of and around all road signs, this task would need doing once a year.

Proposed by AM, seconded by JM and agreed by all councillors.

16.94.2 Accounts received – One.

DCC.	Cutting of DCC owned verges in village for 2016/17 year	£1254.76
------	---	----------

All councillors noted the payments received.

16.94.3 Grants and Donations. Two.

Bourton Players Theatre Group	– Funds for new scenery boards and paint.	£ 250.00
Wildlife and Habitat Group	- Funds for seeds and equipment for year.	£ 350.00

SF confirmed copies of both groups' applications and accounts had been provided to all councillors prior to the meeting as per the policy. Following a discussion both grants were agreed.

Proposed by MM, Seconded by MC and agreed by all councillors present.

16.95 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP

MW confirmed that the NPG had held its last meeting on 16/9/16 and were joined by the planning consultant, Liz Beth to go through the proposed responses to comments received during the recent Regulation 14 public consultation on the draft plan. It included responses from statutory consultees as well as a number of individuals and all of these comments were discussed in detail before a draft response was made and proposed. These responses will form the major part of the NP Consultation Statement which, together with the Basic Conditions Statement and the amended NP is expected to be sent to NDDC in mid-November for them to undertake a further round of public consultation over a six week period. Following this, the draft NP will either be further amended or sent forward to an independent examiner for the next stage of the process. Once this stage is completed, NDDC will arrange for a referendum on the NP to be organised and, if more than 50% of those voting in the referendum, vote in favour of it, then it will be adopted by NDDC and used to help determine future planning applications in Bourton. MW confirmed that the NPG have also prepared a response for the parish council on an outline planning application for the provision of land for a new village hall with amenity land and an enabling housing development on land adjoining Sandways Farm, which is one of the two sites identified in the draft NP as being suitable for the new village hall. There were no questions from councillors.

16.96 NEW VILLAGE HALL

MC confirmed that the project team continue to examine a number of strands to develop an affordable and appropriate new village hall. This has included looking at other hall projects and how funds were raised, how to be successful in obtaining grant aid, looking at more economical hall designs that provide the required facilities and services and attending a training session in November being run by Dorset Community Alert. MC pointed out that to ensure need is identified and funding can be accessed evidence must be current and in any case no longer than two years old. Therefore existing evidence will have to be re-visited and it is hoped that Dorset Community Alert may be able to provide support to do this. SF asked if there had been any progress made by the VHMC concerning the changes to its trustees and their liabilities as a charity. MC stated he was not aware of where this matter currently was. MM asked what the present occupancy rate of use was for the hall. MC stated it was not high and less than 40%. MC said the VHMC understands the need to increase the hire rate of the current hall as this will help any future applications for funding support for a new hall. This would be needed on top of showing how it is proposed a new hall would develop and increase its use by the local community. SF thank the project team for their work.

16.97 TRAINING

SF confirmed there were no new updates for this meeting.

16.98 FOOTPATHS

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

TH confirmed there were no updates for this meeting.

16.98 HIGHWAYS

PLEASE NOTE Any member of the public can contact DCC on the dorsetforyou website, highways section and report a problem on line, including defective, obscured road signs, potholes, blocked road drains and issues with manhole covers.

JM confirmed there were no other updates for this meeting.

16.99 TRANSPORT

JM informed the meeting that the bus time table had been changed and that the 1207 to Wincanton and the 1218 from Wincanton had been withdrawn. A copy of the new timetable is on the website and the bus stop noticeboards. SF stated that were no other updates.

16.100 COMMUNITY SAFETY

SF stated there were no other updates and items had been covered in the open forum.

16.101 HEALTH and WELLBEING

SF explained that given the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group reviews and subsequent consultations this will now be a standing item. SF informed the meeting that whenever any information or consultation on the future provision of NHS and other health services is brought to the attention of the parish council it will go onto the website and where appropriate the village noticeboards. SF stated as was raised in the open forum the most worrying proposed change is the closure of the 12 bed ward at Shaftesbury Hospital with these services going to either Sherborne or Blandford cottage hospitals. This facility is much appreciated at Shaftesbury and if moved will cause difficulties including access, as public transport to Sherborne and Blandford is poor. SF informed the meeting that the parish council sent representatives to the recent public

consultation meetings at Shaftesbury and Gillingham. Both these were advertised on the village website and the attendance at both was excellent with the public attending in such numbers that at Shaftesbury over 100 people had to stand outside the venue. SF confirmed that the parish council had made representations to stop the proposed closure of this local health facility. All councillors supported this stance and the parish council will continue to make representations. SF urged all residents to oppose this closure and ensure they make representations to the Clinical Commissioning Group and through County and District Councillors.

16.102 CORRESPONDENCE

The list of correspondence is as per the agenda and due to lengthy other items in the meeting have not been repeated on the minutes on this occasion.

SF confirmed that the clerk had replied to NDDC concerning the number of agreed planning applications and number of agreed new properties to be built which total for Bourton, 50.

16.103 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

SF confirmed that following the last consultation DCC had decided to discontinue the current mobile library service from next financial year. The council will still be providing services to the housebound and are encouraging greater use of existing libraries and the internet via the dorsetforyou website.

SF informed the meeting that recycling times had now been amended to between 1000 and 1600 at the existing recycling sites in the county.

SF stated that the recent fly tipping on the bridleway/road up to Feltham Farm had been reported, although on previous occasions the Dorset Waste Partnership have stated this is not public land but private. He is monitoring this to see if the rubbish is cleared away.

MM said she will speak with the builder at 2 The Gables, opposite the War Memorial to get the skip and all builders rubbish moved from the verge once and for all.

The clerk informed the meeting that the VHMC had asked if the parish council would be prepared to consider using its VAT reclaim facility to pay a large electric works bill for the hall that the VHMC would reimburse the cost but that the VAT could be claimed back thus reducing the overall cost to the village hall. The clerk confirmed this can legally be done as long as it is to a local organisation that provides benefit to the local community and the item or services being purchased provides such benefit. He gave an example of a nearby parish council who had done this for the purchase of a minibus for a local youth and school group. TH stated he was unhappy with this as in one breath everyone is rightly concerned about the reducing budgets due to reductions in central government funding but then encouraging the legal avoidance of paying tax in this case VAT. MM stated she was also not inclined to support this type of use of the parish council. Following a discussion it was agreed by all councillors present that such requests under Section 33 of VAT legislation relating to the recovery of VAT for community works and projects, should not be supported and where VAT is to be paid it should be paid. Note: The VHMC have been informed.

Meeting concluded at 8.50 pm.

16.104 DATE OF NEXT MEETING - MONDAY 31ST OCTOBER 2016 AT 7PM.

Chairman: S.Firbank

Date: 26th September 2016

Note: The minutes will be reviewed and formally ratified by the BPC on 31st October 2016