

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF BOURTON PARISH COUNCIL
HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL AT 7.00PM ON MONDAY, 22ND OCTOBER 2018**

PRESENT: M Martin, M Chapman, P Williams, M Withers, T Heaton, I McVie, A Gillett, A Miller, G Miller, A Cattaway, E Wynn (Clerk)

APOLOGIES: None received

ATTENDING: 40+ members of the public.

18.92 APOLOGIES – AS PER ABOVE

18.93 OPEN FORUM

MW firstly opened the meeting by welcoming all the members of the public. He then read out a statement as follows:
Good evening everybody. With so many of you here and in order that matters are properly conducted with politeness and respect this evening, I would ask that people listen to the opinions of everyone speaking without interruption and with no disruption. A failure to do this will result, firstly in a warning and, if it persists, the person or people responsible will be asked to leave the debate. A failure to comply with this request will result in all members of the public being excluded from the meeting.

May I say that the Parish Council is fully aware that this is a very contentious issue within the village with strong opinions relating to both sites which were selected during the Neighbourhood Plan process.

The Parish Council is aware of an unofficial petition or straw poll having been carried out by persons who are strongly against the new Village Hall being on the Jubilee Field site. I have received information from a number of people questioned concerning the manner in which information for this petition was gathered, which was clearly inappropriate. I have no doubt that feelings are running high, especially from those of you who may be close to the potential site of the new hall. An example of Government guidance and case law concerning surveys, albeit relating to a different set of circumstances suggests that, and I quote “**we expect good surveys to be neutral and not biased towards one outcome or another. Given the nature of the phase 1 legal test, there is a particular risk to parties that survey results beneficial to their case may be given little or no weight if they are perceived to have been led by a biased survey design**” However Councillors must form their own opinion as to the weight they wish to give to the poll.

The Parish Council's job is to weigh all the factors which affect the deliverability of a new hall including planning issues, effects on neighbours, deliverability and funding issues for the benefit of the whole village.

As to the process tonight, I shall start by asking any member of the public who wishes to make a point to do so. For the sake of time and order, I would ask that you do not repeat a point that has already been made.

After this I shall invite each Councillor to speak and indicate their preference with reasons prior to the vote, taking into account the points that people have made and any other relevant matters that have come to their attention during the years that this issue has been up for consideration. There will then be a formal vote by Councillors and the next Agenda item will follow. There will be no further public involvement following the Councillor's vote.

I must also make it clear that tonight's meeting is not to agree a planning application. The proposals that have been put forward by the two site owners are indicative only and should not be taken as set in stone. There will follow the normal process of an application to NDDC Planners – planning permission is not automatic. The Parish Council also must consider an outline planning application tonight submitted by the Agent for the Sandways Farm site. The selection of the site must, by necessity, precede this consideration.

Should the site selected this evening fail to achieve planning permission or an appropriate S.106 Agreement on land transfer and developer contribution to access roads and services, then the Parish Council reserve the right to revert to the other site.

It is essential to select one of the sites because without a firm site, reasonable prospects of obtaining planning permission and a clear route to the provision of access and shared services, there can be no prospect of obtaining the commitment of funding partners and, consequently, no project. This process is not a beauty parade. An important long-term question is **will the selected site be likely to attract the necessary funding?**

I would just like to mention the very helpful letters I received during the Neighbourhood Plan process. These were signed by the chair of the VHMC and confirmed that, from the VHMC's point of view, both potential sites were equally acceptable to them for a new village hall and that they did not have a preference for either site.

Finally, may I end this long introduction by saying that, subject to receipt of planning permission and the securing of funding, whichever site is selected is good news for those in the community who voted in the Referendum for a new village hall in the Neighbourhood Plan process. The community will be obtaining a donated site for a new hall and associated amenity land at no financial cost which should serve many generations to come.

MW then invited members of the public to speak. Nigel White introduced himself and explained that he was a Planning Consultant working with C. Field Construction on the Bourton Mill site and he was there this evening to give an update on the wooded area that extends across the site. NW went on to explain about the recreational needs survey that was in process with walkers using Footpaths 57/17 and 57/18 being asked about a new tourism network. NW said one potential tourism site would be at Brixey's Farm House but is not part of a proposal for a new house. MW asked if the

site would have leisure accommodation such as glamping? NW said it might encapsulate glamping but that they were looking at more than one option such was winter-permanent accommodation and an eco-pod. The Wildlife and Habitats Group spokesperson said he would be interested in discussing with the PC and NW the possible impact on wildlife. IM said the following 2 issues need a thorough explanation:

- 1) in terms of the future, the PC will require a full explanation of why realigning the IOWA boundary is necessary;
- 2) full understanding and clarification needed regarding the type of tourism accommodation being proposed.

NW agreed to provide this information to the PC before the next meeting.

18.94 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

AG said he had a personal interest in the proposed new village hall site at Sandways Farm.

18.95 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

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

18.96 ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Village Tent – missing panels. **ACTION: Clerk and AG to have a thorough search through the school container.**

18.97 REPORTS BY THE DISTRICT AND/OR COUNTY COUNCILLOR

AC said nothing to report. PW reported that Matt Prosser was now fully ensconced as the new CEO of Dorset Unitary, with Stuart Caundle as Head of Services.

18.98 NEW VILLAGE HALL

MW asked each member of the public for their comments:

MoP: No further public consultation? MW: for the open forum there will be consultation.

MoP: straw poll was not biased, 84 people signed in favour of the Sandways site and we have been totally transparent on the information gathered and had positive comments from those approached. Re transparency we would like to have view of the information gathered at the workshops. MC: all the information is on the parish website.

MoP: live in Charlton Musgrave where there were similar problems to the choice of site for a new village hall, which was built outside the village. The hall now has 150 users per week and they have had to limit the number of weddings. But this has meant problems for local users as events have to be booked 12 months in advance. However, it was completely the right decision to build the hall outside the village.

MoP: we don't need extra houses. MoP: Jubilee site access very dangerous. PW: Jubilee site offers more to the children as the current playing field is very water logged. MoP: complaints always addressed re the existing Village Hall and don't see noise of being a great concern. MW: that was the chairman of the VH Trustees opinion; NHP couldn't write on behalf of the rest of the trust. IM: had response in the past from the VH Trustees and they were satisfied with either site. MoP: village is a mile long; are people going to want to walk to the Jubilee site? It will mean more traffic which equals more danger. We need a central location to bring the village together again. MoP: drove from Jubilee site to Fantley Lane – it's nearly 2 miles. We should consider walking to a hall. MoP: Please listen to the village. The straw poll was conducted in a week and another should be conducted but knows this won't happen. MoP: agrees with a hall sited on the outskirts of the village. MoP: agrees with the Jubilee site. MoP: objects to the Sandways site; planned houses built on the road would dominate my property; complaints would be made re noise; cars; Sandways is in a dip and this will only amplify the noise; land is extremely boggy and designated amenity land is not viable for the proposals. MoP: re the Charlton Musgrave hall, large amount of people using the hall, is it for the benefit of the village? What Charlton Musgrave hall usage was local? MoP: live close to the Sandways site and concerned about access on to the road. It would have the same problems that already exists for the current Village Hall. AC: would like his opinion on the selection of site recorded as studiously neutral. No significant danger re access on either site. MoP: concerns re access at the Sandways site, it would be an accident waiting to happen. MoP: attended one of the workshops. All is subject to change from the Planning Department. Immoveable things should be considered, such as traffic island, etc. MoP: many might assume that living near to the current village hall that we would want the NVH at the other end of the village. We don't. Have lived near to the existing VH for 17 years and have had no issues. Both proposed sites would be affected by the speed of traffic. MoP: have never seen so many cars parked on the main road as there are this evening. Cannot see that either site will encourage/discourage people to walk or drive. MoP: Jubilee site is not nearer site is not nearer to the school. PW invited MC to address various inaccuracies within some MoP statements. MC the website, workshops have been flagged up on Facebook, word of mouth etc. 83 comparative sheets; 45 written comments; positive or negative, they are all available on the website. Balance of comparative sheets 60% Sandways, 40% Jubilee.

MW then asked each councillor to state their preferred site.

AG read his statement as follows: Thank you chairman. I have asked to go first as I am in a different position to other councillors. Following the last parish council meeting we took advice from DAPTC, as suggested, which came back that as I do not have a financial interest in the site I can vote. However, I have taken the view that as I have already

objected to a previous iteration of this planning application I may be perceived to have predetermined my decision, because of this I will abstain and refrain from any debate tonight.

TH read his statement as follows: As you know, I've never really been sold on the idea for a large new village hall on a new site with amenity land, which, to be commercially viable, will have to appeal to hirers way beyond the bounds of this village. But it is now a potential reality, thanks to a small group of highly dedicated and extremely talented people, and I want to give credit to their hard work. However, I'm afraid I just haven't bought into it. What I'm sure the village doesn't need right now is a new hall that comes with nine new houses, at a time when demand for the current supply of 45 new houses at Bourton Mill and Ash Green appears to be at a very low ebb indeed. I understand that this arrangement makes it cheaper, because the land is given free and the infrastructure costs are shared, but I think the village should procure what it actually needs – even if this comes at a greater cost – and not accede to the opportunism of landowners. A smaller scheme for a hall only would obviously open up other sites for consideration.

The only authority the Council has to proceed with the binary option before us is the Neighbourhood Plan, which was approved by only 39% of the eligible voters in the village. In my humble opinion this is an insufficient mandate to proceed with a project of this size and scale, which, as regards its location, appears already to have divided the community. Given my views on the whole matter, I feel it would be inappropriate for me to participate in the allocation of the site and I will abstain from the vote.

GM said he had probably lived longer in the village than most and that the existing village hall was only ever there on a temporary basis. He said it was right that the PC look elsewhere because of parking issues etc and various surrounding villages have their halls in the middle of the village. GM said affordable housing was a necessity for Bourton and therefore he felt the Sandways site was acceptable.

AM said the recent redesign of the Sandways plans, with the hall re-sited to the bottom of the village meant there was a reasonable distance from the existing houses and screening such as hedging could be planted so that the A303 was out of view. AM felt that the Jubilee site would be visible for miles as its position is at the top of a hill and would have an impact on the surrounding countryside whereas the Sandways site is less obtrusive, not many people would want to it which will mean more cars on the road.

MM read her statement as follows:

I am very aware this is the most significant decision to be made by this Council over many years. Consequently, I have read carefully all the letters, notes and emails and listened to residents' comments. I have thought carefully about the issues raised and it is obvious that the two sites under consideration are finely balanced in their advantages and disadvantages. If this were not so the decision would be easy and the village less sharply divided – the debate less acrimonious. Whatever decision is made there will be a tranche of opinion in the village who disagree with the decision and are very angry and disappointed. We will all have to live and work with the outcome, whatever is it.

These are my own thoughts about each site:

SANDWAYS – It appears that for many residents the major consideration for Sandways is its central location in the village. For them, this is the overwhelmingly decisive factor and it is certainly important. There are other issues to be raised about Sandways.

- It is a more restricted site, close to the housing with the impact of noise and traffic from the hall creating disturbance to residents. Other local village halls have had issues with the noise and disturbance from traffic. At Cucklington the hours of opening have been restricted in response to residents' concerns. Charlton Musgrove positively opted for a site outside the village. Noise and disturbance are likely to be significant in the more confined site at Sandways as is the location of a listed building on the site which will impact on the alternatives available in developing this site.
- These restrictions are significant when we recognise the importance of the commercial viability of the future hall. For successful funding we must attract commercial lettings, many of which may originate outside Bourton. The lettings market is competitive, and we cannot compete if excessive restrictions are likely to be placed on and around the site of a new hall.
- Currently, parking is more restricted on this site and the option of long term on-road parking is unsatisfactory to me.
- There are issues of poor drainage on the site and unresolved issues of access for non-agricultural traffic.

JUBILEE –

- In contrast this site is on the current edge of the ribbon development of Bourton. For some, this makes this site unacceptable, but it is well located for the school and the church and the residents of West Bourton.
- The school is flourishing and pressure on accommodation is high. Currently the church uses school facilities for events, but the school kitchen is very limited, and an alternative would be welcomed.
- Jubilee offers more potential for external lettings and future development and use of the site. There will be ample parking and the hall can be made less obtrusive from the road by the tree planting. The noise impact will be less as there are fewer houses close to the site.

This decision is being made not for us but for future residents of the village. It is imperative, in my view, that we take a long-term view and I am convinced that the Jubilee site has the greater long-term potential. The new hall should be functioning for well over 50 years hence – where will the edge of the village be then? What is the settlement shape of Bourton long term? What other housing will be built and how much will the school grow? Jubilee site offers scope in the

future for adjusting provision to the changing needs of the community. This is the strongest imperative for me in choosing the Jubilee site.

IM read his statement as follows: Firstly, can I say that I have great concerns that whatever site is preferred tonight, I personally am not keen on either and am concerned that the building of a village hall will be to say the least difficult. Given that in 2017 it is viewed that a new hall build costs are between £1750 and £2000 per square metre, plus a 10% to 20% contingency and will be even costlier if there are issues such as heritage assets, listed buildings, rights of access and difficult or excessive groundworks costs. But, the sites have been selected as part of two processes, one led by the Village Hall Trustees and one by the Neighbourhood Plan. These clearly showed a preference by residents for a new village hall and through the neighbourhood plan process only two acceptable sites were identified, importantly both of which the Village Hall Trustees have publicly stated would be acceptable locations. Therefore, as part of the planning process the parish council must indicate a preferred site to assist the planning authority which is currently NDDC. I have studied all the information provided by the Village Hall and the additional emails, communication and petition provided by residents. I have though looked at this dispassionately under two main issues or factors:

- The likelihood to eventually obtain planning permission, for enabling housing by the landowner and village hall with amenities by the trustees of the hall.
- The likelihood of an acceptable hall and amenities being affordable and delivered including the future negotiating opportunities with the prospective landowners and/or their agent to maximise the benefits that could be obtained under any Section 106 agreements.

So, turning to planning, both sites have advantages and disadvantages. In terms of technical issues such as highways, environmental assessments/impact and more, both sites have been deemed as acceptable by the relevant specialists as part of the NP process. For me though the issue of likely objections from existing neighbours is key and there undoubtedly will be objections at both sites. Having walked both sites and reviewed the indicative designs I believe there will be a greater number of residents affected or feeling affected at the Sandways site. I have also considered the likelihood of planning objections if there are heritage sites and listed buildings, again the likelihood of these issues blocking or adversely affecting final designs are greater at Sandways. Finally, under planning I considered access to and off the sites. Both will require highways works at the main access/egress point from the main road, but I see no issues in the eventual planning process at either, given previous input by DCC. There are though access issues concerning the Sandways site and its second smaller access point along the existing track to the proposed three 3-bedroomed properties. My understanding is there is no right of way registered to access the land from this point to New Road and vice versa. The indicative plans show a right of an "existing track with established right of access". This is undoubtedly a lawful right based on long use to access the land with agricultural vehicles, but any planning application would change this use as it would be access to residential properties, plus there is likely to be issues on width of access which currently is wide enough for tractors etc but not in the future things like dustcarts. Therefore, it is possible that there would be problems in increasing the type and use of the current established right of access. Finally, on access issues, the amenity land identified at Sandways does not appear to have clearly defined legal right to access either New Road or the public right of way on Clay Lane, whilst there may be a reasonable solution to this latter point it is a further complication within any planning process. Turning to the second consideration, I understand the points made about the benefits of a more central location for Sandways and the advantages of being nearer the church and school for Jubilee in an ideal world either of these would be the crux of any decision. It is though the reality and likelihood of building houses on either site being diminished by the current nationwide financial position. You only have to look at unsold new build properties in West Bourton Road and the current issues at the Mill Site. On top of this both sites will have groundwork costs, as both have slopes to varying degrees and undoubtedly there will be issues discovered in the planning process by either developer? This in turn reduces financial margins and this is what usually causes there to be amended applications to either reduce cost or increase the cost of each housing unit. In other words, it is the effect finance will eventually have on a final design. Whilst both owners and/or their agent have submitted indicative designs as part of this process I would currently object, as a statutory consultee, to both under planning. Plus, the new village hall final design should have enough parking to not affect current residents, new residents or road users on the main road, this may therefore be a trade off with hall size to meet this personal but strongly held view. I understand it is hoped the new village hall would be suitable for larger events and must increase its use by residents and an increased number of events by non-residents to be self-sufficient and possibly to provide income to repay loans, if facilities like the Charity Bank Loan are used to fund the hall build. There will undoubtedly therefore be existing and new neighbour objections under licensing, entertainment and environmental legislation and whilst both indicative designs have tried to minimise this impact the reality is that there will be more residents affected at Sandways than Jubilee plus there will be additional avenues of objections or statutory protection where there are heritage assets and/or listed buildings from the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990.

Given my concerns about an acceptable final planning application going through as outlined in my first point and the issues for the new village hall and its trustees in my second I am drawn to the Jubilee site being the more likely to overcome the planning hurdles, potentially end up nearer the indicative designs and the trustees able to deliver some form of village hall, parking and amenities that will be able to be improved and be of value for residents for many years to come.

PW opened his remarks by commenting on the consultation process. Having been present throughout the community workshops (held on 15 & 29 September) whilst there was a supposed majority in support of the Sandways site, he had witnessed a considerable amount of 'coaching' in favour of this site during the first of these workshops. Also, whilst there had been a positive atmosphere during the initial event, some individuals attending the consultation on 29 September had clearly pre-determined their position against Jubilee site since they arrived claiming bias before they had even studied the material on the respective schemes. As such, PW said that he did not feel bound by the supposed 60: 40 splits of opinion.

He also said that suggestions (by MoP) that there should be affordable housing provision within the schemes submitted ignored Government planning regulations on such matters and the community benefit being afforded with donation of land for new hall and amenity / recreation.

In connection with TH's claim that, since only 39% of village had voted in NP referendum its validity was questionable, PW stressed that this represented a clear mandate in favour of the NP and that the turnout was significantly higher than the national average.

The suggestion made by some MoP that the village school was equidistant between the two sites was disingenuous. If one drew a circle with radius of 200m centred on the main school building, Jubilee site NVH would be inside this circle whilst the Sandways NVH would be well outside.

PW then outlined his views on the two sites:

Sandways site. Whilst the Sandways site's location was reasonably central, this scheme had significant disadvantages, namely:

1. The Hall shown within the Sandways site plan would have a negative impact on neighbouring heritage assets (Sandways Farm and associated cottages).
2. The proposed Hall on the Sandways site would impact a greater number of neighbouring properties (existing and planned) than would be the case with the Jubilee site. Environmental health issues may lead to constraints on the (Sandways) Hall's usage which would have an adverse impact upon the Hall's financial viability.
3. The siting of the proposed Hall on the Sandways site would be such as to give it minimal kerb appeal, impacting upon its prospective commercial viability.
4. The proposed roadside houses, intended as part of the Sandways site's enabling housing development, would be overbearing in relation to existing dwellings adjacent to the site.

Jubilee site. In connection with the Jubilee site, PW expressed the view that whilst this site was away from the centre of the village, it had significant benefits in comparison to the Sandways site:

1. There would be fewer affected neighbouring properties.
2. The potential for synergy with St George's church and Bourton primary school was much greater than would be possible with the Sandways site.
3. Jubilee site NVH would have excellent kerb appeal, enhancing its potential for attracting hirings/ commercial activity.
4. The views from this hall over the Blackmore Vale would be excellent, without compromising views looking towards Bourton and AONB from the south.
5. The Jubilee amenity land is better suited to recreational use as it is unlikely to flood, in contrast to amenity land to south of Sandways NVH site.

In summary, PW considered that the far greater prospects of having a commercially viable NVH at Jubilee site, together with potential synergy with nearby church and school, meant that this was his favoured site.

MC read his statement as follows: Good evening everyone. I am sorry that Tim Sheppard has left the meeting. He was good enough to have let me have a copy of the straw poll he and colleagues undertook. I will say that I put my heart and soul into trying to involve the community in an active consultation.

I have listened carefully to everyone's input. I personally have spent a great deal of time on this subject over the last couple of years. There is much further activity ahead to bring this project to fruition.

I have visited many other halls. Some in the centre of villages that look fine, some that look out of place there and some perfectly successful ones built on green field sites further out. Time has been taken to understand the conservation and environmental issues at stake here in Bourton. We have pitched for and won lottery funding to support research, the two village gatherings and our latest workshops to enable everyone to express their views on what is needed and where. In passing, I must pay tribute to the Village Hall team that has continuously stepped up to deliver these events as well as maintaining a focus on fund-raising.

I say all that to make it clear that I have come to my views on this matter only after a lot of work, factual analysis, thought and discussion. I would add that we invited both parties to put their best case forward to give the community something to consider seriously.

Research and experience show that for the services and activities enjoyed by the village and its outlying communities what matters most is the "what". What is made available, what is put on, what voluntary effort is harnessed, what the facilities are – so that a response can be made to the wide range of needs of the old, the young, the monied, the less monied, the lonely, the less able, the under-employed, the artistic, the cinematic, the dramatic, the sporty. People come to these things in the dark, in the wet and the cold because they want to.

To make all that “what” happen and crucially not make the village pay over the odds for it we need the appeal to the outside world that is looking for and prepared to pay for venues. We need a visible and attractive presence to draw customers in plus the facilities and the freedom to make maximum use of them.

There are three things to be balanced: first, a location that is part of the village, secondly a location that will enable a sustainable facility to be built and used to the full and, thirdly, a location that can adapt over the next 50-100 years as the village and its needs change.

So, as to being part of the village: I believe there really is synergy to be got from closeness of a new Hall to the School and the Church. All three can help all three do more, thrive more.

A sustainable facility – that means long-term commercially viable, attracting continuous investment rather than the long spiral of decline we have seen here. We need the venue with the least constraints because it impacts the fewest residents and is least constrained by its setting.

Flexibility to change, to grow, to adapt in the long-term means having useable, accessible space into the future that is appropriate for a wide-range of community purposes. A location where there is long-standing, active and continuing involvement in the village by the landowner is also a significant plus.

For these reasons, I shall be voting for the Jubilee Field Site.

MW read his statement as follows: I have listened very carefully to all the points raised this evening and I understand the strength of feeling shown by those who have spoken. I am grateful to the two landowners for their responses to issues raised by the Parish Council and for providing the drawings indicating the different schemes that may be achievable on their sites. This decision is very difficult which underlines the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Planning Group in selecting two sites of broadly equal merit.

As I said in my introduction, it is the Parish Council's job to weigh the various arguments for and against both sites and to select the site which will give those whose job it is to take on the delivery of a new Hall the best chance of success. You have heard from Mike Chapman who is project managing the process and will be involved in seeking funding in the future. This process will be very difficult to achieve and, in my view, for the Parish Council to select a site which then fails to attract funding would be the worst of all outcomes.

The Sandways site is preferred by many as it is more centrally located in the village. Position is a very important factor but must be looked at very closely. Alongside its more central location, there appear to be a number of negative points. Whilst the plans provided are indicative only, from previous discussions held with the landowner's agent and NDDC, there is very little, if any, room for manoeuvre as to the location of the Hall itself on the site. We also know that discussions with NDDC Planning, Conservation and Environmental Health departments are likely to result in several changes before a final scheme is set. There seems to be little scope on this site to accommodate such changes, given the views of the Planners and Conservation officer.

The indicative position of the Hall is at the bottom of two slopes with little or no long view from the hall and it is in an area known to be liable to become very wet at times. Drainage of fields is an expensive process which would add considerably to the cost of the hall, therefore requiring even more funding. The location is far away from the kerbside thereby losing marketability appeal which others have raised. Being located at the bottom of a long driveway also increases the cost and delivers a location which impinges on accessibility, with a similar problem for pedestrians being on a slope as with the existing hall.

We have heard that, in terms of deliverability, there have been raised legal right of way questions over both the secondary access road off Main Road and the linkage from the amenity land with Clay Lane and the suggested pedestrian access.

In earlier discussions, the Agent for this site produced a “Constraints” plan which showed a congregation of overhead power lines and underground sewers which made any development in the area to the bottom of the front field difficult to physically achieve and expensive to remedy. This is where the indicative position of the new hall and some of the housing is shown.

Without full design information it is difficult to accurately assess the likely cost of the new hall, but it seems likely that this restricted and disjointed site with many neighbours is likely to be more expensive to build than on a cohesive site with many options to accommodate changes that may be required in any future planning and funding discussions that may be necessary. This is what the Jubilee Field provides.

I believe that the business case for the new hall will be crucial to attract funding and the Jubilee site, for the above reasons, will be able to demonstrate a better case. There is also a synergy with the hall on the Jubilee Field with the School and the Church which is important. I believe that any current issues with proximity to neighbours on this site can be overcome with sensible design changes and, all in all, I believe that the Jubilee Field location will be more attractive to secure hall hirings with its long views to the South, synergy with the Church and School and closeness to the road.

MOTION: FOR THE PARISH COUNCIL TO MEET ITS OBLIGATIONS AS PART OF ANY FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATION(S) TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE RELEVANT LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY, CURRENTLY NDDC, AND TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF POLICY 5F OF THE BOURTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN I PROPOSE THAT THE PARISH COUNCIL PREFERRED SITE FOR A NEW VILLAGE HALL, AMENITY LAND AND ENABLING HOUSING IS THE JUBILEE SITE.

I NOW ASK FOR A SECONDER TO THIS PROPOSAL

Proposer for Jubilee Site: MC. Seconder: MM. 5 votes for the Jubilee site; 2 votes for the Sandways Site; 2 abstained.

18.99 PLANNING

18.99.1 Applications received

2/2017/1357/OUT

Proposal: demolish agricultural buildings, carry out improvements to existing access points, provision of new access track. Develop land for residential purposes and a new Village Hall with associated parking (Outline Application to Determine Access). **Location:** Land adjacent to Sandways Farm, New Road, Bourton, SP8 5BQ.

MW proposed that the councillors object to this application as another site has now been voted in favour.

MOTION: that the Parish Council objects to this application. 6 in favour; 2 against; 1 abstention. Proposer: MC Seconder: MM

ACTION: Clerk to inform NDDC of consultation decision objecting to this application because an alternative site has been selected for the proposed new village hall and for the reasons contained in the councillor's statements above.

18.99.2 Bourton Mill

JM firstly thanked the Parish Council for all their hard work and thoughts put into the proposed New Village Hall. JM then went on to report on Bourton Mill:

1. Work on the river walkway has been delayed due to the recent rain, although progress should be made this week.
2. The road closure now looks to be in place until the end of November. A series of minor adjustments keep having to be put in place before the safety barriers can be installed.
3. Two houses have been sold which means that plots 1 and 2 are being continued. The foundations are already in place and the flooring was delivered on Friday.

JM also said there were concerns re the IOWA and the PC will need to be on guard in the future. PW said S.278 agreement would include the barrier design and said it was very frustrating for those people on the hill as they can't even access the garage/newsagent on foot. PW said pressure needed to be put on someone to get this issue resolved. JM said pressure had been put on the DCC Highways department. AC said he will endeavour to find out exactly who is the correct person to pressurise and will bring an authoritative report to the next meeting.

19.00 FINANCE

19.00.1 ACCOUNTS TO BE PAID

E Wynn	October wages: £403.62 (net) £20.50	£424.12
PM Cowell	Invs 1582 (£183.60); 1583 (£152.40) 1584 (£60.00) 1585 (£180.00)	£576.00

19.00.2 Accounts received

Merefild & Henstridge Ltd	Purchase of grave	£600.00
---------------------------	-------------------	---------

Proposer: JM, Seconder: MM, agreed by all Cllrs present.

19.00.3 Grants and Donation Applications

None received.

19.01 WILDLIFE AND HABITATS

MC reported that phase 4 of the boardwalk on Footpath 11 was to start on Wednesday and that the works may be completed that day. MC said this footpath would not be navigable without the boardwalk. The NDDC ranger's department had originally costed the works as £11,000 and it was at that time that the Wildlife and Habitats Group requested that NDDC supply the materials and the group carry out the works.

19.02 HIGHWAYS

IM reported on the issue of the highway and road signs within the parish. DCC stopped cleaning these 4 years ago. However, the maintenance contract between the PC and P Cowell states, "one off jobs" and IM and P Cowell have looked at the signs to see what works need to take place. P Cowell has submitted a price of £1200 for these works, with the signs that cannot be cleaned to be reported to DCC Highways department for replacement. IM said the cost sort out 3 years of work to include cutting back the tree on the bridge on the West Bourton road.

Proposer: IM Seconders: AG and PW and agreed by all Cllrs present.

19.03 VILLAGE TENT

AM reported that after the tent had been taken down he had collected all the parts of the tent that had been put in the school quadrant at the end of the summer. The clerk suggested that these might still be in the school container.

ACTION: Clerk and AG to check container.

19.04 FOOTPATHS

PW reported that a stile on Footpath 5 was wobbly and needed repairing.

19.05 COMMUNITY SAFETY

SW said there was nothing further to report.

19.06 CORRESPONDENCE

None received.

19.07 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

19.07.1 SILENT SOLDIERS

PW asked if Silton could borrow one of the soldiers for a planned remembrance event as it was now too late for them to purchase one. JM said the soldier on the green was to be incorporated in a poppy display, so it was agreed that on this occasion the Silent Soldiers would not be loaned out to Silton. PW asked how long the Silent Soldiers were to be on display for after 11th November. TH said that the peace treaty was signed on 28th June and suggested that it would be logical to keep them on display until that date next year.

19.07.2 BPC LAPTOP/IT EQUIPMENT

The Clerk reported that the PC should have its own lap top for use by the clerk. At present there is only a monitor and a printer and the clerk has been using her own lap top with all documents being stored on a memory stick. MW suggested that the clerk investigate the costs and this then to be raised and voted on at the next meeting.

DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Monday 26th November at 7.00pm in the Village Hall.

MW closed the meeting at 9.45 pm

Chairman:

Date: 26th November 2018

Note: The minutes will be reviewed and formally ratified by the BPC on 26th November 2018

