

MINUTES OF A MEETING

GREAT AND LITTLE CHISHILL PARISH COUNCIL

Venue: Village Hall
Date: 13th February 2013
Time: 7:30pm

In Attendance:

Chairman: Andrew Gardiner
Parish Councillors: Harrison, Murgatroyd, Erskine, Cartwright, Dring, Ridge
County Councillors: Van de ven
Clerk / Proper Officer: Sarah Scott

Present:

1. Apologies for Absence (and reasons)

Cllr Hales - previous commitment
Cllr Barrett – without transport

2. To receive any declaration of Pecuniary and non-Pecuniary Interest of Councillors

There were none declared.

3. Approved the Minutes of 9th January 2013 (already circulated)

They were agreed as a true and accurate account of proceedings and were signed by the Chairman.

4. Public Participation

To allow up to 10 minutes for any members of the public and Councillors declaring a pecuniary and non pecuniary interest to address the meeting in relation to the business to be transacted at that meeting.

There were no members of the public present.

5. Planning Applications

5.1 Holiday Lets - Rectory Farm

The Clerk reported that after a conversation with Enforcement, they are happy that all lets are bona fide and comply with planning permissions. There are however three outstanding issues which are:

- The new entrance on Chishill Road
- The leaking sewage from next to the original driveway
- The installation of kissing gates on the footpath which runs across the owners land to comply with disabled access rights

The Clerk reported that The Environment Agency is investigating the sewage, Highways is looking at the entrance and the Clerk had failed to get a response from the landowner regarding the kissing gates.

Holiday Lets – North Hall Farm

Enforcement are still working on this and will report back as soon as they have some answers.

- 5.2 S/0145/13/FL, 63 Heydon Road, Roof Conversion and Windows, Mr and Mrs Palmer**
Approved as long as the roof height does not increase.
- 5.3 S/2323/12/FL, North Hall Farm, change of use from a storage building to holiday lets**
Due to the ongoing issues with the original holiday lets, the Parish Council felt that they could not endorse this application and recommended refusal.
- 5.4 S/0203/13/FL, 2 May Street Barns, Extension and Roof lights, Mr and Mrs Herbert**
This was approved.
- 5.5 S/0212/13/FL, Bridgefoot Farm Kennels, Erection of Agricultural shed, Impeccable Solutions**
This was approved.

The Clerk reported that the planning application to convert barns at Hall Farm into residential dwellings had been approved.

6. **LDF**

The Chairman gave an overview of what had happened thus far.

- Around 40 people had attended the public meeting
- There had been 19 responses from the subsequent door drop
- The Chairman had a meeting with the planning department at SCDC to discuss how we submit our findings.

Written responses from the Parish can be summarized as:

- It was broadly agreed that large developments be kept to large towns. Chishill has no infrastructure for large development
- Village envelope – 6 wanted no change and 8 wanted flexibility
- Protection of Vistas – 8 stated that this was important
- Colts Croft type development – 9 stated no and 1 was did not care either way

Tim Harvey is aware of the wish to make Bull Meadow a LGS and Cllr Murgatroyd and the Chairman are meeting with him later on this week.

The Parish Council discussed how they should make a submission. The Chairman will draft a response (attached)

Cllr van den Ven spoke about the framework in Shepreth and the Chairman said that in the case of the Chishill envelope we will be asking for some slight flexibility; however any applications would be subject to all the normal planning legislation and requirements.

It was felt that it is unhealthy for the village to be saddled with no development over the next 20 years, hence the idea to ask for some very slight, limited development and also define the type of development ie no more than three bedrooms, only one per plot etc.

7. Speed Watch

Cllr Harrison reported on progress to date on the monitoring equipment. She is awaiting some final quotes then comprehensive costings can be put together and be presented to the Parish Council. Mike Cooper from Highways will also need to come out to look at risk assessments for moving the equipment. The Parish Council will need to do their own risk assessment, insurance check and it be added to the asset register. The lead time for the equipment is 4-5 weeks. Cllr Dring raised the valid point that had all the households where the equipment would be sited been contacted and asked if they mind it being put outside their homes. Cllr Harrison to check and report back. Traces on utilities are being carried out at the proposed sites at present and Cllr Harrison needs to find a contractor to do the work (from a list from SCDC / Highways)

8. Windmill

There is an issue with insurance and so no progress has been made to date. The Parish Council to contact the Trust to ask for a progress report. It was noted that the Trust do not own the windmill at present.

9. Village Hall -

Janet Erskine had raised the idea of having a manager instead of a committee to run the village Hall. Foxton Village Hall have one and she is to contact them to see how this works. The Clerk knows of someone who might fit the bill and she will do some fact finding on this. She will also liaise with Stuart Farrow about a door drop to drum up interest in membership of the committee as this is dwindling.

10. Section 106 Funding

A resolution was proposed by John Ridge and Seconded by John Murgatroyd to accept a Section 106 funding of £3104.38 from the building of a dwelling on Barley Road. These funds are payable towards off-site provision and future maintenance of public open space infrastructure within the next 10 years. If the monies are not utilized for this purpose in this timescale, then they will be repaid in full and with interest.

11. Track behind Wallers Close

The Clerk showed the Council pictures of the completed works. The Council had lodged an interest in the track with SCDC and a decision will be made in March. If it were granted to the Parish Council, then a risk assessment will be done, it be will added to the asset register and be insured.

The Parish Council were pleased to learn that planning permission for parking of two cars was being sought in Wallers Close.

12. Clerks Training

The Clerk has enrolled on the year long Cilca training.

13. Finance

The Clerk handed out the updated spread sheets and took the Parish Council through them. We had received our grant for hedge cutting. Projects to consider for future spend are:

- the Section 106 agreement (PFA / Skate Park)
- Speed watch
- Windmill
- Village Lock up repairs
- Village notice board repairs

14. **County Councillors Reports**

Cllr van de Ven reported on the 31 bus and the fact that provision needs to be put in place to allow the 16+ to get to college in Cambridge by some sort of transport initiative when the 31 bus subsidy is removed.

Broadband – the strategy for superfast broadband roll out is being discussed.

Black Bin recycling – the separator at Waterbeach has broken and so black bin refuse is not being recycled.

A10 Quarter – The Chishills are represented in this.

There is likely to be 2% increase in Council Tax by the County Council.

The Guided Bus court battle has not been settled and the County have kept £100,000,00 in reserves for this. It will not go back into transport, but into Adult Services.

The County are considering selling Shire Hall and utilizing other smaller offices at Castle Park.

15. **To Accept Notices & Matters for the next Agenda**

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 9:15.

The next meeting is on 14th March

South Cambs Local Plan Great & Little Chishill: February 2013.

-
1. As a basis for debate the Parish Council drew up a brief options paper. This was not intended to encompass all issues, but to be a scene setter for consultation. The paper was placed on the village website and its existence published.

A door drop to all residents notified a Village Meeting. This was held on January 29th 2013, and attended by about fifty residents, at which ideas in the options paper and many others were debated.

It was followed by a door drop to all households, headlining the major themes of the meeting, and inviting an e-mailed or written response. There were nineteen replies. Combining attendance at the meeting plus the e-mails, we estimate there has been an input from c50 households, about 20-25% of the total.

Naturally there were a wide range of opinions on specifics. Nevertheless the Parish Council trusts that it has encapsulated the sentiments and expressed them in as balanced a way as possible.

The Parish Council has considered embarking on a Neighbourhood Plan, though this would appear to be an expensive route for a small community, given that the spirit of heeding local views was integral in developing SCDC's plan.

2. Response.

- (i) We endorse the overall approach of SCDC in that major new housing be concentrated in new communities and the large sustainable villages, thus The Chishills should retain their attractive rural character.

- (ii) Specifically, that there should be no "large development" viz 20-25 units or more, e.g. similar to a version of the Colts Croft, Hall Lane development built in 1976.
- (iii) There was no support for the possibility of removing the village envelope *in toto*.
- (iv) There was, predictably, a diversity of views on whether the current envelope should be 'set in stone', or limited modification be granted. Some villagers support no change, others, perhaps a majority, based on the e-mail response, see a need for limited flexibility.

There is full agreement that the highly desirable character of village environment must be preserved. However, as an in-fill village, under current guidelines, there has been no new build in the village proper for over thirty years (Section 106 Affordable Housing Heydon Road excepted). Following the introduction of the envelope, the few additional dwellings have been agricultural conversions, way outside the village core and envelope.

We therefore seek a balance between zero development and limited scope for new build. There is no support for a general inflation of the envelope, but given the village has no appetite for 'significant' build (see point ii), limited, controlled flex would be welcome.

Any proposal for new build would have to conform to existing planning guidelines re aspect, aesthetics, highways, etc. We would suggest a maximum of two dwellings on a site, with a strong preference for 2-3 bedrooms max. We believe this may provide some scope to encourage younger entrants and facilitate residents downsizing, where the latter wish to stay in Chishill. We wish to avoid a static community in the future.

Each application should be treated on its own merits, with the envelope adjusted *post hoc* if necessary.

An alternative, though less preferred, alternative could be to incorporate the totality of private gardens within the envelope. It is appreciated that parts of larger gardens may be regarded as relating to the rural as opposed to the built environment, but believe this factor should not be imposed as a blanket negative to any proposal.

In any event this flexing is most unlikely to amount to more than a max of ten builds over twenty years, and, if handled well, would not lead to any detriment to overall village character.

- (v) There was no support for the suggestion for 5-6 dwellings abutting the south side of Barley Road. The Parish Council concurs.
- (vi) Important Countryside Frontages: Residents, and the Parish Council are very keen to protect the vistas that befit 'The Village on the Hill', specifically to protect the frontages falling away from Barley Road towards the historic post-mill, and secondly, that from May St/Maltings Lane to the southwest. If, in the event, these frontages do not conform to the current criteria for ICF's, we would wish to seek protection in the spirit of the notes on 'Further Site Options; SCDC Part 2 (p65)'.
- (vii) Local Green Space: A field, traversed by public footpaths, known locally as Bull Meadow on the north side of Hall Lane, adjoining the playing field, and outside the envelope, has been

enjoyed for many years for its visual amenity, dog exercising, etc, and residents seek to protect it from development, possibly by granting LGS status.

- (viii) Playing Field: The village has enjoyed the playing field, north of Hall Lane, for many years without problems, on an indefinite lease/use basis from the The Butler Trust / landowner. No problems are anticipated with this arrangement, but it would be prudent to re-visit the agreement with an eye to the long term.