|  |
| --- |
| **The Minutes of the Meeting of the Great Witley and Hillhampton Parish Council** |
|  |
| **Held at the Great Witley Village Hall on Wednesday 18th September 2019** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Present: Chairman**, Cllr F Chapman (FC). |
|  |
|  |
| **In Attendance:** Clerk, J Evans, Cllrs C Shaw (CS), C Dermietzel (CD), A Goodman (AG), N Drew (ND), C Jones (CJ), B Dallow (BD), A Symonds (AS), P Trow (PT). C.Cllr K Pollock (KP) and D.Cllr P Cumming (PC) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Apologies:** none. | | | | |
| **2.** | **Declarations of Interest:** None. | | | | |
| **3.** | **To consider any application for a dispensation:** None.  *Mr David Clarke from Malvern Hills District Council attended to take part in discussions and help with clarification over the next steps with our draft neighbourhood plan.*  FC said that a questionnaire had been sent around the villages of Great Witley and Hillhampton and was disappointed with only a 30% reply. It was from these responses that the draft neighbourhood plan has been drafted. He has consulted with David Clarke (DC) to check if we were “going along the right lines”.  DC then outlined the history of the plan. In 2011 the plan was introduced. We are familiar with the SWDP which is broadly consistent with National Planning Policy. The neighbourhood plan must be consistent with the SWDP to give local people more control over development in their parishes.  The draft then goes to MHDC before going back into the public domain then finally going to an examiner. Once all these processes have been completed a local referendum is called to vote on it. If there is a 50% or more vote in favour of it, it will be adopted.  DC then returned to our draft in question. The first draft is very “raw” and needs further work and revision. More evidence is needed to back up policies and it must be written more clearly, i.e. in planning language. This means more clear and unambiguous wording. DC can help with this aspect or we have the option to commission a consultant making use of an available grant up to £9,000.  FC said his research has confirmed that this grant is insufficient, and the parish would then have to raise further funds which we are not prepared to do.  DC made the point that the hardest part of the draft is complete, the intention. The next part is making the wording clearer. For example, where we talk about extending fields and footpaths in supporting text, these could be made into policies.  Local green spaces can be designated as Green Belt Land preventing rural communities being over developed. This can also be included in the plan.  FC said we are surrounded on 3 sides by wooded hills which equates to half the acreage of this parish. Could we say this is Local Green Space?  DC said probably not as it is a large tract of land.  AS asked if we could designate multiple spaces to which DC said not the hill tops as they are not near the community. The land must be ‘special’ to some people in the community.  FC made the point that this is “tough” on some landowners. DC agreed and said the landowner must demonstrate it onerously as to why it is deemed ‘special’.  This plan could go for informal consultation. It is not ready for Regulation 14 Consultation by Parish Council.  AS queried, what if our plan was very different to the SWDP? DC said he will steer us in the right direction if it looks like ours is very different. They should run parallel. If there is conflict, then the last policy made will take precedence.  The SWDP(R) Review in 2021:  FC said we need to see the proposed settlement boundaries. DC said that plans will be supported if they are within the boundary and unsupported if they are outside. The problem is that 14,000 new builds must be completed by 2040 inside a boundary which is too small. Therefore, if a site is offered adjacent to the boundary it can be extended.  Development boundaries can be extended if we want or we could allocate a site in the plan. FC said that would not be very popular regarding how much development we have already had. FC asked which sites would be classed as ‘special’ other than Local Green Spaces?  DC said biological sites or where there are rare species found, non-designated heritage assets i.e. structures which are protected such as a Grade 1 listing or something with special interest to the community but not yet recognised. Also, pubs, post offices, doctors etc.  PT asked whether archaeological sites may be considered? For instance, if a battle on one of the hills had occurred historically.  FC and DC will liaise, and DC was formally thanked for taking the time to speak to the Parish Council on this matter. | | | | |
| **4.** | **Minutes:** These will be brought to the next meeting for approval and signature. | | | | |
| **5.** | **Reports:** a. Clerk reported that the siding out on A451 was taking place and due to recent hedge cutting WCC deemed the unlevel 30mph sign to be not a problem.  b.CS reported that the Quartergreen are still receiving no donations/contributions for using the multi sports facilities. These are needed to raise funds for maintenance. It will fall into disrepair if no money comes in. ***ACTION:*** FC to contact HMRC and raise in his report in the parish magazine. Bonfire night will be on 2nd November and will be held in the Quarterman’s field. The film nights have resumed. FC thanked all those who volunteered their time to the working party for clearing the footpath which was becoming overgrown.  c. CJ is very happy with Chris Bunn’s work, our Lengthsman. | | | | |
| **6.** | FC will attend a SWDP2 training meeting when one is organised. | | | | |
| **7.** | PC delivered his report: [..\REPORTS\September 2019 report.pdf](../REPORTS/September%202019%20report.pdf)  KP delivered his report: [..\REPORTS\K Pollock 190918.docx](../REPORTS/K%20Pollock%20190918.docx)  BD asked if tipping fees were abolished could this get rid of the fly tipping problem. KP said you couldn’t abolish these fees as then this would lead to commercial rubbish ending up at the domestic tips. | | | | |
| **8.** | g. 19/01111/FUL : The Gables – Mr Bridgewater, the developer, attended the start of the meeting to outline the application. CJ wants to see similar style bricks to blend in with original building. ND is in support for it to be restored back to its former glory and FC said it was better the building be used than not. BD was worried that the planning for 6 bedrooms would mean an extra single dwelling. It was agreed that the Parish Council would support the application if it was sympathetic and in keeping. | | | | |
| **9.** | The invoices and remittances were circulated as were the bank reconciliation and budget comparison. | | | | |
| **10.** | Regarding the letter from Mrs Franklin ***ACTION:*** the clerk will write to confirm we still require and will undertake the insurance of the bus shelter at Redmarley Orchards. | | | | |
| **11.** | No urgent decisions were made by the clerk since the last meeting. | | | | |
| **12.** | PT reported an issue with a low flying drone. ***ACTION:*** FC will report in the parish magazine that users of drones should respect people’s privacy especially over bridal paths where walkers and horse riders are. AS will forward the appropriate Civil Aviation Authority law regarding the proper use of drones. | | | | |
| **13.** | **Date of next meeting:** It was agreed by a show of hands that the next meeting will be at Great Witley Village Hall at 7.30pm on Wednesday 13th November 2019. | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
| The meeting was adjourned for **Public Question Time**, notes of which are appended to these minutes. | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | | | | |
| The meeting closed at 22:35pm | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
| Signed …………………………………….. Date …………………………………….. | | | | | |
|  |  | |  |  | |
|  | | Chairman | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes of Public Question Time** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3 Members of the public were in attendance and raised the following concerns during Public Question Time: | | | |
|  |  | 1. | Bottle Banks and Cardboard Recycle Bins:  These take up 6 car park spaces and are an eye sore as they are frequently not emptied, and rubbish is piled up around the bins which includes broken glass. FC said they are a useful facility for the village but appreciates everyone’s frustration with the lack of emptying. The company responsible for managing them is not performing as they could. CS has established a relationship with the managing director of the company responsible and they have promised to empty the bins on Monday and the overflow. However, the bins were emptied but the overflow could not be taken, and they promised to return on Thursday, but did not. ***ACTION:*** Clerk to establish who looks after the contract from MHDC and if it is possible for us to take out our own contract? If not, we will ask for the bins to be removed. CJ will ask our Lengthsman to sweep up the broken glass on his rounds. |
|  |  | 2. | The hedge at Mr Newing’s property:  The hedge is still uncut. A letter has been sent out and we understand received. We will wait to see if the hedge is cut by the end of September, as promised, before taking the appropriate action. |