

COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 27th January 2020 at 7.45 pm, in the Village Hall, Barrack Hill, Coleshill

Parish Councillors: Terence Prideaux (TPx) Chairman
Jonathan Herbert (JH)

Lynn Woodgate (LW)
Tony Treacy (AT)

Parish Clerk: Lynda Jackson (LJ)

County & District Councillors: Cllr Jonathan Waters (JW) CDC

Members of Public: 3

1. Apologies for Absence: Cllrs. N Cadman, N Suttie. Cllr T Butcher (BCC)

2. Minutes of previous meetings: It was moved by TPX and **resolved** that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 9th December 2019 be signed as a true record of the meeting.

3. Councillor Vacancy: 1

4. Declaration of Interest: Cllr Herbert item 7i)

5. Matters Arising: i) TPx advised the meeting that an agreement had been made with CDC to remove some trees on the Common in early February. CDC have agreed to take the cost.

ii) JH advised that a meeting with UKPN had been arranged regarding the trees by Chalkpit House. It was decided that the trees did not need trimming apart from one which was resting on a power cable. UKPN are looking to re-route the cable but in the meantime have cut back the tree.

Meeting Closed: 7.50 pm

DEMOCRATIC PERIOD-

- Penny Ware regarding the Village website. Mrs Ware asked if someone could be approached to refresh the website as a lot of the information is out of date. Cllr. Treacy **agreed** to look at the website to bring it up to date.
- Penny Ware regarding the bus services available for Coleshill residents. Could the Council please look into the 103 service that is supposed to have 2 bus stop signs opposite one another on Gore Hill, currently there is only 1 stop. The stop at Rushymead Care Home has been taken out of service and should be re-instated to encourage more residents to use the bus instead of their vehicles. The 103 service stops at Amersham station and so commuters could use it to catch the first train out in a morning.
- Len Tridgell regarding work he is undertaking with a group on planning permitted development. Mr Tridgell asked permission to quote examples from Coleshill where unauthorised permitted development has occurred. JW explained there is no right to permitted development in Coleshill village and that all plans must comply by applying by full planning application. Council **agreed** to support Mr Tridgell's request.

Meeting re-opened: 8.05 pm

6. Clerk's Report: i) LJ informed the meeting that she had received contact from UKPN regarding the 2 substations on the Common. UKPN are looking to obtain a lease or similar on the small pieces of land that the substations stand on. LJ has directed UKPN to CDC.

ii) A street clean has been requested but LJ wanted to point out to Council that parking around the centre of the village is still a problem for any street clean not just Tuesdays. JH **agreed** to meet the street cleaner to ensure that the roads are made accessible for cleaning.

COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 27th January 2020 at 7.45 pm, in the Village Hall, Barrack Hill, Coleshill

iii) LJ met with Derek Higgins regarding the website recently. Mr Higgins was concerned that no work was being done on the village side of the website to keep it up to date. AT has **agreed** to take over the responsibility of keeping the website updated and asked for a log in to be supplied.

7. Report from Planning, BCC & CDC updates:

i) PL/19/4246/FA- OS Field 7437 North of Wallers Oak, Village Road, Coleshill – New Build dwelling house, garage & vehicular access. **OBJECTION**

The first point to emphasize is that the site is in the Green Belt and within the AONB and therefore has special protections. The applicant should be complying with the published guidance relating to these special protections. It is not acceptable or satisfactory to quote from the proposed Local Plan. Until any new plan is adopted the position is quite clear – it is the existing (1997) Local Plan that governs the situation. It follows that the draft new Local Plan at this time has no legal status or effect and the Council should stick to the existing adopted policies in making its decision. Green belt designation is a protection against such applications as the one submitted. This area of land is not a designated infill site despite the applicant trying to persuade otherwise. The applicant cites the latest version of the NPPF. These speak of ‘very special circumstances’ being needed before national policies on Green Belt/AONB can be overridden. The applicant has not demonstrated why building one large residential unit can be regarded as in any way special.

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

1. *a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
2. *b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
3. *c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
4. *d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
5. *e) limited infilling in villages;*
6. *f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites);*
g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings).

The application mentions it is concerned with ‘limited infilling’ being allowable but the proposal does not meet the criteria for infilling as set out in policy GB4 of the still un-superseded Consolidated Local Plan. The proposal does not fill ‘a small gap in an existing row of dwellings ... which form an otherwise fully developed frontage to a road’. The west side of Village Road comprises individual houses of varying size and character, sometimes with large gaps between them. The draft of the revised Local Plan, out for consultation currently, makes the infilling point even more explicit (Policy DM PP1): Infilling on open land which contributes to the openness of the Green Belt will be refused.

Due to the protected status of the Green Belt within the AONB Coleshill PC would ask Chiltern DC to request the views of the Chiltern Society & the Chiltern AONB on the merits of this application, the responses being included in the applicants Design statement.

COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 27th January 2020 at 7.45 pm, in the Village Hall, Barrack Hill, Coleshill

Within the application Drawings (elevations and sections) show suspiciously large blocked in spaces to a full storey-height under the ground floor. The Council would question whether the Applicant is seeking to define space for a future large basement? Council would ask that Chiltern DC investigate this.

There may be ecological reasons for the applicant proposing to install a private sewage treatment and disposal system. Otherwise (apart from even more extensive digging up and re-surfacing Village Road) there appears to be a public sewer nearby, Council would ask why not connect to that.

The Council would like to draw your attention to what appears to be contradictions in 2 documents: Ecology & Trees Checklist- under Habitats, Meadows or Unmanaged dense ground vegetation site the applicant has indicated NO.

Habitat & Protected Species Survey- Section 2 Introduction- 2.3 Mentions an area of dense scrub at western section of the site.

Design & Access Statement:

2.1 Previous consultation- mentions an informative was made to the Village Council on 14.11.19 asking for input. This informative was never received by Coleshill PC and an apology has since been received that this was an error.

In summary the applicant has not sought engagement with the Parish Council.

There is also concern for the large oak that lies in Wallers Oak by the boundary of the land. This tree is listed TPO/1994/016/T1. This tree has historic significance to the village, the tree leaf is the emblem for the village school. The tree, being as large as it is, will have a very large developed root system that could be impacted by any construction on the land of the application.

Finally, if this application were to succeed, it would set a precedent for other developers wanting to extend their activities even further into open land within the village.

Using the objections above Coleshill PC hope the application will not be approved. If for some reason approval is given then if the site is sold following Approval, it is likely that the developer would seek to re-design to produce a considerably larger house. Coleshill PC would ask Chiltern DC in the unlikely event that approval is given then a limit is set on any eventual development to seek to control ongoing sprawling extensions. The urbanising effect of electric gated access from the street frontage is also a concern as they are positively detrimental to the AONB "open-ness" of the village scene, and nowadays there are other equally effective ways to achieve security. If electric gates are insisted upon, they should be located well back from the frontage and carefully landscaped. Consideration is given to set a building footprint size limit. We suggest this be no greater than the Gross External Area and no higher than the building shown in the Application Drawings. Also to limit future "sprawl" that no extension be allowed within, say, 5 years.

Specific controlling limits may need to be considered here, e.g. via an Article 4 direction.

Ref. No: PL/19/4246/FA – Due to the objection above Council felt there was no further need to comment on this amendment.

Ref.No: PL/19/4281/FA – Bowers Mill Farm, Maggie Lane, and Coleshill – Conversion of agricultural barn to single residential unit as previously approved with addition of basement level. **NO**

OBJECTION

ii) Buckingham Town Council letter to Martin Tett- The previously circulated letter was discussed and it was **agreed** to send a letter of support to Buckingham TC.

iii) HS2 design and elements consultation- The previously circulated email from Emma Gaydon was **noted**.

iv) Report from CDC & BCC- JW informed the meeting that CIL has been adopted from mid-February. Parishes will get 15%. Monies will come back to where it has been earned.

After input from towns and parishes it has been decided that there will be 16 community boards, Coleshill will come under the Amersham board. It will have a spend of £2m. Each parish will have 1 representative that will sit on the board. There will be 5 meetings per year, probably in the evening. Community boards will be more diverse reflecting the areas of the County. JW also advised the new County's budget for 2020-21 had gone through.

COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 27th January 2020 at 7.45 pm, in the Village Hall, Barrack Hill, Coleshill

v) Chiltern Community Awards- TPx advised he would send round suggested nominations for the awards so that Councillors could decide by the deadline who they felt most deserving.

8. Report from Open Spaces:

i) **Monthly Play inspection return** – The January routine play inspections had been completed. LW reported that there were no new issues.

ii) **Play inspection repeat order quote** – The quote for an annual inspection of Hill Meadow play area was **approved** for the Play Inspection Company.

iii) **Hill Meadow multi-play refurbishment update** – Councillors had met at the play area to re-look at the quote from Kiwi and the work suggested. As there was not complete agreement on the option quoted for it was **agreed** that JH would contact Duncan at Kiwi to arrange another site visit so that a new quote could be obtained for removing the net and ladder section, installing a new ramp and replacing boards in the housing. It was **noted** that the play area needed to be re-opened as soon as possible. TPx explained about the covenant relating to the Play Area but it was pointed out that it did not apply to the multi-play as this has been brought over from the pub after the conveyance.

iv) **Coleshill Cricket Club letter for HS2 CEF** – TPx **agreed** to speak to Andrew Aylett re. his request.

v) **Came & Co tree article** – TPx advised the meeting that himself and JH had done an unofficial survey and removed a number of fallen branches from Tower Road and Magpie Lane. A survey was done before Christmas with David Stowe of CDC and it was agreed that several trees need attention or felling on the Common. This is due to take place in February at CDC's expense.

vi) **Magpie Lane speed limit** – It was **agreed** that Cllr. Tim Butcher be contacted for help in getting Magpie Lane designated as 30mph throughout its whole length. It was also **agreed** that LAF be contacted to have it raised at the next meeting.

vii) **Hill Meadow play area legal documents update** – TPx advised that Nigel Channer had not been available when contacted but he would contact him again before the next meeting for clarification of the documents.

viii) **Forest School on Common**– The form currently used and supplied by Chesham Bois PC for a Forest School was **noted**.

ix) **TCV Award** – The successful award was **noted**. The Clerk was asked to send back the Landowner form requested.

x) **Common & Village Green course** – TPx & JH had agreed to attend the course run by BALC in April. The cost was **approved** unanimously.

9. Finance:

i) **Cashbook, Bank balances and reconciliation as at 28.12.19**– the previously circulated documents were **approved**. A letter had been prepared by the RFO for the bank querying the errors made on the account over the last 12 months. 2 signatories signed the letter. It was also **noted** that the Amersham branch of TSB will close in June. The account details will not change. Great Missenden branch will be available for transactions and queries.

ii) **3rd Quarter Budget vs. Expenditure 2019-20** – the previously circulated documents were discussed. There were no expected overspends.

iii) **2020 Review of Risk Assessment** - The previously circulated document was **agreed**. The RFO had made some suggested amendments which were **approved** unanimously.

iv) **Payroll provider 2020-21** - The previously circulated quote from Ladywell was **approved**.

COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 27th January 2020 at 7.45 pm, in the Village Hall, Barrack Hill, Coleshill

10. Items for payment:

The payments CB19-78 through to CB19-82 for January totalling £781.10 (Inc. VAT) were approved.

COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL					
PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS FOR JANUARY 2020					

CB No.	NAME	ITEM	TOTAL	VAT	NET
CB-19-78	L Jackson	December wages	278.00	0.00	278.00
CB19-79	L Jackson	phone top up,1&1 fee	21.99	2.00	19.99
CB19-80	Newitts & Co Ltd	replacement goal nets	43.55	7.26	36.29
CB19-81	BALC	Common course for TPx & JH	227.56	0.00	227.56
CB19-82	D J Hall	verge cutting around Common	210.00	35.00	175.00
	TOTAL		781.10	44.26	736.84

11. Councillors reports for areas of responsibility:

i) Common Clearance event 18.1.20 – 9 volunteers attended and found it very enjoyable. No power tools were used.

ii) Community speed-watch training 18.1.20 – The 2 Councillors who were expected to attend had to cancel for unforeseen circumstances. It was agreed that potential speeding in the village should be put onto the Councils agenda in 4 months' time.

12. Next Meeting date: Monday 16th March 2020 7.45 pm. at Coleshill Village Hall.

21:17pm.Meeting Closed.

Signed Date