

ABBOTS BROMLEY PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting
Held on Wednesday 30th March 2022 at 7.00 pm
Held at Abbots Bromley Village Hall pursuant to notice having been given

Present: Cllrs Mr E Rodway-Bowden (Chair for meeting), Mrs C Brown, Mr R Beaumont, Mr K Baker, Mr P Freeman, Mr R Love, Dr H Lockey

In attendance: Mrs S Meads (Clerk),

Members of the Public Attending: 5

Contents:-

37. Apologies for absence	1
38. Public session	1
39. Planning Responses & Update from ESBC	2
40. Declarations of interests	3
41. Minutes of previous meeting	3
42. Neighbourhood Plan Update	3
43. Matters of report	4
44. Planning	4
45. Financial matters	5
46. Group Reports	6
47. Correspondence, bulletins & reports	6
48. Jubilee ____	6
49. Date, time and place of future meetings	6
APPENDIX ____	7

37. Apologies for absence

Apologies received from Cllr Dr C Whorwood

RESOLVED: to accept apologies

38. Public Session

Mr Simon Wilson, asked for update on Jubilee projects. Cllr Beaumont provided an update on Jubilee on grants – road closure funds, beacon, bunting, jubilee gates, 4 pools of money available and all have been applied for but no feedback received as yet.

Mr B Walters raised issues regarding the Neighbourhood Development Plan. (full presentation provided as appendix 1)

Mr Walters asked if there are any councillors that wish to respond. Cllr R Love said that a form of meeting should take place. Cllr Love said that he did feel that the use of the word 'misleading' is wrong and the PC and NDP is not trying to be misleading. Cllr Love said that the leaflet was put out to clear up any confusion and questions and misunderstanding from residents in the village.

Mr Walters picked up on the lack of the social media used.

Cllr Love said that there are a number of points to go through as part of the consultation process. The NDP never wanted to create the impression as a closed shop. Mr Walters said that in other villages that the consultant was made available to members of the public as well.

Cllr Love said that it is an interesting point and valid one, tried to get across the plan is the

view of the village and not the PC. Cllr Love said that we would like to get together and discuss it. The smaller group was formed as others drifted away. Far more constructive to meet up and go through all the points. All changes made to the document were on recommendation from Urban Vision, the consultant. Cllr Love said that the NDP pushed back quite a bit to the consultant, changes have been made are all in response to the consultant's advice. Cllr Baker said that we have advice off this consultant and is very conservative and another one is saying push as hard as you can. We have been trying to achieve a plan that we get through the various hoops. Mr Walters said it does work well for the consultant to go around the community although appreciate it has been a difficult time with Covid and not able to do any events.

Mr Walters said that he doesn't want to get too involved due to the way it was dealt with by the previous group of people and his involvement may not be appreciated by some people in the village.

Cllr Love said that the reason he stood for the council is because of the way that people were treated at the Parish Assembly.

Mr Walters said that he would send through the points to the Clerk.

Public session to a closed

39. Planning Responses and Update from ESBC – meeting attended by three representatives from ESBC via Zoom

Lichfield Road development update – planning application approved, 5 houses, planning condition all the way through process with provision of the footway behind the hedge, pedestrian link at the front of plot one and then will be linked to the footpath into the village.

Cllr Beaumont raised the issue that the planning application was for the footway inside the hedge. ESBC said that the footway was still going to be on the inside of the hedge and the hedge will remain.

Cllr Brown said isn't the work going to narrow the road. ESBC confirmed that the carriage is not going to be narrowed. Just to confirm that this is to the north of the development. Footpath goes all the way to the Thyme House boundary.

Cllr Brown, the current footpath on the plans is going to be 1.6 metres, don't believe there is room to put the path in without removing the hedge and it will be right up next to the property window. Cllr Brown asked if anyone has taken this in to account. ESBC confirmed that it is the developer's the responsibility to make sure this happens. ESBC said that this has always been the case. Cllr Edward Rodway-Bowden asked if there is a possibility for someone to come out to the site and consider the issues that have been pointed out. Cllrs more than happy to send pictures of the site at present. Cllr Baker said that one of the conditions is that no one can move in before the path is in place. ESBC confirmed that this is the case.

Cllr Beaumont said that the Council is aware that conditions are ignored and then permission is given retrospectively. No enforcement or action taken. General concern that this may happen again. ESBC said that it is as frustrating to them as it is to the PC as people can apply for retrospective planning permission.

Cllr Brown, PC is very passionate about this footpath and the amount of people who use this footpath, it is crucial to the village as a link to the ABSA ground.

Mrs Naomi Perry updated on the likelihood of local plan being updated. 2020 it was assessed to ensure that the plan was still fit for purpose and full council approved that assessment. Carry out an assessment every year. Will have to update the plan at some point. Cllr Baker, if the Neighbourhood Plan is accepted if the Local Plan is altered then the Neighbourhood Plan would need to be updated. Mrs Perry said that could be the case. Cllr Baker asked if Mrs Perry is aware of more pressure being made on local authorities to provide more houses. All authorities now work out housing need. Cllr Baker said that as a Tier 2 would there be more demand for more housing. Cllr Baker asked if the Local plan or the neighbourhood plan could extend the development boundary. Mrs Perry said that some villages may go through the process of extending the boundary through the local plan and others may do it through the Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillors asked what is the anticipated timescale from submission of the Neighbourhood Plan to ESBC? Mrs Perry said that there would be a 6 week consultation, then have to appoint an independent examiner, send them all the representations, so the process takes about 2 months.

Cllr Love asked if ESBC has had any communication from Savills or Woodard regarding the school site. Mrs Perry said she had no communication.

Another questions regarding development outside the boundary, if it doesn't meet the criteria then it can be refused but it can be overturned at appeal

40. **Declarations of Interest**

Declaration received from Cllr Mrs Brown in relation to the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

41. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

RESOLVED : *that the minutes of the meetings held 23rd February 2022 be signed as a true and correct record.*

42. **Neighbourhood Development Plan Update**

- Feedback from Surgeries- well attended, positive, some frustration by residents by the A5 leaflet that had gone around. Positive feedback regarding the PC leaflet that had been sent out.
Consultation now finished, 40 responses received, vast majority supported, 80% supportive.
Acknowledgement sent to all those that asked for a receipt.
Three issues to follow-up. NFU regarding Local Green Spaces and Green Lanes. A meeting has been requested by NFU so need to invite to a meeting or the surgery. Philip Stevenson from ESBC has offered to provide some more help. Need to arrange a face-to-face meeting with Mr Walters when he has circulated his notes. Councillors agreed there has been good progress tonight.
- Agree schedule
Meetings over the next few weeks.
Look at end of May or early to pass on to ESBC. Possible referendum, September/October.
- Publicity Plan
Use social media – Clerk recommended a PC specific Facebook page rather than using Spotted. Cllr Dr Lockey said that things should be better badged. Used

Facebook to drive people to the website. Need to use social media to reach the younger people. Cllr Baker asked if Cllr Dr Lockey could put some ideas down regarding publicity and who to reach – engage with more people.

43. Matters of Report

- **Councillor Vacancies**

The Clerk reported that there is still one vacancy left as those that showed an interest do not wish to pursue at present.

- **Working Groups**

To be added to the next agenda as some positions still to be filled.

44. Planning

P/2022/00105 **Bromley Park Farm, Bromley Wood Lanes, Bromley Wood**

WS15 3AJ

Erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and single storey front extension and porch

No Objections

P/2022/00254 **Crofts Barn, School House Lane, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3BT**

Felling of 1 Tilia tree and crown lift lower canopy by up to 6 metres of 1 sycamore tree

Lack of report to justify work

P/2022/00241 **Hurds Farm, Pinfold Lane, Bromley Hurst, Abbots Bromley WS15 3AD**

No Objections

P/2022/00235 **Land off School House Lane, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3BT**

Erection of a steel framed agricultural livestock building and retention of a storage contained (revised scheme)

No Objections

P/2022/00306 **Bagot Arms, Bagot Street, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3DB**

Reduce canopy by 1m, reduce abnormal growth back to canopy line and remove epicormic growth (T1 of TPO 54)

Lack of report to justify works

**P/2021/01691 Abbots Bromley Sports Association, Lichfield Road,
Abbots Bromley, WS15 3DN**

Installation of flood lighting to all weather tennis and netball courts

Councillors raised some concerns over environmental impact. Asked if a 9.00pm curfew could be included as a condition of planning.

P/2022/00289 9 Ivy Close, Abbots Bromley, Staffs, WS15 3FB

Installation of roof mounted PVs (solar panels) on east and west elevations

No objections

**P/2021/01247 Victoria Cottage, Ashbrook Lane, Abbots Bromley,
WS15 3DW**

Application under Section 73 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to vary condition 8 of planning permission

P/2020/00473 relating to the demolition of existing outbuilding to facilitate the erection of a two storey detached dwelling and alteration to existing dwelling including associated car parking to allow the use of UPVC

windows in lieu of timber, retention of alterations to the roof valley of the new dwelling and blocking up of a door to Victoria Cottage (amended description and plans)

No Objections

45. Financial Matters

B Record of payments for which authorisation will be sought at meeting

<i>Vch/Chq</i>	<i>Payee</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Details</i>	
12/2070	Mrs S Meads	576.69	Salary	
13/2071	Mrs S Meads	11.80	Expenses	
14/2072	G McCulloch	210.00	Spring Tidy	
15/2073	DSK Engineering	1410.00	Cleaning surface of wetpour & repairs	VAT £235.00
16/2074	Staffordshire Parish Council Association	382.65	Annual Membership	
17/2075	Mr S Wilson	136.40	Purchase of Flag	VAT £22.73
18/2076	Urban Vision	5670.00	NP Consultant	VAT £945.00

8397.54

RESOLVED: to approve above payments

46. Group Reports

- **Recreation** – Playground Repairs – The Clerk provided an update on repairs. The wetpour repairs are only short-term as this really needs to be renewed. Mr McCulloch has also undertaken a tidy of the playgrounds.
- **Village Property** – awaiting the inspection
- **Traffic, Parking, Highways** - Community Speed Watch, - Cllr Rodway-Bowden updated – tried to contact CSW. Pot Holes to be reported again – Hall Hill Lane, School House Lane – pot holes, Radmore Wood/Radmorewood Lane.
- **Competitions – Best Kept Village –**
RESOLVED : to put a notice on Spotted to ask for volunteers
- **Newsletter** – Clerk to forward distribution list to Cllr Baker
- **ABSA** – focussed on preparation of cricket pitch ready for the new season
- **Village Hall** – nothing to report
- **Almshouses** – yearly property review has taken place.

47. Correspondence, bulletins and reports

All correspondence circulated prior to the meeting and contents noted.

- SPCA Weekly Newsletters – circulated to councillors
- Emails in response to NDP consultation
- Email from resident regarding Glamping site.
- Email from resident regarding road repairs required at Bromley Hurst
- Request from JCB to host feed station at the Buttercross for cycle race on 8th May
- Email regarding Tractor Run
- SPCA National Salary Award

48. Jubilee Celebrations

- Grants/support for village events Cllr Beaumont gave an update on grant applications. Next Jubilee meeting to take place 6th April, 7.00pm.
Cllr Brown said that she viewed that the road closure is too long and is concerned that farmers will need access and emergency vehicles. Plenty of notice would need to be given.

Due to exceeding time limit set out in standing order the meeting closed at 22.05

49. Date, time and place of future meetings

Wednesday, 27th April 2022 Parish Council Meeting 7.00pm Abbots Bromley Village Hall

Signed _____

Date 27th April 2022

Abbots Bromley Parish Council will do all it can to protect Abbots Bromley's heritage and village status and seek to enhance the well-being of the community by moving towards a greener and more sustainable environment.

Appendix

Comments provided by Mr B Walters.

I'd like to comment on the recent double-sided A4 leaflet as published by the Parish Council on the 15th March regarding the Neighbourhood Plan Process. It makes a number of factually incorrect statements that should be cleared up on the record.

Firstly before I get into the detail, I'd like to point out that the leaflet by the time it was delivered to me invited me to attend a drop-in session on 19th March, the day after it had happened – and this isn't an isolated case as the same thing took place before Christmas. I don't understand why the Parish Council believes that this sort of poor time management is acceptable – anyway, onto the incorrect statements within the 15th March leaflet.....

Under the section entitled "Do communities have to have a Neighbourhood Plan" the leaflet states that without one a community has quote, *no clear limits, or controls on development*. This is incorrect as there will always be local planning policy, as there currently is through the East Staffordshire Local Plan, which also references other resources such as conservation area guidelines and policies. The role of an NDP is to add a local dimension to existing planning policies, but it's wrong to suggest that without an NDP there would be no clear limits or controls. Under the next section entitled "should Abbots Bromley have a Neighbourhood Plan" you state again that there are no clear limits or controls on development in the local area, again this false as it fails to recognise local policies and provisions as they exist in the East Staffordshire Local Plan.

Gallimore's Field

The leaflet states that the NDP does not make any provision with regards to this field and has no requirement to do so, which is perfectly true. The process is completely free to not involve itself in securing the field for the community, of that the leaflet is correct – but it misses the key point that the process could help with the securing of the field if it wished to do so. I'm clear that the current NDP process has no wish to do so, I'm less clear if the village have ever been asked as to whether it should do so or not and that is the key point. The point of a Neighbourhood Plan is that the community should decide how issues within a community are dealt through a plan.

It's not about commenting on individual planning applications as the leaflet wrongly suggests, it's about whether the community has been given the opportunity to understand that the NDP could (and again I stress the word could) help to secure the field.

Other schemes considered

You state within the leaflet that a Community Right to build has been discussed with the consultant and it was deemed unnecessary – I would argue that such an important decision was not one to be taken behind closed doors between you and the consultant but was an option that the community should have had an opportunity to understand, get involved in and comment on. No one as far as I can make out has had this opportunity.

You state that a community right to build can take 18-24 months to put in place – I might gently remind you that as it has taken 7 years to get to a first plan draft, so this doesn't seem all that long within that context.

You have identified through a housing survey a requirement for new housing to meet local need, broadly smaller units for starter homes and retirement as well as below market value social and assisted– this is in line with the community wishes. You have assumed that such delivery can be discharged within the existing settlement boundary, but there is no evidence that is the case and there is no evidence to suggest that any landowners who own potentially available land within settlement boundary are prepared or able to make it available to deliver your identified housing requirement. This issue was pointed to by a consultant's report back in 2018. – that is the principal reason why this draft is not sound and why I believe that it will be found unsound by ESBC.

There is an additional issue with the soundness of housing delivery and the robustness of the draft. For development of any sort to come to fruition it has to be financially viable, otherwise it

doesn't happen. Anyone who works in planning or development is aware of this basic fact. Unless you can clearly show how your nonmarket, local housing need is deliverable then in all probability it will not come forward. By identifying a need but being broadly silent on how that need is to be delivered you are leaving those decisions up to a developer at best or leaving the identified housing need to go unfilled at worst – a developer who is to deliver non-market housing is likely to push for a quid pro quo of market housing to support the identified local housing need as identified within your consultant's report – if this can be shown to deliver some community gain then it can be adjacent to existing settlement boundary, especially where there are dispersed redundant buildings etc – hence the possibility for extensive numbers of new houses. This is not *scaremongering* as the leaflet wrongly set out, it the facts of how planning and development works by those qualified to understand it. The idea that the AB school site, extensive as it is could only ever be used to deliver your local housing need before anything else is considered is just plain wrong and fundamentally misunderstands the issues around deliverability. You don't need to take my word for it, there is planning case law regarding market housing delivery within communities as a direct association to discharge local housing need. I suggest you look at *Crane v the Secretary of State* which also deals with a wider issue around 5-year land supply, should that also become an issue over the lifetime of the NDP.

Much of this was set out in an extensive correspondence to you in December of last year, which was ignored – even though it was sent by Phil Ryan from his e-mail address, and the Parish Council acknowledged receipt of the letter. Clearly you could've engaged, had you wanted to. Within that correspondence it was advised that should you choose to ignore - a leaflet would be distributed around the community to raise awareness of the key issues as I have just covered. This was duly carried out. This double sided A5 literature was not confusing or misleading – everything within was completely true and again, I'd like this to be on record.

The first issue of Gallimore field which I covered earlier is absolutely true – the NDP could help with this issue if that choice was made. There has never been any suggestion that the NDP is required to or that it is some sort of stipulation but doing nothing is also a choice.

The second issue, that of potentially using an NDO for the school site is absolutely true – it's an option available and by your own admission it is only one that has been agreed as not being suitable through a decision taken behind closed doors between yourselves and your consultant, not the community.

The third issue – that of potentially seeing exception or quid pro quo development outside the settlement boundary to support your non-market local housing need if it can discharge some community gain – again absolutely true and there is a planning case law where this has happened elsewhere.

Villagers were directed through the leaflet to seek a professional opinion from ESBC as for all of the reasons set out you are failing to be straight enough with people and you don't appear to understand how planning works. It is therefore an absolutely valid thing to do. It is after all why we have neighbourhood plan specialists within the Borough Council.

Ultimately you don't have to listen to me, I have a feeling you probably won't, but my belief is that this draft is dead in the water in terms of soundness on housing delivery in particular and the one consultee that you won't be able to ignore is ESBC if they also deem this to be the case.

Many thanks. I'll make a copy of this available to the clerk for reference within the coming days.