DEERHURST PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Annual Council Meeting held on Wednesday, 26 May 2021, held via Zoom.

PRESENT:

Councillors L Attard (Chairman) L Bromberg J Pollard B Oldham J Rutter Mrs F Wallbank – Clerk

Parishioners:0

1 APOLOGIES: Councillors Smith and Wilkes and BC Mclain

2 ELECTION OF OFFICERS DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE

The Clerk asked for nominations for Chair – Councillor Bromberg proposed Councillor Attard and Councillor Rutter seconded the proposal all voted in favour. Councillor Attard accepted the post, and the Declaration of Acceptance would be signed later. It was agreed not to appoint a Vice-Chairman.

3 DECLARATION OF INTEREST: None

4 MINUTES OF MEETING:

The minutes of the meetings held on the Wednesday, 25 April 2021, having been circulated with the agenda were agreed and signed.

5 APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Village Hall	Ben Oldham		
Deerhurst Parish Playing Field	Len Attard & Anthony Wilkes		
Public Rights of Way	Jim Pollard		
Neighbourhood Watch	John Rutter		
Snow	Timothy Morris		
Flood	Apperley, Gabb Lane: Ginger Blayney		
	Deerhurst: Norman Macpherson		
	Deerhurst Walton: Jonathan Smith		
Planning Sub-Committee	Len Attard – Lower Apperley		
	Jim Pollard – Apperley		
	John Rutter – Deerhurst		
	Jonathan Smith – Deerhurst Walton		
Allotment:	Jean Scorer		
NDP:	Laura Bromberg		

6 PUBLIC COMMENT: None present

7 COUNTY COUNCILLORS REPORT: Cllr Awford started his report with his thanks for the kind remarks from Parish Councillors following the recent Election: He reported the following:

- Chris Riley was leaving Gloucestershire Highways after many years of service but the local team of Craig Freeman and Chris Hawkins remain unchanged
- There is a dedicated E mail facility that can be used by Parish Councils to report local highway issues and he would send that to the Clerk.
- Gave a brief update on the roles he would be taking up at the County Council including a lead on Scrutiny and remaining on Environment and Planning together with Public Rights of Way
- He had already forwarded an update on the issue of Cursey Lane and access having observed the recent EIP into the TBC Local Plan where he had raised the issue with the Inspector

- Had spotted the issue had not been highlighted so had followed it up with Sandra Ford at TBC who has now responded with an addition to the report.
- Following concerns being raised at Coombe Hill in relation to the A38/A4019 junction ahead of the major proposals for junction 10 he had contacted highways given site notices for the potential CPO of the garage/filling station site as it was not in the original proposal. He had been advised by highways it was an option if needed to create the junction improvements, but the full study is yet to be announced.
- Closed by taking on those issues raised by the Parish Councillors and thanked them for their support.

8 BOROUGH COUNCILLORS REPORT: Not present

9 PLANNING:

9.1 Applications: None

21/00411/FUL Land West of Manor Cottage, Walton Hill: Erection of a single residential dwelling (c3) and associated operational development (Plot 1)

Comments to Tewkesbury Borough Council:

The Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal suggests that the inclusion of Deerhurst Walton in the JCS settlement audit of 75 settlements within Tewkesbury Borough is justification for proposing new development. Settlements with more houses were not included in the audit. The total score of 7 in the audit, made up of only three items, is the result of being relatively close to the A38. The score implies better access than is the case.
- 2. Adding two houses to the settlement of Walton Hill amounts to 10% growth, which is double the target in the Borough Plan 2011-2031 for built-up areas with ten times the number of houses. The housing density is similar to other parts of Walton Hill, where houses are significantly smaller than those proposed. The density is much higher than for houses adjacent to the site and to the east. The PIP (permission in principle) granted indicated two houses significantly smaller than what is being proposed, which was misleading.
- 3. The whole of this Parish is in the Landscape Protection Zone defined by Tewkesbury Borough. It includes parts of another 14 parishes and applies to the River Severn, its banks, floodplain, and adjacent hills. The nearest points of the floodplain and Severn Vale nature improvement area are approximately 100 metres from the site.
- 4. Comparing the proposals with the aerial view below, it seems that much clearing of trees and bushes is required to make way for the two houses. What mitigating measures are proposed? The Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Assessment (Toby Jones, March 2020) considers this area (Deer-09) has HIGH sensitivity. Without mitigation, new residential development viewed from the A38 may be conspicuous and distracting.
- 5. Similar aerial views are shown in the ecological impact assessment supplied with the proposal but showing two different houses. The report asserts that there will be no adverse impact but also reports that the site has already been cleared, suggesting that the adverse effects have already been caused.
- 6. The consultation response from Natural England makes little mention of the local ecosystem, referring only to the SSSI at the nearby Coombe Hill Canal and Wildlife Reserve. The map below from Gloucestershire's Natural Capital shows the site is high priority open habitat and, on another layer, part of the woodland connectivity network.
- 7. 21/00411/FUL shows details of the proposed modification to ADE89 not apparent in proposal 20/01171/FTP. There is no indication in either proposal that the footpath will be maintained by the owner, which must be assumed is the future owner of Plot 1. The footpath would be enhanced by use of metal kissing gates instead of stiles. While Plot 1 may have access the footpath by means of a gate, it seems odd that Plot 2 has no access to the footpath.
- 8. Highways has made recommendations about the access to Plot 1. The visibility splays are shown on the map but there is no indication of the hedges and earth bank that must be removed, or the location of the gates required by Highways at least 5.0 metres from the road. The photographs of

the road in the technical note make it appear that the road is wider and less steep that it really is.

- 9. The traffic survey does not report maximum speed, only the 85th percentile which is a less reliable measurement on rural roads that it is on major roads. Extraordinarily, the speed data is only reported in 0-20, 21-35, 36-50 and 51-100 mph bins but the results give numbers of vehicles exceeding the 30mph limit, which is not tested by the survey but presumably assumes linearly distribution across the small dataset. There is no way of knowing if the maximum speed is less than 50 mph; only that it exceeds 35 mph. There is no allowance for a wet road or the downward slope from Walton Hill.
- 10.Plot 2 is unusual in having access for vehicles from the rear and through the neighbouring property to the road. The boundaries on the block diagram indicate common ownership but is this sustainable, if Plot 2 has a different owner?

21/00412/FUL Land West of Manor Cottage, Walton Hill: Erection of a single residential dwelling (c3) and associated operational development (Plot 2)

Comments to Tewkesbury Borough Council:

As above

21/01171/FTP Land yard at Manor Cottage, Walton Hill: Diversion of footpath ADE89 Comments to Tewkesbury Borough Council:

The Parish Council has no objections to this application however wish to make the following comments:

- Restoring this route to enable its use will be an improvement, although it has often been blocked further along.
- There is no link to the latest planning applications: 21/00411/FUL (Plot 1) and 21/00412/FUL (Plot 2), by means of the related cases tab. The block plan for Plot 1 provides important details, not explained in the application.
- The route preserves as much of the original as possible. The revised route is separated from Plot 1 by a 1.8 m high timber fence. Proximity to the existing boundary hedges may well result in the footpath becoming blocked in future. There is no minimum width specified.
- The new owners of both properties may desire access to this PROW at Point F, instead of having to gain access from the road above Plot 1 (at Point G). Access from Plot 1 would be possible with a gate through the fence. This is not possible from Plot 2, as shown on the block plan.
- Stiles might be more useful than styles but, in the interest of improvement, why are metal swing gates not proposed instead? The last time the PROW team offered gates, they were cheaper to purchase than stiles as an encouragement. [The same would apply at Notcliffe Cottages if old stiles were being replaced.]
- There is no stile marked at Point G on the block plan for Plot 1, although the application includes one. There has been a pole and footpath sign at Point B (visible on Google Street) although the stile beside it is completely hidden and inaccessible. The only reason to have a stile (or gate) at Point G would be to prevent uncontrolled pets or small children running into the road but they would have been confined between a 1.8-metre-high fence and mature hedges from Point F.
- Who will be responsible for keeping the route clear of weeds and growing hedges?
- The existing stile is marked at Point F on the block plan of Plot 1. Using it should depend on its condition. It is unlikely to have been used by visitors because of the blockage at Point B, requiring two loosely tied gates to be climbed over.

9.2 TBC Decisions: None

9.3 Appeals/Appeal Decisions: None

9.4 Neighbourhood Plan: Councillor Bromberg reported as follows:

- Councillor Pollard has done a huge amount of work of the February's draft of the NDP.
- Cam Council started their NDP 5 years ago and there are interesting policies some are worth lifting.
- Up to £10,000 grant available to produce a NDP.

10 FINANCIAL MATTERS: 10.1 Accounts for payment and receipts: Mrs F J Wallbank –				
Salary for 1-31 May 2021	363.07			
Less Tax	15.00	348.07	Via Bank Transfer	
Inland Revenue – Tax for FJW		15.00	Via Bank Transfer	
Zurich insurance due 1.6.21 – 3yr LTA		513.15	Via Bank Transfer	
Countrywide for carrying ou	t grass cutting on 375.00 VAT 75.00			
Less credit	<u>160.71</u>	289.29	Via Bank Transfer	
NDP Expenses -reimbursement to L Bromberg		165.57	Via Bank Transfer	
Mr Edwards painting of Hag	gs Multi-play			
Unit 5 days Johour	601.72			
5 days labour Reimbursement of paint pure	· ·			
From Brewers	174.28			
FIOIII DIEWEIS	VAT 34.86			
Reimbursement of additional paint				
Purchased from Brewers	174.28			
	<u>34.86</u>	1020.00	Via Bank Transfer	
Superior English Timber: Co	ost of timber			
For Haggs Unit		700.00	Via Bank Transfer	
Knights Accountants & Tax Advisers: Professional fees for preparing financial				
Statements	200.00			
	<u>VAT 40.00</u>	240.00	Via Bank Transfer	
XL Displays: Cost of new no				
Deerhurst Walton	702.00	942 40	Via Bank Transfer	
Refund due to Clerk Total:	<u>VAT 140.40</u>	842.40 £3620.33	Via Bank Transfer	
Receipts				
Allotment Rent		90.00		
Go Espresso x 2 visits		10.00		
TBC Grant for timber for pla	y area repairs	800.00		
HMRC – VAT refund for 20	20/21	1248.77		
Total Receipt:		£2148.77		

Insurance: The Clerk reported that Came & Co had sent through the renewal premium due 1 June with an increase of over £200. The Chairman had asked the Clerk to obtain other quotations. Unfortunately, BHIB were not even willing to provide a quotation however Zurich Insurance have provided a quotation of £549.94 for a 1 year or £513.15 for a 3year LTA. The Councillors agreed to proceed with Zurich insurance as it was a considerable saving.

10.2 Financial Statement: Noted and signed by the Chairman.

11 MATTERS ARISING

11.1 Apperley Village Hall: Councillor Oldham reported:

- Chris Freeman, Roy Box and Jen Jenkins are trialling an electronic booking system.
- VH Committee looking at refreshing the toilets in the Hall and are currently obtaining quotes and looking into grants from TBC.
- Would the Parish Council be willing to show their support by donating £50? All Councillors agreed.

Playing Field:

- Tewkesbury Colts Under 14 team would like to use the football pitch and will mow the pitch themselves if any additional grass cutting is required.
- Charges agreed at £10 for pitch hire, £10 for use of changing rooms payment will be made to the Parish Council and then the PC will transfer their portion of the charges.

Play Area: Gave an update on the current situation.

Carpark: Recycling bin is being delivered week commenting the 7 June and will be placed on the right-hand side of the carpark out of sight.

Allotments: Nothing to report

11.2 Highways:

Councillor Pollard reported as follows:

Drainage School Road: Ongoing – Highways has sent out another specialist team to investigate.

Holly Tree Cottage: Ditch is full of water - emailed Chris Hawkins.

Wainloade Lane Closure: The repair works to the bridge have had to be delayed due to the high river levels.

Updated on a few other issues that have arisen in the Parish.

Clerk to instruct Ken Preece to carry out a verge cut asap.

11.3 Public Rights of Way: Councillors Pollard gave a short update.

11.4 Proposed Path: Defer.

12 CORRESPONDENCE: None

13 MATTERS RAISED FOR NOTIFICATION:

Website: Councillor Bromberg has asked Mr Davies to liaise with the Clerk direct regarding the provision of a new website.

Rotary Club: Councillor Rutter reported that the Rotary Club in the Southwest had grants available for "Chat Bench for the Community" of up to £500 and he would like to obtain one for the Deerhurst residents. The Councillors were in full agreement and asked Councillor Rutter to obtain a quote for the bench.

14 DATE FOR NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, 23 June 2021 at 7.15pm

The meeting closed at 8.06pm.