

ABBOTS BROMLEY PARISH COUNCIL
 Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting
 Held on Wednesday 27th June 2018 at 7.00 pm
 At the Village Hall, Abbots Bromley, pursuant to notice having been given

Present: Cllrs P Charles (Chair); Mrs A Appleby; D Denny, J Houlihan; R Jarman, Mrs M Moore; Mrs R Robb;

In attendance: Mrs S Meads (Clerk), Ms Michelle Shaker (Community Speed Watch)

Members of the Public Attending: 5

Contents:-

75. Apologies for absence	1
76. Public session	1
77. Declarations of interests	5
78. Minutes of previous meeting	5
79. Community Speed Watch	6
80. Matters of report	7
81. Planning _	8
82. Financial matters	11
83. Group reports	12
84. Correspondence, bulletins & reports	13
85. HS2 _____	13
86. Agenda items for next meeting	13
87. Date, time and place of future meetings	13
Appendix _____	14-17

75. Apologies for absence
 Cllrs P Ryan, B Walters
 Mr P Male

76. Public Session

Rev Payne asked if the councillors had received his letter. Cllr P Charles confirmed that he had received it. Rev Payne offered the councillors extra copies. Councillors took a few minutes to read the letter.

Mr Wheeldon sent apologies for Mr Baker and said others may join the meeting later. Mr Wheeldon then made the following statement regarding the meeting on 21st June.

The Agenda for the meeting gave a definite indication to the public that this was to be the occasion whereby a decision was to be made for restarting the 'stalled' NDP process for Abbots Bromley Parish.

Up to that point three 'open' discussion events had been conducted where the community attended in significant numbers in order to express their concern in relation to the existing NDP process; whilst also offering well considered opinions for moving forward. These opinions were quantified and submitted to the Parish Council for consideration prior to the meeting of 21st June 2018.

The meeting commenced with a short open public session. Following a number of comments from the floor the public session closed with no further opportunity afforded the public for comment.

What then followed was a pre-scripted narrative by one of the councillors informing of the NDP process thus far. Whilst the content of the narrative was in my opinion inaccurate in areas of its finer detail, I would like to focus my attention on Four Options that were put forward as the PC's guide to supporting them in arriving at an outcome at this evenings meeting.

Abbots Bromley should have No! Neighbourhood Plan?

The community have been extremely vocal in their support for a NP, and the topic has been given similar approval over the last few weeks by the outgoing Chairman of the NP committee, as well as the local Borough Councillor.

Why put forward such an option that doesn't mirror popular opinion?

Neighbourhood Plan to be put forward by a Parish Forum?

This has never featured in submissions from the public. What has been proposed is that a sub group to the PC be formed (eg NP Group) which doesn't necessarily require a councillor to be on its committee. The Local Government Act provides for this.

As the PC is the lead authority in any case, TOR's would ensure that the sub group briefed directly to the PC.

Why put this inaccurate option forward and then inform us that it has already been given a 'NO' decision?

PC to employ an Independent Consultant to review the NP work to date and to report directly to the PC?

The community have already said that they want to see the NP revisited by a new independent and impartial committee formed by community representatives who report directly to the PC.

Why propose this option that does not reflect the wishes of the public?

PC to employ an Independent Consultant supported by a reformed group?

As above the community have already said that they want to see the NP revisited by a new independent and impartial committee formed by community representatives who report directly to the PC.

Why propose this option, although a community led committee would be well advised to seek the support of an Independent Consultant, but at their own considered appropriate time.

None of these Options have been put forward by the public, yet the PC has sought to identify them as their only options for choice.

Councillor Moore summed up the situation very well, when amongst a number of pertinent questions to the PC she openly thanked the community for their support as contained in the summary provided from a public meeting at Church House on 7th June. She advised that, "the comments provided will guide the PC in making its decision" I hope that this is the case?

As I will more than likely not have a right of reply, I would like these points to be properly considered when the PC finally arrives at the relevant point in this evening's agenda.

A copy of my comments will be made available to the PC Clerk after this meeting.

Tom Wheeldon

Mrs J Wheeldon provided the following statement.

Dear Mr Chairman,

I would like to make a statement in respect of the Parish Council (PC) meeting on 21st June 2018 and I would like my points to be considered and responded to in your discussions this evening.

This is a full copy of my statement, with comprehensive supporting evidence, that I indicated I would supply to the Parish clerk for accuracy and inclusion in the minutes

Release of NDP documents into the Public domain

1. At the Parish Assembly on 23rd May, 2018, I made the firm assertion that there was very little information available to the community in the public domain. At the community meeting in Church House on 7th June, 2018, this assertion was supported when Borough Councillor Hall suggested that the background documentation that had been prepared should be made available to the community.

It is pleasing to see that these documents are now available. However, I want it to be made clear for the record that the documents now appearing on the NDP website in the 'Documents library' have only been released since the Parish Assembly.

This is to ensure that there is no confusion or debate later, as to the timing of their release. The documents which are now available are:-

- Landscape Character & Build Environment
- Housing Needs Assessment – Report of Consultation
- Statement of Community Involvement

The document entitled 'Results & Report of Site Selection Process' has been visible to the wider community since July 2017.

Is the ESBC Local Plan 2012-2031 current and enforceable against developers?

2. The short answer is YES it is.
3. The ESBC Local Plan (LP) is the legal document against which all planning applications are assessed. Had it not been for the government inspector signing-off ESBC's Local Plan in his report dated 7th October 2015, just a fortnight before the ESBC Planning Committee was due to hear the Ashbrook Lane application, then the application would almost certainly have had to be passed. It could not succeed in the face of such a robust and clear LP development policy which satisfies the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
4. The ESBC is regularly reviewing and monitoring its plan against the requirement for a 5 year land supply. As confirmed by Borough Cllr Hall at the Parish Assembly on 23rd May, 2018, "*at the moment the 5 year land supply for ESBC is sound*". Therefore, so long as this remains the case we are afforded protection against undesirable development.
5. Of course, we would be further protected if we had a robust Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) which is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the LP. In other words the NDP development policies mirror the strategic policies contained within the LP for Abbots Bromley. This requirement of 'general conformity' is a basic condition that needs to be satisfied for the NDP to be deemed legal.

The Development Requirement for Abbots Bromley

6. There was once again reference made to the development requirement for Abbots Bromley of 40 units being a minimum figure.
7. It appears that the PC are not aware of the supporting background documentation that **removed** the word 'minimum' from the development requirement contained within the ESBC

Local Plan adopted by Full Council on the 15th October 2015 and which covers the Plan Period 2012-2031.

8. In order for the PC to be properly appraised in relation to the inaccuracy of the statement that 40 is a 'minimum', I can direct them to the report from **B J Sims**, BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI - Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, dated 7th October 2015. ¹ The full relevant paragraphs are referenced in the attached annex²
9. In summary he stated "*The evidence **now** provided in support of the submitted Plan, **robustly** justifies the Plan housing requirement in terms of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) paragraph 47; The Plan should provide for a total housing requirement and there is **no need to state this requirement, as a minimum figure.**"²*
10. In respect of Abbots Bromley and its development requirement, the Local Plan (LP) is at pains to emphasise that development should not be excessive to ensure that the historic character of the village is preserved.³
11. Nowhere in the LP is the word 'minimum' stipulated against the development requirement for Abbots Bromley. Therefore the stipulated figure of 40 is the requirement that AB has to fulfil and this remains the case until the current LP is revoked and replaced by a future LP.
12. The latest figures supplied by ESBC show that from April 2012 – March 2018 **60** planning applications within the settlement boundary have been approved. The majority of which have already been built. Abbots Bromley has therefore more than satisfied its development requirement for this plan period 2012-2031.

No: of Units Approved per Year and the number within or outside the Settlement Boundary

Sum of Capacity of Site	Column Labels		
Monitoring Period	In Settlement Boundary	Not in Settlement Boundary	Grand Total
Apr12-Mar13	9	3	12
Apr13-Mar14	6	3	9
Apr14-Mar15	13	9	22
Apr15-Mar16	9	7	16
Apr16-Mar17	17	5	22
Apr17-Mar18	6	5	11
Grand Total	60	32	92

13. The 32 developments just outside the settlement boundary will no doubt have impacted on the village in terms of traffic and use of facilities such as the surgery and school.
14. This represents a total housing development within Abbots Bromley Parish of **92** and we still have 13 years of the plan period to run!
Can the community influence the development (in terms of type and number) on existing SHLAA sites?
15. The short answer is YES it can.
16. I have heard many assertions that the community can't influence such development, and I wish to direct those who seek to promote this inaccuracy to the following evidence.

Firstly, I would direct the PC to the ESBC Local Plan 2012-2031³ and the Settlement Boundary Review Topic Paper November 2013⁴ (which includes email from Abbots Bromley Parish Council dated 25th September 2013 regarding SHLAA sites and expansion of village boundary.) The full relevant paragraphs are referenced in the attached annex²

17. In the ESBC Local Plan 2012-2031, paragraph 2.23 page 59 it states that:-

*Tier 2 Local Service Centres will **accommodate limited development over the Local Plan period**, in step with the more limited range of facilities in each of them, **and also their sensitivity to the erosion of their character... The delivery of this development allowance will be community led. Communities can decide how the allowance will be delivered over the plan period** and there are two options that can come forward. The first option is to rely on windfall infill development which will be allowed on appropriate and mostly brownfield sites within settlement boundaries as opportunities arise over the plan period. **The second option is the allocation of small sites, which has greater potential to deliver affordable housing and other community benefits. Where communities have already chosen an option settlement boundaries have been extended.** Where communities have not yet decided, settlement boundaries will be revised, once they have chosen, through the adoption of Neighbourhood Plans.*

18. On 25th September 2013 Abbots Bromley Parish Council chose its preferred option. The allocation of two small sites, one on Lichfield Road and one on Uttoxeter Road both of which required an expansion of the settlement boundary in order to accommodate the 40 houses required under the development allowance. These sites became designated SHLAA.

19. Para 2.23 above as highlighted confirms that this allows the community “**greater potential to deliver affordable housing and other community benefits**” on those two sites.

20. Further “**The delivery of this development allowance will be community led. Communities can decide how the allowance will be delivered over the plan period**”.

21. In other words, there was and continues to be an opportunity for the PC to have instructed the developers to include affordable homes in their plan.

22. The SHLAA site on Uttoxeter Road selected by the PC in September 2013 has not yet been built on. Para 2.23 of the LP states the community **can** influence the type and number of houses to be built on this site.

23. Secondly, in respect of any NDP looking at housing development the Site Selection toolkit provided by the Government⁵ (which is advised to be followed) specifically states at page 11 ‘Site assessment processes’ that SHLAA sites should be considered first, and comprehensive reasons have to be provided if a SHLAA site is to be discounted.

24. Therefore there is no reason not to consider the SHLAA site on Uttoxeter Road in an emerging NDP.

Monitoring and Controlling Development

25. Moving forward, I would hope that the PC utilise all of the planning legislation documentation at its disposal, to control future development in Abbots Bromley until a NDP is brought forward and ‘made’.

26. There is a clear legal basis to oppose any further development in the current plan period. Indeed the ‘brakes’ should have been applied earlier given that the development requirement has already been exceeded by 50% and we are only 6 years in to the plan period!

27. Will the PC be doing its utmost on behalf of the community to preserve “*and enhance Abbots Bromley’s significance as a conservation area*” and ensure that Abbots Bromley’s retains its designation of “*special interest as a conservation area*” as identified and confirmed in the Abbots Bromley Conservation Area Appraisal, July 2015⁶ which was produced to ensure “*its accordance with current policy framework*”.

28. Any development identified as appropriate within the NDP will have to be delivered in this current plan period, i.e. before 2031. If the combined Anglesey and equestrian sites, with an estimated number of dwellings exceeding 60 as per the School's exposed draft plan, were in the NDP, the impact on the character and conservation status of the community would most certainly be severe. Particularly in view of 60 planning applications having already been approved to date.

Cllr Appleby asked to clarify the three key points that Mrs Wheeldon had raised, primarily the Parish Council's view on the requirements of 40 houses, the sanctioning of more houses and whether the Parish Council will protect the conservation area.

Cllr Jarman asked when the report figures were taken from. Mrs Wheeldon confirmed 2012.

Cllr Moore asked who the consultant was that compiled the report. Mrs Wheeldon confirmed that this was B J Sims.

Mrs Hurst said that she has many conversations with people in the village and many raise concerns over how many houses would need to be built to put us in to the next tier. The Clerk and Councillors confirmed that it is not the number of houses that puts us in to the next tier but the facilities and infrastructure. If the village has more operating buses and shops then this would have more of an impact than number of houses. This is why the village was downgraded due to the lack of services.

77. Declarations of Interests

None

78. Minutes of Previous Meetings

- **RESOLVED:** that the minutes of meetings held on 30th May be approved with 2 amendments.

79. Community Speedwatch

Ms Michelle Shaker, Community Speed Watch Coordinator gave a presentation on Speed Watch.

Key points:-

- 63 groups in the area, 85 areas.
- There is now a great deal of support for groups
- Not just about speed, also able to report use of mobile phone, heavy goods vehicles in excluded zones and driving not appropriate to the conditions.
- Now operates on a two offences and then an officer will visit the offenders home
- The concept is now working well
- Once trained volunteers would set up a site in the village and display two temporary signs

Groups that have been active for six months can now apply for permanent community speed watch areas. This means that more officers can support and ticket there and then. If they identify high speeds they would task an officer to make a visit to the offender. Often officers threaten to contact insurance companies. All about education.

Cllr Houlihan said that you mentioned that it was more than speed. Mobile phone usage and driving on pavements are both issues in the village.

Ms Shaker said that at present usage of mobile phones or HGV in restricted areas are currently monitored using a log sheet. Letters are being issued by councils to offenders.

Mrs Wheeldon asked about tractor drivers not driving to the conditions rather than driving over the speed limit. Ms Shaker said that this can be reported, giving details of what is happening and timing.

Mr Wheeldon mentioned that tractors are often driven by young lads and in a manner that is dangerous and his car was hit on one occasion. Ms Shaker said that he should call 101 straight away or 999 if necessary. Everyone needs to be talking to each other.

Cllr Appleby asked how many volunteers are needed. Ms Shaker said that at least five would be needed to start and it is recommended to go out in groups of two or three.

Cllr Appleby mentioned the new speed limit at the end of the village. It would be useful to have something that says slow down, new speed limited.

Ms Shaker said that she could help with this. Possible use of wheelie bin stickers. She could liaise with Richard Rayson regarding this.

Cllr Appleby mentioned the Correx Policeman by the hospital.

Ms Shaker suggested putting ideas forward and see what the authorities say.

Cllr Denny asked what protection is given to volunteers. Ms Shaker said that is rare that there are any serious issues. However, before groups go out they send an email logging on and giving their location so that if there is a problem they can call 999 and receive a quick response.

Ms Shaker said that 80% of the people caught will be local.

Cllr Moore said that the fear is that we get volunteers and then interest drops.

The speed gun was discussed. Ms Shaker said that the one the Parish Council currently has will most likely still work.

Ms Shaker confirmed that the group will be provided with training, high viz jackets and signage. Training is carried out at 10.00am on a Saturday morning. Volunteers need to be 16 years old and over.

Volunteers to liaise direct with Ms Shaker. An article would be included in the next Bulletin in July.

The Chair and Councillors thanked Ms Shaker for her time.

80. Matters of Report

i. General Data Protection Regulations

The Clerk confirmed that she had circulated the contract for the GDPR for the officer services supplied by Staffordshire County Council

RESOLVED :that the Clerk would sign and return the contract and then complete the GAP Analysis.

ii.Goat's Head

The Clerk reported that she had still not received a response from Star Pubs regarding the repairs to the car park.

RESOLVED: that the Clerk would make contact with Star Pubs again.

iii.Iron Man

The Iron Man competition was discussed.

RESOLVED: that the Clerk would write to the organisers and ask for the following:-

- that the grass be cut before the competition next year so that cleaning up is easier.
- better directions need to be given to residents if they need to leave the area
- road closure signs to removed quickly after the race has finished

- suggest that a donation is made to local groups.

81. Planning

1138 - P/2018/00632: Old Blacksmiths Shop, Bromley Wood Lanes, Bromley Wood, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3AG

Erection of a two storey extension on the south facing elevation and a single storey extension on the west facing elevation alterations to windows and change of use of agricultural land to domestic use.

Received: 04/06/18 Reply due: 25/06/18 Request that hedgerow be reinstated. Cllr Denny he objected as further development of the rural development. No objections from other councillors.

1139 - P/2018/00642: Beck House, Lichfield Road, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3DL

Erection of a part first floor and single storey rear extension, front porch, 1.2m high retaining wall to front and widening of existing access

Received: 01/06/18 Reply due: 22/06/18 No Objections

1141 - P/2018/00489: Rookery Farm, Orange Lane, Bromley Hurst, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3AX

Erection of an infill building for storage use

Received: 14/06/18 Reply due: 05/07/18 No Objections

1142 - P/2018/00625: 1 Bagots View, Abbots Bromley, Staffordshire, WS15 3BU

Removal of Conifer hedge

Received: 17/05/18 Reply due: 15/06/18 No Objections

1143 - P/2018/00472: The Crofts, Market Place, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3BS

Listed Building application for the repainting of masonry, window frames, iron railings and coping and front door

Received: 05/06/18 Reply due: 26/06/18 No Objections

1144 - P/2018/00507: Cricket View, Ashbrook Lane, Bromley Wood, Abbots Bromley, Staffordshire, WS15 3AL

Change of use of agricultural land to domestic and erection of a detached building to comprise of a 2 bay open fronted garage, 3 stables, store room and tack/feed room together with the formation of a manege for private use

Received: 19/06/18 Reply due: 10/07/18 It is not clear from the plan the change of use boundary would be as the applicant failed to submit a before and after. Object on the grounds of domestication of the countryside.

Decisions

Agreed

1130 - P/2018/00377: Radmorewood Farm, Radmorewood Lane, Abbots Bromley, Staffordshire, WS15 3AS

Prior approval for the change of use of a storage building (Class B8) to form a dwelling (Class C3)

1131 - P/2018/00427: Bromley Lodge, Bromley Road, Bromley Wood, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3AG Conversion of detached stable block to form ancillary accommodation

1134 - P/2018/00275: Barn Cottage, Uttoxeter Road, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3EG

Erection of a single storey rear extension to form a sunroom

1140 - P/2018/00531: Bromley House, Uttoxeter Road, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3EG

Crown reduce up to 2.5 m one Yew tree and one Cedar tree, crown reduce by 25% and side prune

canopy up to 1.5 m two Yew Trees, reduce height by up to 3 m two Holly trees, crown reduce up to 2.5 m one Holly tree and crown reduce secondary branches one Pear tree

Refused

1136 - P/2018/00620: 2 Ivy Close, Abbots Bromley, WS15 3FB

Felling of one ash tree

Revised

1135 - p/2018/00574: Nursery Lodge, Lichfield Road, Abbots Bromley, Staffordshire, WS15 3DN

Erection of a two storey rear extension

ii. Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr Moore said that it was reasonable to address the points in Mr Baker's report from the meeting on 7th June.

Cllr Appleby read out main points from the report.

Cllr Moore said that she agreed that one parish councillor on the group is sufficient and reasonable that the group should be the chair. She doesn't agree that Borough Cllr Hall could not be part of the group. He is no longer a member of the planning committee. Cllr Appleby agreed with that statement. Cllr Houlihan said he couldn't see how it is a conflict of interest. He would be one voice of the group.

The Parish Councillors raised concerns over electronic recording of the minutes due to GDPR, need to ensure that no names are included. Cllr Moore said that it is important that the secretary takes notes but not necessarily verbatim. She agreed that minutes should be presented quickly. Cllr Houlihan said that it is important to add context to the decisions. Councillors confirmed that there is no budget to pay for a secretary but rather one of the group members to take notes.

Members discussed the issue of public being 'present' at meetings. It was agreed that the meetings could run similar to a Parish Council with an open session at the beginning and public to stay to hear the discussions but not able to comment.

Cllr Mrs Moore said she was concerned about whether school plans should be on the website if not actually going to proceed with those plans? This could cause unnecessary worry or anxiety, when in reality those plans may not come to fruition.

Cllr Jarman said that the group would have to decide what is put in to the public domain.

The Parish Councillors discussed suggestions that had been put forward in Mr Baker's report regarding communication. It was agreed that there were good ideas but some will need money. The Bulletin already goes through every door and more pages could be added to it or have a pull out supplement. Councillors to ask Cllr Walters to pass over details for the media that has been used to date.

Councillors discussed the key stages; Initial survey and housing need analysis

Cllr Moore said that these are areas that the consultant advise and support on. Cllr Denny said that is if we use a consultant. Cllr Jarman said that the housing needs survey may not have been robust.

Cllr Appleby said that we need to go back to ESBC and say that we have conflicting information regarding 40 being a minimum figure as this is the information that the Parish Council had been given.

Cllr Jarman said we were advised by ESBC about the 40 minimum. Naomi said recently that it is still a rolling plan and under review. We can't influence the development of sites within the boundary and that's why we chose another site, but the group might come to another view?

Cllr Appleby said that Naomi said we don't need to identify sites; rather we have to say what we would like. On the 40 we will take some advice and get it clarified. If we deliver more won't it take us to the next level?

The Clerk confirmed that were downgraded to Tier 2 from a Strategic Village because of lack of facilities for example buses and shops. Cllr Moore confirmed this.

A few questions were raised about the statement that Cllr Appleby read out at the meeting on 21st June. Cllr Appleby confirmed that it was taken from the Statement of Community Engagement, work done so far and catalogue of what has been done.

Cllr Jarman said that it is extremely important we bring in a consultant. ESBC have advised that it would help to have an independent person involved.

Cllr Appleby responded to Mrs Wheeldon's questions raised in the open session as follows-

- Preserving the character of the conservation area is one of the key things
- The council needs to feedback on the forty houses and minimum/maximum
- Is it appropriate to sanction any more houses, the PC needs clarification on the number of houses above.
-

The Clerk updated on progress to date:-

Details have been for consultants to assess the work done by the group. One consultant has already come back with a detailed outline of what could be done. The tendering process needs to be completed and therefore the PC has to have at least three quotations. Cllr Robb asked if the PC had to go for the cheapest option. The Clerk said that is not the case it is the one that offers the best value in terms of finance and experience. Ideally looking at reviewing by the end of July 2018 based on a quick appointment. The Clerk confirmed that there are funds available for the review and has been advised that gaining the funding grant for further support is not an onerous process.

Cllr Denny asked what guarantee do we have that the NDP group will accept the consultant's recommendations? Cllr Moore said that this will be included in the TOR

It was agreed that Cllr Walters would be asked to put everything on a memory stick for the consultant to enable them to undertake the review.

Cllr Moore confirmed that the consultant would review everything; sort out what works and what hasn't bearing in mind at the Parish Assembly there were a few people who were quite vocal and get suggestions about how we get back on track without taking too much time.

The Clerk said that the consultant that she had spoken to already would envisage a draft plan by end of November/December.

Cllr Appleby proposed that an independent consultant to do a review, seconded by Cllr Jarman, supported by the NDP group, all members agreed.

The Clerk went through the proposed changes to the ToR as follows

- the recruitment of a consultant
- group will work with a consultant
- consultant to be chosen by PC
- the group & consultant will be responsible for all consultation, media etc.
- Allocation of resources on approval by PC (previously had the benefit of someone who prepared plans for free – not likely to be the case going forward).
- Group will familiarise itself with planning policy
- Positively put forward a plan
- In absence of PC member Chair or vice chair will feed back to PC
- There will be one PC member or PC as a whole
- Chair can be any member of the group and will be approved by the PC
- Group a max of 10 minimum of 8 and can co-opt
- Minimum of one councillor at each meeting
- Quorum 4 x residents plus one PC i.e. 5 attendees to allow meetings to go ahead
- Consultant to attend as required
- Group chair to have the right to remove members
- May draw on people or groups at certain times, involvement will end on 'a task finished' basis
- Cllr Moore said that these are to be professionals and are subject to the approval of the consultant
- Produce minutes promptly but mark up as draft until approved
- The group to sign the TOR
- Need to include the fact that public can attend meetings
-

The Clerk agreed to send draft changes to the ToR to the consultant for their view point and will go with his decision but will also make them available to the new group.

The new group were discussed. It was agreed to ask the new NDP to get together soon to agree the Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary.

Proposed Cllr Moore, seconded Cllr Appleby.

82. Financial Matters

A Record of payments made after discussion with Chairman or Vice Chairman

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>
17/1771	Mrs Sarah Meads	406.87	Salary and taxable expenses
18/1772	Mrs Sarah Meads	11.80	Non Taxable expenses
19/1773	SCC Pensions	160.20	June Employee and Employer contribution plus outstanding balance
20/1774	Mr G McCulloch	1150.00	Grounds maintenance for May/June and clearing of Narrow Lane
21/1774	Information Commissioner	40.00	Data Protection Registration

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

Vch/Chq	Payee	Amount	Details
---------	-------	--------	---------

1768.87

C Record of payments received

Date	Amount	Details
------	--------	---------

30 th May	400.00	Donation from ASD Construction towards Best Kept Village
----------------------	--------	--

RESOLVED: *that the above payments be made.*

ii. Finance Report to 31st May 2018

The Clerk presented the finance report up to 31st May 2018

iii. Clerk's Salary

The Clerk reported that the Clerk's salary grade had an increased to £10.739 per hour. There was also an increase in the pension contribution to 23.4%. All members agreed the increase.

The Clerk also raised concerns over the hours she had worked recently. She confirmed that she did not want to be paid for the extra hours but would just like to make the council aware of the extra hours worked and would like hours to return to normal. Councillors agreed and appreciated the extra hours put in.

83. Group Reports

i. Recreation

The Clerk reported that the football shelter had been removed. Cllr Houlihan reported that The weeds were growing back on the path by The Nuttery. Councillors asked The Clerk to chase up the painting of The Nuttery.

ii. Village Property

Cllr Houlihan said that he was still waiting for a phone call back regarding the Christmas tree lights.

iii. Traffic, Parking & Highways

- Traffic calming repairs have been done but not the middle. Road outside the building sites on Uttoxeter Road losing the edges due to debris, need to keep the road swept. Members discussed yellow lines from the crossing outside the school down to Ivy House due to parked cars.

RESOLVED: *that the Clerk write to the school about parking outside the school*

The gully emptying schedule was discussed.

RESOLVED: *that the Clerk asks for the gully emptying schedule be requested under the Freedom of Information Act.*

iv. Competitions

Potentially in to 3rd round of judging

v. Newsletter

Published in July

vi. Village Hall

Nothing to report

vii. ABSA

Nothing to report

84. Correspondence, bulletins and reports

- Letter from Rev Payne, discussed previously in the meeting
- Letter from Mr P Male regarding Neighbourhood Planning process, circulated prior to meeting
- Email from Mrs J Wheeldon regarding consultation process, circulated prior to the meeting
- SPCA Newsletter, circulated prior to the meeting.

85. HS2

***RESOLVED:** keep on the agenda*

86. Agenda Items for the next meeting

***RESOLVED:** that the following items be added to the next agenda:-
Neighbourhood Plan, HS2, Speed Watch, Horn Dance*

87. Date, time and place of future meetings

July Parish Council Meeting, 25th July 2018, – Village Hall

There being no other business the chair declared the meeting closed at 10.00pm

Signed _____ Date 25th July 2018

APPENDIX

1. The Development Requirement for Abbots Bromley

Relevant paragraphs from the Inspectors Examination Report dated 07.10.15

[Inspectors Report October 2015 examination final.pdf](#)

The Inspector considered a number of issues including - Issue 1 page 9:-

Issue 1 - Housing Need and Requirement

Whether the Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs of the Borough for market and affordable housing within an appropriately defined housing market area

He makes a number of observations specifically **pages 12-13** paragraphs:-

56. Following the release in February 2015 of the most recent DCLG 2012-based SNHP, the Council provided additional evidence [F.59] that these figures confirm a substantially lower household projection than the SHMA. Although there is no direct comparison with the employment-led projection, this indicates that the calculated OAHN of 11,648 dwellings is likely to prove more than adequate. Given that there is no policy provision that the Plan housing requirement acts as a ceiling to development, **there is no need to state the requirement as a minimum figure**, as was considered in the Examination.

Ultimately his conclusions are summarised as:-

Conclusions on Issue 1

57. No question has arisen that the housing requirement for the Borough should be constrained by any policy considerations within the Plan. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the Plan should provide at SP3 **for a total housing requirement** equal to the OAHN as calculated above.

58. Arguments will remain on the one hand that the country as a whole is simply not building enough homes to meet the overall national target of some 250,000 dpa and on the other that, in villages particularly, communities are in danger of being overwhelmed by unwarranted new development. Be that as it may, **the evidence now provided in support of the submitted Plan robustly justifies the Plan housing requirement in terms of NPPF paragraph 47** and PPG on housing and economic development needs assessments, as positively meeting the full OAHN of the Borough for market and affordable dwellings within an appropriately defined HMA.

2. Can we influence the type and number of dwellings on existing SHLAA sites?

Relevant paragraphs from the ESBC Local Plan 2012-2031

[ESBC Local-Plan-2012-2031-FINAL.pdf](#)

2.23 Tier 2 Local Service Centres will **accommodate limited development over the Local Plan period**, in step with the more limited range of facilities in each of them, **and also their sensitivity to the erosion of their character**. To ensure that housing development is delivered, the Council is specifying a development

allowance for each settlement. The two largest villages, Abbots Bromley and Yoxall are assigned 40 dwellings whereas the remaining 4 villages are assigned 20 dwellings. These levels of growth recognise that the two largest villages are relatively remote from Burton, Uttoxeter or any other town, and so perform the role of supporting a larger rural hinterland than the other Local Service Villages. **The delivery of this development allowance will be community led. Communities can decide how the allowance will be delivered over the plan period** and there are two options that can come forward. The first option is to rely on windfall infill development which will be allowed on appropriate and mostly brownfield sites within settlement boundaries as opportunities arise over the plan period. **The second option is the allocation of small sites, which has greater potential to deliver affordable housing and other community benefits. Where communities have already chosen an option settlement boundaries have been extended.** Where communities have not yet decided, settlement boundaries will be revised, once they have chosen, through the adoption of Neighbourhood Plans.

Abbots Bromley Parish Council on 25th September 2013 chose its preferred option, the allocation of two small sites, one on Lichfield Road and Uttoxeter Road both of which required an expansion of settlement boundary to accommodate the 40 houses required under the development allowance. Para 2.23 above as highlighted confirms that this allows **greater potential to deliver affordable housing and other community benefits.**

3.How Abbots Bromley reached the decision to expand the settlement boundary and create two new SHLAA sites

Relevant paragraphs from the Settlement Boundary Review Topic Paper November 2013

[Settlement Boundary Topic Paper-November13.pdf](#)

1.10 Tier 2 Local Service Centres will accommodate limited development over the Local Plan period, in step with the more limited range of facilities in each of them, and also their sensitivity to the erosion of their character. **To ensure that housing development is delivered, the Council is specifying a development allowance for each settlement. The two largest villages, Abbots Bromley and Yoxall are assigned 40 dwellings** whereas the remaining 4 villages are assigned 20 dwellings. These levels of growth recognise that the two largest villages are relatively remote from Burton upon Trent, Uttoxeter or any other town, and so perform the role of supporting a larger rural hinterland than the other Local Service Villages. **The delivery of this development allowance will be community led and they can decide how the allowance will be delivered over the plan period.**

Relevant paragraphs with specific reference to Abbots Bromley

4.1 Abbots Bromley is a historic settlement with medieval origins which is linear in character with long linear burgage plots that extend backwards from the main road through the village. Some growth has occurred in the post-war period, especially in the north of the village and most recently some development in the east of the village. This has complemented some infill such as Paget Rise.

4.3 The Parish council were given the constraints map for the village including flood zones, conservation area and ecological designations along with the existing SHLAA sites. ESBC and Abbots Bromley Parish Council met in June 2013 to discuss the settlement boundary methodology. This has been followed by email correspondence. The Parish Council then met to discuss the Settlement Boundary amendments in further details at their meetings held on 26th June, 31st July and 25th September.

4.4 The Parish discussed the merits of each site in detail with regard to constraints, housing numbers required and likely impact on the village and nearby residents.

4.5 The two chosen locations are:

- SHLAA site 355 – capable of delivering up to 20 dwellings
- New SHLAA site ‘1’ (in the 2013 SHLAA update) – capable of delivering a small development of approx. 15 dwellings

Both these sites are adjacent to the existing Settlement Boundary, have good access off the main roads into Abbots Bromley and are available and deliverable. ESBC consider both these sites suitable for the villages’ development allowance for the plan period. The Parishes’ full assessment of the available sites can be found in Appendix 1.

4.6 On the 25th September 2013 the Parish Council met and agreed the new Settlement Boundary. In an email from the Abbots Bromley Parish Clerk on 26th September 2013 ‘The Parish Council discussed the extension of the development boundary last night and approved the inclusion of the two sites.’ The email is featured in Appendix 1.

4.7 Conclusion/Recommendation: **Amend the settlement boundary around the chosen sites.**

(Page 27) Appendix 1: Email extract from Abbots Bromley Parish Council regarding SHLAA Sites

The following is extracted from an email from the parish Council in response to them looking at all available SHLAA sites:

‘After lengthy discussions the Parish Council agreed that the most appropriate sites to put forward for development between 2012 and 2031 would be Site 1 (shaded in yellow) and Site 355. Both of these sites could take up to 20 houses on each and provide the 36 houses required during that period as a tier 2 village.

Below is an analysis for each site currently identified by ESBC.

Site 1 (shaded in yellow) although in the conservation area this site is located opposite and adjacent to other properties. Access to the site would be directly from Uttoxeter Road and therefore no additional access would need to be built and disruption of neighbours would be kept to a minimum. As properties have been built on the opposite side of the road all major services are already in place. This site would also be in keeping with the linear layout of the village as it currently is. The Parish Council would support a development of 15 to 20 properties on this site.

Site 2 (shaded in yellow) this site is extremely large and a development of this size would be detrimental to the character of this part of the village. The access to the site would need to be via Goose Lane and Lintake Drive and would dramatically increase traffic on these unsuitable roads. Disruption to the village would be considerable due to the location of the site and new services would need to be put in place. The Parish Council does not support a development on this site.

Site 357

The Parish Council examined the proposal submitted and strongly objects to development on this site. The size of the proposed development is 19 homes. This size of development is unsuitable for the size of plot that has been identified and will cause major disruption to residents within the area. The agent has identified two entrances to the site, one off Goose Lane and one off Preedy’s Close. Both of these entrances are unsuitable for the number of cars that would be entering the site. The entrance off Goose Lane is steep and almost blind and Goose Lane itself is unsuitable for the number of car movements on to and off this site each day. Also traffic going left or right onto Goose Lane, or straight on to Yeatsall Lane, would immediately enter single track roads. The extra traffic generated would therefore cause major disruption and potential danger. The other entrance being considered off Preedy’s Close would cut straight across Narrow Lane. Again the extra traffic generated would have a major detrimental effect for the residents of Preedy’s Close and the neighbouring roads. In ESBC’s character appraisal of Abbots Bromley conservation area, dated March 2009, Narrow Lane and Goose Lane were both identified as areas “with green character” and “have historically and ecologically important hedges lining their route”. Any proposal to damage the character of these lanes is strongly opposed. This site is also not in character with the village and other sites identified would be more suitable for the linear layout of the village.

Site 348

The access to this site is via School House Lane (single track) and Bagots View. This is an unsuitable access for a development of size. The maximum of two houses that are currently being considered would not be disruptive either generally or to close neighbours.

Site 116

This site is extremely large and if there was a large development here this would change the character of the whole village. Road access to the site would also cause disruption to existing home owners as there is no direct access on to the land and therefore new roadways would have to be created either from Ashbrook Lane or Lichfield Road. This may require demolition of existing homes in order to create this access.

Site 121

This site seems to be landlocked and any further development on this site would need to go through existing properties.

Site 355

This site is located on Lichfield Road and is opposite other homes. The size of the plot would accommodate 15-20 homes and would help to provide the 36 homes required. Access to the site would be direct from Lichfield Road and would create little disruption to other home owners or to the existing road network. If this site was developed it would provide a link between the village and the approved Sports Field development and enable safe pedestrian access to the sports complex. The site is also in keeping with the linear layout of the village. The Parish Council would support development on this site.

In summary the Parish Council would support the movement of the development boundary to accommodate Site 1 and Site 355.

Best wishes SARAH MEADS Clerk to the Parish Council

4. Abbots Bromley's designation as an area of "special interest as a conservation area

[AbbotsBromleyCAAJul15.pdf](#)

1.9 The appraisal identifies key positive and negative impacts, erosion of character, potential threats and considers the appropriateness of the boundary. It makes recommendations for future actions by the Council to preserve and enhance the areas significance as a conservation area.