

Minutes of the meeting of Somerford Keynes Parish Council (SKPC) 7 December 2020

Present: Cllr J. Whitwell (JW, Chair), Cllr R. Elsey (RE, Vice Chair), Cllr M. Rigby (MR), Cllr M. Keegan (MK), Cllr R Sleeman (RS), Cllr G. Valentine (GV), Cllr T. Berry (TB CDC), Cllr S Parsons (SP Gloucester County Council GCC)

Parishioners: P. Eales (PE), T. Lloyd (TE), R. Munroe (RM), S. Pawlowska (SPa), M. Wilding (MW), Lisa Willis (LW)

Held by Zoom conference due to ongoing Coronavirus crisis.

- 1. Apologies:** W. Cartwright (WC clerk) Cllr A. Stradling
- 2. Declaration of interest:** GV and LME
- 3. Minutes** of meeting held 2 November were approved. proposed GV, seconded MR
- 4. Clerk's report**
 - 4.1 Village Website** Mike McKeown and Jon Lunn demo'd possible features of website and a request has been made for photographs of Councillors has been made to place on the website. MR and MK raised concerns about pictures being placed on the website
 - 4.2 Keynes Country Park (KCP)** A new meeting to be scheduled between Victoria Hadnett (General Manager, Cotswold Country Park and Beach) and RE and MR – suggested date 21 January at 5pm (to be confirmed)
 - 4.3 Village Lake** MW (Village Lake Committee) gave update of Village lake projects:

Owl Box, owl box camera (being installed) and a grant to be sought for planting of wild flower meadow. Planned filming by Calor gas at the village lake to be arranged for the spring. Also general comment and observation that boardwalk section is not nearly so slippery since maintenance and cleaning carried out at the end of the summer.
 - 4.4 LME** No progress has been made with gaining access to LME lake area for walking, difficulty in accessing LME personal (Oberon Rogers) has led to some frustration as repeated attempts have been made to do this. GV and MR have tried to seek clarification and a ruling on the request for Parishioners to access the private lake area. RM suggested to seek alternative person for ruling (Will Vickery) RM was thanked for his suggestion. Action: MR to contact Will Vickery
 - 4.5 LME cycle Way** No updates
 - 4.6 GCC Highways/ footpaths:**
 - Village gateway** No installation dates have been advised as yet
 - Damaged/ fallen road sign** – still to be repaired
 - 4.7 Parish Field** Nothing further to report
 - 4.8 Neighbridge**

County Meeting has been held and difficulties at Neighbridge have been discussed (JW attended). SP suggested some of the options to combat the number of cars parking on verges and creeping further in the village, it is recognised in the County that Neighbridge is a significant problem that if possible needs to be resolved:

- A) Traffic Regulation order: this carries some problem as it has to be funded – cost approximately £15,000-£20,000 and supported by 50% of the local community to be approved
- B) Highways can create some barriers on the verge to make parking harder
- C) Enforcement is difficult but it may be possible to have a part time visiting attendant

SP stated that although it appears that removing the car parking fee for the Cotswold Waterpark Trust (CWT) carpark at Neighbridge may be a sensible option it is very unlikely that it would be approved as CWT manager Ben Wellbourn (BW) has been approached before on this matter he has very strong views on the Carpark charge to be in operation.

Parishioners (TL and PE) and Councillor MR made very sensible observations about the genuine problem, TL offered to recompense CWPT if free car-parking was reintroduced, also PE offered a film recording she had made of the number of parked cars and the hazard created by them if evidence needed to be submitted.

Action: WC to try and obtain from Ben Wellbourn information about the level of income from the Neighbridge car park.

JW thanked everyone for their comments.

5 Planning applications

20/03601/FUL- LME change conditions

20/03592/FUL- LME – erection 8 detached holiday units, ancillary buildings, provision new landscaping, vehicular access plus amendments to the water's edge of Minety lake

20/03840/FUL- LME occupancy change of condition

20/03600/FUL- LME occupancy change of condition

20/03916/FUL- LME to vary conditions of 2 and 4 of planning permission 11/03126/FUL to change the permitted unit type and occupancy restriction

20/03885/FUL-LME to vary condition 2 and 4 of planning permission 11/03126/FUL to change the permitted unit type and occupancy restriction

20/02500/FUL-LME erection of timber fishing cabin at plot 47 Mill Village Lower Mill Lane

White Barns update

20/03532/FUL- LME jetty, render colour, door window finish, gravel path, decking

No objections in principle were made other than to the fishing cabin plan.

GV submitted that LME have instructed fishing cabin application to be withdrawn, TB to investigate. It was observed by GV that as lay people in SKPCC, the council don't

have the requisite expertise to comment in a professional manner on planning matters and JW suggested that LME planning applications were difficult to appraise thoroughly as we don't have an accurate picture of how the estate is developing. It can't be in the interest of owners and managers of LME to allow developments that negatively impact on the attractiveness of the estate. TB and SP reassuring that proper scrutiny was made at the planning meetings.

TB to investigate the apparent further development of the white barns on the North edge of Somerford Keynes.

6. Correspondence

6.1 Land to SE Ashland House development

A lot of correspondence associated with this proposed development has been received from Parishioners over the last month JW observed that a formal planning application at the time of the meeting had not been made. JW summarised the points against the plan under the following headings:

- Traffic problems
- Difficulty of access and blocking of pavement
- The gifted land to the village – maintenance and access
- Potential problems associated with flooding and drainage
- Contradictions to NDP
- Miscellaneous

This summary can be accessed via the Clerk to SKPC if required. Tony Berry addressed the councillors and Parishioners present at the meeting, he stated that representatives of the SKPC meeting the developers was a good idea as it potentially opened negotiation regarding benefits to Parishioners from the planned development and gave SKPC the opportunity to potentially influence any future developments that could be made on the land. TB felt that although the proposed development does not comply with the NDP on the grounds of ribbon development and the provision of 2 x 5 bedroom homes it did on all other grounds and he felt that there was a good chance it would go through planning (potentially on appeal) despite the objections from parishioners and SKPC. Therefore he felt a pragmatic and realistic approach from the Parishioners and SKPC to gain as many benefits from the developers was a commonsensical approach. This could be in the form of community orchard, play area which would prevent any future further development of the land.

RM felt that the draft plan had very little chance of approval as it directly contradicted the NDP (this is not formally approved as yet) which had been constructed very

carefully with a lot of community consultation. He felt that the loss of field views for the houses directly affected would reduce the market value of the homes and strongly advised that SKPC and TB should object to the proposed development plans in the strongest terms when they are submitted.

SPa commented that she would be much happier if the plans if submitted were not approved but felt that if they were then the directly affected homes should be gifted extra garden as was originally presented to the village some time ago.

PE was concerned that the plan would be submitted to coincide with Christmas break and would not have time to be discussed at the SKPC meeting.

RS agreed with the points that had been raised by the Parishioners, JW thanked everyone for their comments and reassured that the meeting that took place between the members of SKPC and developers was done 'without prejudice' and no opinion was sought or granted at the time of the meeting.

6.2 Hardship fund An anonymous donation had been offered regarding a village hardship fund for any parishioners who were suffering financial hardship associated with the current pandemic. Comments were made that the existing SK charities fund administered by Judy Monger or the church would be better than setting up a new fund. RS stated that previously these groups had helped parishioners who were in difficulty and RS stated that the administration of such funds was fraught with difficulty Action: WC to invite the anonymous donor to link up with SK charities.

6.3 Sparkle This event in the village had created lots of interest and goodwill but MR and PE voiced concerns over the lack of social distancing observed and potential risk of virus transmission at the gathering that took place at The Bakers Arms.

6.4 Trees there was a suggestion by a parishioner that a tree planting plan for the village was a good idea, particularly in relation to Lake House. RE stated that lake House grounds already have a lot of trees and is a genuine wildlife resource, RS informed that the land was originally a tree nursery. Action: LW to link up with Diana Clark about her suggestion.

6.5 Plastic barriers noted that plastic barriers on side of Spine Road need clearing SP said would investigate

6.6 Four Acres site SP informed the meeting that a number of complaints had been received regarding the public right of way between South Cerney and CWP Lakes. This allegedly associated with quad bike use and some intimidating behaviour which was assumed to be caused by residents of Four acres site due to proximity. This problem was going to be formerly investigated by GCC and appropriate liaison groups.

7. Financial Matters

Approval of Clerks salary (£691.80); GAPTC training (£25), Village lake expenses (£360.02) and zoom subscription (£14.39) were approved – RS proposed, MR seconded.

8. Questions and comments

Enquiry was made about pub opening over the holiday, this was deemed unknown until news announcement in week beginning 14 December. The Bakers Arms was offering a Christmas Dinner for £75 for Parishioners.

The meeting was closed at 21.15