

# COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES

### Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.30 pm, via Video due to Covid 19 pandemic

Parish Councillors: Tony Treacy (AT) Chairman  
Nigel Suttie (NS)  
Linda Daly (LD)  
Neil Cadman (NC)  
Jonathan Herbert (JH)  
Andrew Davis (AD)  
Louise Templeton (LT)

Parish Clerk: Lynda Jackson (LJ)

County Councillors: nil

Members of Public: 2

- 1. Apologies for Absence:** Cllrs. Jackson, Waters & Butcher (Bucks C)
- 2. Minutes of previous meetings:** It was moved by AT and **resolved** that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021 be signed as a true record of the meeting. This will be done by the Clerk sending hard copies to the Chairman by post for return.
- 3. Declaration of Interest:** AT Item 6i). Clenemer Cottage, Village Rd PL/21/0967/KA, PL/21/0971/VRC
- 5. Matters arising: Bank Terms & Conditions & removal of service**

On the 7<sup>th</sup> April a letter was picked up from TSB dated 31.3.21 advising that the Council's bank account would be closed as 30.5.21 as they are no longer able to offer CPC a banking service. This was due to a member unable to supply proof of identification to TSB's satisfaction. More up to date documents have been supplied and TSB confirmed at 3.24pm today that the bank account is now compliant. This issue has highlighted that there is a requirement for any potential new Councillors to prove who they are before consideration can be given as to whether they are a suitable candidate. Council **agreed** that the risk assessment be updated so that all prospective new councillors prove their identity by either passport or photo driving license + a utility bill, HMRC notice of coding with proof of address. The information for new Councillors will also be updated.

#### **Use of Coleshill Common by Woodland Adventure for a Forest School**

An article in the latest village newsletter has identified that there is to be a Forest School run by Woodland Adventure on Coleshill Common. Although some years ago the Council did agree in principle to such an activity it was agreed it would need more information before any final approval could be given. The Council had not been approached by CMC regarding this activity and had not received any information on the Terms & Conditions agreed with Woodland Adventure. LJ contacted Woodland Adventure direct who have now supplied public liability insurance certificate, DBS checks documentation and a site specific risk assessment. Kathryn from Woodland Adventure had agreed to speak to Councillors about the activities and answer questions.

Kathryn advised the meeting that the 1<sup>st</sup> session that day had been received very well with 4 adults and 10 children attending. 1 attendee was from Coleshill. NS raised a potential issue that the 3 ponds on the Common were not included in the risk assessment. Kathryn advised they would not be using the pond areas although no set area had been allocated by the Common Management Committee (CMC) the activities would take place between the area opposite Mount House on Village Road down near the tree stumps, towards Windmill Hill and then towards the tree with a swing in it, so a small area. The company had raised one concern that there could be a problem with parking if the class sizes increase dramatically but hopefully this would only be those attending from outside the village.

Sessions are in term time on Monday mornings they are a Community Interest Company who do not set out to make a profit but break even. The company only use natural materials and will always leave the Common as they find it. No arrangement had been made by CMC to ask for a donation or fee for using the Common. It was agreed that Woodland Adventure should be allowed

# COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES

### Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.30 pm, via Video due to Covid 19 pandemic

to continue to use the Common for this weekly activity. CPC will discuss at a later stage whether a charge would be made. AT thanked Kathryn for attending at such short notice.

**Meeting Closed: 19:56**

---

#### DEMOCRATIC PERIOD-

- Penny Ware regarding what the Common Management Committee can sanction without attending a meeting and how it could be stated that the CPC were unaware that there was to be a Forest school using the common when Graham had sent an email to the Management Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> Feb about the suggestion of a Forest School. Mrs Ware said she was `flabbergasted` that Council could say that they didn't know about the plan. Mrs Ware had said that today's session was lovely. Mrs Ware went on to say that you could not say how many ponds were on the Common as they come and go. Mrs Ware pointed out that a personal trainer runs sessions on The Common and that horse riding pupils from Luckings farm have also be seen making use of the Common. Mrs Ware was concerned that CPC would be considering charging for the use of areas of the Common.

#### Meeting re-opened: 20:01

6. Clerk's Report: - The Clerk had circulated a report and update on the following prior to the meeting with some items requiring action from Council.

- **Remote meetings**- Unless advised otherwise the May meeting will be held in the Village Hall providing the large hall is available so that we can social distance. There is a 12 week `call for evidence` on the pros and cons for remote meetings to continue and more flexibility. There is also a legal case being heard at the High Court later this month so advice may change.
- **ANPR response** – responses are trickling in with mixed opinions it will need a longer period or a full public consultation to determine whether ANPR is wanted by residents. Costs would not be pursued until there is firm need.
- **Election update** – as communicated on 9<sup>th</sup> April Coleshill is an uncontested election and so all current members will be new Councillors from 10<sup>th</sup> May. New signed acceptance of office, register of interests and return of election expenses will need to be completed by all Councillors. Paper copies will be sent out to all Councillors, once completed they should be put into the village hall post-box so that LJ can collect and action by the relevant deadline.

#### 7. Report from Planning, BC updates:

**i) Ref. No: PL/21/0945/NMA** | 12 Chase Close Coleshill

**NO OBJECTION**

**Ref: PL/21/0967/KA** | Clenemer Cottage, Village Road, Coleshill

**NO OBJECTION**

**Ref: PL/21/0971/VRC** | Clenemer Cottage, Village Road, Coleshill

**NO OBJECTION**

**Ref: PL/21/0981/FA** | Wheatsheaf Cottage, Village Rd, Coleshill

**OBJECTIONS**

The lack of information & detail submitted via the planning portal with this application is considered insufficient for the Council to give an objective view.

It is important that any planning application submitted achieves the best possible design for the benefit of the environment & the village. There are no detailed plans and with a plan of this scale the Council would have expected CGI as a minimum. The D & A statement clause 10.3 clearly states as a `suggested condition` that materials are specified on the plans, in this application they are not. The application appears to throw up more questions than answers.

# COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES

### Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.30 pm, via Video due to Covid 19 pandemic

Considerations need to be taken into account regarding policies, the D&A statement provides lengthy reference to policies dictating what can & cannot be allowed, guidelines for sustainability these all form design guidance, but neither the drawings nor the D&A statement detail how these policies would be applied.

There is a notable size increase on the current dwelling which would suggest this new property would look overbearing from the road. Although not in the Conservation area this application if successful would be seen from within it and should be sympathetic to the surrounding area. The current property has an existing basement, there is no mention on the application as to whether this will be filled in or whether the current outbuildings are to stay. Council would ask is there a connection (there is no mention on any drawings or planning information) of how will this be shown in relationship to the new house.

Another question raised is, does this application and its outbuildings comply with current policies, especially as it is in the greenbelt & should show openness within the landscape and its surroundings.

Wheatsheaf Cottage has a lengthy history of planning applications. Of the various planning applications that have been submitted most have been refused & of those granted, few have been actioned. We assume any past applications that have been granted have now expired. Most importantly the accepted extension CH/2011/1327/FA.

The Council would like to refer the planning officer to the successful pre-app PQ/21/40036/PREAPP, the Parish Council believe it would have been prudent for the applicant(s) to have shared the details & detailed information via the LPA given its past history.

From the planning website the Council cannot see any evidence that neighbouring properties have been consulted. Councillors have spoken to a number of neighbours who are unaware of this application and do have an opinion. The applicants have not advised either the Parish Council or neighbouring properties of their plans.

The question has been raised as to whether this new property would overshadow other houses & block views via its suggested new location and also given its new height. Neighbouring properties could lose 'Openness' & 'Light' that they currently have.

It is interesting to note that bricks used to build Wheatsheaf Cottage were locally quarried. This current house was built in the 1800s and does have significant historical interest, it is referenced in the history of Coleshill on the village website. [www.coleshill.org](http://www.coleshill.org)

#### ii) BC updates-

- **HS2 Road Safety Fund** – JH confirmed that the first application for a 30mph speed limit throughout the whole of Magpie Lane had been submitted. The 2<sup>nd</sup> application for a 7.5t weight limit throughout the village would be submitted early next week. JH had taken lots of photographs which showed the damage to verges, trees and roads after the Gore Hill closure these would be sent as evidence with the application.

- **Waggoners Bits stables update.** An update had been received from BC advising that the gate on New Rd does not require planning permission. The site is now back under investigation by planning enforcement. JH suggested that Highways should be contacted as the gate is less than 75m from a busy junction.

**iii) Transport report-** JH covered this topic in his reports above plus went on to report on the HS2 meetings he had attended. JH also commented on an email received from a resident stating there was an increase in the number of vehicles using the village as a cut-through. 90 vehicles were counted in 1hr using Village Road. JH raised the issue of the Beaconsfield by-pass, which is still not open, at one of the HS2 meetings the response was that it was a private matter and nothing to do with HS2. JH had also attended a planning meeting on 12.4.21 which he gave Councillors an

# COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES

### Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.30 pm, via Video due to Covid 19 pandemic

overview of. JH stated that enforcement will do everything they can to avoid often lengthy and costly legal action.

**8. Report from Open Spaces:** AD NS had provided a report on their responsibility areas and the items needed action and approval. This was circulated to Councillors prior to the meeting.

**i) Monthly Play inspections** –AD had completed inspections at both sites. AD confirmed that the play bark was now in stock and would be ordered the following day. The gate at the JAF is closing in 4 seconds which is within the 4-8 seconds guidelines. AD explained it is difficult to get volunteers to complete small repairs within a given timeframe, he suggested a village handyman should be employed. The Hill Meadow slide roof has been fixed but the volunteer was not able to paint it. It was agreed that the Clerk should contact Hill Meadow residents to see if someone would come forward to paint the roof. JH advised that Council should be mindful of just how much Hill Meadow play area continues to cost in maintenance. All Covid 19 safety signage will be in place by the time of this meeting.

**ii) Tree survey quote for Common** – council **approved** the quote from Pete Whipp to carry out a tree inspection of the Common. It was also **agreed** that Pete Whipp should be asked to provide a quote for a tree inspection at the Jack Adams Field.

**iii) CMC update** –the Common Management Committee had provided a plan for works they intended to complete on the Common this year. The Clerk confirmed she had received confirmation from Bucks that the budget for 2021-22 had been approved. David Stowe had also supplied available dates to come and look at the trees requiring attention on the Barrack Hill side of the Common that are growing through power lines. Council **agreed** that for the next meeting they should receive a clear plan from the CMC on what will be spent on which projects and when they will be completed. JH insisted that CMC must get value for money and be diligent about spending wisely, a clear plan was essential.

**iv) Cricket Club nets update** – It was **noted** that confirmation had been received from a senior planning officer that planning permission was not required to replace the current net in the same location or for installing an all weather strip.

**9. Finance:** The RFO had provided a report which was circulated to Councillors prior to the meeting.

**i) Cashbook, Bank balances and reconciliation as at 28.02.21**– the previously circulated documents were **approved**. LJ advised that although the statements were dated 28.3.21 screen prints up to 31.3.21 had been used to reconcile the bank accounts to the end of the financial year.

**ii) End of year Actual vs. Budget expenditure 2020-21** – There are 2 outstanding invoices which it is unclear when they will be received so will be carried over into the new financial year, 1 is for the dog-bin emptying from BC the 2<sup>nd</sup> is for the internal audit for 2019-21 which due to the auditors ill health will likely come when someone is appointed to wind down his business. The accounts are now containing the CMC expenditure and reimbursement which inflates CPC`s costs and income figures.

**iii) Certificate of Exemption AGAR 2020-21 part 2** – The previously circulated statement was **agreed** and **approved** unanimously. The clerk was **authorised** to ensure that the appropriate documentation was returned to the External auditors by the deadline stated.

**iv) Fixed Assets – annual check** – JH confirmed he had almost completed the annual check.

#### 10. Items for payment:

The payments CB108-109,113-114-through to CB21-01, 02, 03 for March final and April totalling £1013.52 (Inc. VAT) were **approved**.

**PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS FOR MARCH 2021 - FINAL**

# COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES

Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.30 pm, via Video due to Covid 19 pandemic

CB No.	NAME	ITEM	TOTAL	VAT	NET
CB20-114	L Jackson	postage	10.32	0.00	10.32
CB20-109	G Thorne	CMC reimbursements timber for bridges	203.66	33.94	169.72
CB20-108	BALC	Councillor course L Daly	38.00	0.00	38.00
CB20-113	A Treacy	newsletter printing	250.00	0.00	250.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>		501.98	33.94	468.04

**PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS FOR APRIL 2021**

CB No.	NAME	ITEM	TOTAL	VAT	NET
CB21-01	L Jackson	March pay	475.16	0.00	475.16
CB21-02	L Jackson	phone top-up, ionos fee	21.99	2.00	19.99
CB21-03	A treacy	April Zoom fee	14.39	2.40	11.99
					0.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>		511.54	4.40	507.14

### 11. Councillors reports for areas of responsibility:

Align meeting 23.3.21 – JH attended this meeting which discussed the increased number of vehicles that will be using the A413, A404 & A355. Gore hill roundabout is expecting to receive 1 HS2 vehicle every minute. It was also suggested that an Air Quality review be conducted on Gore hill.

Hub reflection meetings- No-one from Council was available to attend, slides will be forwarded once received.

AT thanked everyone who attended and the Councillors for their contribution.

### 12. Next Meeting date: Monday 17<sup>th</sup> May 2021 7.30 pm

---

**21:04pm.Meeting Closed.**

---

Signed ..... Date .....

Planning response from March meeting-

**Ref. No: PL/21/0664/FA | Westrip Barrack Hill Coleshill HP7 0LW – (comments after last meeting)**

The Parish Council do not overall have objections to the application, however, using local knowledge and the photographs sent with the application the Council would like to draw the officer

# COLESHILL PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES

### Of the Parish Council meeting held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 at 7.30 pm, via Video due to Covid 19 pandemic

to the following: It is noted from the agent's submission on behalf of Mr & Mrs. S Templeton they may have filled in the application form(s) incorrectly. Specifically referring to:

1: Trees & Hedges - there are Tree's & hedges all around Westrip & the adjoining properties & driveways as shown on the photo with the planning application submitted. A question has been raised as to how are the Tree's & hedges not going to be damaged if a 2m closed board fencing is going to be erected as stated by the agent & from the drawings attached? What distance is the fence going to be from the already established natural hedging?

2: Site Visit: Can the site be seen – Again this may have been answered incorrectly – the neighbour's property adjoins and also a driveway can be seen from Barrack Hill meaning the site can be clearly seen & accessed from a driveway, public land & neighbours adjoining properties.

3: Have any of the following species been known to use the site: This has not been answered It should certainly say nesting birds are very much around all of the tree's & hedgerows currently, however it is noted they may not be in the conservation area.

Coleshill Parish Council recommend that the applicant update the documents to reflect the correct observations for the planning officer. It is also suggested that an accurate drawing of the garden should be included to include full dimensions – the trampoline looks as though it is a 3.05M trampoline – meaning the drawing is incorrect & not correctly scaled, also a drawing of the land would be helpful for height implications as the land seems to fall away, there are, we believe, regulations to maximum heights of 2.5 & 3m respectively, also platforms & bases cannot exceed 0.3m there is no information on the paved area or of its height(s).

6: The NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework section 13. Refers to Greenbelt & protecting the 'openness' & 'Encroachment'. Paragraph 145. Proposals affecting the Green Belt - The Countryside Rights Way acts 2000 section 85 refers to AONB & the parish council protecting the AONB. Although this work will be in a private garden it is felt the future open-ness of the site must be considered.