

Wisborough Green Parish Council

Draft Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting to be agreed on 20th March 2018

Date: Wednesday 7th March 2018

Present: Mr A Burbridge (AB), M N Beresford (NB), Mr P Drummond (PD) (Chairman),
Mr A Jackson (AJ), Mr M Newell (MN), Mrs S Overington (SO), Mr H True (HT)

Apologies: Mr K Charman (KC), Mr M Watson (MW)

In Attendance: Mrs L Davies, Clerk

Members of Public: 7

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7.45 pm and welcomed all.

Action By

1. Apologies for Absence: Apologies were received and accepted from Mr Charman and Mr Watson.
2. Declaration of Members' Interests: Being the applicant, SO declared her interest in the planning application for Holly House, Newpound Lane and would withdraw from the meeting. Being a resident on the west of the Green, MN declared his interest in the Pavilion. No other interests were declared.
3. Minutes of the Last Meeting: The Minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday 20th February 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
4. Public Questions: The members of public had attended the meeting to listen to discussion in relation to the proposed new Pavilion. The Clerk acknowledged receipt of some further information which had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting and would also be displayed. The Chairman advised that he would permit public participation on points for clarification during the following discussion, if requested by members
5. New Sports Pavilion:
 - a. Building Plans: The Chairman reminded members that the principle of providing a new building and its general design had been agreed, but it was important for all to be mindful that this building would be in the position for the next 100 years. The Village Green was a hugely important asset for the village which was highlighted by the community during the Neighbourhood Plan consultations. He reiterated that a poor decision now could not be undone and it was, therefore, essential that members were happy about all elements of the proposal for the benefit of the whole village.

AJ thanked the Sports Association for providing the amended plans and further information as discussed at the meeting on 6th February, highlighting that the plans were now version 10. Plans were displayed and AJ gave explanation to the current proposal and the slight amendments that had been made. The main change was to the roof line at the rear of the building which had reduced the bin storage area but opened up the vista a little. The inside of the building was relatively unchanged. An overlay was displayed which demonstrated the existing building, the February 2015 proposal and current plan. Photographs from various aspects around the Green, with images of the proposed building superimposed to simulate the effect of the building, were displayed. AB highlighted that these views would be softened by the leaf cover in the summer.

It was noted that the reduction in the rear corner had revealed more above the single storey extension. AB highlighted that the church could now be seen which was a concern raised at the last meeting. Although the small movement to the left had improved the impact on the views, AJ highlighted that the physical position still extended quite a long way across the Green. Members queried if one photograph gave the correct location in relation to the junior football goal.

AJ explained that the information provided by the Sports Association earlier in the evening explored the impact of turning the building, with additional notes stating that there was no gain in rotating in the same position. Considerations were: the impact upon Ivy Cottage (Listed Building in the Conservation Area), the root protection zone and tree canopy of the Horse Chestnut tree at the rear of the building and the requirement to be 2 metres from the edge of the football pitch. Moving the building further north would impact upon sight of the cricket for scoring. AB advised that although the scoreboard could be made higher, with the 3m drop from the square to the Pavilion, it was on the limit of acceptability.

The Sports Association advised that from the glass box to the centre of the square was 113 yards. The scorers were currently on the edge of struggling to see and with the current proposal, although it faced the square, it was about 7 metres further back.

AJ displayed a further set of comparisons of sightlines against existing and the new proposal. Members expressed concern that the building still cut the Green, so AJ demonstrated the effect of further rotation and movement and the reduction of the length of the glass box. The angle between the main building and glass box was discussed (currently about 135 degrees) and the Chairman asked if this could be reduced. There was some discussion over the rotation and angles of the building.

It was confirmed that the design was based upon the constraint of the tree and that Chichester District Council (CDC) had indicated that abutting Butts Meadow was not acceptable.

SO highlighted that the tree had a huge impact on the location of the building. Although the Arboricultural Survey indicated that the tree was heathy, other nearby trees were on the decline. This tree was of the same age and unlikely to last beyond 100 years; such an important decision was being based around a tree that could be lost in the not too distant future. AB concurred; it was the value of a tree in comparison with a facility for cricket as well as other sports for the whole community. However, he highlighted that when Parish Council and Sports Association members met the CDC planning officer for the initial meeting in February 2015, she viewed the retention of the tree as critical. AJ advised that the plan initially discussed was very different to the current proposal, and the question posed to CDC at that time was to either extend or increase the height. AJ gave brief explanation to conflicting advice received for the village hall and therefore suggested that perhaps this question be re-visited with CDC as opinions did change. He also made reference to a planning application later on the agenda that proposed the removal of a 150 year old Oak Tree. He believed that it was worth asking CDC to rank the potential harm to ascertain what was now acceptable.

The Chairman agreed that there was a strong argument to revisit the tree position with CDC, particularly as there were 83 trees within the Conservation Area and that this tree was of a similar age to those already lost. He reiterated that he believed the sightline along Kirdford Road and the division of the Green was critical. AB highlighted that it was only 15% of the Green that would be behind the building so not entirely cut off. The amendments and new orientation had improved the sight of the church. The glass box had been turned to the opposite side at CDC's request. AB questioned what was actually being lost. The Chairman advised that it was important to retain as much of the integrity of the Green as existing. MW and KC, both absent from the meeting, had circulated concerns relating to this impact on the Green.

The Sports Association highlighted that the CDC Officer had rejected the location opposite the Wyatt Close entrance; extracts from the meeting minutes were read.

HT highlighted that he had spoken to some village residents who would not support a proposal with a perceived cutting off of the Green. HT did not believe that the proposal would be acceptable to the village and felt that further public consultation was required. Although a consultation event had been held in February 2017, the Chairman felt that this had concentrated on the design and not in the context of the Green. He reiterated again that the wrong decision could not be unmade. Any repercussions would be directed to the Parish Council, not the District Council or Sports Association. He would therefore support further consultation and suggested that this could be in the Parish magazine, which gave details of all the constraints and considerations that needed to be taken into account. Planning details could be included which would allow support or otherwise to be directed through the planning system.

It was generally agreed that any small improvements to help reduce the impact and effect on the Green was required. SO summarised the constraints to be addressed: tree, Ivy Cottage, scoring, views but also highlighted policies in the Neighbourhood Plan stating that this plan had been prepared by the

Parish Council in consultation with the community. The Parish Council should therefore support these policies which were designed to protect the Green, open space and character of the Conservation Area.

The Sports Association advised that there had been considerable correspondence between CDC and their architects which had not been shared with the Parish Council. Moving the glass box had made the principle of the design acceptable to CDC; previously it had not been accepted.

SO stated that what was acceptable to CDC was not necessarily acceptable to the village. HT concurred. He liked the design but was concerned about the location and footprint.

The Sports Association wished to enhance the Pavilion building. At the last meeting a list of definitive requirements had been given to the Sports Association planning team. AB believed that these had been addressed and it was therefore essential to give a clear steer. The architect had now prepared 10 different designs on a fixed fee basis. The Sports Association had been encouraged by the general unilateral support for the design by the Parish Council and amendments had been made to enhance the view. The design had been prepared with input from 67 people who commented at the consultation event, the Football Association, Sport England, England and Wales Cricket Board and CDC. The removal of the tree could lift a constraint but could be a fundamental re-design. AB was concerned about the implications on funding as well as the enthusiasm of the Sports Association to continue.

Mr Elliott, Chairman of the Sports Association expressed his concern that he believed that after 5 years and the required level of funding to get to this stage, he felt that the Sports Association had been misled over the design. They had provided a number of different iterations to satisfy both the Parish Council and community. He believed that all wanted to work together, but if a major re-draw was required, would the Parish Council be willing to fund. He believed that after the last meeting, the Sports Association had achieved the Parish Council's requirements.

The Chairman re-emphasised that previous discussion had focused on the design and it was only the most recent iteration that highlighted the position on the Green and the physical divide. The Parish Council liked the design but it was important to minimise the impact on how the Green flowed. The removal of the tree potentially gave the ability to change position and adjust the angle to lessen the impact.

The Sports Association gave explanation to the ECB requirements that would allow funding to be accessed; the ECB had already compromised over the padding up area.

AJ stated that all would have to accept that the end result would be a compromise for everyone but it was important to consider the balance of harm. He would be interested to hear CDC views after 3 years in the context of the other considerations and concerns.

The Sports Association confirmed that the small incremental changes discussed would not constitute a major re-design and the architect could be instructed to undertake. The Sports Association Chairman respected the public accountability of the Parish Council and acknowledged the due process to be followed. He was now far more confident that both parties had the same objectives, the one constraint having always been the tree.

The following was agreed:

- The Chairman and AJ to meet with the CDC planning officer to discuss the tree; PD agreed to prepare an argument to remove.
- Following this discussion, Sports Association architect to consider orientation, scope to change hinge of the glass box and reducing the length of the glass box but maintain the area (square and not rectangular).
- Details to be provided in the May Ad Vincula – copy to editor would be required by 14th April. Parish Council to prepare article to bring planning consultation to community's attention.

PD

- b. New Lease: Members agreed to the preparation of a new Lease and that the Sports Association should pursue the establishment of a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO). It was confirmed that the

Sports Association had sought further advice to clarify that a CIO could manage incidental income and it also provided the flexibility for elements unrelated to the charity objectives. The Sports Association acknowledged the Parish Council’s concerns in relation to commercial activity and confirmed that it was not the Association’s intention to run a commercial entity; it would be run in the same way as present.

AJ gave brief explanation to the current arrangement and referred members to a presentation that had recently been re-circulated. Members agreed that consideration would need to be given to potential uses, competition with other establishments, use of flat roof area and nuisance. It was agreed that a working group should be established to discuss further with the Sports Association. Members to be AJ, PD and MN, although MN advised that whilst he was happy to be involved, his possible conflict of interest might make it difficult to be completely objective. AB was also happy to be involved but other commitments could prohibit. Sports Association representatives were confirmed as Mr I Elliott (Sports Association Chairman), Mr S Calder Smith (Cricket Club Chairman), Mr J Newman (Cricket Club Secretary). Clerk to ascertain if there were example leases for similar organisations available.

Clerk/PD/AJ

9.30 pm – 7 members of public left the meeting room

6. Planning: SO left the meeting room.

- a. Planning Applications: The following application were reviewed. Application details and plans had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were also displayed:

WR/18/00375/DOM - Case Officer: - Maria Tomlinson - Other Dev - Householder Developments	Mr & Mrs B Overington Holly House Newpound Lane WG RH14 0EF Re-use of domestic outbuilding for ancillary accommodation <u>No Objection</u> on the condition that the accommodation was ancillary to the main dwelling.
WR/18/00410/TPA	5 Glebe Way, Wisborough Green Fell 1 no. English Oak tree (marked on the plan as T1) within Area, A1 subject to WR/61/01109/TPO. <u>Objection. The tree should be retained.</u> The tree was in the location prior to the erection of the garage and outbuildings, and an appropriate barrier should have installed at this time. Alternative root control measures had not been explored, and members felt strongly that root pruning and a barrier to prevent further root spread and manage growth should be considered. This was a mature and important tree and removal would make a significant and negative impact on the area.

7. Any Other Matters to Report:

- a. The Clerk reminded members to complete any outstanding Risk Assessments for consideration at the March meeting.
- b. A meeting to discuss the Winterfold Open Space had been arranged with the developer for Friday 23rd March; PD, KC and AB would attend.

8. Date of Next Meeting:

Parish Council Meeting on Tuesday 20th March 2018 at 7.45 pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.00 pm.

.....
 Chairman

.....
 Date