



Tinwell Parish Meeting

Meeting Minutes for the Tinwell Parish and Village Hall Annual General Meeting

Held at: Tinwell Village Hall
Date: Wednesday 25 October 2017 at 7.00pm
Time: 1900hrs

Initial Items Discussed and Introductions Made

- The Village Clerk welcomed Councillor Gary Conde and Councillor Gordon Brown to the meeting and explained their roles.
- The Village Clerk clarified the new arrangement with the amalgamation of the Parish Meeting and Village Hall Committee as agreed during the last AGM.
- No declarations of interest were declared.
- Apologies were received from Ian Lyon and David and Lynda O'Regan.
- 51 Residents were present.
- At the request of the meeting attendees, the Village Chair read the Meeting Minutes from the previous AGM which was held on 25 November 2016. These were accepted as a correct record.

Community Response Plan

Councillor Gary Conde outlined this initiative which has been developed to allow a smaller community to build a rapid response program in the event of a disaster. E.g. Industrial, Infrastructure, Medical or Natural. He advised that Ketton Villages' plan is nearly completed, and it is proposed that Tinwell join their plan.

A core Team would co-ordinate the plan and Tinwell villagers would be asked to volunteer their skills to allow the creation of an effective response plan.

Councillor Gary Conde volunteered to be the overall co-ordinator for Ketton and Tinwell villages.

We would need a Tinwell co-ordinator for identification and collation of the information and the villagers were asked to consider how they could support this. There were no volunteers at the time of the meeting.

Introduction and Update from Councillor Gordon Brown - (Appointed to Ketton Ward July 2017)

Councillor Gordon Brown confirmed that in his new role he will do all he can to support the Tinwell Village Committee.

St George's Barracks

Mr Brown went on to provide an update on North Luffenham's St Georges Barracks site. It is part of the November 2016 'Better Defence Estate' announcement and has been identified for intended disposal of, by the MOD in 2020/221.

Rutland County Council and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) are working together as partners to develop plans aimed at delivering the best possible outcome for the site.

As well as ensuring the MOD infrastructure is optimised to meet the UK's strategic defence needs, the estate optimisation strategy also contributes to a cross-government target of releasing enough land for a potential 160,000 new homes by 2020, with surplus MOD sites to be utilised for housing and other forms of development.

The partnership between Rutland County Council and the MOD aims to make sure the St George's Barracks site is developed in a way that takes account of existing communities, local needs and the environment.

The MOD and Rutland County Council will develop planning for the St George's site, with input from local groups and organisations.

The proposed goal is the creation of a new 'Garden Village' with the right mix of housing, enterprise, leisure and recreation.

Councillor Brown advised that Helen Briggs, Chief Executive of Rutland County Council, will provide a briefing on the development at St George's Barracks, Edith Weston on Wednesday 15th November at 7.00pm in the Congregational Hall in Chapel Lane, Ketton. All are welcome to attend the briefing.

Councilor Brown then responded to key questions from the group.

- ***How many new homes will be provided?***
This has not been decided and will be determined following the outcome of master planning, a minerals assessment and a market assessment.

- ***Why is a minerals assessment needed?***
An unknown quantity of minerals has been identified below the site, the extraction of which takes priority over any future development opportunities. In addition, contamination of land due to fuel spillages, weaponry etc. will need to be resolved as part of an Environmental Assessment.

Short term this could limit development for a proportion of the site, however, once extraction is complete, land would be made available again in future years.

A survey is planned to understand the full impact of the minerals issue – results are expected before the end of 2017.

- ***When will the development start and finish?***
It is hoped that development will begin as soon as the site is disposed of. Expectations are this would be 2020/21. The project is anticipated to last some 10-15 years.

Health Watch Rutland

Rutland County Council (RCC), along with Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council, had run a consultation to seek the public's views on how Health Watch Services should be provided across the area in the future.

The overwhelming response from Rutland residents was in favour of remaining with a separate Health Watch in Rutland. Thus, RCC have decided to tender for a standalone Rutland Health Watch contract to commence April 2018.

Finance Updates

RCC's Government funding will continue to reduce over the next few years. Government funding for 2018/19 is £9.48m compared to £10.95m in 2017/18 and £12.1m in 2016/17.

The draft budget for 2018/19 assumes that by 2022/23 the annual funding **gap** will be £1.157m and the Councils' reserves will be £4.19m compared to £8.8m today if no further action is taken.

Activities and actions are underway to reduce costs and increase funding. These include:-

1. Domestic Green waste charges being introduced (£35 per household per annum). This contribution will create approximately £250k income.
2. Increase in Council Tax of between 3-5%.
3. Removal of Council Tax discounts for empty homes £240k.
4. Use of existing reserves.

Other Matters Arising

Cottage Refurbishment

The conversion of the empty cottages adjacent to Tinwell Church is now complete. Owners, William and Sacha De Gale were congratulated on a job well done given the standard of the finished works.

New Home

A warm welcome was extended to Robin and Britt-Marie who moved into their newly built home, Culpepper House, this summer.

Speed Reducing Wheelie Bin Stickers

The 30 MPH stickers, kindly supplied by Ian Lyon and distributed throughout the village, have been put to good use. Spares remain available should anyone require - please contact the Village Clerk.

Boon Day

Another fun and successful event was held this year with an exceptional turnout of 54 Villagers, young and not so young! It was a real team effort which included clearing the Church yard, weeding the Village Hall car park, as well as cleaning of the chairs and crockery in the Village Hall.

Updates were also made to the Book Exchange in the phone box and fly tipped rubbish was removed from Casterton Lane. The event finished with a very welcome BBQ to recharge the batteries! Thanks, was expressed to everyone involved.

Village Hall

Mr Terry Baxter reported that the front security light on the Village Hall was faulty and needed urgent repair. It was confirmed that an Electrician would be contacted as a matter of priority.

It was reported that the storage within the hall needed some attention and that this would be included on the maintenance list.

Digital Updates

The Village Clerk advised residents that the village now had a new Website which would begin to help with communications. The Village Clerk thanked Ashley Brewis for his help in launching the site: - <https://tinwellvillagehall.com>

The News Letter Editor, Cathy Jarvis, request that anybody wishing to be added to the Newsletter Distribution List, pass on their email addresses at the end of the meeting. Alternatively, please contact tinwellnews@btinternet.com and request to be added.

Police Report

The Village Clerk reported that there had been an increase in burglaries across Rutland and that there was a specific target on 4x4 vehicles. One such theft had occurred during the summer at a property on Casterton Lane.

It was advised that the regular Police report can be provided should anybody wish to receive it. Please email the Village Clerk with your request? TinwellClerk@btinternet.com

For additional information, it was commented that many Social Media sites are now available including a Facebook page for Leicestershire and Rutland Rural Watch <https://en-gb.facebook.com/leicsruralwatch/>

Grass Cutting

It was reported that the old lawn mower was no longer serviceable and a decision had been made by the Village Committee to replace it from Village Hall funds.

Mr Graham Harris confirmed his ongoing voluntary support with the grass cutting duties and the maintenance of the Lawnmower. Mr Harris was asked to submit fuel/maintenance expense receipts to the Village Hall Treasurer for re-imburement.

Mr Harris confirmed he would attempt to sell the old lawnmower for 'parts'. Any money made from this would go back into the Village Hall Fund.

The Village thanked Mr Harris for his ongoing support, which is very much appreciated.

Mrs Rita Kelly

A special 'thank you' was extended to Mrs Rita Kelly who had retired from the Village Committee as Parish Chair after ten years of service. Flowers were presented to Mrs Kelly.

Councillor Gary Conde also thanked Rita on behalf of the Hanson Liaison committee for all her support.

Mrs Kelly addressed the room and in addition provided a brief update on Hanson Cement Liaison Committee Report. Mrs Kelly confirmed that the Plant continued to strive to improve the Environment with several Ecological projects.

Hanson are also exploring plans to provide an access road to the North via the A606 which would significantly reduce Plant traffic through Tinwell village. Mrs Kelly requested that villagers keep an eye out for any speeding of Contractor trucks and to report them to her.

Parish Precept Report

The Village Clerk confirmed the detail of the accounts related to the Parish Precept. Please see the breakdown on the following page.

- The opening balance was £317.28.
- The 2016/17 Precept was £1,120.00.
- Various expense related to, printing, postage and street lighting amounted to £547.37.
- The remaining balance was £889.91.
- A vote was cast to utilise part of the 2016/17 Precept surplus as a donation to support this purchase of the new Lawnmower. The vote was unanimously carried.

Parish Clerk's Expenses 1/4/2016 to 31/3/2017			
Date	Description		Value
19-Apr-16	2nd Class Stamps - Post Office		£6.60
05-Apr-16	Stapler - Colemans		£3.99
01-Jun-16	Printing - DAG Brown (Some Colour)		£22.00
28-Oct-16	Printing - DAG Brown		£11.00
02-Nov-16	Printing - Dag Brown		£11.00
03-Jan-17	Sub Total Re-imbursed to Clerk		£54.59
12-Apr-16	Parish Clerk Expenses		£131.28
12-Jul-16	Audit Fee RCC		£72.00
03-Oct-16	Street Lighting RCC		£60.00
26-Nov-16	Tinwell Christmas Party C Brewis		£100.00
26-Nov-16	AGM Expense		£29.50
12-Jan-17	Ian Whitmore Gift for Voluntary work		£100.00
Total Expense			£547.37
HSBC Account 51463608			
31-Mar-16	Opening Balance		£317.28
26-Apr-16	Precept		£1,120.00
	Expenses		-£547.37
21-Mar-17	Closing Balance		£889.91

Village Hall Treasurers Report

The Village Hall Treasurer, Nicky Wilkinson, confirmed details of Income and Expenses for the Village Hall.

- Opening balance - £2089
- Closing balance - £2450
- Income - £9001
- Expenditure - £8641

A copy of the Village Hall Treasurers full report will be distributed alongside this meetings minutes, however, if anyone has any questions, please contact Nicky Wilkinson at tinwellvillagehalltreasury@yahoo.com.

Lawnmower

As discussed earlier, a new ride-on lawnmower will be purchased and therefore Tinwell residents can continue to maintain the field opposite the Village Hall. The lawnmower will have a three year pay back.

Maintenance of the Village Hall

It was acknowledged that minimum maintenance had been carried out on the Village Hall recently. It was noted that there is now a small list of jobs to be carried out and a request was made for residents to ask around the village to see if any skilled locals might be able to help with these items. The Village Hall Treasurer confirmed that this work would be paid.

Electricity

There are two electricity meters at the Village Hall.

The 'paid electric meter' is for the heating in the hall only. All other items such as lights and plug-in items are paid for via the 'normal meter'.

- The charge for the heating is currently set at £1 per hour. This is going to be increased to £2 per hour to cover electricity cost.
- Mr Derek Brown kindly offered to assist with the changes to the meter.

Parties

Some damage has been made to the Village Hall and its surrounding areas/property during recent teenage party bookings. As a result of this, along with noise levels they create, it has been decided that no further bookings will be taken for this age group.

Development Sites within the Village

The Village Clerk confirmed that two key sites within the village have significant interest from developers and would be likely to receive applications for planning in the short term.

1. Green Barn Site – Casterton Lane (Part of the Cecil Estate)

Interest has been expressed by Hereward Homes to develop this site. Hereward Homes have carried out various 'New Build' and 'Renovation' developments within the village in the recent past.

Proposed plans were distributed by the Village Clerk to a number of villagers living close to the proposed site in September 2017. The response to these plans from the villagers was summarised in a letter forwarded to Hereward Homes on 25 September 2017. The Village Clerk read the summary as follows: -

25/09/2017

Dear Jon

Following our recent correspondence, I have been liaising with members of the village to solicit open feedback for your proposal to develop the "Green Barn" site adjacent to Holme Close and Casterton Lane.

I would preface this feedback with the confirmation that there is a desire to see the barn site put to more productive use in support of the ongoing village improvements.

The following feedback encapsulates the general sentiment, from a range of perspectives, which I hope proves useful in the desire to harmonize your own vision with that of the community it immediately impacts.

I note your latest email dated 20 September, announcing changes to the original plan in terms of the Office space. I do not think it alters from the original submission to any great degree, so I am comfortable that the feedback below would remain viable.

I have split the feedback into sub-headings to simplify the narrative into prominent areas to review. Whilst I have summarized the feedback, I have also included key comments so that they are not diluted.

Preservation of Green Space and Conservation Status of the Village

The village will need some assurance that the extent of the development does not invite further speculative approaches for additional development beyond the current curtilage.

- Although this is a brown field site, the principal concern with this development is that it will subsequently spread to the green belt land surrounding. If this development is given permission, despite being outside of the village curtilage, what's to stop further development

on the fields? Can a guarantee be given that this will not be allowed going forward?

Access to adjacent land currently being used for grazing etc.

The current plans do not indicate what access will remain for the existing use of the grazing land adjacent to the site. The current access would be lost so an alternative is required.

- Where will the new access to the field (for topping & paddock management) be?

Office Space Requirements

It is not apparent that office space is a priority for the village. Given the existing business activities in the village (at Messenger Offices and Zeeco House), coupled with proximity to the sites at Tinwell Lodge and Southview, it is felt that a higher level of priority should be given to domestic affordable property rather than office space.

- More affordable residential properties are required within the village rather than office space.
- Those more affordable properties proposed lead directly onto Casterton Lane, which is a busy road. Why is the parking not to the front and instead increasing traffic further into the residential area?
- Vehicles visiting offices via a residential area would not be an acceptable option for the village.
- Building offices in the middle of a residential area is not something the village would support.

Traffic Impact

The level of traffic and lack of speed discipline is a major concern for the village even without this development. In addition, the narrow access to Holme Close and the parking facing the entrance, will need consideration in respect of this proposal.

- There are serious concerns over traffic in the village, especially given the number of offices proposed.
- The increase of some 40 extra vehicles entering and leaving the area via Holme Close would not be acceptable to village residence.
- There will be a large increase in traffic turning in and out of Holme Close with 20 parking spaces allowed for the offices and the exit is already awkward with the parked cars opposite.
- Vehicles coming into Casterton Lane will be considerable at times if the proposed plans go ahead. There is already a considerable number of vehicles using Casterton Lane as a join to the A1, particularly heavy at peak times and when there is a problem on the A1. The Main Street is also extremely busy with some 600 lorry movements per day adding to the strain.
- Casterton Lane is narrow all the way to the A1. There are a number of parked cars opposite Holme Close as the residents and visitors to Holme View have no other parking available.
- Any increase in the volume of traffic in this lane will seriously impact safety in what is already a problematic area.
- Could parking be accommodated into this plan for residents in Holme View, who do not have an off-street facility, with groundwork in their front gardens?
- Although there is a need for some more affordable housing (perhaps for those wanting to downsize or families wishing to move onto the property ladder) we do not feel that Casterton Lane needs any further traffic flow that this development would bring.

Impact to Immediate Residential Properties

Properties immediately adjacent to the site will be impacted on a number of levels and residents have expressed concern regarding levels of privacy, respect to current perimeter walling and impact to the mature trees within the area.

- The position of some of the proposed properties is not sensitive to the current homes. Can this be addressed?
- Can mature trees be planted to maintain privacy?
- There are possible party wall issues. Provisions would need to be put in place for current

property owners.

Section 106

This will be a major project for the village with significant disruption and is outside of the current building curtilage. The village has very limited services and infrastructure in place currently e.g. pub Closure, High Speed Internet etc. Have you considered any proposals that would benefit the village infrastructure / amenities directly as part of this proposal?

- Will Hereward Homes contribute anything towards the village under section 106, if this development goes ahead?
- If we add to the commercial infrastructure of the village, will we be able to return the Pub to its original state so that this new demographic can contribute directly to the village rather than remain 9-5 commuters.

Housing Needs

It would be very useful to share with the village the detail of the proposed property types and perhaps engage them in a design forum. In particular, the design and number of “affordable” housing plots has generated some emotion, which in part stems from the definition of affordable.

- This would be an ideal site to construct some properly planned large and smaller housing that could be low cost to run.
- Offices are not needed, however, smaller, more affordable properties are.

I trust this candid feedback is of value to your understanding of the needs of the village and look forward to continuing our dialogue once you have had a chance to digest the detail.

Yours sincerely

**David Jarvis
Tinwell Village Clerk**

After reading the letter, the Village Clerk requested feedback and a general discussion took place.

Items raised were: -

General Comments/Opposition Points

- The site of the ‘green barn’ is a brown field site and the area to the rear of it is a green field site.
- Concern was noted that although the brown field site could possibly be developed, this newly proposed development encroaches onto a green field site.
- Hereward homes will need to demonstrate the need to go outside the village boundary.
- The adjacent grazing land would need new access if a development were to go ahead. The Cecil Trust would be required to assist with new access.
- Mr Terry Baxter advised that he opposes new access to the grazing land from Casterton Lane.
- How would access work from the new development site?
- Preservation of green space in the village is important to its’ residents.
- Concern of ‘over development’ of sites is worrying.

Proposed Offices – Opposing Items

- As there are already two office sites within the village, the overall feeling was that further offices were not needed in the village.
- A higher priority for residents was affordable housing.
- The increased level of traffic which this development would bring to the village is of major concern.
- There are a large number of proposed car parking spaces between the proposed houses on Casterton Lane and the proposed offices. Why are such a high number required?
- Additional offices will increase the number of vehicles in a residential area. There are a number of young families living in Holme Close and this is of great concern to them as it would mean children could not play outside freely.
- There will be parking implications for those who park on Casterton Lane.
- There will be reduced privacy to current properties.
- What would happen to the spoil from the proposed development?
- How can we ensure that any spoil remove is removed responsibly and not left in the field next door or similar?
- As Tinwell is in a Conservation Area, any new development should be designed around mature trees on sites.
- Bats have been observed leaving and entering the green barn. As these are a protected species how would they be protected if the barn were removed?
- It was felt that more offices wouldn't bring anything back into the village/community.
- The proposed properties next to Casterton Lane are too close to the busy road.
- The proposed properties next to Casterton Lane would cause an obstruction to drivers coming out of Holme Close – visibility would be severely reduced in an already difficult area.
- Could the site be developed with something alternative such as an allotment or an orchard?

Supporting Items

- Such a development could mean that there is potential for mains gas in village. This would need to be investigated. Historically, Herewood Homes have installed LPG Tanks in the gardens of other houses they have built/renovated in the village.
- It was suggested that Herewood Homes might subsidise the refurbishment of the village pub, however, after extensive work and investigations carried out by Sacha de Gale in 2016/17 it has already been suggested that the cost for buying / renovating / running would be too high and that such a project is not viable.
- The Village expressed a desire to improve the 'green barn site' but not as Herewood Homes plans are currently suggesting.

- The consensus was that the villagers would prefer to see the site being utilised to a more beneficial use to Tinwell residents.
- This site is outside of the current limits of development and close to the heart of this Conservation Village and as a result, significant reservations exist with regards to Herewood Homes proposed plans.

Noted Items

- The current village infrastructure needs upgrading (roads, traffic calming, mains gas, broadband etc) and at present there is no plan/budget to do this. Increasing traffic would not help the situation as it stands currently let alone if there was increased traffic.
- The green field area of the proposed development has been observed as being an area of historic interest. It is known to have links with Thomas Laxton who conducted plant breeding research for Charles Darwin and developed two well-known apple varieties along with the Royal Sovereign Strawberry variety.
- In the past a proposal was made to extend the A1 and this would have cut off Casterton Lane. This did not proceed.
- There is a 'weight limitation' sign at the top of Casterton Lane, but not at the bottom.
- The villagers and their representatives would like to be consulted with regards to the types of proposed properties and their design.
- Herewood Homes would (possibly) like to move their Administration into one of the proposed new offices.

Next Steps if Planning Permission is sought by Herewood Homes

Those individuals in opposition of the development will need to write to Rutland County Council (RCC) with their concerns or log their opposition on the RCC Planning Portal. This cannot be done as a collective.

Those in favour do not have to do anything but can also contact RCC to show their support.

2. Crown Inn Site – Crown Lane

The Village Committee advised that they had met informally with Mr David Pennell from Burghley Trust Estate. The meeting had been organised to discuss the Crown Inn site in both the respect of maintenance and its future use. Information from that meeting was relayed to those in attendance: -

Site Maintenance

Prior to the meeting, the Village Clerk had contacted Mr Pennell. This was to discuss:

- The roof of the Crown Inn which needed some attention.
- The site in general which was becoming unkempt.

Mr Pennell had swiftly made roof repairs and sent in a team to tidy up the site.

The Crown Inn Building and Public House

Mr Pennell advised that it is not economical for Burghley Estates to develop the pub and they would not be doing so.

An alternative to this is considering renovating the building into a private residence. This would be done in conjunction with developing the land on the site.

A percentage of the properties would be sold and the rest would be retained by Burghley Estate Trust to rent out. The estate has many properties, the income from which is used to maintain Burghley House, its properties and its 'estate'.

Various issues from the previous attempt to develop the land were raised with Mr Purnell:-

- Current lack of parking in Crown Lane.
- The requirement for private parking for any new houses, to limit further 'on road parking' in the lane.
- Access to all the properties from Crown Lane is not supported (those on the main road could be accessed from the main road therefore reducing traffic flow in Crown Lane).
- Building design to be in keeping with current properties in the immediate area. To demonstrate his support of this, Mr Pennell used the example of the new development Burghley Estates are involved with at the old football ground site in Stamford. The design of these houses is very much in keeping with others in Stamford town.
- Tinwell residents would be consulted on the above.

Mr Pennell advised that developing the site would only be done if the Tinwell residents were to support such a scheme and for Burghley Estate Trust and Tinwell residents to work together at all stages of the development.

Mr Pennell was very happy to consult with the residents of Tinwell, however, it was felt that the residents should be approached first, and the matter discussed.

Residents Responses

- It was advised that the Crown Inn has now been closed for nine over years (a resident advised that it had closed as of 9th October 2008).
- It was noted that Councils can require properties to be maintained if there are health issues such as rats (although at present this is not an issue on the Crown Inn Site).
- A pub within the village would be an asset of community value, however, there is a question if there would be enough people to support it.
- Some villagers indicated an objection to reinstating a pub because of the problems it could bring.
- Sacha de Gale has previously championed the reinstatement of the pub and alternatives (sale etc). Unfortunately, it was determined that: -
 - The building itself is too expensive to buy (even as a collective).

- The use of a village pub would not cover the costs of purchase, renovation, set up, running etc.
- There are no rooms to let (which could bring in extra custom) and creating such accommodation would add significantly to the set-up costs.

Councillor Brown then suggested that if the village develop a Neighbourhood Plan, then RCC would need to take this into account when planning is sought for the site (regardless of what is submitted).

Neighbourhood Plan

Councillor Gordon Brown asked if Tinwell would be interested in developing a neighbourhood plan.

It was explained that this is a statutory document, created by the village, which RCC would have to consider when making decisions on planning applications within the village and surrounding areas.

It can take between eighteen months and two years to develop such a plan.

It was suggested that if Tinwell village would like a Neighbourhood Plan, that they could join with Ketton village to do so. Joining forces with Ketton could assist Tinwell in this process.

Tinwell village voted to proceed with developing a neighbourhood plan with Mary Whitmore proposing and Ian Rendall seconding. The vote was carried unanimously.

Volunteers to support this project were requested to make their interest known to the Committee over the coming weeks.

AOB

- Thanks were expressed to Georgina Anthony and Mim Capewell for managing the Village Hall bookings.
- A proposal was made to re-elect the committee. This motion was carried.
- The date for the next AGM was set for 24th May 2018.

End of Meeting

<u>Parish and Village Hall Committee Members</u>		
Parish Chair:	John Brewis	brewis4@sky.com
Parish Clerk:	David Jarvis	tinwellclerk@btinternet.com
Village Hall Treasurer:	Nicky Wilkinson	tinwellvillagehalltreasury@yahoo.com
Village Hall Bookings Managers:	Mim Capewell Georgina Anthony	tinwellhallbookings@btinternet.com
Village Hall Secretary:	Cherie Carlill	ch3rie@hotmail.com
News Letter Editor:	Cathy Jarvis	tinwellnews@btinternet.com