

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held on Friday 23rd August 2013 at the Pavilion.

Present:- Parish Councillors Cowey (in the Chair), Baker, Morton, Neighbour, Peirson, Smith, and Wardale.

Clerk – J.Wardale

12 members of the public.

08/13/39 Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Falkinder and Slingsby.

08/13/40 New Sportsfield Lease
Cllr Cowey outlined the current situation with the lease.
Cllr Baker had obtained funding for over £80,000 but this means that the lease for the Sportsfield will have to be extended.

Discussed the proposals to develop CHER1 and how it had been removed from the Local Development Plan.
Following a meeting with ERYC there had been a discussion about CHER1 and the lease.
ERYC have now produced an altered lease which takes back the Sportsfield Road and this could give access to CHER1.

The Parish Council had asked who made the decision at ERYC and why. The response was that John Reid, Estates and Valuations Manger, had made the decision and it was done to protect the interests of ERYC over the next 30 years.

Discussions had taken place today with John Read about the concerns of the residents and the Parish Councillors. He stated that the new lease would leave the Sportsfield with a new road and that the ERYC could sell the access rights to developers and would therefore raise revenue. He was asked if the amendment could be removed, but this was not an option.

The Chair had suggested that the Parish Council would not sign the new lease and there may be publicity about the loss of MUGA funding. He had suggested the possibility that the existing lease be extended to ten years and it was agreed that this would be considered. The Parish Council would have to email officially to ask that the clause either be removed or extend the existing lease for ten years.

Cllr Baker agreed with this. Had been discussing with Caroline Grant from Planning at ERYC about CHER1. Asked why it had been removed in January and she stated it was mature trees, the access and location of Sportsfield. The other sites that have been identified are more suitable for development. There is nothing to stop a developer putting in an application however for the site.

Cllr Baker outlined the urgency of getting a decision as the constructors will need access to the field before it gets too wet. If this was not done then it would incur more costs.

The motion was put forward that if a response was received that the new lease had a 10 year road exclusion clause or the current lease could be extended over the 7 year qualifying period then the Chair could sign it.

Resolved – unanimous.

Cllr Peirson expressed concerns about the sub-lease and Schedule 4 which is a record of the standard of repair of the road and car park before the work commences.

Cllr Baker mentioned that the PC still has over 6 years as a negotiating tool.

Cllr Peirson suggested that extending the existing lease may make sure that CHER1 was out of the Development Plan.

The motion was put forward that if the existing lease was not to be extended then the Chairman could sign the new lease.

Resolved – 5 votes to 1 and one abstention.

Standing orders were suspended

A resident asked why CHER1 had been removed without any reasons and Cllr Baker clarified that it had been rejected in January but so did not need to be put back into the new revised plan.

Mr Whitfield, Chairman of the Sportsfield Committee, mentioned that the Local plan was available online for consultation and he asked about pressure from the funding bodies to get the work done and Cllr Baker updated him on this and said that he would get further information.

A resident mentioned that the meeting with ERYC some time ago where the planning officer had said that CHER1 could be brought back into the plan. He suggested that the PC should ask for an assurance that CHER1 would not be developed. Cllr Cowey responded that this would be difficult to do. The resident felt that the Parish Council has been manipulated and that the ERYC have not been open and transparent.

Another resident commented that they had no objection to the MUGA but it was the way that the situation had been handled.

Another resident commented that the users of the MUGA may be in danger with increased traffic if the development did take place but the Chair commented that they would still have to negotiate the other roads in the village before they get to the Sportsfield. Cllr Baker commented that ERYC had commented that this was one of the reasons why CHER1 had been rejected.

The Chair summed up by stating that CHER1 would still need planning permission and the residents and Parish Council would be able to comment then and object then if necessary.

Cllr Smith commented that if the MUGA increased the use of the Sportsfield, then they would have a stronger case if ERYC tried to develop the Sportsfield site in the future.

Cllr Peirson asked for a show of hands from the members of the public as to who would prefer an extension or an exclusion period. Cllr Neighbour protested that this was against the meeting rules and this was upheld.

The meeting ended at 7.30pm.