

VILLAGE PLAN WORKING PARTY (VPWP)

Notes of remote meeting on 2nd July 2020 at 7pm

Present at the meeting were Cllr Anne Cutforth (Chairman), Cllr Daphne Sharpe, Cllr John Wilson, Cllr Tim Nicol, Cllr Jerry Rawlinson, Kevin Cox, Deborah Davenport, Sue Hunt, Jeff Davies

1.	<p>TO RECEIVE AND NOTE ANY APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE. Apologies were received from David Wheatley, Debbie Greaves.</p>
2.	<p>TO SUMMARISE CURRENT POSITION WITH VPWP AND PFWP/PFA It was agreed to change the order of the agenda and so item 3 was done first.</p>
3.	<p>TO REVIEW VILLAGE PLAN TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONSIDER ANY CHANGES FOR COUNCIL TO AGREE The current terms of reference had been circulated and all noted these. It was recognised that changes may need to be made following the discussions later in the meeting. Later, it was agreed that the reference to the playing field working party needs to be removed as it is no longer in existence, the consideration to a Neighbourhood Plan needs to be included in the terms of reference and that the village plan working party will continue to implement the recommendations made by the playing field working party and agreed (all bar one) by the council until such time as a Playing Field Association can be set up. See below 5. Action Clerk to change the terms of reference, circulate and present them to council for agreement at the next full council meeting.</p>
4.	<p>TO REVIEW VPWP OUTSTANDING RECOMMENDATIONS including conservation of the wild areas - church yard/Spring Close etc, village sign possibility? All present received and noted the minutes of the meeting on 4th February 2020. A review of what has been done was made, including the village guide and trails, website improvements, orchard planting, Spring Close and Millenium Garden improvements. The traffic working group is ongoing and there is a new Parish Path Warden. In health and well-being there has been work done to support those with diabetes, volunteers doing work for the elderly who have been asked if they will continue as a group to offer help where needed beyond the virus. Lots of good work is continuing and will do now neighbours are more familiar with each other. Communications are good with many strands, ie news and views, what's on the hill, facebook and website. Recreation and Leisure has seen the survey and recommendations by the PFWP and these have been started with one grant success for the path and new benches and another grant application submitted. The second ownership title application is still with the land registry and delayed by the staff dealing with it during the pandemic. Any lease for a PFA is also delayed as this is dependent on the title. The cricket club draft lease has been drawn up/agreed and needs checking by a solicitor once the ownership title is registered. A review of outstanding issues took place. It was reported that Ken Rawson is continuing work on the trails guide and Jeff Davies is working on nature trails but not sure it warrants a leaflet in itself. It was noted that the Deeps, the church, Spring Close are all getting more visitors now. The area of the Deeps and the PC owned area leased to the Wildlife Trust SSSI was discussed. There is a small strip not part of the SSSI that is left wild for nature and also the hawthorn scrub area which could be made useful as a woodland trail/children's area with bird and bat boxes, information etc, as recommended by the PFWP. There was a lot of enthusiasm to do this and a working party to be set up in the autumn to start the work will be formed. Action Secretary to put on a future agenda and working party to be organised</p>
5.	<p>TO REVIEW CURRENT POSITION OF PFWP/PFA AND DISCUSS HOW BEST TO PROCEED It was confirmed that the parish council has already agreed to the setting up of a PFA, as recommended by the Playing Fields Working Party (PFWP). The PFA terms were discussed and Kevin Cox explained that he (and other members of the old PFWP) were not in favour of being a part of a PFA but just wanted to enact the recommendations regarding the new equipment. A document had been previously circulated to explain the differences between committees, working parties and a</p>

	<p>PFA and how they have to operate to ensure the council is making legal decisions, as previously explained. The long-term benefits of a PFA were discussed and the need for accountability of value for money spent on the PF and the need for usage to be accountable to a body to avoid possible future under-usage and wasted facilities, as seen in other areas.</p> <p>In view of the situation with the drafting up of a lease to a PFA being dependent on the title application and this being on hold until staff at the land registry are working again, it was agreed to “park” this for now as it is not possible to do. No volunteers had come forward to set up the PFA as yet either, despite the expectation.</p> <p>It was therefore suggested that the VPWP could continue with the recommendations of the PFWP and prioritise what is spent and how it is spent by further and future recommendations to the council, if and when grants are received, whilst the title application is awaited. The membership of the VPWP covers different groups within the village and can represent the wider community in its work and recommendations that stem from the village plan. It was voted on and a majority voted in favour of the VPWP continuing to look at the village plan action plan and keeping the progress moving in this forum by carrying on the PFWP recommendations.</p> <p>Feedback from the solicitor meeting was given in that there could be a conflict if leases with the cricket club if the PFA have a lease – ie there cannot be 2 leases on the same piece of land. This will need to be ironed out before leases are drawn up when/if a PFA is formed.</p> <p>A further discussion took place about the relatively short-term nature of the village plan and that maybe consideration to a Neighbourhood Plan should be made for a longer-term vision. It was recognised that it is a costly and involved process with a village referendum and a judicial review and takes over 2 years at least, but does become law that has to be considered by local planners in the planning process. It was resolved that this should be added to the terms of reference for a future action. Action clerk to amend Ts of R.</p>
6.	TO DISCUSS IDEAS FOR MEF 1-3K GRANT APPLICATION
	This item was not discussed and will be on the next full council agenda instead with ideas being put forward separately.
	<p><u>Documents</u> VPWP current terms of reference Village plan – on website if you don’t have a plan yourself Committees vs working parties vs associations guide A way forward document, Kevin Cox Minutes of last meeting 4/2/2020 Minutes of meeting Oct/Nov 2019</p>