

**Medbourne Parish Council**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL**  
**MONDAY 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014**

**Present:** Cllrs Polito (Chair), Clarke, Cory, Pilkington and Gidley Wright. 23 members of the public attended including David Tuffs who is to present Item 8.0.

**1.0 APOLOGIES:** Cllr Beatty and Bill Barrie

**2.0 DECLORATIONS OF INTEREST:**

**2.1** Cllr Polito declared an interest in the Drayton Road planning application (Item 6.1).

**3.0 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2014:**

**3.1** The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.  
Proposed: Cllr Clarke. Seconded: Cllr Gidley Wright

**4.0 MATTERS ARISING:**

**4.1** Cllr Pilkington -reference 10.3 (field opposite the Sports Club). The owner of the field contacted the Parish Council after November's Parish Council meeting and is clearly in full knowledge of what permissions and processes are required to hold events in the field. If any member of the public has any questions, do contact the Parish Council or the owner of the field directly.

**5.0 PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS**

**5.1** The following representations were made regarding Item 7.0, Neighbourhood Plan

**5.2** Public comments (Italic): *There may be a bias regarding the amount of development HDC are proposing for Medbourne; if the village doesn't want 50 dwellings maybe they should listen to the residents.*

**5.3** Cllr Polito outlined that HDC has provided this information and the Parish Council felt it right to impart this to residents who will have an opportunity to comment on housing numbers and the emerging Local Plan in general when they have completed writing it and go out for consultation. The purpose of the questionnaire was to see what appetite there is in the village for a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and to put out information.

**5.4** *The Core Spatial Strategy has in Harborough District a total of 533 dwellings for selected villages and rural service centres, that being so how did they reach 50 houses?*

**5.5** Cllr Polito advised that the Parish Council had been in touch with HDC to get an indication of figures so that an idea can be given to villagers what may be expected in the Local Plan. Cllr Pilkington advised the meeting that HDC had been challenged on site allocation of houses and had lost. HDC does not have a 5-year housing land supply and is working to remedy that.

**5.6** Cllr Pilkington advised that the purpose of the questionnaire was to get people interested in the process and to get the information out that HDC had given to the Parish Council. In that light, we wanted to empower residents, do you want a say?

**5.7** *50 houses over the plan period is 3/4 houses a year, the information is unnecessary scare mongering – the 'where do you want development' question is completely ahead of time.*

**5.8** Cllr Pilkington: HDC advised the Parish Council regarding what to put in the questionnaire and

was advised by two planning officers, the questionnaire was run past them in the first instance before putting it out to residents.

- 5.9** *The information within the questionnaire is very alarmist; the numbers are in a state of flux and are up in the air. The questionnaires result in a Neighbourhood Plan without going through the process is are getting ahead of itself.*
- 5.10** Cllr Polito advised that the Parish Council understands it's an emotive subject but just wanted to get the information out.
- 5.11** *The details sent round should have provided information on what a Neighbourhood Plan is, what it can do and how the village can get involved.*
- 5.12** Cllr Pilkington: We want to get people involved and want what's best for the village and want people to think how it may affect them. Cllr Clarke explained that the questionnaire was originally a lot longer but much had to be cut out.
- 5.13** *The information didn't tell us what a Neighbourhood Plan is – the questionnaire prejudices the plan and gets an end result.*
- 5.14** Cllr Polito: There is lots of information available to view, it is very wide and embracing. Cllr Gidley-Wright: the questionnaire only intended to provoke a reaction and there is no requirement to answer any questions. Individuals can answer questions if they wish and can also raise queries about them.
- 6.0 PLANNING:**
- 6.1** Councillors considered the following Planning Applications:
- 6.2 Cllr Polito left the room during Item 6.2**
- 6.3 14/01411/FUL – Erection of 6 dwellings (revised scheme 13/01508/FUL)**  
The Paddock, Drayton Road, Medbourne, Leicestershire
- 6.4** Cllr Cory updated the meeting that Cllrs (excluding Cllr Polito) had met to discuss the application in detail and outlined the discussions that had taken place noting all the correspondence the Parish Council had received.
- 6.5** Cllr Clarke: Cllrs discussed in detail the importance of design and materials proposed and appreciated that the proposed access was an improvement on the previous proposal.
- 6.6** RESOLVED: That the Parish Council does not object to the proposal providing that HDC find the principle of development acceptable and the reasons for refusal of the previous application are no longer relevant. This being subject to comments regarding the design of the development, ecology, highways and general observations.  
Proposed: Cllr Clarke  
Seconded: Cllr Gidley-Wright
- 6.7 Cllr Polito returned to the meeting after this Item.**
- 6.8 14/01492/LBC - Conversion of existing integrated garage into habitable accommodation, including replacement of existing garage door with window and infill wall**  
Brook Cottage Drayton Road Medbourne Leicestershire

- 6.9** Cllr Clarke commented that there wasn't enough information on the plan to put the proposal in to context, e.g. are there more garage spaces within the site. Without this information it's not possible to judge the proposal in its entirety.
- 6.10** Cllr Gidley-Wright agreed with Cllr Clarke and had been to the site to view the information needed to make a judgment on the proposal.
- 6.12** RESOLVED: Whilst the Parish Council do not object to the application it was difficult to make a judgement on the proposal as there wasn't much information with the application, e.g. No information as to whether there is another garage at the premises. This sort of information would be useful when judging future applications.  
Proposed: Cllr Clarke  
Seconded: Cllr Gidley-Wright
- 6.13** **14/01546/PDN - Prior Notification for the conversion of agricultural building to a dwelling house (C3)**  
Land Adj 40 Manor Road Medbourne Leicestershire
- 6.14** Cllrs objected to this application however would like further clarification on what applicants are able to do under this type of application.
- 6.15** RESOLVED: The Parish Council objects to the application as the building does not appear suitable for conversion, corrugated steel does not have an appropriate appearance for a residential building and the access arrangements would not be suitable. The Parish Council would also like clarification on the legal position of this application and also whether enough information has been submitted to determine whether highway safety would be retained.  
Proposed: Cllr Pilkington  
Seconded: Cllr Cory
- 7.0** **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**
- 7.1** Cllr Cory conveyed the importance of putting on the respondents' postcode on the response to the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaires. Cllrs would be starting to collect them in the next week.
- 7.2** Cllr Pilkington advised that there would be a cut-off point for when the questionnaires could be submitted and this would be advised through the usual channels (email and online). Some positive feedback had been received and people were looking at wider issues.
- 7.3** Cllr Polito noted that visiting people had jogged people into looking at the questionnaire.
- 8.0** **SUPERFAST BROADBAND/VODAFONE MOBILE SIGNAL**
- 8.1** David Tuffs (DT) reported that Gigaclear did a really good job in presenting their proposal at last week's presentation. Cllr Polito and DT put a list of questions to Gigaclear who were able to answer them all. They appear credible and honest company. The meeting was highly attended however not many residents from Medbourne attended.
- 8.2** It was reported through the summer that the offer from BT was protected and the public funding that was being made available is committed to Medbourne. Now this has been achieved it is seen as vital to look at the Gigaclear offer which would be another option in addition to the BT service.
- 8.3** Whilst the Parish Council is completely neutral so as to allow residents to make up their own

minds now that more information is available about the offer being made by Gigaclear it is seen as important to pass this information on to residents. From the information the Parish Council has at present, the costs generally would be similar to BT, but the download and upload speeds on offer from Gigaclear are superior to those being offered by BT. This might result in some cost savings for businesses.

**8.4** For Gigaclear to come to Medbourne a 30/35% take up/interest would need to be forthcoming from residents. This level of interest is needed before they would lay the cables and junctions for each property. Once the cables are laid residents can then decide whether they wish for this to be extended from the junction box to their house.

**8.5** Cllrs discussed:

- *Whether there is any competition to Gigaclear?*  
Yes however they will not be coming to Medbourne for a number of years
- *What the benefits are to Medbourne?*  
Future proofing with the village being at the forefront of technology in this field
- *What impact Medbourne has on neighbouring villages if it doesn't have the necessary uptake?*  
Neighbouring villages are concerned that if Medbourne doesn't support Gigaclear coming then they may miss out on a better quality of broadband (Hallaton for instance have 32% interest in take up so far).

**8.6** It was outlined that Medbourne has the opportunity for the cable to be layed not at our expense. This can only take place if there is an uptake of 35% of households (70 properties). It was unfortunate that it wasn't until last Thursday what Gigaclear were actually offering.

**8.7** Whilst the Parish Council is not going to 'sell' the product, the same approach to BT should be taken. The Parish Council should convey as much information as possible to residents so that the benefits of what is being offered by Gigaclear is available to them so that an informed decision can be made.

**8.9** RESOLVED: The Parish Council would seek to ensure residents are made aware of the offer being made by Gigaclear so that an informed decision can be made.  
Proposed: Cllr Pilkington  
Seconded: Cllr Clarke

**9.0** **CORRESPONDENCE:**

**9.1** A number of items were circulated during the month including information regarding road closures, Gigaclear, the SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) now being available online on the HDC website, updated figures for Election costs which are yet to be finalised, an event being hosted by the Police regarding changes to the operational model, details of when the copy of the new Electoral Register would be made available and the Rural Communities newsletter. (The various items of correspondence referred to should be separated by semi-colons, rather than commas)

**10.0** **REPORTS:**

**10.1** The Clerk reported that the salt bin by the Packhorse Bridge had been filled, however the other bin within the village was owned by the District Council who would need to fill that bin up if required.

**10.2** Cllr Clarke reported that the Sports Club will be open on Friday nights between 8pm and 10pm.

**11.0 PARISH REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE:**

**11.1** Cllr Polito reported that the potholes on Brook Terrace would be reported to Leicester County Council in due course. The Pavement on Manor Road has been repaired and further work will take place at a later date.

**12.0 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN**

**12.1** None.

**13.0 ACCOUNTS:**

**13.1** During the month the following invoices had been submitted to councillors for payment:

Poppy Appeal Donation	£ 40.00
Harborough District Council Dog Bin Collection	£ 188.94
Daniel Ray Clerks October Pay	£ 114.51
Daniel Ray Clerks November Pay	£ 114.51

The payments were a correct record.

Proposed: Cllr Clarke. Seconded: Cllr Gidley Wright

**13.2** A donation of £200 had been received towards The Hollow.

**13.3** The precept calculation had been provided to Councillors prior to the meeting, with an overall budget requirement of £7398 being calculated. Cllrs discussed that an additional £500 should be included for administration expenses due to the costs of starting work on the Neighbourhood Plan as grants are not available until a formal decision on whether or not a Neighbourhood Plan is to go ahead. Costs have already been made for printing the questionnaires, therefore suitable provision to cover further expenses should be made. This results in an overall budget requirement of £7898.00. The precept amount shall be lowered by the amount of the support grant. Last year the support grant was not treated as a windfall, this is proposed to be the same again.

**13.4** RESOLVED: Councillors agree a budget requirement of £7898.00. The Precept Requirement shall be reduced in line with the Council Tax Support Grant. The Council Tax support grant shall not be treated as windfall. £256.32 Council Tax Support Grant has been agreed leaving a Precept Requirement of £7641.68).

Proposed: Cllr Pilkington Seconded: Cllr Clarke

**14.0 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

**14.1** The next meeting will be held at 7.45pm on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2014.