|  |
| --- |
| **The Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Great Witley and Hillhampton Parish Council** |
| **To discuss planning application 19/00407/FUL, Hillhampton Farm, proposed change of use of land for the stationing of 14no. static caravans for holiday accommodation by Mr Nigel Drew** |
| **Held at the Great Witley Village Hall on Thursday 6th June 2019** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Present: Chairman**, Cllr F Chapman (FC). |
|  |
|  |
| **In Attendance:** Clerk, J Evans, Cllrs C Shaw (CS), C Dermietzel (CD), A Goodman (AG), N Drew (ND), C Jones (CJ), B Dallow (BD), A Symonds (AS). |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** | **Apologies:** none. | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | |  | | |
| **2.** | **Declaration of Interest:** ND has an interest as he is the applicant. | | | | | | |
| **3.** | **To Consider any Application for a dispensation:** ND said he would like to claim dispensation. TheChair explained the procedure to be followed and pointed out that ND was the applicant for a change of use for his benefit. It is not a case where a councillor benefits marginally as a consequence of another decision. ND then withdrew his application for dispensation but asked to address the meeting which the Chairman said he would allow.  **FC addressed the meeting** | | | | | | |
| FC explained that ND was making an application concerning land in Hillhampton where he is the only representative on this council and could not be wearing two hats representing the views of the people of Hillhampton. He reported that all but CJ attended the site and so he updated CJ as to what their site visit findings where. The land is of little use agriculturally. There are views across a huge area, around 200° or more and it does not immediately overlook anyone else.  There has been a strong response from Hillhampton on MHDC planning website not in support of the application. The narrowness of the lane seems to be an important issue. At present there is little traffic using the lane, no facilities in the immediate area, 4 buses per day mainly to facilitate the local schools and the footpath to Great Witley is difficult to negotiate due to it being dangerously narrow, only 2ft wide and in some places even more narrow. Those who live near the site are not happy.  **ND addressed the meeting:**  He thanked the Chairman and other Councillors for attending the site to become aware of sight lines and views. And thanked the council for calling an Extra-ordinary meeting so that the application could be consider in detail. He has looked at the objections and disagrees with the complaint that the visual impact of the site impacts on its surrounding neighbours. The traffic is a cut through at school times so he will consider relocating the entrance. Regarding the point on migrant workers; he is now moving away from farming and moving towards the leisure business. If this application is successful, the migrant caravans will go. When it was being run as a farming business there were between 50-100 workers so 14 holiday goers at weekends is not nearly as bad. He suggested he could move the entrance to the main gate as the entrance being consider at present is slightly concealed. He re-emphasised that the lane from Shrawley to Great Witley is a cut through and that as he is moving away from growing crops and therefore the need for migrant workers, he does not want to create homes for residents.  He said that it was his daughter’s long term plan to create a leisure park with static caravans and maybe lodges, shepherds huts and yurts. The plan is to sell static caravans to families and use the capital returned to develop the site.  Regarding the land scarring caused by his groundworks creating irrigation pools grass seed is being swn. Any noise produced by the holiday park will be less than when he was growing crops.  FC asked ND that it be a condition that the migrant caravans would be removed should the Parish Council support this application. ND said he would look at it. The caravans in question are attached to the strawberry growers. Any caravans by the main building he would remove but could not promise to remove those by the grain store. He said he was not doing anything underhand.  **ND left the meeting**   |  | | --- | | The meeting was adjourned for **Public Question Time**, notes of which are appended to these minutes. |   **4. Discussion:**  FC personally feels that this is an empty rural green valley and caravans will bring an end to this. Their intrusion will mean it will no longer be tranquil.  It looks as if the applicant would like to see this as a holiday park expanding into a glamping business; this would ultimately create more traffic. With static caravans the reality is that people can live in them for 11 months of the year as is the case in Stourport.  The site could attract touring caravans, with up to 5 being allowed without permission. Again, with these commuting along the lane access problems would arise.  Residents have bad memories of migrant workers who were noisy, confrontational, disrespectful and intimidating. They are fearful this could happen again.  CS is in support of the application. He does not believe it is detrimental to neighbours for the short length of the lane required to be in use. Comments from outside the village are not relevant. He said that ND had been upfront about his daughter, Laura’s plans to expand the site. He said that landscaping will screen the site from view, and this will improve in time. He also thought that the residents of the caravans would be looking for tranquillity in them and not partying in them. The closest neighbour to the caravans would be ND.  CD said that when the leaves from trees fell during winter the site might be more visible.  FC questioned the noise nuisance.  CD said that the lane is short but the extra traffic using it, and the junction, is not suitable for this increase in volume.  CJ has worked that land in his role as Lengthsman and supports CD’s points.   |  | | --- | | AG queried the term holiday lets as what ND had just said was not in the planning application. There is no plan in the application for a visitor centre and Laura’s name is not mentioned which is strange if this is her idea and she is the driving force. For him, this raises questions. He would be in favour of holiday lets but not for long term leases or sales. He also asked why are they going into caravans first and not straight into glamping?  BD would be happier if this was an application for a glamping site. ND had said that the groundworks for glamping is more expensive but in the long term it is more sustainable.  BD found in some research that income generated in the community from each caravan can be £38 per caravan per year (this is an average gain across the country).  AS said that he potentially supports the application but as it seems to be expanding before it has even been granted, he is concerned.  CD considers that the land could be farmed. She is concerned that after this the next step could be housing development plans. The lakes which have been completed are not used for irrigation purposes as per their original plans and permission. Static caravans can be cheap living for 11 months of the year where the occupier could vacate/return home for 1 month.  Some areas of the valley we want to leave untouched.  FC said that the evidence that ND had presented was inconsistent with the application.  AS highlighted that once again the local residents would be subject to loud lorry beeps and work noise while roads and groundworks are carried out on the site.  **Voting:** 1 councillor supported the application, 1 abstained the remaining 5 were opposed.  FC will now draft and circulate the Parish Council’s response to MHDC planning department. | | | | | | | |
| **5.** | **Date of next meeting:** It was agreed by a show of hands that the next meeting will be at Great Witley Village Hall at 7.30pm on Wednesday 10th July 2019. | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | | | | | |
| The meeting closed at 10.00pm | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
| Signed …………………………………….. Date …………………………………….. | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  |  | | |
|  | | Chairman | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes of Public Question Time** | | | |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 Member of the public were in attendance and raised the following concerns during Public Question Time: | | | |