

MINTING AND GAUTBY PARISH COUNCIL

The minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the

Minting and Gautby Parish Council

Held on

Monday, 20th June 2016 at Gautby Village Hall at 19.30

Present

Chairman Cllr. J Heselwood, Cllr. J Laver, Cllr. J Stuchfield, Cllr H Padfield, Cllr G Keys, and Cllr. E Brown. 10 members of the public (J N Heselwood, D Jones, G Newborough, Martin Poucher, David Reed, Dianne Reed, M Sumner, L Sutton, F Wych and S Wych)

PUBLIC FORUM

The Chair welcomed members of the public to the meeting, explained the meeting procedure and how the public are legally allowed to participate at the beginning of the meeting at the public forum. She then invited questions as part of the public forum.

Mr David Reed requested that agenda item 15 of the May 2016 minutes should be amended and it was agreed by all to consider the matter at item 4 on the agenda.

Mrs S Wych, whose property lies at the eastern edge of Gautby, enquired about the planning application (agenda item 7); as depending on the wind direction the sound of shooting can be heard quite clearly and means she cannot sit out and enjoy her garden. She wondered if there were any barrier or buffer to baffle the sound.

Mr M Poucher (planning applicant) advised that the number of shooting days is to be reduced to 4 per week, and Saturdays 10-3pm, Sundays 10-2pm.

Mrs Wych said that the application appeared to show the number of shooting days increasing.

Mr Poucher replied that they are considering cutting down on clay Pidgeon shooting and increasing activities such as archery and corporate event days. The shooting might be cut down to 3 days per week; they have spent a lot of money setting it up, but they had spoken to West Lindsey about altering the focus of the business towards more corporate events, which involves less shooting.

Mr M Sumner enquired as to how the number of shooting days in the application compared to the last year; as they had heard it every week, several days per week; but he thought it was supposed to be only 28 per year. He advised he would object if the shooting was more than 28 days, as the noise was not acceptable, but he did not object to the other activities, just the shooting.

Mrs D Jones said she would like to support the application for shooting and the provision of corporate entertainment locally and farm diversification.

Mrs L Sutton said that having a venue locally which provided shooting and corporate entertainment is good for her B&B, and although she did hear the sound, she is not as close as others to it.

Mrs S Wych restated that she was worried that it might take place every day and depending on the wind direction the noise would be very bad. Had they got buffers?

Mr Poucher replied that it would cost a lot of money to get buffers put up and they still may not be granted planning permission, so he had not wanted to purchase these up front. His planning consultants had carried out a desktop sound survey.

Cllr Keys, referring to the cost of buffers, suggested that is surely a mitigation to put to the planners.

Mr Poucher advised it was futile to put in baffles until planning permission was granted.

Cllr. Keys requested more information on the type of sound protection they would fit.
Mr Poucher replied that it would be buffers of different heights as advised by acoustic specialists.
Mr Sumner advised that this would only reduce the noise by 2 decibels.
Mr J Heselwood asked if earth burms would be built; to which Mr Poucher advised yes.
Cllr Heselwood asked if a sound survey had not been carried out on site
Mr Poucher said no, it had been done using drone footage.
Cllr Heselwood asked if some houses had been missed off the survey?
Mr Sumner advised that his property had been missed off and was 1.6 miles from the site.
Mrs Newborough suggested that this could be because it was a new build property.
Mr Sumner advised that there has always been a dwelling there.

The chair drew the public session to a close at 7.50pm.

1. Chairman's remarks - Welcome Members of the Public

The Chair thanked members of the public for their participation.

2. Apologies for absence and reasons given

Cllr. Bell sent apologies due to ill health. It was agreed by all to accept the reasons for the apology.

3. Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests under the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012 made under the s.30 (3) of the Localism Act 2011

Cllr Padfield declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 9 as he has a business arrangement with the owners of the Sebastopol Inn.

4. To confirm or amend, and sign the minutes of the meeting held on May 23rd, 2016

It was proposed by Cllr Stuchfield, seconded by Cllr. Brown and agreed by all to amend the May 23 2016 minutes by removal of the clause "at the insistence of the owners of the Sebastopol". The Chair duly signed the minutes as a true record of the meeting on May 23 2016.

5. Dispensations

a. To Resolve that the Council delegates the power to grant dispensations to the Clerk until May 2018. The power rests with the relevant authority under section 33(1) of the Localism Act 2011 and the basis is set out under section 33(2).

The Chair reminded Councillors of the purpose of dispensations. It was proposed by Cllr Stuchfield, seconded by Cllr Keys and agreed by all to grant dispensations to the Clerk until May 2018. The power rests with the relevant authority under section 33(1) of the Localism Act 2011 and the basis is set out under section 33(2).

b. To Resolve to extend the provisions of the above paragraph (5a) to apply in the same way in the case of a "non-disclosable pecuniary interest" and a "non-pecuniary interest", as defined in the Code of Conduct.

It was proposed by Cllr Keys, seconded by Cllr Brown and agreed by all to extend the provisions of the above paragraph (5a) to apply in the same way in the case of a "non-disclosable pecuniary interest" and a "non-pecuniary interest", as defined in the Code of Conduct.

6. To receive applications for dispensations in respect of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, non-disclosable pecuniary interests and non-pecuniary interests, as defined in the Code of Conduct.

Councillors Padfield, Heselwood and Brown completed application for dispensation in relation to agenda item 7. These were duly approved by the Clerk and signed accordingly.

7. To consider planning application from West Lindsey District Council ref 134453, concerning change of use of land from agricultural land to clay pigeon shooting club and other outside activities at Bardney Airfield, Gautby Road, Bardney LN8 5JN

Councillors discussed whether they had enough accurate information to make a decision on the planning application. Councillors were very concerned about the key issue of sound pollution as sound travels and noise pollution prevents people enjoying their properties and felt they needed assurances as to sound mitigation plans. The Chair opened the meeting to allow Mr Poucher to respond.

Mr Poucher advised that the biggest stumbling block to the planning application being passed was the effect of noise and he had been discussing with colleagues whether it is in fact more lucrative to do axe throwing, archery and air rifle shooting and some days clay pigeon shooting. He wondered if this would pacify people.

Councillors indicated that, as noise is the key issue, that would be encouraging.

Mr Poucher said that he had spoken to the West Lindsey planning officer about this and if she advises them to go down that route he could withdraw the application and re-apply.

Cllr Heselwood asked if the application was still open.

Mr Poucher said yes, but he is awaiting West Lindsey's response.

Councillors wanted to clarify that they did not want to damage the local economy, but that noise pollution was the issue with this application.

Mr Poucher said that on reflection, perhaps they should have gone down the outdoor activity centre route, where shooting is limited to instructors teaching individuals how to shoot rather than clay pigeon shooting as on the current application as there is much less noise associated with this type of activity. He advised that there is another part of the business involving simulated game days where activities are taken out to other sites and therefore will not add to the noise locally.

The Chair asked Mr Poucher if he thought that if the parish council were to write to West Lindsey in support of an application for such an activity centre (providing axe throwing, archery, air rifle shooting and some clay pigeon tuition), this would be of help.

Mr Poucher replied that he thought so, yes.

Cllr Laver asked whether this business model would reduce the amount of shooting days.

Mr Poucher said yes, as the activities would be diversified.

The Chair asked the other members of the public what their opinion of this type of activity would be.

Mrs Wych advised that she didn't mind what activities went on, but the problem was the constant noise from shooting.

Mr Sumner said he would fully support an outdoor activity centre, as the noise from shooting is the problem.

Mrs Sutton confirmed that she would support any local business.

The Chair then closed the meeting to public comment.

It was proposed by Cllr Stuchfield, seconded by Cllr Keys and agreed by all for the Clerk to write to West Lindsey, saying that: In its current form, the parish council has concerns about the application as the information provided is not as comprehensive as it should be and noise caused by shooting is the main concern to our residents. However, we understand that the applicant is considering changing the business model to an outdoor activity centre, which would greatly reduce noise impact, with far less clay pigeon shooting, as the emphasis would be on other outdoor activities such as archery, axe throwing and air rifle shooting. The Parish Council would support such a revised application, as long as the maximum noise impact levels were between the NOEL and LOAEL levels of the DEFRA noise policy statement for England, dated March 2010.

8. Finance – to resolve to add additional Councillors to the bank mandate as cheque signatories

It was proposed by Cllr Stuchfield, seconded by Cllr Laver and agreed by all to add Cllr. Keys to the bank mandate.

9. **To consider contents of letter received from the owners of the Sebastopol Inn dated 5 June 2016**
Councillors were given a second copy of a letter dated 5 June 2016, from the owners of the Sebastopol Inn.

The Chair clarified to Mr & Mrs Reed and Councillors that the parish Council is not a bidder for the Sebastopol. The Council's role is as a community facilitator, at the request of the Sebastopol owners, to raise awareness, create interest and host a public meeting to gauge interest in the community forming a steering group to consider their suggestion of making the Sebastopol a community pub and the viability of such.

The Chair thanked Mr & Mrs Reed for their offer, made in the letter, to give first refusal to a community bid, in the event of a competitive situation. The Chair also stated that regarding the parish council commissioning professional valuations, the parish council had voted to provide initial funding (if necessary) for a feasibility study to the steering group, to enable a bid to proceed. However, efforts are also being made to access grant funding for this. The Chair also said that she felt sure that the steering group that could be formed would be happy to work with the Sebastopol owners to achieve a satisfactory outcome.

It was proposed by Cllr Heselwood seconded by Cllr. Keys and agreed by all that in light of the contents of the letter, East Lindsey should be asked to cease processing the application for the Sebastopol to be registered as an Asset of Community Value; and that Council will follow procedure as per Standard Orders regarding the rescission of previous decisions and a motion be put to the parish council meeting in September to reverse the decision to apply for the Sebastopol to become registered as an Asset of Community Value.

It was further noted that the number 1 desired outcome of the public meeting was the formation of a steering group and the Chair and Clerk were asked to publicise this as widely as possible.

10. **To consider offer from Horncastle Police to borrow speed indicator device in our parish**

The Clerk advised Councillors that the Horncastle Police had written, asking if the parish would like the use of a speed indicator device for a few days; there was no information about a possible charge for this. It was agreed by all to accept the offer, if there was no cost to the parish council; and it could be chained up in the area of Gautby centre as traffic goes through Gautby village very quickly.

11. **To receive reports from the Clerk and Councillors on matters outstanding and not on the agenda**
None

12. **To suggest agenda items for the next meeting on Tuesday, 20th September, 2016 at Gautby Village Hall**

Update from Victoria Atkins questions at APM on broadband etc
Motion to rescind decision on asset of community value application