

Burton Pedwardine and Burton Gorse Village Meeting

Thursday 10 November 2022

In the Church

Present: Michael and Jan Coy, Wayne and Luisa McIntosh, Graham Webb, Elizabeth Thompson, Richard and Ali Sutherland, Barry and Amanda Gray, Mandy and Andy Topp, Pete and Jenny Davy, Fraser Key, Joe and Clare Hughes, Frances Jerram and David Beaver.

Apologies: David Jerram, Martin Thompson, John and Gill Augilla.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting and any matters arising

Approved as a true record.

Defib training refresher MC has agreed we can use Lodge Farm. Dates/times to be agreed.

Highways: Richard and Michael met with Rowan Smith and Cllr Key and had a tour of the village. Thanks to Michael for hosting the meeting, and the positive outcomes so far, as a lot more seems to have happened in the last few months, than in previous times.

Thanks to Gill for organising the Jubilee event which was fantastic.

Community Speed Watch: £50 to register and then the kit is around £600. It's not difficult to sign up to, but having volunteers is essential. It would be useful to find out if neighbouring parishes who don't have a portable SID would be interest in sharing the speed watch kit. We do have the two old SIDs, but they may be unrepairable.

Agreed to go ahead with purchasing the kit if volunteers come forward. If we can do this in conjunction with another parish that would be good, if not, we should still go for it.

2. Current Planning Applications

2.1 David Beever attended the meeting to answer any questions. The 8 Sail Brewery are now joint applicants for this application. A Memorandum of Understanding has been put in place to counter any concerns that the application could change into something else.

DB explained that access for larger vehicles would be from Heckington Road and would be possibly weekly, maybe less. Daily traffic would access the site from Helpringham Road. Concerns were raised about the access, and the blind bend round Heckington Road.

A question was raised about the malting process and if malting barley could be successfully grown on the land. It was commented that malting barley had been grown locally many times. Currently hops etc are stored at the site.

8 Sail state they need additional outside storage space, and concerns were shared about barrel storage. DB explained that most of the storage will be inside, as it is a larger shed. However, it does not reflect that on the application. DB will clarify that on the form.

A query was raised about potential odours. DB stated that there would be none. Concerns were raised about noise from the canning process. DB responded that the proposed cannery will be installed in the shed, with insulated panels.

There were concerns about the siting of the building, but these may have been addressed by moving the location further away from neighbouring property. It was commented that this seems an unusual site for the 8 Sail brewery when there could be more suitable options closer to the windmill and existing brewery.

Further supporting documents have been added to the planning portal. The deadline for providing comments is Monday 21 November.

DB left the meeting, and a secret ballot was held.

- 17 people voted (one abstained)
- 10 supported the application
- 7 objected to the application

The result of the ballot was given after the discussion on the next application, Brackenbury Fishponds. When asked if all were happy with the result, five residents cited that they were not, and that following the discussion on the other application (Brackenbury Fishponds) their opinion had altered and that they wanted to change their vote. It was decided that a second vote would not take place.

ACTION: provide relevant comments and feedback to the District Council.

2.2 Brackenbury Fishponds 22/0912/FUL

The applicant was not able to attend the meeting but had been invited. Printed copies of the block plan and proposed elevations and floor plans for the pods were handed out.

A discussion took place that included considering the design and location of the pods, the potential impact to the neighbouring properties, and the probability of its approval. It could be fair to say that in theory this was a non-contentious application, the pods may be portable, cannot be seen particularly well from the road, and overall, their siting would cause little impact on the village. However, there were several views shared that were to the contrary.

It was noted that both of the applications being discussed are from people who do not live in the village. It was doubtful that either application would have a positive effect on residents of the village, but would quite probably have a negative effect. It was commented that what

appears to be happening is that very few dwellings are being approved, and instead, the District Council seems to be allowing the industrialisation of the village. Burton needs to be recognised for what it is: a residential settlement, and no longer an agricultural village.

Several references were made to the similarity in terms of location to the unsuccessful application for a dwelling on Screddington Road (planning reference 17/020/FUL). It was noted that that application had been supported almost unanimously at a village meeting, because it would have enabled a young person, who taught at a local school, and was very much part of the community to remain in the village, close to her family.

It was commented that approving the current application – which would bring no benefit to the community, but could generate antisocial behaviour - would be insulting to the previous applicants. The applicant does not live near the village and would simply benefit from the income generated from the site.

FK explained that changes to planning policy meant that it is now possible to achieve approval for single dwellings, where previously it wasn't. With that in mind, if the previous application that was unsuccessful was submitted, it may be approved.

Reference was made to LP26 from the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Design and Amenity: "All development proposals must take into consideration the character and local distinctiveness of the area..." Does the siting of two fishing pods fit these criteria? Does approving this application set a precedent for other pods or similar structures to be introduced? Do we want this type of development when it won't benefit the village at all, and could potentially have a negative impact from noise, antisocial behaviour, and increased traffic.

At the end of the discussion, a secret ballot was held with the following results:

- 18 people voted
- 5 supported the application
- 13 objected to the application

ACTION: provide relevant comments and feedback to the District Council.

2.3 Orchard House, extension 22/1493/HOUS

No comments or concerns were raised.

3. Setting the precept

The precept for the current year was £400. MC suggested keeping the precept as £400. PD seconded the proposal.

4. Discussion on the proposed reservoir

MC provided a summary of the proposal and encouraged everyone to attend one of the consultation events. A more general response will be submitted from the village meeting to the consultation and will include an invitation to come to one of our meetings to discuss how this could benefit our village. It is important that everyone submits their own individual comments.

Surrounding villages should be working together to make sure we get the best outcome for us all. One of the main areas of concern at the moment is about the roads, and proposed changes and/or improvements to the road network. It might be an opportunity to address the fact that village roads are being used as a rat run for many, and particularly large vehicles.

A fundamental change to the roads would need to be coordinated by the County Council. Suggest working with neighbouring parishes and the County Councillor in future.

5. Village Events

Over £1000 was raised at the recent Harvest Supper. Thanks to all who were involved in organising and attending.

A quiz night is being planned, subject to a suitable date being identified.

6. Any Other Business

Footpaths. Can we have a footpath through the middle of the village? Even if it shifts from side to side. LCC are not maintaining the paths we do have. Can this be raised with Cllr Key?

ACTION: MC to raise the issue of footpaths with Cllr Key.

FK asked if we were going to put forward an application for funding from Sleaford REP for a play area. LM explained that applications need to come from a constituted group and cannot be accepted from a precepting parish. An application was being prepared but that was for tables and other supplies for the church. If anyone wanted to explore the idea of a play area, then please do. FK knows most of the people who would benefit from a play area and so will speak to them to gauge levels of interest.

7. Meeting closed at 8.45pm