

July 2021 Minutes

Held at 7.30 at Yeeveley Arms

Present Councillors J Fitzakerley (Chair)

L Schroeter

H Watson

A Higgins

Clerk, J Bailey

County Councillor, S Bull

Members of the Public, Helen Titterton, Jason Oakley, Rachel Salt, Mark Hilton, Andy Snell

Declaration of Members' Interests. There were none

Public Participation. The Chair explained that this is the time when members of the public can state their reason for attendance and air their views on any item on the agenda, or, ask for an item to be put on the agenda of the next meeting. The time allotted to public participation is 30 minutes and no one person may speak for more than 5 minutes and that once the meeting is underway members of the public must not interrupt.

Jason Oakley explained that he had come to answer any questions the meeting might have with regard to his proposal re 'Curious Cobbles' - item 11 on the Agenda. He said that they are planning a leaflet drop of a pack entitled "proposed licence brochure for family events on Darley moor" to every house in the surrounding area, with a covering letter explaining exactly what they would like to do and what they will not be doing. This will invite everyone with any interest to take part in a consultation period where concerns can be voiced and opinions and issues raised. They will take into account every opinion and issue before committing to the next stage which is planning permission and licencing. They will not commit to this stage if there is strong opposition to the venture. So far they have applied for pre application advice with planning and touched base with licencing in order to see if there would be any major barriers from those authorities before submitting proper applications, post consultation period with local residents. He went on to say that they closely watched the Darley dance festival situation unfold and saw the hearing on Youtube. They are desperate to distance themselves from this and allay any fears or concerns that they are planning a music festival of any shape or form. It would be easy to jump to this conclusion as we also own the Y Not festival, but this is not the case. One of the main reasons for hoping to do this series of family events is to build back relationships with local people and local businesses now that the Y Not festival is back in local hands. For this reason we would not continue if there is strong opposition because doing so would not facilitate us achieving this aim.

They would like to open a seasonal area where young families can come for a day out in the daytime and older families can come for a drink in the early evenings with limited operating times, closing at 16:30 on weeknights and 22:00 on Friday and Saturdays. Noise, traffic, litter and transport for customers will be at the forefront of their plans and they seek to deliver long events with minimal impact. They do not want to develop this into anything other than what it is - they won't be sneaking in large stages or camping and the landowner, Sue Kent, would certainly never permit a music festival on the site.

Their hope is for an area that can provide customers with a heart-warming day, or evening, out that is a celebration of the season and that can provide local businesses with an opportunity to target a larger range of customers and increase the profile of their businesses.

He concluded saying that they really see this as something that the surrounding homes can enjoy and look forward to, whether it's a festive drink, a seasonal movie, a look round the shop or a go on the coconut shy and would love to bring some festive cheer to the area. They would like to have the licence encompass live music and film as well as alcohol and this is for things like choirs at Christmas, background atmospheric music, "silent" headphone cinema and for the ability to sell seasonal, alcoholic beverages. He was willing to put wording into the licensing application that would prevent this ever 'ballooning' into a big summer festival.

Rachel Salt, the land owner of the site in question, said that she was present to support Jason and had no issues with his proposal.

Andy Snell explained that he was present because of item 12 Camping at Airsports Site. He explained that this was only being offered to clients who would provide their own tents. He hadn't spoken to planning authority about this but would do so.

The members of the public left the meeting at this stage.

60/21 Minutes of the Last Meeting were recently circulated to councillors. They were ratified and signed by the Chair. This was proposed by Cllr Schroeter and seconded by Cllr Higgins.

61/21 Neighbourhood Watch. There was nothing to report.

62/21 Compliance with conditions of Formation of New Access and Track to Land Opposite the Entrance to Rodsleywood Farm. (Also Item 50/51). Although a pile of chippings has been at the site for some time no effort has been made to spread it which would make the edge of the road safer for vehicles. Cllr Bull was asked for advice on how to progress this problem. He suggested that the Enforcement Officer should be involved. The Clerk explained that previously Planning had been told about the situation but that they had merely said that there were no time constraints on getting the work finished. Cllr Bull then suggested that since it was a safety issue that Enforcement was the route forward. The Clerk will action this

63/21 Planning Application for Erection of a Dwelling etc. on Land at the Junction with Shirley Lane and Rodsley Lane in Rodsley. (also Item 51/21). No decision as yet but applicant has posted lengthy rebuttals of comments made by local residents and also the PC.

The following is a quote from an email with regard to the rebuttal, 'Once again Brian Ingram is looking to avoid the key element to Paragraph 79 of planning law, around the fact that the site would not be an isolated dwelling.

There are a couple of other areas that are factually incorrect. The first around the auction process, at the foot of page 6 of the rebuttal, when he suggests that the residents of the village should have looked to purchase the land through private treaty and that the land was sold at Auction conditions. Those of us who were at the auction know that this is untrue. An email from Dean Mann dated the 3rd October 2017 stating the property was withdrawn from Auction and the auction declared closed and then to let us know that an unconditional offer had been received from Brian Ingram immediately after the auction. More interestingly at the foot of page 7 Brian Ingram makes the comment that the "land would be much more suited to be owned by the residents than in private ownership. However, the residents have refused to purchase and the maintain it". I know that a number of Rodsley residents did look to make offers to purchase the land ahead of the auction, but these were not accepted by the vendor.

It may be that Brian Ingram is resigning himself to the fact that he is unlikely to gain permission and that an approach is made at some stage to see if he is open

to selling the land as suggested in his rebuttal statement. There are some serious points made in his rebuttal statement that do require absolute clarification from the planning team, especially around whether or not they have indicated to Brian Ingram that his application is in line with Paragraph 79. Reading through the text and response from the planning team at the original site visit it states an "application will be considered as the residential development within the open countryside", however nowhere that I can see have they said that planning is likely to be agreed under Paragraph 79. I will again seek clarification from Andrew Stock if the planning team know exactly what has been said between the two parties so that we are dealing with facts.'

The outcome of the latter is not known but the Clerk will try to find out.

64/21 Planning Application for Conversion of Barn/Storage Building into an Office and Games/Cinema Room at Leapley Mount Farm, Yeaueley. The meeting had previously seen the application online and agreed unanimously that they had no objections. The Clerk will inform the planning authority.

65/21 Planning Application re Retention of Noise Attenuation Bund at Darley Moor Race Track. The PC did not object so long as it adheres to and is maintained as the planning authority direct. No decision as yet.

66/21 Proposed Licensing of Dance Festival on Darley Moor. (Also Item 52/21). The PC objected to the license mainly on grounds of noise pollution and safety issues. Almost 100 residents, including those of neighbouring parishes, had written objecting to this proposal and asking for a decision to be made by committee. A very well attended zoom meeting was held by the Licensing Committee who listened to arguments brought by over 40 residents and then the applicant. After about a week the decision was reported that the application had been refused. The applicant is expected to appeal. The event is now going to be held at the Cricket Ground in Derby in September. **The item is closed.**

67/21 Proposed Family Events Programme on Darley Moor Race Track. Following the explanation given by Jason in the Public Participation section the meeting felt that at the moment they could see no reason to object to the plans. It had been stressed that the applicant would add any wording to the license application that would make sure that it did not eventually develop into a full blown dance festival.

68/21 Camping at Airsports Site. It was brought to PC attention that Airsports were advertising that camping was available on site. Andy Snell had explained during Public Participation that this was on a very small scale and open to clients only. Since the DDC site about camping states that 'If you allow your land to be used as a camping site by the public for more than 42 days consecutively - or 60 days in a year, you require a licence from the District Council.' It would appear that they are not in breach of any regulations. **This item is closed.**

69/21 Footpath Issues. (Also item 53/21) Lynn Taylor was going to approach the residents at North View Cottage with the intention of asking them to remove the notice saying that the footpath was closed due to covid. The notice has now been removed.

Darryl Cottingham, a resident of Rodsley asked how to ask for better signage for footpath 9 Rodsley which crosses his land. The Clerk has actioned this but also asked that he reports it as well. The more people who 'complain' the better the chance that action will be taken.

The Clerk has reported that the fingerpost pointing to fp20 Yeaueley on Hales Green road has been knocked over.

70/21 Highways and Flooding Issues. (Also Item 54/21). No issues have been reported. Cllr Bull asked that residents be informed that they should report any highways issues on a new app on DDC website called DO IT NOW and follow the 'buttons' to the site you need to report on.

72/21 End of Lockdown Party in June (Also Item 57/21) The party had to be postponed because covid restrictions still applied. The decision was taken not to rearrange a new date until it was certain that restrictions were lifted. Cllr Morley has given the Council a grant of £150 towards the event.

73/21 Clerk's Report. (Also Item 58/21). The District Council has been trialling managing a small number of verges for wildflowers as part of increasing the biodiversity of the district. They are currently reviewing them and most have done well and have been positively received. They are looking at extending the number of verges for next year. All parish and town councils are being contacted to see if there are any in the area that we would be interested in putting forward. Ideally the verges would already have some wildflowers growing in it but if we are interested in creating a wildflower verge where there is just grass then we can work with your local community group to do this.

The meeting agreed that this was a good idea as long as it did not include T junctions or cross roads.

It should be on wide verges so that the road edges can be mown and kept clear. A couple of areas on Rodsley Lane were suggested. The Clerk will action this'

74/21 Financial Matters. (Also Item 59/21). Bank statements and Summary of Accounts, as shown on the next page were circulated and signed by non-signatory Cllr Higgins.

Receipts Precept £2,900.00

Interest 0.09

Total £2900.09

Payments Cemetery Green Bin £ 50.00

Clerk Salary to end June £ 442.56

Petty Cash £ 35.94

DALC £174.14

Microsoft Office £ 21.45

Insurance £ 173.69

PAT Test £ 40.00

HMRC £ 110.40

Total £ 1,048.18

Excess of Receipts over payments £1,851.91

Funds in Hand 1st April 2021 £5,007.73

Funds in Account 00117946 £2,977.91

Funds in Account 00054278 £3,873.13

Petty Cash £ 8.60

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm.