

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Fiskerton Parish Council held on
Monday 2 August 2021 at 7:30pm in Fiskerton Village Hall**

Present: Cllrs S Canner, C Hill, A Walker; R Wall; Mrs M Vail (Clerk)

Absent: Cllr K Brereton

Meeting started at 7.36pm.

1) Open session – suspension of standing orders for 15 minutes:

No Open Session took place due to no members of the public present.

2) Apologies for absence: Cllr Darcel, Cllr Whitt

3) Declaration of interests: No declarations of interest were made.

**4) To approve time sensitive actions in respect of response to the Central
Lincs Local Plan (CLLP) consultation:**

The CLLP is under review and a consultation on it runs until 24th August 2021. AW has circulated a draft response ahead of this meeting for consideration. The draft response has taken into account the many documents available to view on the CLLP website.

The draft response was then considered; with the initial following points being made about the CLLP:

- Fiskerton appears to come off worse than everyone else
- No apparent connection with the Paddock; with it being listed as a green space only
- Three areas of green space have been allocated: the pond, Holmfield open space; and the green.
- Planning gain not a consideration from the planning committee

RW:

- Residential allocations for Fiskerton rejected for the first time
- Site reduced from 10.66 hectares to 8.14 hectares to allow for lining up with existing housing. No planning gain in respect of what FPC has discussed previously. No way will the Church Commissioners agree to the Paddock as a result of this. Fears the Paddock will be removed from consideration.

AW: The Neighbourhood Plan can deliver more than the CLLP; therefore, it is possible to write into the NP; and write planning gain into these negotiations with the Church Commissioners.

- Tanya site rejected: considered a shame as it's a good site for development; supported by the public. Suggested that this site be reintroduced; thereby supporting the need for development idea that Fiskerton wants.
- Manor Farm yard development rejected: considered a shame if dropped. FPC had supported the drawings. Noted that proposed CLLP only nominates sites of 10+ houses whereas this development was only for 8 or 9 homes therefore is outside of CLLP's criteria.
- Considered that little is likely to happen at Fiskerton as developers may see it as not viable as the allocations number of 129 are too small when compared

Approved Minutes For Signing

Signed:(Chairman) Dated: 13th September 2021

Page 1 of 2

to allocations in nearby villages (eg Cherry Willingham = 562, Greetwell = 512).

Discussion then centred around the proposed number of homes to include:

- Now there is no village shop, this removes any applicable uplift to total number of homes (note: under old CLLP there was uplift up to 15%)
- Old CLLP nominated sites for 25+ homes, whereas this is now reduced to 10+ homes. The resultant adjusted baseline to 46 homes has meant that Fiskerton's figures have dropped by more than elsewhere.
- FPC wants to drive the figures down, reduce the village footprint, give negotiating space with the Church Commissioners.
- Band of 46 – 200 homes: find the middle ground with the Church Commissioners.

RW:

- North of Holmfield nominated for local green site but it does not meet the criteria, but can be assessed for important open space status
- Ridings (private garden or not?). Are CLLP referring to a previous version of the NP and not the emerging one? **AW:** can insert a paragraph that the land is privately owned but publicly accessible. This featured in a previous NP so no reason it won't appear in a future NP.
- Essential that the Paddock remains a protected green space; and the only way to protect it is if FPC owns it.

It was **RESOLVED** unanimously, with the inclusion of the suggested amendments, to submit the draft response to CLLP.

Due to the clerk going on imminent leave, should the amended response not be completed before her leave, it was further **RESOLVED**, proposed by AW and seconded by RW, that AW submits the agreed response in the clerk's absence.

Action: clerk, AW

Meeting ended at 8.35pm.

Mrs Michelle Vail, Parish Clerk

Date: 25 August 2021

(Note: on 3 and 4 August 2021, Cllr Canner and Cllr Wall respectively spoke to the clerk to request that it be recorded that they no longer wish to support submission of the response to CLLP as agreed at the meeting. Reasons include: insufficient time to read the circulated draft document; that not all of the document had been discussed at the meeting, and there is a feeling of being railroaded into making a decision.

Lincolnshire Association of Local Councils advised on the matter as follows: 'Unfortunately, if they voted FOR at the meeting then their vote stands. I do not think the agenda item was too vague, particularly when the draft response document was also sent out prior to the meeting. It is the councillor's responsibility to read that document prior to the meeting')

Approved Minutes For Signing

Signed:(Chairman) Dated: 13th September 2021

Page 2 of 2