

Winkleigh Parish Council

Winkleigh Parish Council

MINUTES of Extra-ordinary Meeting of Winkleigh Parish Council WEDNESDAY 16th March 2016 7.30pm Winkleigh Village Hall

- E1.03.16** **PRESENT** – Cllr Flockhart (Chair), Cllr Pearce (Vice-Chair), Cllr Turner, Cllr Hodgson, Cllr Kane, Cllr Jacobs, Dist Cllr Boundy, Mel Borrett (Clerk)
- ALSO IN ATTENDANCE** - Russell Williams, Nick Forrest – Greenslade Turner Hunt Planning Consultants, Mr Royston Naylor – co-option applicant
- E2.03.16** **APOLOGIES** - None
- E3.03.16** **MINUTES** - The signing of the minutes of the PCM held on 24th February 2016 – **Proposed** by Cllr Flockhart, seconded by Cllr Jacobs, and Resolved; that the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting on 24th February 2016 be approved by the Council,⁴ in favour,² abstentions, **motion carried**
- E4.03.16** **DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN MATTERS TO FOLLOW**
- E5.03.16** **COUNCIL VACANCIES** - Clerk
There are currently 5 casual vacancies on the Winkleigh Parish Council which are eligible for co-option. They are advertised on Parish Notice boards, website and within the current edition of Distinctly Winkleigh. Mr Royston Naylor co-opted to Winkleigh Parish Council, **all in favour**. Mr Naylor signed declaration documents and joined the Council.
- E6.03.16** **GUEST SPEAKERS – GREENSLADE TAYLOR HUNT PLANNING CONSULTANTS** – Russell Williams and Nick Forrest
Pre-Planning Community Engagement in support of a planning application to TDC for the proposed residential development of land off Eggesford Road, Winkleigh for 23 dwellings. Greenslade Taylor Hunt state they are the agents acting on behalf of the landowners, there is no involvement of the development company at this time and that their clients are not local to the area and are unlikely to be in attendance.
The purpose of the statement is to see early engagement with the community of Winkleigh through the Parish Council and its elected members in relation to the future residential development of the land off Eggesford Road, therefore, we welcome and thank the agents for this opportunity to comment at an early stage.
- Mr Forrest thanked WPC for allowing them to come along and share what they have so far. Mr Forrest reported that GTH had been asked by the clients to explore the possibility of planning on this site and as planning consultants it is pretty clear as the site is surrounded by residential development, then this site is clearly possible for residential development. On this basis, GTH carried out an initial assessment of the site in terms of the District Council's policies and the Government's policies under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) under which there are National planning guidelines. Under these guidelines, it was believed the site is a sustainable development site, which means there is technically a '*presumption in favour of development*' and because the site is surrounded by residential properties, that development could be residential.
- GTH then assessed the size of the site and what could be the appropriate number of dwellings and identified 23 houses, 8 of which are affordable houses and a play area.
- GTH are here to gather important local knowledge and have produced concepts only, no planning application has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Part of the assessment of putting houses on the site is to engage in a pre-application enquiry with the planning department over several months, collating information from them and consulting with their various colleagues in the District Council. GTH have also discussed this with the County Highways Authority and also the drainage authority, resulting in this concept of plans.

GTH want to work out the viability of this scheme and what impact it will have on the community by looking at three key areas, namely; (i) Traffic, Parking and Pedestrians, (ii) Density and setting (relationship with other dwellings), (iii) Drainage.

- **Parking** – this layout shows 44 parking spaces which hits certain standards required by the Highways Authority for the number of parking in relation to the number of residents, which is regarded as acceptable. In addition there are an additional 8 parking places on Eggesford Road itself. Therefore, with regard to the site, parking is adequate, plus the new road on the site will also provide additional parking opportunities. The 8 additional parking spaces on Eggesford Road will be for the residents of Eggesford Road directly opposite the site.
- **Traffic movement** – 23 houses will increase traffic movement. GTH have engaged with County Highways Authority who carried out a technical safety audit, and they have concluded the indicative scheme as drawn would be acceptable which covers safety and various other issues.
- **Pedestrians** – GTH want pedestrians to be safe. Eggesford Road exits on to the junction with Exeter Road, where there are no pavements, therefore GTH have considered putting a pavement behind the 8 parking spaces on Eggesford Road, that then runs across the site to the main road so pedestrians can walk through the site and cross the main road, which is safer than the junction itself, and again the safety audit people were happy with this concept.
- **Drainage** – SW Water have been contacted and the scheme as it currently, which shows all of the foul water from the 23 houses would go on to the foul water drain in Eggesford Road, which is technically a combined drain, and SW Water are happy with that.
- **Surface Water & Sewage** – GTH have a scheme requiring catchment tanks underground which discharges the water slowly off in the direction of the Elms Meadow development, which has a surface water drainage system and the site will be linking in near to that. Gravity serves the foul sewage which goes down Eggesford Road, any pre-existing backing up of foul sewage is the responsibility of SW Water.
- **Density** – the density of site works out at 33.8 dwellings per hectare, Elms Meadow is 44.6 dwellings per hectare. The average for a rural area should be 25-35 per hectare, so the site sits within the average brackets.
- **Setting** – houses in groupings will have an effect on the view from other houses in grouping. In placing these houses where we have, we have shown the new houses in relationship to the existing ones, chalet bungalows to the south and the terraced and groups of houses on Eggesford Road to the north. For example, the lines of houses parallel to Eggesford Road are approximately 70ft away which follows general guidance on what is acceptable. The rest of the site, particularly in relation to windows and dwellings to the south have very few openings on their northern side which gives a balance according to what is generally accepted, which is GTH assessment. In terms of setting, the heights of the buildings, pitching heights etc, would not adversely affect the settings of the other dwellings, in our view.

GTH are going to submit an outline application as covered, it is not a full application at this stage. An outline application is to establish the principle of a number of dwellings on the site, and once that principle is accepted and approved, the next stage would be by a developer who would submit a 'reserved matters' application (full planning application). This stage is outline, therefore, the layout proposed is indicative – it just generally shows what is happening, the exact size of the houses, exact height, location of windows, how it appears, exactly where the landscaping goes is what is called a 'reserved matter', but the access itself and layout and locations of the houses is more or less set.

The outline planning permission would establish the very principle but GTH's intention would be to secure the layout of the development itself. You can have approved at 'outline stage'? various issues such as landscaping, appearance, layout, access, what is approved is taken forward by a developer but wouldn't prevent a developer making significant changes in the future which is out of our hands and taken forward – developer hopefully wouldn't come in and seek to make significant changes before taking it to the reserved matters application stage but no guarantees can be given.

The proposed site is not in a defined archaeological area, some holes have been dug in the field and nothing found, therefore we would have to go to the county archaeologist for a determination of what he would wish to see us do, however GTH/applicant are not statutorily bound to do this unless the field was identified as an area of high archaeological interest, however, it isn't in terms of the District Council's mapping policies and Local Plan policies.

E7.03.16**PUBLIC PERIOD I** commenced 7.55pm

Any Member of the public may address, the Council and Guest Speakers, **once** only, for a maximum of 3 minutes on any issue. The Council are not permitted to enter into discussion or explanation with the public, however, any item requiring a response from the Council, or investigation may be included on the agenda for the next pcm.

The following points raised by the public and Cllrs, to be noted and considered by WPC in their response to GTH at the next pcm on 23rd March 2016

- i. VDS has had a lot of input from local people, we would like to see demonstrated even at the outline stage, and how the elements and principles of the VDS have been taken into account in the outline application.
- ii. Design principles, you have to look at the development in line with the local village, its surroundings, it has to belong to the village and be part of it, use of local materials and craftsmanship, maintaining existing countryside views going out of the village and create new vistas from within.
- iii. Access through the frontal development, particularly the hedge and banking where the access is punched through it needs to be in scale and sympathetic to local surroundings and picks up on the frontage of the residences in Eggesford Road/the village, and the change of level is critical.
- iv. Pedestrian access needs to put connectivity across the village not just the site, to include some kind of crossing to help pedestrians' safety
- v. Affordable housing element needs tying to a registered social landlord.
- vi. Despite the measures for pedestrians, the extra (estimated) 44 cars will create a danger due to extra volume of traffic in Eggesford Road for pedestrians and more importantly, children walking to school because of the access onto Eggesford Road instead of the main road.
- vii. Danger to pedestrians – people will still walk up Eggesford Road rather than detour and walk through the site out of habit or because they enjoy the scenery.
- viii. Pedestrians crossing from the new footpath will be stepping out between parked vehicles to cross a highway that is not a local domestic road but a significant east-west through route. The few extra feet will merely enable the traffic to move faster. How is this safer for pedestrians?
- ix. The village already has lots of problems with traffic. There are already massive traffic issues trying to come out of this junction on to the main road and crossing the main road. Site is not suitable for residential development because it does not have any serious connectivity options to the rest of the village – it is not safe now to allow the children to walk into the village by themselves due to parked cars on the roadway causing hazards to pedestrians due to lack of footpaths
- x. The proposed development is out of scale and out of character with this quarter of Winkleigh that bears the historic name East Park. It is an area of low density housing
- xi. Aesthetics – this area is part of the community – East Park Place, 1st Hunting Park that William the Conqueror established shortly after 1066 – Winkleigh Wood is the gateway into the village – every house along Eggesford Road has a well as it is extremely wet, local materials used for their constructions. Winkleigh is a very ancient village established 1262, it has 2 castle mounds and the first English civil war. It is an ancient settlement that is about agriculture.
- xii. Pressure on Winkleigh's infrastructure, the village is remote, rural and an ancient place with very limited ability to cope with traffic due to the lack of parking and the extremely narrow roads leading to the village centre, the expected traffic increase with the 55 houses north of the village and this one would be in the region of 150 more vehicles. This has the potential to create friction between drivers trying to negotiate an already congested village centre due to lack of available parking.
- xiii. Once outline planning has been given, it is possible for revisions to be requested to allow more dwellings, at a higher density, even less in character.
- xiv. The consultation with Highways does not seem to have taken into account the types or number of existing movements of the diverse traffic using Eggesford Road which is already tight, which include farm machinery, milk tankers, hgvs. Traffic flow survey needs to be representative of the variability of type and frequency of vehicles and the time of day and time of year.
- xv. The new access may widen the road part way down but a bottleneck will be created at the top as you approach the A3124 with traffic backing up on the A3124 either side of Eggesford Road. The development could also add an extra 40 plus cars to this traffic.
- xvi. The impact of additional traffic merging onto an already busy road will create further congestion and increasing danger to pedestrians, school children, and residents. On 16th March 2016, 0730-0900am and 3.30-5.00pm, I (member of public) carried out a personal observation on the traffic flow, which showed vehicles, which included buses, agricultural tractors, large commercial vehicles, as well as cars using Eggesford Road during this peak time, when pedestrians and children are likely to be walking along this already busy road which will vary month to month, not least because of the large dairy farm along the route.
- xvii. The access onto Eggesford Road makes less sense than onto Exeter Road, due to already considerable pinch points on Eggesford Road due to size of vehicles using it.
- xviii. Eggesford Road does not have, and was never meant to have, the capacity for busy two-way traffic and a

junction.

- xix. The extra parking spaces would be defined by how useful they were, number of cars per household relate to number of drivers in the household not number of bedrooms a property has – TDC have minimum requirement but this is not reflective of reality.
- xx. There are 13 houses in Park Place, allocated parking for 8 cars is totally insufficient – are these spaces to be specifically designated?
- xxi. The access onto Eggesford Road will have hampered visibility for vehicles leaving the site due to the provision of the parking spaces.
- xxii. Play area – can it be moved, there is a lovely park in Winkleigh, why do you need a massive play area, which could encourage teenagers to congregate, sitting around, smoking, drinking and disorderly behaviour.
- xxiii. Sewage and surface water may flow onto nearby properties, every other year I (member of public) have had overflowing effluence in my garden, as my property shares effluent drain and further development may increase this.
- xxiv. Even though SW Water have spent a lot of money upgrading the sewage works, no new pipes have been laid to the sewage from the village or the from the sewage works to Bullow Brook. This apart since 2001 it has been on record that the dilution afforded by Bullow Brook limits the volume of effluent than can be discharged no matter what improvements are made to the treatment works.
- xxv. The site is not suitable for residential development due to the negative impact of access and traffic and the associated dangers which should rule it out completely.
- xxvi. In the forthcoming Local Plan, land for 55 houses has already been identified by the Parish Council north of Chulmleigh Road and south of the cemetery. With 55 new homes as part of the Local Plan, Winkleigh cannot sustain another windfall site, the community is a small village.
- xxvii. Winkleigh already has the proposition of 55 new houses north of village, if you add this 23 homes, this would give 78 new homes, which is 10% of rateable houses in the Parish already, we have 797. 10% is a lot of new houses to impose on a village of this size and is not sustainable and beyond what a community should be expected to cope with.
- xxviii. The school is running at near capacity. It is planned to take a maximum capacity of 210 pupils. It has 183 at this point in time. In Sept 2017, a further 28 children are expected to attend the school, with a maximum of 30, so will take the school close to capacity a year ahead of when we might be expect this proposed development coming online, so where would all of these children get an education?
- xxix. Building houses without prospective employment being available to the residents is a recipe for social disaster, this tranquil village will become a dormitory and morph into a satellite township and not have a sense of belonging, which doesn't make a community.
- xxx. Taking a holistic approach, just building homes without taking into account the social and economic effects of that action is not well planned development but mere opportunist.
- xxxi. The Community would like to engage with the owner to keep it as a green field and purchase and keep it for the village as a green field, to become an area of nature and beauty for the villagers to go to, we have made representation to owner but they have not engaged back, we would give it to the Parish council as an area of beauty, the last thing Cyril and Betty wanted was any development.
- xxxii. Density is too great no matter it fits with Planning Regs, 44 parking places, 8 garages, 8 parking spaces on road, there could be at least 3 cars per house not 1.9 as shown. The density should be reduced to allow parking within the complex for visitors, and 3 parking spaces per house
- xxxiii. One of the issues affecting the residents of the village is that we are in the country but there is nowhere to walk the dogs or enjoy the countryside. The concept of having the field donated to the village is a wonderful idea.
- xxxiv. With the known heritage of the Village, will a geographical survey be commissioned to determine if there is of anything ancient within the field?
- xxxv. Not a preferred development at all, the layout at the moment is a very bland, overcrowded layout which doesn't reflect the character of the village, however, if the access could be altered to Exeter Road, it would assist the 8 parking spaces on Eggesford Road were kept and extended for 12 -15 cars adjacent to the new development site, which would go a long way to reducing the congestion on Eggesford Road.
- xxxvi. Where does the surface water go from Eggesford Road?

GTH RESPONSE- The surface water attenuation is effectively designed so the collection chambers which are the actual tanking itself to the south of Cross Park, has capacity to take surface water flows from the site at a slow release mechanism with hydro-breaks, which would release the surface water into the existing main drainage at a rate that does not exceed the existing greenfield run off rate from the site so not increasing flood risk. The runoff water is the blue line on the map which joins with Elms Meadow

- xxxvii. Elms Meadow management group residents pay a management fee for the privilege for the runoff water arrangements in Elms Meadow, what arrangement do GTH have with the management company in Folkestone to use that facility? It is owned by the property owners through Redrow, we pay a management fee to have that maintained every year as part of our ownership. This facility is not owned by SW Water and requires further investigation.

GTH RESPONSE – We are aware that SW Water regard this as an acceptable system but we will obviously investigate your information. As far as we are aware we are going to be ok linking into the site with SW Water system and we will raise that with them.

xxxviii. Where is the demand for these houses, given the demographic nature of Winkleigh, does this have to be justified within the planning process?

GTH RESPONSE District Council have to identify a certain number of dwellings over a 20 year planning period and demonstrate over a rolling 5 year period that they have enough land to supply the housing need within the District. TDC cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, which puts them in a difficult position when housing developments come forward. From GTH element, the open market goes some way to provide the identified affordable housing need in Winkleigh and this development would satisfy that in almost its entirety which would be of obvious benefit to the local community. In terms of the wider housing needs, there is no need for us to justify the need for new open market housing within Winkleigh, because TDC, through their planning policy process, have already identified Winkleigh as a potential growth spot. In their emerging Local Plan they have identified that the 55 new houses do not necessarily satisfy the number of new houses that ought to be delivered over the planned period within Winkleigh. The emerging Local Plan is a long way from being adopted.

xxxix. If TDC have a rolling need for housing, they would have identified this area when developing the Local Plan, they have already accepted what we have put forward and this is purely windfall, if they haven't got enough housing land for the District, they would be looking at other larger towns which are more suitable.

xl. There are 2 empty properties on Eggesford Road. These properties have been unoccupied for at least 8 years which begs the question of a need for further housing in this area of the village?

xli. Drainage – access onto Eggesford Road bank will be too high and need reducing, how is it proposed to stop the surface water from this area running down the road?

xlii. Do you have the trip generation figure for your site, if not how can you put the access onto Eggesford Road if you don't have that figure prior to talking to the highways? You must have given highways a trip generation figure, otherwise they wouldn't have given you the nod.

GTH RESPONSE we have involved a highways consultant, we will have certain information which we are going through at the moment. Our highways consultant isn't with us today, however, we have engaged with them concerning the number of houses and through the Safety Audit System it is considered ok, that will obviously be further explored through the planning process.

xliii. There are no elevations provided for the view of the houses from Eggesford Road, and the aesthetics of these new houses are quite imposing, how are they going to match in context?

xliv. 23 houses being built parallel to Eggesford Road, will result in a significant number of current houses being potentially overlooked. There appears to be insufficient and insignificant differential between current and new housing height. This will also impinge on our lighting level and we feel cause serious loss of outlook.

xlv. The community spent over 2 years developing the Community Plan. We fought as a Local Centre to only take 5% additional housing development due to exponential growth in the village through the three recent developments at Redrow, Westcotts and Kings Meadow, the issue of the number of houses in short term and density seems too high.

xlvi. Light pollution, how many lampposts are proposed for the site?

xlvii. The current hedgerow will be removed and not adequately replaced which will impact environmentally and will result in no form of screening from the new development.

xlviii. Far reaching views across the surrounding countryside to Dartmoor would be obstructed more or less completely by the development.

xliv. Many of us have chosen to live in this area of Winkleigh specifically for the benefits of the view and for the rural nature of this part of the village, the development is nothing short of a (rude) invitation to move on.

i. A separate meeting with the planners/developers will be required to discuss landscaping and to ensure mature trees/hedging are planted from the outset to soften the development and ensure the existing wildlife will remain or return after the construction.

ii. To lessen the impact of 2 storey buildings directly in front of the existing Eggesford Road residents, a small development of bungalows would maintain some distant views and lessen the roadside and infrastructure impact

iii. Why can't the access come out onto Exeter Road?

GTH RESPONSE - The access has been explored in the other direction and it is because of the high priority of the main road and junction it has on the opposite side, it is basically too close and it is all about right hand turning areas within the road construction and it is just that bit too tight. The way the county highways authority look at this, they would have far more concern with the access there than off

Eggesford Road, which is why we explored the access of Eggesford Road, which the highways authority were much happier with.

20.55pm Public Period Closed

21.00pm Meeting adjourned for short recess to allow public wishing to vacate the meeting to do so.

21.05pm Meeting resumed

E8.03.16 PRE-PLANNING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN SUPPORT OF A PLANNING APPLICATION TO TDC FOR THE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF LAND OFF EGGESFORD ROAD, WINKLEIGH FOR 23 DWELLINGS

Consider WPC response

Clerk to collate responses, for WPC to discuss on 23rd March – **Action Item**

WPC agreed that **Cllr Flockhart** will work with Pauline Warner/Penny Griffiths to formulate a response from WPC to be considered at the next pcm on 23rd March.

E9.03.16 PLANNING - Chair

a) New Applications

1/0176/2015/FUL Proposed use of existing lakes for commercial fishing; formation of banking area and vehicular access, Venn Lakes, Winkleigh

Proposed by Cllr Hodgson, seconded by Cllr Flockhart, and Resolved; that the application be refused due to the potential of intensification of traffic movements on an 'A' class road, ~~is~~ inevitable if a change of use from private to commercial is granted, be approved by the Council, 3 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions **motion carried**

E10.03.16 FINANCE - Clerk

a) Bank Signatories

Mandate to update signatories signed by Cllr Turner

b) Aims accountants

Standing Order for £48.00 per month effective from 1st April 2016 for 12 months fixed period for carrying out the role of the Parish internal auditor, previously resolved on 24th February 2016, authorised.

E11.03.16 CURRENT BUSINESS MATTERS

a) Bungalow exterior light

Quote has been received which is under £500 in accordance with current standing orders. Councillors to resolve to give approval for works to be carried out.

Proposed by Cllr Flockhart, seconded by Cllr Hodgson, and Resolved; that Mike Wilson be authorised to proceed with fitting a new exterior light to the bungalow, at a cost not exceeding £150.00 as per his quotation, approved by the Council, all in favour **motion carried**

b) Cemetery Terms & Conditions 2016 – Cllr Hodgson and Cllr Pearce

For the benefit of new members to the Council and public, Explanation of amendment to Cemetery Terms and Conditions for 2016 Ratified on 24th February 2016

28/10/2015 Minutes 14.10.15a Resolution made to fully accept revised Cemetery Terms & Conditions for April 2016 to be ratified by full Council as current Cemetery Terms & Conditions before publication.

24/02/2016 Minutes 9.2.16 e) Proposed by Cllr Flockhart, seconded by Cllr Hodgson, and Resolved that; Cemetery Terms & Conditions 2016 as amended 28th October 2015 be ratified with immediate effect, be approved by the Council, all in favour.

Cllr Hodgson expressed his apologies to the Council and public as he hadn't realised what changes had been made before ratification and seconding the motion even though the proposals were resolved in October 2015.

- i. It is possible to purchase either a single or a double depth plot, **or two plots side-by-side** and removal of the Advance purchase of Exclusive Right to buy a burial plot Following discussion by the Council which involved the maintenance contractor for the cemetery,
- Proposed by Cllr Flockhart, seconded by Cllr Turner, and Resolved; to relax the 6 month rule on revisiting the resolution made on 28/10/2015 14.10.15a in relation to the purchase of either a single or a double depth plot, **or two plots side-by-side** and removal of the Advance purchase of Exclusive Right to buy a burial plot, as it is not deemed to be in the interest of the Parish, be approved by the Council, all in favour **motion carried**
- Proposed by Cllr Flockhart, seconded by Cllr Turner, and Resolved; to revert the Cemetery Terms & Conditions with effect 1st April 2016, to permit the advance purchase of Exclusive Right to buy a burial plot between plots 575-513 inclusive, be approved by the Council, all in favour **motion carried.**
- Action item – Clerk** to amend T&Cs and bring to pcm 23rd March 2016 for ratification.

- ii. Winkleigh Parish Council hold **the undertaker responsible for the rectification** to the burial plot of any shrinkage or levelling of the soil to the surrounding ground level and require the Undertaker to carry out an onsite inspection after a 6 month period and again at the 12 month period to do any final levelling of the grave at their own expense.

Following discussions, the council carries out an inspection of the cemetery that covers all aspects of maintenance, including whether an undertaker has levelled graves that are 12 months old or more. If grave re found to be un-level during this inspection, the appropriate undertaker will be notified.

Action item – Clerk to remind Undertakers of T&Cs when allocating plots prior to burial/cremation and to diarise reminders to Undertakers.

- iii. Fee increase Explanation of how the fee rise was determined

The cost of the maintenance of the Winkleigh Cemetery plus Council tax stands at £2200, any overrun costs revert back to Winkleigh residents through the precept. When investigating fees charged it was found that the cost at Winkleigh cemetery was far less than the cost in Torrington. The last fee increase was £5 together with a £15 admin fee. The maintenance contractor is due to retire in November with the possibility of the new contract being considerably more money.

Taking these factors into consideration it was decided to raise the fees but also removed the £15 administration fee.

E12.03.16 PUBLIC PERIOD II

Only for matters arising from this parish council meeting

Mole in the cemetery needs to be attended to

There has been dumping of soil under the tree near the ashes plots instead of in to the soil bunkers.

E13.03.16 REMINDERS & LATE ITEMS AT THE CHAIRMAN'S DISCRETION

E14.03.16 LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

North Devon Sanctuary for Refugees Councillors Forum – Clerk

Invite to Northern Devon Sanctuary for Refugees Councillors' Forum on the 22nd March at 7pm in Petroc, Barnstaple. All councillors and any council officers from your council should attend to be provided with the information needed to deal with our area's contribution towards dealing with the current refugee crisis

Cllrs Pearce, Jacobs, Kane and Naylor will represent WPC

E15.03.16 DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

23rd March 2016. 7.30pm Winkleigh Community Centre

21.55pm closed