

CHORLEYWOOD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Extra Ordinary meeting of the PARISH COUNCIL held in the Chorleywood War Memorial Hall, Common Road, Chorleywood, on Tuesday 26th April 2016

MEMBERSHIP & ATTENDANCE

Chairman:	* Tony Edwards	
Councillors:	* Jo Clarke	Ken Morris
	* John Copley	* Alison Preedy
	* Harry Davies	* David Raw
	* Barbara Dickens	* Martin Trevett
	* Barbara Green	* Steve Watkins
	* Raj Khiroya	* Jane White
	* Rodney Kipps	* Jenny Wood
	* Jill Leeming	* Jackie Worrall

*Denotes Member present

Officers Present: Yvonne Merritt – Clerk
Claire James – Deputy Clerk
Michelle Putman – Admin Officer
Laura Hamilton – Admin Assistant

The Chairman opened the meeting by explaining the format of the meeting and general health and safety briefing on the use of the Hall. The Open Forum would allow six people to speak, three for and three against, registration of interest in speaking having taken place prior to the start of the meeting. After the apologies for absence there would then be discussion by the Councillors with the opportunity for every Councillor to have their say. The Chairman thanked everyone who had written in to the Parish Office and Councillors on the subject of the Play Area, and the Play area Advisory Committee (PAAC), Officers and Councillors for all their hard work.

15/86 OPEN FORUM

There were sixty-six members of the public present; six addressed the Council on the subject of the meeting – the proposed location of the proposed Play Area in Chorleywood:

Greg Hill representing Friends of Chorleywood Common speaking against a play area on Chorleywood Common but in favour of one in Chorleywood House Estate
Simone Tyson speaking on behalf of Chorleywood Mums in favour of a Play Area on Chorleywood Common,
Doug King in favour of a play area of Chorleywood Common
Simon Varnals against a play area on Chorleywood Common
Katie Simons in favour of a play area on Chorleywood Common but if this was not possible also of Chorleywood House Estate
Anne Pearson against a play area on Chorleywood Common.

15/87 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr Ken Morris due to ill health. The Chairman sent the best wishes of the Council and wished him a full and speedy recovery.

15/88 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS

The Council had received two petitions which were read out and recorded as follows:

1. Friends of Chorleywood Common – we the undersigned call upon the Parish Council to encourage children to explore and enjoy the Common, to protect the Common’s unique natural environment from development, to vote for a new play Area to be in the Grounds of Chorleywood House Estate and to reject the suggestion that the Common might be considered as a suitable alternative. **160 Names**
2. Chorleywood Golf Club – We the undersigned object to the siting of a play area on Chorleywood Common. By siting the play area on the Common there are significant issues regarding accessibility by foot, parking, setting a precedent for placing a structure on the Common and Safety. **103 Names**

15/89 PLAY SPACE FOR CHORLEYWOOD

Before the discussion started the Chairman sought questions or queries on the PAAC and Clerk’s reports.

Cllr Barbara Green spoke first wishing to clarify a number of points.

Referring to the Clerks report Para 7.4 regarding the letters of objection to the play area being sited on the Common, she stated that the numbers were confusing and had sought to clarify this in an email sent to Councillors prior to the meeting. The figure of 318 objectors in the report was not letters, there was an overlap between the letters and petitions. Of the 57 letters of objection, 40 were standard letters which she was of the view that the Council, when considering Grovewood letters of objection the previous year had decided it would not accept, 4 more were golfers, 5 were Friends of Chorleywood Common (FoCC) which in her view left 8 genuine letters of objection. There had been 6 new letters of support in the few days prior to the meeting which gave a total of 16 letters of support.

Secretaries note – The Council has a set procedure for accepting petitions and letters – standardised letters have been accepted by the Council in all circumstances to date.

She also gave her analysis of the FoCC petition advising that of the 160 names on the petition, 60 did not live in Chorleywood with some coming as far away as Hemel Hempstead, Croxley Green and Maidenhead.

She further spoke about Para 5.3 in the Clerks report regarding insurance and thanked the Clerk for getting further clarification. It was now clear that the Parish should lease the land on the Common for insurance purposes. Once leased Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) would pick up the insurance and seek a safety report. This was now done as it had been inappropriate to seek clarification of the insurance situation until now.

She moved on to para 6.1 on the Clerks Report regarding fencing, advising that she wished to point out to the Council that there was one document missing – the letter received from the Planning Inspector that if fencing is considered, a request for fencing could be made as part of an application for a play area. Cllr Jackie Worrall interjected to say that she did not think anyone was in any doubt on this to which Cllr Barbara Green responded that she was clarifying it for the Council further stating that in her view; permanent fencing was perfectly possible if the Council wanted it.

With reference to para 6.2.8 which referred to a number of fact sheets and information available to applicants for planning permission and Section 38 applications Cllr Barbara Green stated that she was sorry that these were not available like they were at TRDC. She went on to state that there were a number of reports that the Planning Inspector would need to see that had not been listed by the Clerk in her report but referred out to. She gave her view that the Clerk had pre-empted this by approaching Natural England, Open Spaces and Ecologists saying well done, although they will be asked for again. These would be requested, as part of a whole tranche of reports that would be asked for.

With reference to Para 7.4 she stated that she wished to clarify and expand, the results of the Residents Association Survey as follows:

- 60% of potential users preferred a site on the Common
- 75% of respondents would drive to Chorleywood House Estate (CWHE)
- 25% would drive to the Common

75% would walk to the Common

At this point Cllr Jackie Worrall stated that she wished to enter a protest, feeling that it was unfair that Cllr Barbara Green had had so much time to state what her opinion was.

Cllr Barbara Dickens sought an explanation from Cllr Barbara Green of why a letter was not a letter and a survey was not a survey. She further asked a question of the scoring in the PAAC report. When it had become apparent that fencing might be possible, the scoring was adjusted. In Appendix 6 Safety and Security, she did not understand why CWHE was marked the same as Site 15 when no horses are allowed in CWHE – this was therefore a red herring. Cllr Barbara Green attempted to clarify this.

Cllr Jenny Wood then spoke raising the issue of receiving an email at 4.30 that day which had shifted the goalposts. It was disingenuous to be presented with that information so close to the meeting, Councillors would have prepared for the meeting on the basis of the information available in advance of the meeting.

The Chairman Cllr Tony Edwards then opened up the discussion to allow all Councillors to make their individual statements, starting with the first Councillor on his left, Cllr Allison Preedy and wishing to go clockwise round the table from her.

Cllr Barbara Green stated that she would like to make the point that Cllrs were not being asked for proposals at this stage.

Cllr Allison Preedy stated that she had been a Councillor for 6 years and had been on the PAAC last time the play area was considered and this time. At the start of the process she had wanted the play area on the Common thinking that it was a lovely idea. She had brought up five children in the area. The site wanted the first time round was at Christchurch near the pond. She stated that she had then started to learn more about the Great Crested Newt and this had caused problems. She further understood the status of the area with it being a Natural Heritage site and Local Nature Reserve. Given these findings she stated that her feelings had changed. Both the sites on the Common – 15 and 13, had their own difficulties, the gradient at Site 13, Shepherds Bridge, concerns over the proximity of the railway and the potential gathering of youngsters close to this. She was uneasy about TRDC and the insurance aspects of being on Parish Council land. With respect to parking she felt that neither site was suitable and she was worried about potential damage to the Common given that the Station Car park was always full. She also gave thought to local residents to a site on the Common. She felt that CWHE offered more benefits. The area was very busy with footballers and family outings. The crossing of the road she felt was a poor excuse for not placing the play area in the Grounds. She agreed that she wanted to see the project move forward but stated why could the problem not be passed to TDC and let them build on their own land.

Cllr Barbara Dickens stated that she had been on the Parish Council for a couple of years. When the discussion on the play area had first started her first thoughts had been that she could not see a need, her views had changed however and she now felt that there should be a play area and soon. Like Cllr Alison Preedy she had been keen on the Christchurch area but the newts had other ideas. No-one had voiced the opinions of the disabled and less able children. She had heard Simone Tyson speak about the demographics of the area but felt that the grandparents needed level ground. She thanked the PAAC for the time spent; stating that there could have been a nature trail in that time and the Council should be looking at what we can have. She stated a preference for CWHE which also had room for expansion. The Council could then get on with the Nature Trail on the Common.

Cllr Barbara Green stated that she was the Chairman of the Open Spaces Committee and the Chairman of the PAAC for 2 ½ years. She stated that she had come onto the Parish Council to achieve a new play area in Chorleywood. She stated that she had heard lots of comments and that the more she heard the more convinced she was that Site 15 was the safest and most accessible. When the PAAC had done the original report, the scores had been identical but not identical in terms of distribution. She stated that she had been overruled in the final PAAC meeting, that she had wanted site 15. CWHE did not fulfil the TRDC criteria for a play area in terms of proximity to the main user population therefore it did not offer Value for Money. If this site was considered suitable there would have been a play area there by now. She stated that in her opinion a vote for CWHE was a vote for no play area. She went on to ask that Site 15 be considered with an open

mind. On the positive front there were no trees, no falling branches, no birdsong, no trees to fell. It was relatively flat therefore minimal earthworks would be necessary and therefore less disruption. It was within easy walking distance from the Village. Access was not via Shepherds Bridge and was possible in a number of ways. Parking at the Ferry Car park where there were always spaces would mean that people would be able to drive. There was therefore no need to use the parking at the War Memorial Hall which she knew to be the main concern of the Golf Club. There were no golf balls, no newts, no horses, as horses were supposed to keep to the horse track, no dogs as it was not an area used by dog walker and it was possible to put a fence round. Site 13 was a concern with respect to dog fouling calling it "pooh corner" and this area had always had a problem. Site 15 was much more accessible; less able visitors could be driven into the station car park and wheeled to the play area at this location. It was close to the Old Shepherd Public House and she stated that the landlord would be quite pleased for parents and children to use the pub. She covered the FoCC view of all the facilities that would need to be provided at the play area stating that no way would this be allowed. Fencing would be required as passing cars would be an issue to protect children from running out. The site was an elevated site with natural surveillance from passers-by. She referred to the Public Forum at which she has been impressed by the PCSO's statements about 10-14 year olds missing out with very little provision for them resulting in them hanging round street corners. They do not walk to CWHE to attend the Youth Club – it was too far to walk. Site 15 would be a good place to for the teenagers to meet and socialise. She stated that she would not be doing her job if she did not point out the down side. She quoted from two reports regarding the unimproved grass at site 15. CMS had stated, although it was a small area, to which she added the fact that it was 0.2% of the Common, . She went on to quote from the report by Brenda Harold which said that there was no single species worthy of protection in its own right but together forms a unique mosaic of ancient unimproved grassland worthy of protection. Site 15 therefore ticked all the boxes and there was a need to grasp the nettle of the ecological issue. It needed to be weighed against the safety of children and the desire to walk. She stated a couple of ideas to mitigate the issue, stating that when the translocation of grassland had been looked at by the Cricket Club when considering moving the pitch, one of the problems had been that it would have been moved onto acid grassland. It was suggested then that we could translocate the grassland and she suggested that it was perfectly possible to translocate the grassland at site 15, adding perhaps onto site 13. Another idea she had, thinking outside the box, was to consider the option of taking two inches off each of the golf fairways, this would more than compensate and golfers would not notice. She stated that the choice was the health and wellbeing of children vs the health and wellbeing of the heather and grass. She stated that the Council needed to consider a vote on Site 15.

Cllr Rodney Kipps was the next to speak stating that he had served many years on the Council, had brought up four children with no problem finding areas to play and now had nine grandchildren. Chorleywood Common was not the place for a play area. He raised the question of why there were only 17 – 20 teenagers at the Youth Club. He questioned the statement about the wellbeing of children stating that he loved children but also stating that when he was elected it was also to protect the Common for future generations. His vote was for CWHE, in his view the Common was in its own right a play area and let the Council look at the Nature trail on the Common.

Cllr Steve Watkins stated that he had been a Councillor for 14years. He referred to the article in My Chorleywood News about play space for the less able. He stated that it was a 'no brainer' with respect to disabled access on CWHE, concrete paths were possible adding that the tennis courts had already been put in. He quoted an extract from a report in June 2015 regarding the grassed area at Site 15 stating that the Council was limited in what could be done here. At a Public enquiry the first question would be is there an alternative. With the Cricket Club translocation, the only reason that they gave up was that it was going to cost over £100K and they could not afford this – how much he asked was it going to cost to move the grassland at site 15. He stated that "it beggared belief" that people can't walk to CWHE. Once there, access for the disabled was available. With respect to the CWHE area, he stated hundreds of children played football there at the weekend, yet parking opposite on the Common was empty. He raised the issues of the proximity of the site 15 right next to the railway track and a play area right outside a public house.

The next person to speak was Cllr John Copley who stated that he was still working through a lot of information provided in the last week or so and it. Part of the process was to listen tonight. Site 13 – he had always had reservations about, it was a very steep site and although a play area could be built there would

be a lot of different levels. He stated that ROSPA mentions these issues. In his view people in Chorleywood don't seem to be pleased by hills. With respect to other options he was not committed at that point.

Cllr Jenny Wood thanked the PAAC group and Staff for the time given to this project. She stated that she has sons of 20 and 18 who had been brought up in Chorleywood. 12 years ago she said she would have voted in favour but since becoming a Councillor she had become more educated on the Common and she felt strongly that children were underrepresented. The Parish Council needed to ensure that the Nature Trail went ahead. From the ROSPA report, the disabled would struggle with site 13, similarly for site 15. Large trees would need to be removed from site 13 and there were also the insurance issues. She referred to the Disability act suggesting that the Council did not have the legal responsibility but had the moral responsibility to consider the disabled. What she had experienced at first hand led her to the view that CWHE lends itself far easier than other sites for disabled access.

Cllr Martin Trevett stated his credentials saying that that he outranked everyone with 21 years as a Councillor trying to get extra play facilities in Chorleywood he had been seeking extra play facilities, during which time two batches of 4 – 14 year olds had grown up without adequate facilities. He had always been of the view that the play area should be on a site close to the population which was therefore the Common. He asked what 0.2% of resource would be damaged if the sites were reversed. He stated that he wanted to scotch the view that this was the "thin end of the wedge" of development. He stated that the Parish Council was unlikely to grant permission for a toilet block on the Common, two sets of planning permission would be required and it was extremely unlikely that toilets would be permitted. TRDC do not provide toilet facilities anywhere else so why here he asked. TRDC had closed all toilets and he made reference to the fact that the Parish Office had once been a toilet block. Of the three sites considered, his preference was Site 15 for the reasons mentioned by Cllr Barbara Green. If the Parish Council did not support the Common then realistically the Councillors were voting for no play area in Chorleywood. He stated that he did not know why CWHE was being considered stating that if it was TRDC's preferred option Chorleywood would have had it years ago. District councillors would have their say; Site 15 had twice been identified by District Councillors as their preferred site. It would go through planning at TRDC who may turn it down. The planning Inspector may refuse it. If it comes round again it would be known that the Common was a no go. He stated the view of going with Site 15, if it got approved ok, if turned down everyone would know that the Common was not an option in the future

Cllr Jo Clerk expressed that her view for a long time was CWHE – it had lots of advantages but she had geographic concerns about it. In the light of information about fencing she had seriously considered site 15 and the ecological implications. She was very much opposed to site 13 – reasons being the road, golfers and the slope. She felt that there needed to be further investigation of site 15 and the mitigation of issues. She was also mindful of parking but felt that site 15 was closer for walking and therefore car parking would not be an issue. There was a physiological barrier to CWHE. There was a distinct advantage to an area close to population that would encourage use of the play area. She was mindful of the ecological issues – if these could be mitigated Site 15 was an ideal option.

Cllr Harry Davies stated that he had lived for 21 years in Chorleywood and had long held reservations about a defined play area. There was a clear need for a play area but it was apparent that CWHE was not viable. He had strong views about site 13 and had been impressed by arguments on Site 15. He felt that a play area could be constructed that was rustic in nature, sympathetic and harmonious to the surrounds – it was up to the Parish Council and Residents how best such a site could be created, they would not allow anything not harmonious to the surroundings. Had there been another viable option outside the Common he would have preferred it but Site 15 was the best viable option and he stated his preference for it.

Cllr David Raw stated the most important issue was children's wellbeing with a play area that was safe, central, accessible, near the concentration of residents, open, light and easy to get to. This process had taken three years, there was a need to plan processes better which was an issue for the Council to look at. He outlined figures from the 2011 census giving the figures that out of 12,000 people, there were 2,500 young people under 18 of which 1500 were aged 0 – 12 and 400 were aged 0-5 who would now be ten years old and they would need somewhere to go. As Councillors he felt they were there to represent the children

who should come first. Site 15 could be a good idea, sites 13 and 15 as Cllr Barbara Green so rightly said would not be suitable. Site 15 would therefore be his favoured choice.

Cllr Jill Leeming started by commenting that all Chorleywood Residents do not live near the station. CWHE had reasonable parking or 20 minutes walking with a stick from the centre. She would have been delighted if 40 years ago there had been a play area sited near the tennis courts so the younger ones could play while the older ones were occupied elsewhere. The Common has plenty of fallen trees to play on. CWHE was flat, whilst there were issues of fences, flattening the land and the grassland on the Common. Many residents walk run and fly kites on the Common. She stated that she did not want it on the Common, near the football pitches was ideal. With respect to Site 15, in her experience the station car park was nearly always full, there were masses of birds in the trees, trees right by the site. She also pointed out that the top part of the Ferry car park was assigned to the shop keepers. On the whole she was in favour of CWHE.

Cllr Raj Khiroya stated that he had been on the Council for a number of years, when he had been Chairman the Council was considering the same issue. "This issue about the play area, we have gone past if it is necessary, the question today is where. Whatever site we choose is wrong, half will not be pleased". Up till that point he stated that he had not been happy with site 13 for a number of reasons. He felt it was between 15 and CWHE. This evening he had heard reports and views of fellow councillors but the most important issue was the children. He was happy to consider 15. Whichever site was chosen would be subject to planning which would require formal consultation with the owners of the land, community, others with legal interest, Parish, District and County Councils, Natural England, English Heritage, Open Spaces Society. There was a process to go through he stated, a decision has to be made it cannot go on any longer. He stated that he was personally in favour of site 15.

Cllr Jackie Worrall was then the next to speak. She stated that she had been on the Council for a number of years and provided some statistics on the households in Chorleywood South. There were 1838 households in Chorleywood South. There were 888 households not in Chorleywood South but this side of the M25. In referring to the Public Forum held in February, she stated that the majority appear to agree that children need exercise. If not careful however the Council will be building a white elephant. If the play area was put on the Common, the Swillett would become a white elephant. She gave the option of upgrading the Swillett for one side of Chorleywood and CWHE for the other side. Two and a half years ago there were concerns about safety and there were still concerns. With respect to fencing, it was not the first occasion that time had been wasted on section 38 referring to the Conservation grazing. If the play area was put on the Common the Council would be postponing a play area. She stated that a public Inquiry would be necessary before TRDC could move forward. If the play area was to go in CWHE grounds, Chorleywood could potentially get it before Christmas, if it was to go on the Common it could be another 2 and half years and the Council might still get a no at the end of it.

Cllr Jane White started by thanking the PACC for their report and the Clerk and Officers for the planning and legal aspects covered in the Clerks report. She stated that she was not against a play area on the Common per se but not that it should not be just be for pro development reasons. From the PAAC report Site 13 was OK, Site 15 TRDC choice, Officers report pointed towards CWHE and in her view there was not much to choose between. This was half of the picture she said and wanted to turn to the planning and legal considerations. There were legal and environmental hurdles as sites 13 and 15, which would take time and money to resolve, there was huge uncertainty in her view of success. She stated that she took her role of Parish Councillor seriously and wanted what was best in the circumstances. She felt this did not mean that the Common could not be enjoyed by children, most of the requirements could be met by the Nature Trail. In her view the Nature Trail would offer very many of the things that people were looking for in a play area on the Common. In her view there was a very high chance of failure and the Common was simply not on. She wished to choose the site that would be successful which therefore was CWHE. She stated that she had not been particularly impressed by the late submission of site 15, if she had been on the PAAC she would have felt it offensive and ignored all the work done by the group. She asked if site 15 was so compelling why it had not been recommended. She asked the Chairman to consider asking the Ranger to give his views.

It was then the turn of the Chairman, Cllr Tony Edwards to speak as the final Councillor. He stated that a lot of correspondence had been received. A lot in favour of the Common have the same issues of being able to

walk to the site, the site being close to the Centre. This was true he said if you lived in some roads. He stated he and everyone round the table were Councillors for the whole of the population. He asked the question, "if you were a busy Mum with an hour to spare, were you really going to walk for 15mins, play for 30 mins and walk back for 15mins?". He stated that he was all in favour of introducing more people to the Common but asked if, at site 13 or 15 there were two siblings, one at the play area, one wanting to be elsewhere, would you let this happen at site 13 or 15. He raised the issue of walking to either site from the Centre, at Chorleywood Bottom there was no pavement. If you drive to Shepherds Bridge he stated, to get to site 15 you have to walk across the bridge, further stating that he didn't like walking across this bridge as an adult. With respect to equipment he stated that all parties agree on sympathetic equipment but asked whether TRDC would be prepared to accept this. The sort of things people want would be addressed by the Nature Trail. He further asked whether anyone thought that the obesity crisis would be solved by walking to the play area. With respect to the obesity statistics for Chorleywood he asked where these children were. He went on to consider play for the disabled and the report from Linda Carrol, a specialist in this area for 30 years. Site 13 was not suitable but CWHE was ideal for play equipment for disabled children. He stated that he had phoned her that evening before the meeting and advised Members that her opinion did not change significantly if site 15 was considered instead of 13. With respect to Shepherds Bridge, he stated that it had been confirmed that the bridge would not be upgraded in any way and that representatives of the Railway had advised that notices were to be posted that it was not a pedestrian bridge. In his view Site 13 was not an acceptable site for a play area. Any equipment requires flat ground, CWHE is relatively flat, site 15 is not which would result in damage to the ground. As far as the Planning Inspector was concerned, Members had been told that 11-12 such applications had been approved, however the majority of these had been for replacement or for additional play equipment with one on a village green which may or may not have had objectors. He stated that anything on the Common would have objectors, Natural England and the Open Spaces Society had already written in this respect on Site 13 and he stated that Site 15 would be far more objectionable. The Common was a local Nature Reserve (LNR), had protective species, Grade A County Heritage Site and was under Higher Level Stewardship. He asked whether any Planning Committees would approve given these factors. With respect to the unimproved grassland he raised the issue of the Football Clubs application which had been rejected by TRDC due to the grassland. Site 15 grassland had been untouched for centuries. The figure from the Cricket Club for the translocation of the grass land was 120K, at site 15 this would mean the whole of the budget would go on the translocation. The idea raised by Cllr Barbara Green earlier in the meeting of taking 2 inches off the fairways would not achieve anything, pointing out that Site 15 is totally unimproved grassland whereas as the edge of the fairways had been cut and managed for years. He then referred to the report commissioned by TRDC which had considered Site 13 and CWHE inappropriate and Site 15 as an ideal site for a play area. This was based on children not being able to walk to CWHE. He suggested that children of 8 upwards could cycle. He moved on to the ROSPA and ecologists suggestions that if TRDC consider a site at CWHE outside the Conservation area and although still grassland it was of little ecological value.

The Chairman went on to say that the Council had heard various opinions and asked for a show of hands if it was appropriate to ask the Common Ranger for his input on the grassland issue. 13 voted in favour with 3 against. The Common Ranger was therefore invited to address the Council.

The Common Ranger explained that if the translocation of grassland was to be considered a donor site needed to be found. Cllr Barbara Green suggested Site 13, site 13 was already unimproved. The Ranger explained what had to be found for 15 was acidic and neutral. A donor site for both was required – either the same or two sites. All acidic ground was woodland. To establish a site, woodland could be felled with surveys then necessary on protected species which would incur costs. The grassland at 15 was neutral and acidic so a third donor site would be required. Acidic sites were heavily dominated by bracken and without dealing with this at a donor site before translocation it would still dominate. He explained that any chemical control of bracken was outlawed. The only method would be consistently rolling the area over a period of about 8 years which would gradually discourage the bracken; this clearly added many years to the plan. Economically it was not viable; it was not simply a question of picking it up from one area and dropping onto another. There needed to be careful consideration and expert opinion would need to be sought and it was not a simple process. Cllr John Copley suggested that regular mowing could reduce the bracken. The Ranger agreed by advised that this could change the PH soil balance. Cllr Steve Watkins asked the Ranger

the implications of going ahead, the Ranger explained that if no viable alternative was available development may be allowed but that as there were other options this was unlikely. Cllr David Raw asked for a yes or no Answer on whether it was doable. The Ranger started to respond with an explanation but Cllr David Raw insisted he make a yes or no answer to which he answered yes it could be done.

Cllr Barbara Dickens stated that someone had said that TRDC considered CWHE not to be an option. She understood if such a play area was only used by a handful but if it was used by and was accessible by the disabled it would attract children from all over TRDC. She stated that there was a real demand in this area for play facilities.

Cllr Jane White stated that she would like to know why TRDC did not like the CWHE as a site. She asked why the Common should be given up with the associated costs and time issues just because TRDC do not like it.

Cllr Tony Edwards asked Members to consider the play area at Scots Bridge. TRDC were of the view that many people had limited access to cars. Scots Bridge is located at the bottom of Scots Hill and it was viewed that many would walk from Croxley Green. He stated that the play Area at Scots Bridge is successful and suggested that there was very little difference between Scots Bridge vs Croxley Green and CWHE vs Chorleywood.

Cllr Martin Trevett stated that what he had said was questioning why in 20 years a play area had not been put at CWHE. The Common was not being given up; it was being given to the children.

Cllr Jane White stated that she had been misquoted which was not fair.

Cllr Barbara Green took up the issue of the time already taken and suggested that Chorleywood had already waited so long already that surely another year, if that was how long it would take, is not a big issue to parents. She also picked up the issue of the costs stating that TRDC had already confirmed that they would be covering the costs of the public inquiry and the reports to the Planning Inspector, further stating that it was not going to cost the parish. She stated that it would cost more money in officer time and further stated that if an officer was not prepared to spend time on this important topic then they should not be Officers. At this point Cllr Preedy interjected demanding that Cllr Barbara Green take back this unfounded stated. Cllr Barbara Green continued further to say that what the Council had was "Project Fear". She was not undermining or ignoring significant ecological issues. Cllr Jackie Worrall repeated her earlier statement that the Council had been here before on the Grazing and DEFRA had told them that they could not put up temporary fencing. It was therefore not fear but experience.

Cllr Tony Edwards interjected at this point and wished to correct a point made by Cllr Barbara Green stating that Officers at no time had said they would not spend time on these issues and that it was totally unfair to make these accusations.

Cllr Steve Watkins asked if anyone in the audience had a disabled child and stated that they were entitled to play facilities too. He quoted an example of a child in his road. He stated the in Chorleywood there were no really deprived children and therefore a new play area should have access for all.

Cllr David Raw stated that Members were doing exactly what Cllr Barbara Greed had said – Project Fear. He further stated that during the planning process, access and disability would be considered.

Cllr Martin Trevett stated that the business re fencing for the cattle had been sorted, Cllrs had laboured under the misapprehension that they needed to get permission for temporary fencing overrides the Scheme of Regulation.

Cllr Jackie Worrall said that it was not fear; years had been spent on the subject.

The Chairman, Cllr Tony Edwards then stated that the meeting had come to a point and proposed from the Chair rejecting a play area on Chorleywood Common and ask TRDC to look at a Play area in CWHE taking into account the ROSPA and Ecologists reports.

Cllr Barbara Green challenged that the vote should be a show of hands on site 15 and a show of hands for CWHE. She further stated she was outraged.

Cllr Tony Edwards stated that a proposal had been made and sought guidance on procedure from the Clerk to the Council as the Proper Officer. The Clerk stated that a proposal had been made with a proposer and if a member wanted to amend it that was possible. Cllr Barbara Green proposed the amendment to take a vote on Site 15 or CWHE asking members to consider this proposal. Cllr Martin Trevett asked if they were going to vote for a preferred Common site. Cllr Barbara Green stated that they were not talking about tabling a motion. This was a proposal; it was a provision under Standing Orders to have a show of hands. She asked why members did not want to do this. Cllr Jackie Worrall asked if they were being asked to vote twice and asked the Clerk a point of order. After further discussion a way forward was proposed by the Clerk. A proposal to reject a play area on the common, effectively 15, if carried, there was nothing stopping a new proposal. Cllr Barbara Green stated that she wanted to ensure that there was a vote for a playground somewhere. Cllr Tony Edwards stated that it was established that they were voting whether site 13 or 15 and then CWHE. He stated there was a proposal that the Council rejects a play area on Chorleywood Common and respectively suggests that TDRC consider a Play area in CWHE. Cllr Barbara Green stated that it was ridiculous. Cllr Martin Trevett proposed an amendment to accept Site 15 as a site on Chorleywood Common which was seconded by Cllr David Raw. The Clerk clarified the amendment now on the table that this Council accept Site 15 on the Common as a suitable play area for Chorleywood. Cllr Barbara Green clarified that members were being asked to vote. At this point Cllr Tony Edwards stated that in view of the confusion he would withdraw his proposal and a vote was then taken with 6 in favour, 9 against and 1 abstention and the amended proposal was recorded as failed.

Cllr Tony Edwards then reinstated his previous proposal that that the Council rejects a play area on Chorleywood Common and respectively suggest that TRDC consider a Play area in CWHE. This was seconded by Cllr Steve Watkins and the vote taken.

The Council
RESOLVED

that the Council rejects a play area on Chorleywood Common and respectively suggest that TRDC consider a Play area in CWHE
This was carried with 10 votes in favour and 6 against.

Cllr Barbara Green stated that she hoped the Council was not just rejecting a play area in Chorleywood. She respected the vote and would do everything in her power to ensure that we get this play area in CWHE.

15/90 CLOSURE

The meeting having started at 7.30pm, closed at 10.20pm

These minutes have been checked by the Chairman.

Signed Dated

These minutes have been agreed at Full Council and signed by the Chairman.

SignedDated.....