

TWIGWORTH PARISH COUNCIL
AGENDA
OF MEETING TO BE HELD AT 2.15PM ON 18th August 2026
IN THE DOWN HATHERLEY VILLAGE HALL

<https://twigworthparishcouncil.gov.uk/>

1.	Welcome by Chair of Council
2.	Attendance to be recorded (anticipated as Parish Councillors Rick Harris, George Sharpley, Graham Bocking & Mike Davies) Members of the public
3.	Apologies to be received and recorded from Parish Councillors Council to note the legal process regarding Apologies from Parish Councillors to be APPROVED where a dispensation request has been made prior to the meeting and The Council agree the reasons for the dispensation request are appropriate to LGA 1972 s85
4.	Council to invite Declaration of Interest regarding matters on the agenda. Any Councillor declaring an interest in matters on the agenda should not take part in the decision-making process for that item (further advice available from the monitoring officer at TBC)
5.	Members of the Public (and Councillors who have declared an interest) to be invited to speak to the Council and then are invited to observe the remainder of the meeting (The period of time designated for public participation at a meeting in accordance with standing order 3(e) shall not exceed 15 minutes unless directed by the chairman of the meeting)
6.	Council to note that following resignation of John Redfern, the legal requirements for a bye-election have been met. The election date has been set as 24 th September 2026. The PC are responsible for costs of a bye-election The PC have been given a provisional cost summary for a contested election Election costs with polling cards £3567 (without polling cards less £1100) Portacabin costs with generator £4099 (without generator less £1041) Site fee TBA Therefore the Parish Council are potentially exposed to costs in the region £8k Council to consider financial reports attached Council to agree if it wishes to using polling cards Council to consider vire the “building” fund to election costs
7.	Minutes of previous meeting held on 2 nd July 2026 to be agreed for accuracy- amended from initial publication
8.	Council to agree its response to the Church Commissioners consultation on selling part of the churchyard and the church building (deadline 24/8/26) https://www.churchofengland.org/resources/parish-reorganisation-and-church-property/consultation-parish-reorganisation-and-closed-church-proposals/proposal-affecting-closed-church draft response attached for the Council’s consideration
9.	Date of next meeting confirmed as Thursday 3 rd September 2026 Council to note that the proposed meeting on May 6 th 2027 cannot take place due to statutory Parish Council elections (all Parish Councillors will be re-elected). There is a legal requirement for Council to agree alternative date between 10 th to 24 th May 2027
10.	Close of meeting

budget to date	budget	Year to date receipt/ spend	BALANCE AVAILABLE TO SPEND
PRECEPT	36000	18000	
grants		0	
CIL		4099	
INCOME	36000	22099	17000
EMPLOYMENT COSTS	17000	0	625
ADMIN	625	0	400
INSURANCE	400	0	0
previous HMRC underpayment		0	
WEBSITE & emails	115	0	115
SUBSCRIPTIONS	500	0	500
repairs and replacements	500	0	500
EQUIPMENT (CAPITAL)	1200	0	1200
VENUE HIRE	350	0	350
AUDIT	500	0	500
TRAINING	200	0	200
PAYROLL COSTS	175	0	175
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	630	0	630
LCA	0		0
VAS	400		400
VILLAGE GATEWAYS	2500		2500
ENVIRONMENT POLICY	0		0
NEWSLETTERS	0		0
WASTE BINS	500		500
TRO FOR 20MPH			
property	10000		
Expenditure	35595	0	
contingency/balance	405	22099	
expenditure	36000	22099	25595

<u>reserves</u>	Mar-22	Mar-23	Aug-23	Mar-24	Mar-25	Mar-26
defib	3145	871	3277	2500	1000	1000
SWAG			575	575	575	575
PRECEPT		1500	1500	2500	2500	5000
EQUIPMENT			200	200	1000	2700
VAS					400	800
BUS SHELTERS			3000	300	300	300
NDP	585	585	585	585	585	585
contingency				500	500	500
building						
general	-846	4639	9386	59	735	4063
waste bins						500
village gateways						2500
bank balance at Y/E	2884	7595	18523	7219	7595	18523

It is anticipated that Council will be able to move £10k into reserves at the end of the financial year from the “building” cost centre. Council may wish to vire this sum to election costs at the September meeting

Draft Response from Twigworth Parish Council to the document provided by the Church of England Church Commissioners titled

EXPLANATORY NOTE
MISSION AND PASTORAL MEASURE 2011
DRAFT PASTORAL CHURCH BUILDINGS SCHEME
TWIGWORTH ST MATTHEW
DIOCESE OF GLOUCESTER

27th July 2026

Background / Preamble

The fabric of the building that is St Matthew's Church was left largely untended for several years prior to its closure in 2020. Whilst the closure of the church as an active place of worship was understandable given the attendances at the time, it did not seem to have taken into account the major increase in the population of the village from 2020 and ongoing (fivefold and more). It was also the parish church of Longford, which has also seen a significant rise in its population.

In the years leading up to the closure, there was minimal consultation with local people, or contact with Twigworth Parish Council, and it is a major regret that opportunities to secure Section 106 monies from the developments to restore the building and develop a village amenity were missed: it is understood that discussions took place between the Church and Tewkesbury Borough Council regarding Section 106 monies, to which the local Parish Council and residents were not party.

Two points of fact in response to remarks under 'Background' on page 1:

"There is development in this area and it was hoped that this would help swell the church attendance but unfortunately for Twigworth the main focus of the development lies away from this linear village and correspondingly most people look to Longlevens rather than Twigworth."

1. St Matthew's Church closed before the new housing sites were built.
2. "The main focus of the development lies away from this linear village and correspondingly most people look to Longlevens rather than Twigworth": With regard to what? We do not understand what is meant by this statement.

Response to the Current proposals

The prospect of restoration and a use for the building is broadly welcomed.

However, there are significant caveats which we believe the Church Commissioners should act upon, and where appropriate formally include in any transfer.

1. The building is one of precious few that reflect the history of the village. While it is very much welcomed that the purchaser has expressed an intention to preserve the character and charm of the original building, we feel that this should be formally stipulated in a covenant by the seller so that it remains in place for future owners.
2. The purchaser intends the building to be occupied as a single dwelling for one family. That too is welcomed, but again it is critical that this is formalized by covenant by the seller. The reasons for this:
 - i. The churchyard is still active. Relatives regularly visit the churchyard, not only of the recently deceased but also those who died longer ago. Multiple occupancy or an increase in dwellings (e.g. several apartments) would without doubt impact upon the churchyard in an unacceptably negative way.
 - ii. The narrow private road running alongside the churchyard, sometimes referred to as 'Church Lane', whose entrance/exit is on a bend of the A38, cannot take a substantial increase in traffic without its use becoming significantly more dangerous.

Parking/garden

We report local people's shock and deep concern about the proposed space for parking/garden. It includes four burial sites from the last ten years, which are regularly visited by relatives, including one visited frequently by the deceased's parents. Very close to the space outlined in the proposal are several other very recent graves.

As the intention of the purchaser is to build a single dwelling, we believe that such space does not have to be anything like as large. We respectfully remind the Church Commissioners that the churchyard is a much cherished area for both the villages of Twigworth and Longford.

We note that The Rectory, which is close by and also under the supervision of the Church Commissioners, is now vacant, and has a plentifully large area for parking.

Construction traffic

We ask the Church Commissioners that the vacant Rectory car park be made available to the purchaser during construction for construction support, such as building supplies, skips, vehicles, and other machinery, and such items are not stored in the churchyard (unless it is within the footprint of the church building itself), or in the lane or in front of the church by the A38.

The lane is used by residents of the adjacent properties, and their rights to come and go should not be impeded.

Ancillary buildings

We note that the footprint of the church building is very large and so question the need for ancillary buildings. We ask what these buildings are intended for.

In sum

We ask the Church Commissioners to respect local feelings and sensitivity for the churchyard and take steps to ensure a minimum of interruption or negative impact; and to address concerns listed above formally and properly.

Two covenants are needed, as already mentioned, one to protect the character of the building, and the other to ensure the dwelling is a single one for one family's occupation. It is much welcomed that both are the intention of the current purchaser, but it needs to be formalized for ongoing occupiers.

Twigworth Parish Council
July 2026

TWIGWORTH PARISH COUNCIL
Draft minutes

OF MEETING HELD AT 2.45PM ON 21ST JULY 2026
IN THE DOWN HATHERLEY VILLAGE HALL
<https://twigworthparishcouncil.wordpress.com>

1.	Welcome by Chair of Council
2.	Attendance recorded as Parish Councillors Rick Harris, George Sharpley & Graham Bocking & Mike Davies 2 Members of the public
3.	No Apologies received from Parish Councillors Council noted the legal process regarding Apologies from Parish Councillors to be APPROVED where a dispensation request has been made prior to the meeting and The Council agree the reasons for the dispensation request are appropriate to LGA 1972 s85
4.	Council noted the resignation of John Redfern and the steps taken for the handover of Council assets
5.	Council no reports were received from County Councillor and Borough Councillors
6.	Minutes of previous meeting held on 2 nd July 2026 agreed for accuracy- noting amended from initial publication
7.	Council invited Declaration of Interest for matters on the agenda - none
8.	Members of the Public were invited to speak to the Council and then were invited to observe the remainder of the meeting (The period of time designated for public participation at a meeting in accordance with standing order 3(e) shall not exceed 15 minutes unless directed by the chairman of the meeting) - It was agreed members of the public would be invited to join in at the appropriate agenda item - Overnight closure of M5 junctions in the vicinity noted has caused speeding and concern on the A38 - Council discussed speed watch training and future TRO schemes - Motorbikes on a specific night causes concern and DHPC are seeking guidance from speed watch team at GCC Public session closed at 15.00
9.	Council considered updates on upgrade (using CIL) to brick bus shelter outside Orchard Park agreed actions Council to seek alternative quotes for repair and Clerk to obtain quote for new Perspex shelter including Information board for new communities to be included and bring to Council in September 2026 Roof is safe at current time, removing roof and putting a flat roof on top
10.	Council considered using a planning consultant and the logistics and cost implications - Clerk advised on process, cost and budget implications - Council considered potential future developments across parishes - Council considered a working party joining with DHPC/Longford - Clerk to seek tendering of professional planning advising, to support the pc in their responses to large planning applications (to be defined) and strategic developments on a retained basis.
11.	Council considered outstanding planning matters and agreed comments to be submitted by the Clerk - note for information: The application reference is provided to enable Councillors to prepare for the meeting and not for pre-determination of a decision. Decisions must be taken at legally convened meetings, S106 “wish list” discussed 26/00524/OUT - Manor Farm Sandhurst Lane Sandhurst Gloucester (170) OBJECT Council expressed concerns over the planned infrastructure upgrades stated by the Developer including sewage infrastructure and the specific methods stated in the developers documents and Council request a grampian condition should be included that no properties should be occupied before the date stated in their documents, anticipated as 2028 (as in condition 12 of Chestnut Tree Farm- 24/00457/FUL and subsequent planning appeal decision APP/G1630/W/23/3326538/ ref 22/01343/OUT summarised as new houses may not be connected to the public sewage network until the sewage network has been upgraded) relating to the works specified in the planning application The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that a development should be genuinely sustainable and supported by sufficient infrastructure. In five years the village has grown from 170 dwellings to over 1200, with virtually no improvements to the infrastructure. Sewerage capacity

The sewerage system is frequently bursting through manholes and flooding into public spaces. In times of heavy or persistent rain surface-water infiltrates the network causing an overload.

The Manor House at the corner of Sandhurst Lane and the A38 (adjacent to the proposed site) is regularly revisited by sewage spilling right across their entire property.

There is talk of a Severn Trent upgrade, but no dates are given. A further 170 houses here will inevitably exacerbate problems faced by many other homes in the neighbourhood.

- **HSE advise against granting planning permission in this case due to high risk of harm to people**
- NDP of 2011 is not reflected in this application, specifically the fact that there should be no development and open spaces should be maintained land west of the A38
- Council are concerned over the construction traffic turning in and off the A38 and the ongoing traffic issues especially when the M5 is closed
- Construction method statement should include strict rules regarding mud on the highway.
- Flooding risks in flood zone 3 and surface water flooding risks noted and displaced water will need to go somewhere else. Existing flood meadows will be taken away and Cox's Brook will not be able to cope with volume of water in a flood situation, especially if the valves where it joins Hatherley Brook are constantly closed
- NDPPF raises the issue of land that can be used to safeguard, manage and alleviate flood risks are being taken away

26/00547/OUT parcel 4100 tewkesbury road twigworth (100) Planning application for land west of A38- Council agreed to object based on the following:

Council expressed concerns over the planned infrastructure upgrades stated by the Developer including sewage infrastructure, anticipated as 2028 (as in condition 12 of Chestnut Tree Farm- 24/00457/FUL and subsequent planning appeal decision APP/G1630/W/23/3326538/ ref 22/01343/OUT summarised as new houses may not be connected to the public sewage network until the sewage network has been upgraded) relating to the works specified in the planning application. The developers stated in their public presentation –“OFWAT is planning to upgrade Twigworths sewage and drainage system so that it is capable of sustaining new homes” We do not believe that there is a guaranteed programme or date for this works – Therefore the implication is that the current system is not capable of sustaining any more new homes and the Council request a grampian condition should be included that no properties should be occupied before the upgrades stated in their presentation are completed

Flooding

The government flood-risk map shows how much the proposed site is at risk of flooding from the River Severn; and then the map for surface-water flooding shows even more parts of the site at risk. Flood Zone 3 (maximum fluvial risk) even enters the site in the northwest corner. This is based on the record of actual flooding in 2007. The rest of the site is very close to Flood Zone 3, and there is very little gradient between the two. If flooding is to get worse after 2007 due to climate change, then there is nowhere for the water to go.

It may be that the new houses can be built on raised imported hard core; but the loss of what Ivor Gurney called Gloucestershire's 'water meadows' to soak up the water, both fluvial and pluvial, will have an inevitable impact off site.

The NPPF states that new development must be safe for its lifetime and *must not increase flood risk elsewhere* (Planning and flood risk 170). Given the vulnerability to flooding and its closeness to Flood Zone 3, it is impossible to see how such a development built on raised imported hardcore (for all the attenuation ponding and permeable areas) will not increase risk elsewhere.

The National Planning Policy (2.1.3) states that the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. There clearly are areas with a lower probability of flooding than this one; but in Twigworth, almost all of them have been or are being developed already.

	Sewerage capacity The sewerage system is frequently bursting through manholes and flooding into public spaces. In times of heavy or persistent rain surface-water infiltrates the network causing an overload. An additional 100 houses connected to the sewer that leads to the pumping station at the entrance to Wallsworth Lane will have a horrendous impact on a pumping station that already floods Wallsworth Lane and nearby houses and businesses with sewage in time of heavy or persistent rain. This pumping station now receives sewage from the north and the west, as well as the south, and from here it travels east to the pumping station in Ash Lane, which has its own record of flooding people's houses and gardens. Our understanding is that there are no fixed plans for upgrading the sewerage network. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that a development should be genuinely sustainable and supported by sufficient infrastructure. In five years the village has grown from 170 dwellings to over 1200, with virtually no improvements to the infrastructure. • NDP of 2011 is not reflected in this application, specifically the fact that there should be no development and open spaces should be maintained land west of the A38 • Council are concerned over the construction traffic turning in and off the A38 and the ongoing traffic issues especially when the M5 is closed • Construction method statement should include strict rules regarding mud on the highway. S106 list to be requested – better pavements, controlled crossing , bus shelters, litter bins, community building, TRO to reduce speed on the A38
12.	Date of next meeting confirmed as Thursday 3rd September 2026 Agreed EOM to be arrange to discuss Twigworth church consultation
13.	Close of meeting 16.01