



**CYNGOR CYMUNED YR YSTOG
CHURCHSTOKE COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

E J Humphreys MA Oxf, BA(Hons) Community Governance, FSLCC
Clerc i'r Cyngor | Clerk to the Council

2 Rows Terrace, Plough Bank, Montgomery, Powys, SY15 6QD.

**MINUTES of COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
on Thursday 16th October 2025 at 7.00pm**
at Hyssington Village Hall and remotely on Zoom-Pro platform.

1.0 Welcome, Attendance: to record attendance, and to remind attendees to show civility and respect to all, throughout the meeting in line with the obligations of the Code of Conduct.

The Chair of the Council, Cllr M J Jones, welcomed all, including several members of the public, to the meeting and reminded attendees to show civility and respect to all throughout the meeting.

Attendance at the hall: Cllr E Evans, Cllr J Jones, Cllr M J Jones, Cllr R K McLintock, Cllr A Richards, Cllr C P Smith, Cllr R K Steel, Cllr D N Yapp.

Attendance online: None.

In attendance: E J Humphreys (Clerk to the Council).

2.0 Elections of Committee Chairman & Vice-Chairman for 2025-26

2.1 Chairman: to receive nominations, to resolve the election of Committee Chairman, and the new Committee Chairman to sign the Declaration of Acceptance of Office and take the Chair. Nominations will be taken from the floor.

Council received one nomination.

RESOLVED

CCC elects to the office of Chairman of the Planning Committee as follows: Cllr M J Jones.

2.2 Vice-Chairman: to receive nominations and to resolve the election of the Committee Vice-Chairman. Nominations will be taken from the floor.

Council received one nomination.

RESOLVED

CCC elects to the office of Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee as follows: Cllr R K McLintock.

3.0 Apologies for Absence: to receive and resolve if desired on apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence approved by Council: None.

Apologies for absence received reported to Council: Cllr B L Smith, Cllr M A Whittall.

Other Members Absent: Cllr D Bebb.

4.0 Declarations of Members' Interests and Dispensations: to receive declarations of interest from Members in accordance with Part III of the Local Government Act 2000, which established the Local Government Code of Conduct for Members, and to note Members' dispensations. Members are asked to submit any declaration forms to the Clerk (papers 2a-b previously circulated).

Members declared personal/ prejudicial interests at the start/ during the meeting as follows:

Agenda Number	Item	Councillor	Nature of Declaration
None			

5.0 Public Participation: to receive members of the public who wish to address the council in respect of any item of business included in the agenda. Any member of the public wishing to speak must notify the Clerk by email to clerk@churchstoke.org or telephone 01686-668790 or in person, no later than 15 minutes prior to the start of the meeting. Members of the public addressing the council are asked to respect matters of confidentiality and privacy.
None.

Cllr J Jones joined the meeting at this point.

Cllr A Richards joined the meeting at this point.

6.0 Planning & Building Control

6.1 Planning Policy Consultation: Powys Replacement LDP (2022-2037) Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs.

6.1.1 To recap the consultation closing Wed 22nd Oct'25, now extended to 5pm Fri 31st Oct'25 (papers 6.1.1a-e previously circulated).

The Chairman referred Council to the consultation and supporting documents highlighting the six site options – 3 in Leighton, 2 in Forden, and 1 in Churchstoke. The Clerk reminded Council that the community council is a consultee and the responsibility for drafting the policy remains with the county council planning authority.

6.1.2 To receive, for information, if any, further written representations regarding the consultation.
None.

6.1.3 To report on the considerations of the community council working group meeting Tue 7th Oct'25 (paper 6.1.3 to follow previously circulated).
The Chairman referred Council to the report of the considerations of the working group.

- 6.1.4 To receive the recommendations of the working group, and to resolve a response to the consultation (paper 6.1.4 previously circulated). The Chairman referred Council to the recommendations of the working group objecting to the proposal for a gypsy/ traveller site in Churchstoke, reading each objection reason aloud, and invited Members' further comment and questions.

RESOLVED

CCC accepts the recommendations of the working group objecting to the proposal for a gypsy/ traveller site in Churchstoke, for the reasons stated in the draft response with amendments as follows,

- a) Q4: amend the impact on the local school to include a significant impact on the demographic profile of the school*
- b) Q4: add that impact will be more concentrated in Churchstoke than in the other site options*
- c) Q5: add the objecting reasons from Q4 as supporting reasons for sites 1, 2, 3 at Leighton*
- d) Q6: add a comment to invite planners to revisit the feasibility of extending the site at Leighton Arches, building up the land if necessary, on grounds of proximity to existing site*
- e) Q7: remove reference to brownfield sites*
- f) Q8: extend the answer with a reference to distance from pharmacies*
- g) Q8: add a comment to urge planners to invite comments from other public service consultees.*

Action – Clerk to process

The Chairman reminded members of the public to also register their own responses to the consultation directly with the planning authority.

[Clerk's post meeting note: for the assistance of members of the public the response is appended to these minutes].

7.0 Chair's Announcements, Items for Future Agenda & Date of Next Meeting

- 7.1 Chairman's announcements: to receive for information announcements from Chairman, Members, and the Clerk.

None.

- 7.2 Date of next meeting: Council 30th Oct'25, 7.30pm, at Churchstoke & online.

Meeting ended – 7.27pm.

APPENDIX 1: FEEDBACK FORM

How we will use your information

On 25th May 2018 the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) came into force, placing restrictions on how organisations can hold and use personal data and defining rights with regard to that data. Any personal information disclosed to us will be processed in accordance with our Privacy Notice. The Council's Planning Policy Privacy Notice can be found at:

[Planning Policy Privacy Notice - Powys County Council](https://en.powys.gov.uk/article/12891/Planning-Policy-Privacy-Notice) (<https://en.powys.gov.uk/article/12891/Planning-Policy-Privacy-Notice>)

Please note that comments made in response to this consultation paper could be made available for public inspection and cannot therefore be treated as confidential.

Have your say

Q1. Are you answering this survey as...? (Please select one option)

An individual

AN OFFICIAL RESPONSE FROM A POWYS BUSINESS, GROUP OR OTHER ORGANISATION

An elected representative of a constituency in Powys (e.g. a county, town or community Councillor, an MP or an MS)

Q2. This survey concerns the gypsy and traveller community. Do you consider yourself a gypsy or traveller?

Yes

NO

Q3. Your Details

Name:

E J HUMPHREYS

Business, Group or Other Organisation Name (if applicable):

CHURCHSTOKE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Property/Postal Address:

2 Rows Terrace,
Plough Bank,
Montgomery,
Powys.

Postcode:

SY15 6QD

Email address:

clerk@churchstoke.org

Q4. Please comment on one or more of the site options. Tick to indicate whether you support, object or have other views and provide your reasoning. Continue on a blank sheet if necessary.

** Note the site options provide indicative areas of search only. The site requirement is for an area of 1.2 ha – 2.00 ha.*

***In determining a future planning application on any site, the Local Planning Authority will be making decisions taking account of the statutory development plan and other material (relevant) considerations. See: <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/services/help/faq/planning/about-the-planning-system/what-are-material-considerations> .*

Although this is only an initial scoping stage, it is suggested that you consider how well your support/objection/comments relate to the planning merits of the proposals. Focussing on these aspects is likely to provide the most meaningful and influential feedback.

Option 1: Parcel 1 at Leighton, Welshpool

Support

Neutral

Object

Other

Please provide your reasoning:

- **Closer to a greater number of employment opportunities, town facilities, leisure and medical facilities and local police, medical/ pharmacy facilities and other emergency services at Welshpool**
- **A likely quicker, easier, and cheaper build than sites at Churchstoke and Forden**
- **The community council urges planners to use sites(s) other than greenfield site and agricultural holding for the development, with less impact on the local agricultural economy**
- **The sites are less prone to flooding than at Churchstoke**
- **Easy access to the sites**
- **No known public footpaths cross the sites**
- **Visual impact is less than that on village centres at Forden or Churchstoke**
- **Less significant change to the nature and character of villages centres than at Forden or Churchstoke**
- **Clear of proximity to a conservation area**
- **The sites are closest to the existing gypsy/ traveller site at Leighton Arches**
- **Lower impact of the site on the valued landscape and associated tourism economy**
- **Less impact of the site on future investment (employment and residential) than in Churchstoke**
- **The proposed site has privacy which the gypsy/ traveller community may prefer**
- **The impact will be less concentrated on the village than in the other site options.**

Option 2: Parcel 2 at Leighton, Welshpool

Support

Neutral

Object

Other

Please provide your reasoning:

- **Closer to a greater number of employment opportunities, town facilities, leisure and medical facilities and local police, medical/ pharmacy facilities and other emergency services at Welshpool**
- **A likely quicker, easier, and cheaper build than sites at Churchstoke and Forden**
- **The community council urges planners to use sites(s) other than greenfield site and agricultural holding for the development, with less impact on the local agricultural economy**
- **The sites are less prone to flooding than at Churchstoke**
- **Easy access to the sites**
- **No known public footpaths cross the sites**
- **Visual impact is less than that on village centres at Forden or Churchstoke**
- **Less significant change to the nature and character of villages centres than at Forden or Churchstoke**
- **Clear of proximity to a conservation area**
- **The sites are closest to the existing gypsy/ traveller site at Leighton Arches**
- **Lower impact of the site on the valued landscape and associated tourism economy**
- **Less impact of the site on future investment (employment and residential) than in Churchstoke**
- **The proposed site has privacy which the gypsy/ traveller community may prefer**
- **The impact will be less concentrated in the village than in the other site options.**

Option 3: Land Holding at Gwyns Barn, Leighton, Welshpool

Support Neutral Object Other

Please provide your reasoning:

- Closer to a greater number of employment opportunities, town facilities, leisure and medical facilities and local police, medical/ pharmacy facilities and other emergency services at Welshpool
- A likely quicker, easier, and cheaper build than sites at Churchstoke and Forden
- The community council urges planners to use sites(s) other than greenfield site and agricultural holding for the development, with less impact on the local agricultural economy
- The sites are less prone to flooding than at Churchstoke
- Easy access to the sites
- No known public footpaths cross the sites
- Visual impact is less than that on village centres at Forden or Churchstoke
- Less significant change to the nature and character of villages centres than at Forden or Churchstoke
- Clear of proximity to a conservation area
- The sites are closest to the existing gypsy/ traveller site at Leighton Arches
- Lower impact of the site on the valued landscape and associated tourism economy
- Less impact of the site on future investment (employment and residential) than in Churchstoke
- The proposed site has privacy which the gypsy/ traveller community may prefer
- The impact will be less concentrated in the village than in the other site options.

Option 4: Parcel 1 at Forden, Welshpool

Support Neutral Object Other

Please provide your reasoning:

Option 5: Parcel 2 at Forden, Welshpool

Support Neutral Object Other

Please provide your reasoning:

Option 6: Land Holding at Fir House, Churchstoke, Montgomery

Support

Neutral

OBJECT

Other

Please provide your reasoning:

The community council objects on the following grounds,

- The proposal is on a greenfield site and agricultural holding. The community council urges planners to use sites(s) for the development with less impact on the local agricultural economy
- The site is prone to flooding (photographic evidence will be submitted separately)
- Access to the site is problematic
- A public footpath crosses the site diagonally
- Adverse visual impact, out of keeping with the centre of Churchstoke village
- A significant change to the nature and character of Churchstoke village
- Proximity to a conservation area
- The site is furthest away of the six candidate sites from the existing gypsy/ traveller site at Leighton Arches
- The site is furthest away of the six candidate sites from employment opportunities, town facilities, leisure, and medical/ pharmacy facilities and local police and other emergency services at Welshpool
- Public transport links to employment opportunities, town facilities, leisure and medical facilities and local police and other emergency services at Welshpool are poor
- Sewerage infrastructure at Churchstoke is already inadequate for the village growth
- Anticipate an adverse impact of the site on the valued landscape and associated tourism economy
- Possible negative impact of the site on future investment (employment and residential) in Churchstoke
- Anticipated significant impact on the demographic profile of the local school which has turned a corner and growing in numbers
- The proposed site lacks privacy which the gypsy/ traveller community may prefer
- The impact will be more concentrated in Churchstoke than in the other site options.

Q5. Do you think one site has advantages over another/the others?

YES

No

If so, please comment on your preferred site option.

My preferred site option is:

Sites 1 to 3 at Leighton

Please provide your reasoning:

- Closer to a greater number of employment opportunities, town facilities, leisure and medical facilities and local police, medical/ pharmacy facilities and other emergency services at Welshpool
- A likely quicker, easier, and cheaper build than sites at Churchstoke and Forden
- The community council urges planners to use sites(s) other than greenfield site and agricultural holding for the development, with less impact on the local agricultural economy
- The sites are less prone to flooding than at Churchstoke
- Easy access to the sites
- No known public footpaths cross the sites
- Visual impact is less than that on village centres at Forden or Churchstoke
- Less significant change to the nature and character of villages centres than at Forden or Churchstoke
- Clear of proximity to a conservation area
- The sites are closest to the existing gypsy/ traveller site at Leighton Arches
- Lower impact of the site on the valued landscape and associated tourism economy
- Less impact of the site on future investment (employment and residential) than in Churchstoke
- The proposed site has privacy which the gypsy/ traveller community may prefer
- The impact will be less concentrated in the village than in the other site options.

Q6. Do you have other suggestions/ideas on how the Council might meet the identified needs?

YES

No

If Yes – what are your suggestions/ideas?

- The community council urges planners to consult the traveller/ gypsy community on their preferred site, especially in view of the distance of Churchstoke from existing traveller/ gypsy site at Leighton
- The community council invites planners to revisit the feasibility of extending the site at Leighton Arches, building up the land if necessary, on grounds of proximity to existing site.

Q7. Are you proposing an alternative site?

YES

No

If so, have you included a map and further details?

Yes

NO

Please ensure you have provided your contact details and use the box below to set out your reasoning/support for the alternative site:

- The community council urges planner to consider county council owned sites and suggests a site at Arddleen of approx. 3.8 acres.

Q8. Further Comments? The space below can be used for any additional comments:

- The community council is of the view that the population in Churchstoke village is concentrated in a small area compared to the sites at Leighton and Forden in which the populations are spread less densely and more widely
- The community council urges planners to reference to distance from pharmacies
- The community council urge planners to invite comments from other public service consultees.

The Welsh Language

QG. Do you have any concerns or evidence to suggest that the council is treating/using the Welsh language less favourably than English in relation to the proposal to provide a gypsy and traveller site in the Welshpool area?

YES

No

I don't know

Q10. If yes, please give details and state how the proposal suggested in this survey will affect opportunities to use the Welsh language in your view?

- The community Council is of the view that the Welsh Language in Churchstoke is vulnerable, being bordered on three sides by England, and efforts to nurture the Welsh Language in Churchstoke will be put at risk by an influx of travelling/ gypsy community.