

Minutes of the Full Council meeting held on Monday 14th September 2015 at 7.00pm in the Parish Office, Neath Hill Local Centre.

Present: Councillors; Bedford, Calverley, Crooks, Foskett, Lawar, Macaulay, Maclean, Stabler Panes (Chair), Widdowson and Windridge.

Also Present: Parish Manager, Jim Rawling (Barrats), Ian Young (Barrats) Rebecca Dougall (Barrats) Simon James DLP and two members of the public.

1. **Apologies** were accepted from Cllr Omole (working) and Cllr Dean (unwell).
2. **Resignation** from Cllr Ken Bejon was received and accepted.
3. **Declaration of members' interests** – 8.4 Cllr Calverley declared a prejudicial interest in Dragons Den and Cllr Crooks noted his involvement with Parks Trust (details declared at start of the year).
4. **Minutes of the meeting held** on the 10th August 2015 were proposed as a true record by Cllr Widdowson, seconded by Cllr Foskett and all agreed
5. **Matters arising** – (Matters Arising 08 10 15) Conniburrow Baseball Pitch - Cllr Stabler requested that as there was no response from Milton Keynes Council the Parish Manager should chase for a reply.
6. **Land at Linford Lakes - a summary of the questions and answers discussed is noted**
 - 6.1. Cllr DS – Who is the target audience of the development?
 - 6.2. IY – There is to be a mixture of housing size and type, the level of affordable housing would comply with housing policy but would be dependent on the expense of the other attributes to be agreed and provided such as the country park.
 - 6.3. SJ – The information provided is a summary of the detailed conclusions to date. Data is still being compiled. The project is at the very early stage and the parties are working through the required aspects of the development process and doing many detailed surveys.
 - 6.4. Cllr DS – there are only 6 pages about sustainable development, the report does not explain what is required to make the area sustainable.
 - 6.5. SJ – Housing will be of a mixed type but any abnormal costs would lead to a reduction in the level of affordable housing. This would be agreed with Milton Keynes Council.
 - 6.6. Cllr PW – local concern is that the facilities and services that are required by the new development are based on what currently exists and therefore will this level be able to cope with the extra population?

- 6.7. SJ – This is the authority’s decision, but for example 250 housing equates to a contribution of £3 million for education. Using this money is the responsibility of the Authority. This is a small development and developers will provide monies that the authority requires, this then leads to developers ensuring that there is a level of viability in terms of what the developer can pay for the needs of the community.
- 6.8. Cllr Lawar – what percentage of the development will the country park be?
- 6.9. SJ - 12 hectares built development, the country park will be 69 hectares.
- 6.10. Cllr TB – the report does not address the environmental impact, what is being done to consider this?
- 6.11. SJ – The document provided deals with the general reference and summary. Ecological surveys have been started, they have to be carried out for a whole year to ensure the cycle of all plants and animals has been studied. Barrat’s will review where the ecological sensitivity lies and where the impact of development affects the areas and thus what solutions can be introduced, there is a lot more work to be completed.
- 6.12. Cllr AC - who has identified that there is a need for another country park?
- 6.13. SJ – The old local plan identified this area as a country park area, Milton Keynes Council have been seeking public access for many years in this area. Working with partners MKC wished to see how this country park could be developed. Parks Trust had visions of the use of this area as a country park but the exact use had not been defined.
- 6.14. IY – after the first consultation it was evident that the Parks Trust thoughts and the local people’s ideas for the area were very different.
- 6.15. Cllr KP – GLPC was asked by MKC to provide views on the development. GLPC had produced a policy to judge the principles of any new development, this was as a result of the cumulative effect that was noted from the allowance by MKC of lots of separate small developments. Collectively they were having a negative impact on the environment. GLPC reviewed the impacts of all developments in terms of education, transport, health etc. and also the contrivances of some MKC policies. MKC are the planning authority, GLPC are not, in this case, the statutory consultee but our communities are affected by these developments. We would welcome more detail and information.
- 6.16. Cllr DS – Where is the evidence and examples of sustainability is this development?
- 6.17. SJ – We are at an early stage in engagement – what constraints, ecology or otherwise will have to understand the aspects and see how it is to be managed long term.
- 6.18. Cllr JM – What is the time scale of this development, when will the planning applications be seen?
- 6.19. SJ – As the ecology survey needs 12 months’ worth of data, the plans will not be for another 12 to 18 months or sooner if the ecology work already started is used.
- 6.20. IY – Public consultation event – to reiterate the original consultation suggested that people did not want a “bells and whistles” country park , Barratt’s need to understand the needs of the local people – e.g. Daventry where a Drs surgery has been funded

The Chair closed the session and opened it up to the public.

7. **Public Question Time** – one member of the public raised their concerns about the development

Cllr Crooks asked Cllrs to consider that in the MKC Strategic review there is to be an increase in population that will make Milton Keynes the same size as Nottingham. There is a need to build 1700 houses a year. MKC will have to discuss building strategy with neighbourhood councils. MK2050 are an outside group looking at the economic viability of building homes and jobs in several larger towns. Cllr Crooks requested that in January 2016 the Monday Council meeting should review the site allocation, planmk and the core 2033. It was agreed that this should be a future meeting topic.

8. **Finance**

- 8.1. Cllr Widdowson proposed the retrospective agreement of the August payments. This was seconded by Cllr Foskett and all agreed.
- 8.2. Cllr Stabler proposed that a grant of £400 be awarded to the Food Bank for the St Ledger Court emergency shelter. This was seconded by Cllr Macaulay and agreed by all.
- 8.3. It was proposed by Cllr Stabler that the parish council should be an Associate member of the Bus Group and that Cllr Windridge would be the GLPC representative. This was seconded by Cllr Foskett and agreed by all.
- 8.4. It was proposed by Cllr Stabler and seconded by Cllr Foskett that Cllrs should formally agree the “in principle decision” made relating to the Dragons Den process. All applications were vetted and deemed compliant to the process. Due to the lack of applications that were entered the process of a public vote was not required and thus each group was awarded the monies they had requested. Monies were awarded to;
- 8.4.1. *Two Mini grants upto £500*
- Peartree Pond Association - £483.94 for an outdoor chequer board with giant chess and draught pieces.
 - Great Linford Football Club - £450.00 to enable funding for up to 5 children from low income families to be able to participate in the game.
- 8.4.2. *One Midi grant up to £750*
- Peartree Pond Association - £750.00 to replace the old Pilgrim’s Bottle pub sign to a ‘Great Linford Local Centre’ sign.
- 8.4.3. *One Maxi grant up to £1500*
- Redhouse Park Residents Association - £1,500.00 to provide infrastructure costs for the successful running of the group.

This was agreed by all.

9. **Governance**

- 9.1. Staffing - a report was presented by Cllr Maclean. It was suggested by the Chair that the next step was to make this a formal project looking at ; resourcing, pension provision, the office structure in relation to the activities required and also clarification of Cllr and

resident expectation of the parish office. Cllr Maclean volunteered to lead the project, Cllr Windridge, Cllr Lawar and Cllr Widdowson would support. This was agreed by council.

9.2. Neighbourhood Plan INTU and CMK Town Council

9.2.1. Cllr Stabler proposed that GLPC should write to the National Planning Casework Unit supporting the request by CMK Town Council that the planning application 15/01014/OUT is called in by the Secretary of State. This was seconded by Cllr Foskett. Voting was 9 for, 0 against, 1 abstention.

9.2.2. Cllr Panes proposed that GLPC writes to the Secretary of DCLG regarding the power and status of neighbourhood plans within local planning policies. This was seconded by Cllr Bedford and all agreed.

9.2.3. Cllr Stabler proposed in principle that GLPC would consider supporting the cost of a judicial review of planning application 15/01014. This was seconded by Cllr Foskett, a vote held was 3 for: 6 against and 1 abstention. The proposal was defeated.

9.3. SPD for Parking Standards Cllr Calverley summarised the meeting that he had attended and the points of interest in the SPD. The report identified the recommendations that GLPC should agree to and which would form the basis of the reply to the consultation. In addition to the recommendations from Cllr Calverley, Cllr Stabler proposed that a Use Class C3 Dwelling (house) and Use Class C4 HiMO should have the same standards plus the number of parking requirements. This was seconded by Cllr Widdowson and agreed by all.

9.4. Annual report the Parish Manager reported that the External Auditor had returned the Annual Return with no comments.

10. **Projects**

10.1. Art project - it was noted that the Arts Council grant had not been successful and therefore a proposal for a smaller number of art pieces to meet the budget available is planned for completion July 2016.

11. **Planning**

11.1. **Report on Planning Progress** – the report was circulated by Cllr Stabler there were no questions.

11.2. **Planning Applications**

11.2.1. Conniburrow HiMOs – Cllr Stabler recommended refusal of these planning applications as they fail to satisfy one or all of the four criteria:

- I. Failure to show that noise mitigation measures are provided.
- II. Failure to provide the minimum on-plot off street parking required in the schedule.

For 5/6 lettable rooms in Zone A this will be 3 spaces.

- Or elsewhere within properly laid out parking spaces, in the highway fronting the site.
- III. Failure to provide cycle storage: 1 space per bedroom e.g. 5/6 spaces to be provided.
 - IV. Failure to provide a 15m square bin storage area and space for a whirligig clothes dryer.
 - V. Evidence that concentration of not more than 35% has been exceeded, although GLPC does not have the mapping ability to prove this in all cases.
 - VI. Evidence that sandwiching s of dwellings between 2 HiMOs is occurring.

This was seconded by Cllr Calverley and agreed by all.

- 11.2.2. 15/01864/FUL Ash House, The Wharf No comment was proposed by Cllr Stabler, seconded by Cllr Bedford agreed by all.
- 11.2.3. 15/01806/FUL 8 Orne Gardens No comment was proposed by Cllr Stabler, seconded by Cllr Bedford agreed by all.
- 11.2.4. 15/01312/FUL The Cross and Stable Objection was proposed by Cllr Stabler and seconded Cllr Calverley due to highway and parking policy grounds and as there is insufficient information to make a full considered response. This was agreed by all.
- 11.2.5. 15/01803/FUL 33 Rowsham Dell Conditions on acceptance of this application was proposed by Cllr Stabler. If MKC were minded to approve the development then the full wording of the following condition should be applied, without it GLPC would object to the application. *“Planning permission hereby granted shall restrict any use of the flat roof of the pool house or wet room for access only, for the sole purposed of maintain the roof, up stands, flashing or the lantern and cleaning the lantern glazing.”* This was seconded by Cllr Calverley and all agreed.
- 11.2.6. 15/01867/FUL 4 Beauchamp close Neath Hill Conditions on acceptance of this applications was proposed by Cllr Stabler and seconded by Cllr Maclean. If MKC were minded to approve the development then the full wording of the following condition be applied, without which GLPC would object to the application. *The single-storey extension hereby permitted shall be used solely as ancillary accommodation to №4 Beauchamp Close. And solely be used by members of the household residing at the premises and shall not be let or sub-let, or transferred separately from the main dwelling.*
- 11.2.7. 15/01989/FUL Land at Glazier Drive - deferred

12. Community and correspondence

- 12.1. Great Linford Manor Park Heritage lottery fund bid – Cllr Panes noted that the previous letter was sent to Parks Trust in support of their bid.

12.2. Cross and Stable Management Committee - it was noted that Cllr Maclean is the GLPC representative on this committee.

13. **The dates and topics** for the next three meetings were proposed as acceptable by Cllr Calverley seconded by Cllr Bedford and agreed by all.

- | | | | |
|-------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 13.1. | Full Council Meeting | 30 th September | planning and monthly business |
| 13.2. | Full Council Meeting | 12 th October | Strategic plan and future projects |
| 13.3. | Full Council Meeting | 21 st October | planning and monthly business |

The meeting was closed at 21:20pm

Chair _____ Date _____

DRAFT