

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF ASHCHURCH RURAL PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD ON 5<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2019**

Present: Cllrs J Hargreaves JH; T Davies TD; B Cooke BC; D Garnett DG;

Pauline Clarke - Parish Clerk

Ian White – Webmaster

Jo McCauley – Volunteer Assistant to Council

Public 2

Ex. 01.06.19	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>  Cllrs Street, Shurmer and Brown	
Ex. 02.06.19	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  None	
EX. 03.06.19	<b>TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22<sup>ND</sup> May 2019</b>  Minutes were agreed and signed	
Ex.04.06.19	<b>TO NOTE SECTION 2 – ACCOUNTING STATEMENT 18/19 AGREED AT ABOVE MEETING</b>  The Statement was noted and agreed	
Ex. 05.06.19	<b>TO NOTE SECTION 3 – ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 18/19 AGREED AT ABOVE MEETING</b>  The Statement was noted and agreed	
Ex. 06.06.19	<b>TO CONSIDER VARIOUS RECENT EMAILS AND REPORTS IN REGARD TO THE NDP AND AGREE ACTION</b>  TD - Updated members with recent correspondence from Jayne Wormold TBC, who considered the NDP was not fit for purpose in its current format and Andrea Pellegram who had also studied the NDP  Members need to agree the way forward.  AP has agreed with Jayne Wormold, and has highlighted particular concerns with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence- It is not sufficient, is old and predates the JCS.</li> </ul>	

- Masterplan - should be included, and there is now new planning guidance.
- The document will have to be re-written.
- The policies are quite good but the evidence is poorly documented.

Members raised the following points:

TD- AP is willing to work with TBC in reworking the document it will then have to be reviewed, but she is unable to give costs but probably in the region of £10,000

Will have to go back to Reg 14 with a further consultation

Could get £9000 Locality funding for the review

Time scale is end of July for draft and submission by December

JH - Have asked ITP for the evidence and they can't find it, also considered the policies were driven by councillors

DG - ITP has also sent through evidence from another NDP consultation in error

TD- It is important this is now done properly as affects future funding through Cils. With a NDP we would get 25% of Tax, which is uncapped but without NDP this is only 15%. We have to get the NDP over the line. It's a powerful tool when in place, and can force TBC to comply

JH – Gives us some control on development and provides a tax to spend on the community

TD - Proposed accepting what AP has said and to go forward with some haste

DG - Should we also ask someone else to quote for work, we trusted the previous consultants, and have been let down.

TD - AP has had a lot of experience with NDP's

The Clerk noted Standing Orders state we need to get 3 different quotes for work carried out

TD - If we sought legal advice it would slow things down

	<p>TD- Clerk has provided reports and invoices which state ITP have received £17,500 since 2015, plus there is an outstanding invoice of £4000</p> <p>TD- Suggested claiming some money back from ITP, they are willing to meet with Council, noted they have never done a NDP.</p> <p>AP is approved within Locality and feels she will do work at a reasonable rate. In effect she is not preparing a new NDP but resolving problems raised from our previous consultants, and it would be difficult to get anyone else who would take this on rather than starting from scratch.</p> <p>DG- Proposed employing AP to rewrite the existing NDP, correct any errors and resolve any issues</p> <p>Seconded BC and agreed</p> <p>TD - Proposed meeting ITP to present our concerns and ask for our money back, the lack of a NDP has created a lot of Planning issues seconded BC and agreed</p> <p>DG - ITP need to demonstrate how many NDP's they have worked on and completed.</p> <p>Clerk to invite AP to next meeting</p>	<p>A: Clerk</p>
--	--	-----------------

Ex. 07.06.19	<p><b>TO NOTE ANY MATTERS ARISING NOT OTHERWISE ON THIS AGENDA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hitchins development and Community Centre</b>  Consultation is going to appeal and Hitchins have agreed to provide a community centre. To comply with planning criteria must consist of 3 sports fields plus changing rooms and showers etc.  ARPC have created a relationship with the developer which is important  TBC will need a legal agreement which specifies size, location plus car parking and storage  Will be built in approx 6-7 years after 425 houses are in place.  Has to go in s106 agreement, and design to be agreed with Parish Council  The plan includes traffic analysis, there is no objection from Highways but includes improvements to J9  There is money that we could tap into if we engage  Hitchins would facilitate pubs and retail and we need to be aware of what is going on.</li> <li>• <b>Linden Homes</b>  There is £72, 536 available in s106 finding for the Linden homes development but ARPC did not liaise with developer in the first place</li> <li>• <b>19/0038/FUL Three Ways Claydon</b>  BC expressed concern that Highways have not yet objected to this application, they objected to the previous application for 8 units   Clerk to write to Bob Ristic</li> <li>• Appeal against training centre at Newton Farm</li> <li>• Grass Cutting</li> </ul>	<p><b>A: Clerk</b></p> <p><b>Future Agenda Item</b></p> <p><b>A: Clerk Future Agenda Items</b></p>
Ex. 08.06.19	<p><b>TO NOTE DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p><b>Parish council Meeting - 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019</b></p>	
	<b>No further business – meeting ended at 8.40pm</b>	