

MUCH HADHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Much Hadham Parish Council meeting held on Monday, 5th December 2016, in the Much Hadham Village Hall Green Room, following the close of the Much Hadham Parish Council Planning Committee meeting.

Cllr W Compton
*Cllr I Hunt (Vice Chairman)
*Cllr B Morris
Cllr Mrs M O'Neill
*Cllr W O'Neill

*Cllr C Thompson
*Cllr K Twort
*Cllr Mrs P Taylor (Chairman)
*Cllr Mrs J Liversage

* denotes present.

In attendance: F Forth, Parish Clerk and 14 members of the public.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr M O'Neill, Cllr W Compton and Cllr G McAndrew (HCC).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr K Twort declared an interest in a cheque to be approved under agenda item 13(i) and therefore would not be voting on the motion to approve the payments. No other declarations made.

3. NOTIFICATIONS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

4. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) Next meeting

The Chair highlighted that the next meeting would be on Tuesday 10th January 2017 due to Christmas. In addition, it was reported that dates for all 2017 meetings are now detailed on the website.

5. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Following an amendment to item 10(ii), it was RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 1st November 2016 be accepted as a correct record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chairman.

Amendment: to add in “Cllr B Morris pointed out it was a planning matter and not a footpath matter.”

6. REPORTS ON OUTSTANDING MATTERS

Report on outstanding matters noted.

7. MEMBERS' REPORTS

(i) Community

Cllr K Twort reported that a quote from EG Brett Ltd had been received for the treatment of the woodworm at the Pavilion amounting to £425.00. RESOLVED to accept this quote. Subsequent monitoring will be required to ensure that there is no further infestation.

Cllr B Morris raised whether any contractor working on the playground needs to be DBS checked prior to undertake work. This will be investigated.

An update on the main swing was provided by Cllr K Twort. The swing has been cordoned off until repairs can be organised. Current quote received is for £600.00 therefore, in accordance with Financial Regulations, a further 2 quotes required.

In terms of the shower mats for the Pavilion, further information and quotes to be obtained prior to a decision being made.

Cllr W O'Neill highlighted that the Village Hall Green Room floor had been subject to a number of delays but it is scheduled to be progressed this month with the cement floor being laid. The floor covering will be laid in January. Confirmation has been received that the grant is still available despite the delays incurred. The Village Hall continues to be used for events.

It was also clarified that the lights down the side of the Village Hall are sound detection ones. PIR sensor lights would be better but currently not considered a priority by the Village Hall Management Committee.

(ii) Environment (inc Public Rights of Way)

Public Rights of Way

Cllr B Morris provided an update on the state of PRoW in the parish.

(iii) Highways

Cllr W O'Neill provided an update. Regular inspections of street lights are continuing with faults being reported and fixed, when possible, with reasonable promptness. Work is progressing on the modernisation of the parish light system.

Microsurfacing will be carried out in the near future in Ash Meadow and Ferndale.

(iv) Media

None.

(v) Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr I Hunt provided an update on the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Work continues in identifying suitable sites and the work on assessing housing mix is now at a stage where policies can be drafted. Priorities for the coming months link towards preparing for the next public consultation.

Total spend to date on the Neighbourhood Plan remains at £1,885. The next meeting will be in the New Year but a date and venue has not yet been fixed.

(vi) Security

Cllr Mrs J Liversage reported that, based on the latest Police crime statistics, Much Hadham continues to be a safe place to live. However, there have been reports of poachers driving over crops, and the police have requested help and support from the public in relation to this matter.

Defibrillator

Cllr Mrs J Liversage had been unable to arrange a presentation in relation to defibrillators. However, video links to presentations are available and these will be circulated together with a relevant paper from the British Heart Foundation.

(vii) Other

None.

8. PARISH COUNCIL 3 YEAR PLAN

Progress has been made in respect of street lighting as referred to earlier.

Issues with car parking at the Village Hall raised and agreed that this should be discussed further between the Parish Council and the Village Hall Management Committee.

In reference to an incident near the school, it was highlighted that there is a lollipop vacancy.

9. REPORTS FROM COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS

(i) Report from District Councillor (Cllr I Devonshire)

Cllr I Devonshire read a prepared report in respect of the proposed development at Gilston/North of Harlow (see Appendix A).

(ii) Report from County Councillor (Cllr G McAndrew)

Cllr G McAndrew was not present at the meeting.

10. PARISH COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO EAST HERTS COUNCIL'S DRAFT DISTRICT PLAN

Cllr I Hunt outlined the proposed Parish Council's response to EHC's draft District Plan. Following discussion, it was RESOLVED that the response, as outlined in Appendix B, be approved.

Recorded vote:

- For: Cllr C Thompson, Cllr W O'Neill, Cllr Mrs P Taylor, Cllr I Hunt, Cllr K Twort and Cllr Mrs J Liversage
- Against: Cllr B Morris
- Abstained: None

11. RESIDENTS' COMMENTS

(i) Church Lane

In response to a question relating to road sweeping in Church Lane, this matter will be raised with Highways.

(ii) Transport modelling

Reference was made to the predictive modelling undertaken in relation to transport and query raised as to what this showed for Much Hadham. This is to be identified.

12. PLANNING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 1st November 2016 be received and the decisions taken be ratified.

13. PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT

(i) Payment of Accounts

RESOLVED that the accounts, as shown overleaf, be duly authorised for payment.

PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS - DECEMBER 2016

Chq	Payable to	For	Amount
714	Miss M Johns (For J Johns)	Pavilion cleaning	60.00
715	H Simmons	Hedge cutting opposite green at Green Tye	350.00
716	K Twort	Reimbursement dog fouling signs	58.00
717	Propotec Ltd	Survey inspection Pavilion (woodworm)	72.00
718	Broadmead Leisure Ltd	2x playground inspections	120.00
719	Davmoor Ltd	Pavilion cupboard for electrics	50.00
720	Green Tye Mission Hall	Hall hire 1st October 2016	27.00
721	Mr T Walker	Grass cutting etc	610.00
722	Abel Alarm Company	Call out fee - net offset by SA	96.00
723	FM Forth	Clerks expenses Invoice 4 (Stationery & postage)	52.91
724	FM Forth	Clerk's salary 22/8/16 to 30/11/16	1,848.22
Total payments			<u>3,344.13</u>

Cheques will be signed and despatched at the conclusion of the meeting.

(ii) Financial Statement

The financial statement was received. There were no matters to highlight.

Cllr Mrs J Liversage appointed to review the mid-year bank reconciliations in accordance with Financial Regulations.

RESOLVED that the Business Saver Account held with Barclays be closed in line with the recommendation made in Internal Audit's 2015/16 report, since this account is no longer used by the Parish Council.

(iii) Internal Audit

The recommendations made by Internal Audit for 2015/16 have been addressed.

14. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

15. CLERK'S INFORMATION

None.

16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 10 January 2017, at 7.30 pm in the Much Hadham Village Hall.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 22:07 pm.

DRAFT

GILSTON / NORTH OF HARLOW PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Planning for a sufficient level of infrastructure to support development forms an integral part of the District Plan process. The Plan itself contains a considerable amount of information with regards to the type of infrastructure that will be required, however much of the detail is contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), the first version of which is available on the Council's website: <http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/idp>. This document has been prepared following extensive discussions with service and utilities providers as well as site promoters. In addition to identifying specific infrastructure schemes, the IDP seeks to provide information regarding costings (where currently available) and phasing. The Council recognises that ensuring delivery of infrastructure schemes when they are required, in tandem with housing delivery, is essential.

The Council has worked closely throughout the plan making process with our neighbouring authorities (Harlow, Epping Forest and Uttlesford as well as Hertfordshire and Essex County Councils), in order to consider how new and upgraded infrastructure should be delivered to support growth in the wider Harlow area (including the proposed Gilston Area development within East Herts). With regards to highways, the partnering authorities have undertaken transport modelling work which has identified the strategic schemes that will be required over the Plan period. These include upgrades to Junctions 7 and 8 of the M11, a new Junction 7a, a second crossing of the River Stort and widening of the existing crossing, as well as upgrades to various junctions within Harlow. It is important to note that East Herts and our neighbouring authorities are all still at the plan making stage. As such, the highways schemes identified above are also still being planned for (with the exception of upgrades to Junction 7 which was identified previously and funding has already approved by Highways England). However, all schemes are costed and are considered to be deliverable. The Council will be signing a Memorandum of Understanding with its partnering authorities (and Highways England) which will confirm that the various bodies will work together in order to deliver these schemes at the stage that they are required.

The challenges facing Princess Alexandra Hospital are well known and the partnering authorities have engaged with the hospital trust in order to consider a suitable location for a relocated facility in the Harlow area. Ultimately however, the deliverability of such a scheme is reliant on Government funding, a decision on which is expected in the near future.

With regards to rail capacity, discussions have taken place throughout the plan making process with the relevant Train Operating Companies and Network Rail. Hertfordshire County Council has also recently updated its Rail Strategy which influences how train services can adapt to growing demand. The need for additional capacity on the Liverpool Street line has been highlighted through several mechanisms and the four-tracking of the line between the Tottenham Hale and Broxbourne areas has been included in Network Rail's recently published Anglia Route Study, March 2016. This currently anticipates potential commencement between 2019-2024.

In addition to the issues above, the IDP identifies a range of other infrastructure schemes that will be required to support planned growth. Often on larger sites, such as the Gilston Area, these schemes will be delivered directly by the developers. Planning permission for these sites will not be granted unless there is certainty of these schemes coming forward at the time that they are needed. These requirements include new schools and healthcare services as well as community facilities, utilities infrastructure and public open space.

The Council is continuing to work closely with the relevant organisations, and as such, an updated, more detailed version of the IDP will be prepared and submitted to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the District Plan in March 2017. In the meantime, any comments on the District Plan can be submitted as part of the current Pre-Submission consultation which closes on 15th December. All comments received will be considered by an independent Inspector at an Examination who will decide whether the Plan is 'sound' (i.e. fit for purpose). It is currently expected that the Examination will take place in Summer 2017.

Cllr. Ian Devonshire

5th. December 2016

DRAFT

MUCH HADHAM PARISH COUNCIL – RESPONSE TO PRE-SUBMISSION DISTRICT PLAN CONSULTATION

The Examiner will be looking to see if the Plan meets the four tests of soundness i.e. that it is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The definition of this last test is that “the Plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the framework” (meaning the NPPF).

It will be an ongoing requirement through the plan period that the district council can demonstrate that it has a 5 year supply of land for housing development. The Plan goes out to 2033 and, on past performance, it should be anticipated that this requirement is not achieved every single year.

The Plan does not have a policy for what the district council would do in those circumstances. However, in such cases, the NPPF applies and, as we have seen, in practice this means that development approvals become much more heavily weighted towards villages and rural areas*. This is in breach of the strategic objectives to favour development in the main settlements i.e. the most sustainable locations. There, planning approvals are more likely to match jobs with housing, they have less impact on natural habitats and facilities, and services can more easily be reached by walking, cycling and public transport so they require less use of cars.

It would be prudent for the Plan to ensure it is still able to meet its own strategic sustainable development objectives even if it fails to demonstrate a 5 year land supply at certain times. This could be achieved by having a process to monitor and report the land supply for the villages, the rural areas beyond the green belt and the green belt respectively and compare this to development targets for those specific sections of the settlement hierarchy. If the district falls below the 5 year threshold but the villages, rural areas beyond the green belt and / or green belt, as applicable, are shown to be meeting their allocated housing development targets and to have allocated deliverable sites sufficient to meet the rolling 5 years’ requirement for those areas, then the policy should be for the NPPF sustainable development requirements to apply to the main settlements only. The other areas of the settlement hierarchy that are meeting their share of the housing target would continue to be managed in accordance with the Plan.

As it stands, developers are potentially incentivised not to bring forward deliverable sites because, in not doing so, they reduce the land supply. This in turn helps to trigger the NPPF regime by which they could seek planning approval for sites in villages and rural areas that otherwise would not be available to them. Consequently, development of less sustainable sites would be preferred and approved over the most sustainable sites, which have been held back.

The Plan policies should include provision for dealing with this foreseeable and preventable situation, to ensure delivery of the most sustainable development across the District to 2033.

END

*The Authority Monitoring Report for 2014/15 records that, since the commencement of the current plan period in 2011, locations outside the six main settlements, including Category 1 villages such as Much Hadham, have absorbed 41% of new housing development completions in the District. It is clear that the LP Strategy of concentrating development in the 6 main settlements and of strong restraint in the development of the rural area beyond the green belt is not being enforced because of the shortfall in development on allocated and unallocated sites in the main settlements.

The corollary of allowing a greater proportion of housing development in the villages and the rural areas beyond the green belt solely to make up the shortfall across the District is to undermine the LP Strategy of directing the main initiatives for growth to the main settlements. Some degree of limitation or restraint outside the main settlements is appropriate for reasons of achieving a balanced, sustainable growth strategy. Permitting significant growth in excess of the targets for development in the villages and the rural areas beyond the green belt undermines the principles of sustainable development set out in the LP, which in turn significantly undermines the confidence of residents (and, indeed, developers) in the plan-making process.