

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ASHURST AND COLBURY PARISH COUNCIL.

Held Online via Zoom on 20th October 2020 at 7.30pm.

Present; Cllr Caroline Hubbard (Chair), Cllr Clive White (Vice Chair) Cllr Sue Robinson, Cllr Adrian Eyre, Cllr Andy Austin, Cllr Mike Thomas.
NFDC: Cllr Derek Tipp
Police: PCSO Richard Williams
Clerk; Helen Klaassen
Members of the Public; 0.

- | 19/130 | Apologies for Absence. | Actions |
|--------|--|----------------|
| | None.
It was noted that Cllr Bonnin had given her resignation. | |
| 19/131 | Disclosure of Interest in an Agenda Item.
None. | |
| 19/132 | Public Participation
The question was raised regarding the possibility of hosting a virtual coffee morning. It was suggested that this was something that the Community Engagement Committee should consider at their next meeting (26 th October, 2pm via zoom). | Clerk |
| 19/133 | Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Full Council Meeting as a Correct Record of Proceedings, and Matters Arising / Action Updates From those Minutes.
The minutes were AGREED and the Chair would sign them in due course.

It was noted that the matter of installing new benches was progressing nicely. | |
| 19/134 | Reports. To receive reports and relevant information from;
1. County and District Councillors
Cllrs Derek Tipp and Joe Reilly reported that:
NFDC Environment Panel were looking into waste and recycling, including the potential of wheely bins, food waste recycling, a greater uptake of non-food recycling and changing collection frequencies. The aim was to get the recycling rate up. They noted there were issues with contaminated recycling waste which would then make the whole bag un-recyclable. Approx. £500,000 per annum is spent on black sacks and whilst the cost of providing everyone with the requisite bins would initially be higher, over time it would be lower.
There would be public consultation to canvass residents' views, running from 12 th November to 10 th December and residents and the parish council were encouraged to respond.
Cllrs Tipp and Reilly also noted that there was money left in their devolved budgets if anyone had a project that needed support.
2. Committee Chairs
H&T:
Cllr Austin report that a meeting had taken place to review and assess the Christmas lighting and that he and the Clerk would be meeting the electrician shortly to assess the electrical requirements for the lights. It was noted that Operation Resilience that had been halted until next year would not be making the repairs that were required in Wood Road and these would need to be reported separately.
3. Parish Councillors
None.
4. Police / Neighbourhood Watch.
None. | Clerk |
| 19/135 | Planning White Paper. Changes were made (appendix 1), and some clarity was required round point 10 and the effect of the change from S106 to CIL on the parish, the Clerk would incorporate them and resend out the document for councillor comments. | Clerk |
| 19/128 | Accounts and Clerk's Update. To:
1. Receive and Approve the Quarterly Bank Reconciliation (appendix 2)
Received and APPROVED.
2. Receive and Approve the Monthly Schedule of Payments (appendix 3)
Received and APPROVED. | |

3. Receive any relevant information from the Clerk, including any decisions taken under delegated powers.

The Clerk fed back on her week attending the virtual SLCC conference and some of the highlights. Noted no delegated decisions to report.

19/129 Items for Discussion at the Next Meeting.

Meeting concluded at 21.08.

Signed:

Date:

Appendix 1

Key Points:

1. **Loss of Local Democracy**
2. **Aim to Streamline Planning Process**
3. **Failure to address the issue of the gap between permissions and completions, the Build Out rate.**
4. **Proposals to introduce mandatory top down housing targets**
5. **Proposals to introduce new digital technology into the planning system**
6. **Introduction of Design Codes**
7. **National Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) proposals**
8. **The introduction of National Development Management (DM) Policies**
9. **Impact on development of affordable housing**
10. **Replacement of the Community Infrastructure Levy and the current system of planning obligations with a nationally-set value-based flat rate charge**
11. **The local Planning Authority will submit the Plan to the Secretary of State, and simultaneously publicise the plan for the public to comment on.**

1. Loss of local democracy

We do not recognize any democracy in the new processes. Given that people do not understand the current local plan process and few engage with it, we can't see how the proposed system with its single consultation at the local plan stage and pre-approval of development offers any democracy at all.

The proposal that development management policies are established at national level, rather than being developed in Local Plans, is contrary to the principle of localism, and may not be appropriate considering the enormous diversity of those communities which will be affected by this.

The Statement: "Streamlining the opportunity for consultation because this ... allows a small minority of voices...to shape outcomes" is of concern as it appears dismissive of the rights of people to be able to have a say on planning applications and will effectively remove voices from the local area, including a Parish Councils, and prevent them from shaping outcomes. In any case, centralised planning is not necessarily more effective, as has been demonstrated by the agile and effective response of local communities, as compared with central Government, during the COVID 19 lockdown.

2. The aim to streamline and speed up the planning process by categorising ALL land into 'zones' on of one of 3 categories.

It should be confirmed that the entire area of each National Park has full protection as this has not been adequately clarified. This top down approach has limitations. Some land/developments may not be easily categorized and opposition may be faced at local level as the top-down process does not easily allow local influence from communities who know their areas best.

The removal of the duty to cooperate with neighbouring planning authorities is a retrograde step. It will have an adverse effect on local landscapes, especially in the New Forest National Park where the pressure of new development on areas just outside the Park has a significant impact on its protected landscapes.

3. The White Paper fails to address the issue of the gap between permissions and completions, the Build Out rate.

According to the Local Government Association there are 1 million homes with planning permission that have not been built, and this number is increasing. Clearly the planning system is not an impediment to construction and if those houses were to be pushed to be built then it would amply meet the government's targets. It is unlikely that the 'generational divide' within housing will be solved without addressing this issue.

4. Proposals to introduce mandatory top down housing targets

We disagree with the whole process of setting targets of Objectively Assessed Need for new housing because these targets are not based on genuine need but rely on computer generated estimates which take no account of local circumstances. It offers no option for adjustment by LPA.

These should not be applied to protected areas or planning authorities which have a large proportion of protected areas as all housing will be funneled disproportionately into their unprotected areas.

5. Proposals to introduce new digital technology into the planning system.

There is no need to further digitalize the planning process and it is noted that numerous large IT projects undertaken by Government have failed to deliver their stated objectives. At the New Forest National Park Authority, for example, everything is online and readily accessible already. Additionally, modernising the process, moving to a process driven by data, will only work if the data is utterly reliable. This is not always the case, as has become evident during the current pandemic.

Despite understanding that decisions should be streamlined and within firm deadlines the proposed move from documentation to data, including social networks and phones, is not inclusive and risks relevant parties being excluded from decision making. There are a significant proportion of people who do not use technology in this way and who rely on the 'green sign' method to be aware of what is happening in their neighbourhood.

6. Introduction of Design Codes

The good intention to have beautiful, well designed homes and buildings may not be realized given that the construction industry is primarily focused on **minimizing cost and maximizing profit.** – *Add more here*

7. Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) proposals

We are concerned that it is significantly undemocratic to allow large scale developments to be built with no input from LPAs, parish/town councils and local communities. We believe that it will erode trust in the planning system as communities will feel their fundamental right to be heard is dismissed. It allows developers the opportunity they have always desired – that of bypassing those who may object and who place hurdles in their way.

8. The introduction of National Development Management (DM) Policies

It is hard to understand how centralising this process will benefit LPAs and their communities. It appears to allow no room for manoeuvre to embrace good, place-based planning. There is no opportunity for local communities to scrutinise and contribute to these policies.

9. Impact on development of affordable housing

The housing crisis is in social/affordable housing for rent. Giving more freedom to developers will not improve this situation, as they are adept at reducing the requirement for affordable housing within developments, using the excuse that it impacts the viability of the development.

The proposal to push development in areas where affordability pressure is highest is flawed as there is no evidence that significant housebuilding reduces local house prices. Specifically, in areas of high demand and high house prices, this can be simply due to the locality being sought after and increased house building in those areas is unlikely to change that.

It is disappointing that this opportunity to offer real reform in the social/affordable housing crisis has been missed.

10. Replacement of the Community Infrastructure Levy and the current system of planning obligations with a nationally-set value-based flat rate charge

The introduction of a nationally set, value based flat rate charge, replacing Section 106 and the need to consider site viability, is a concern for Parish Councils and could be viewed as counterproductive. The policy will require strong legal foundations especially given the propensity of developers to try claim the charges are unreasonable and unviable. – Need to clarify / relate to parish / exactly how it will work.

11. White Paper proposal 8: The local Planning Authority will submit the Plan to the Secretary of State, and simultaneously publicise the plan for the public to comment on.

This proposal does not require public consultation on the plan once it has been drafted, merely a period of engagement once the Plan has been submitted. Whilst a Planning Authority has to "achieve public involvement" (without any definition of what this would entail) at stage 1, the public will have no opportunity to influence the Plan once it has been drafted.

Appendix 2

ASHURST AND COLBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Bank Reconciliation

Month ending 30th September 2020

Prepared by; Helen Klaassen, Clerk and RFO – 18th October 2020.



Balance per bank statements as at 30.09.2020:	£	£
Current Account	62,751.05	
Reserve Account	<u>32,388.09</u>	
	£95,139.14	
Less: any un-presented cheques	3764.56	
Net balances as at 30.09.2020	£91,374.58	
Add: any un-banked cash at 30.09.2020	£0.00	
Total Closing balance as at 30.09.2020	<u>£91,374.58</u>	

The net balances reconcile to the Cash Book (receipts and payments account) for the quarter, as follows:

CASH BOOK:

Opening Balance 1st July 2020	£82,664.40
Add: Receipts from 01.07.2020 - 30.09.2020	£20,059.82
Less: Payments from 01.07.2020 - 30.09.2020	- £11,349.64
Closing balance per cash book [receipts and payments book] as at 30th September 2020 (must equal net balances above)	<u>£91,374.58</u>

Appendix 3

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE - September/October 2020

Date	Payee	Details	Chq	Amount	VAT	Total
30.09.2020	Gristwood and Toms	Emergency call our to tree in Rec	2531	£382.32	£76.46	£458.78
30.09.2020	TLC Online	October Mag	2532	£450.00		£450.00
30.09.2020	Nightingale Ground Care	Maint in Rec and Allots	2533	£203.25	£40.65	£243.90
30.09.2020	RM Smith	Repair to Allot fencing post	2534	£250.00	£50.00	£300.00
30.09.2020	Rokill	Pest Control at Allots	2535	£140.00	£28.00	£168.00
20.10.2020	Hampshire County Council	S171 License Fee	2536	£439.00		£439.00
20.10.2020	A Baker	Lengthsman Salary	2537	£156.00		£156.00
20.10.2020	H Klaassen	Clerks Salary and Expenses	2538	£1,272.22		£1,272.22
20.10.2020	HMRC	PAYE/TAX	2539	£127.18		£127.18
Totals				£3,419.97	£195.11	£3,615.08