

Minutes of a Meeting of Aldercar and Langley Mill Parish Council

Held at 6.30 pm

On 22 October 2020 by Zoom Remote Meetings

PRESENT

Councillors S Brown, M Fowkes (Chairman), R Fernandez, S Fowler, E Hamilton, J Karpasea-Jones, and D Lacey.

ALSO PRESENT

Mr A Sharpe (Clerk/RFO) and Miss J Mellor (Assistant to the Clerk).

58/20 **Apologies for absence**

RESOLVED that apologies for absence be noted and approved from Councillors J Attwood, S Bower, M Brown and S Oakes.

59/20 **Declaration of Members Interests**

Councillor E Hamilton declared an interest in planning matters as she was now a Member of the Planning Board.

60/20 **Public Speaking**

No members of the public but Councillor E Hamilton updated Members on the work of Amber Valley Borough Council.

61/20 **Dispensations**

None.

62/20 **Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2020 be approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman in due course.

63/20 **To determine which items, if any, of the Agenda should be taken with the public excluded**

RESOLVED that no items be considered with the press and public excluded.

64/20 **Chairman's Announcements**

Council received a report from the Chairman including matters relating a donation from the proprietor of McDonalds towards the Christmas tree and the office move arrangements.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

65/20 **Parish Council – Items for Decision/Action/Update**

(a) **Office matters and future action plan**

Council received an update report on matters relating to the closure of the office and future services (including additional litter picking & bins, community skips and other service additions).

RESOLVED–

- (1) That the photocopier contract and phone contract be settled.
- (2) That an agreement be reached to provide storage, possible meeting facilities and office space at Langley Mill United Cricket Club from 1 January 2021 be for an initial 6 month trial.
- (3) That other matters be considered at an appropriate time.

(b) **Events**

Council received a report on the organisation of events and other matters in relation to the current health emergency including arrangements for Christmas lights and Remembrance Day.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(c) **Government White Paper on devolution.**

RESOLVED that the report on possible devolution be noted and the Clerk write to support the “Vision Derbyshire” proposed by the District Councils.

(d) **Consultation on planning process**

RESOLVED that the following response be submitted –

Proposal 1: The role of land use plans should be simplified

The identification of land into 3 categories

Whilst the principle of zoning land use seems to be a good way forward we have concerns over the local knowledge of key decisions revolving around transport and highway issues and the current view of each application being decided on its merit does bring the local residents to comment on these applications. On this basis, a blanket approval position does give us some concerns especially the possible growth and renewal areas being combined.

We are keen to keep our village shops thriving and we already provide free car parking to help staff and customers, however we would have a concern with regards to the proposal to automatically approve the converting of our shops to residential units especially as we are trying to recover from the effects of the pandemic.

Proposal 2: Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans

Our Parish Council would support the alternative option for this proposal with the exception that policies which duplicate the NPPF would not be allowed. We would be happy, that as long as there is flexibility in the setting by local authorities to set development planning policies as under the current Local Plans is retained.

Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, replacing the existing tests of soundness

We have a slight concern on this proposal especially the withdrawal of the 'Duty to Corporate' which has been especially useful for Amber Valley and its adjoining authorities and as we are at the 3rd level of Government we have been able to contribute to our Local Plan. If housing numbers are to be centrally set by the government then this level in co-operation will be vital.

Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that the land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.

We feel that the government are looking at the wrong issues here, they need to be targeting 'land banking' developers to build within reasonable time frames and also be ensuring that the statutory bodies who need to be consulted respond quicker on applications. If numbers are decided from the top down then local issues and constraints are not going to be understood.

Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building.

As previously stated, our council has reservations about any 'automatic ' approvals and we do not support presumption in favour of development in Renewal areas.

We think that a new specific planning application should be needed if a different plan comes forward due to a change in local circumstances.

We totally support the status quo proposal for Green Belt applications which have stood the test of time to prevent the coalescence of towns and villages

Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology

We can all see the benefit of digital technology but we have to be careful not to alienate the more knowledgeable local residents who want to be involved. IT access and broadband speeds are also issues which need to be addressed. However we do recognise and support the need for clearer consistent planning conditions but as mentioned earlier statutory consultees need to be included in the timescales.

Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.

As above there is a concern over resident's technological skills and availability of IT access especially in smaller villages such as ours, who do not even have libraries anymore. If we are still requiring local public input we need to think of new ways to make these plans inclusive to all groups.

Proposal 8: Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.

Looking at our local area we do not believe that the 30 months is realistic and if it was that easy then local plans should have not had the long consultation periods which they currently have. There are also major concerns over the validity of the plan if automatic approvals in 'Growth Zones' and/or renewal zones are put through. There also needs to be a credible method of including local views.

Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools

In the past residents involved in Neighbourhood Plans have believed that this would prevent any house building in their areas rather than looking at the best options but to try and get these down to street level is going too far. Once again thought needs to be given to peoples IT skills and availability.

Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning

Our council is fully supportive of this proposal

Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predictable, we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development

With the emergence of Climate Change being paramount in people's minds more and more authorities are looking at differing types of houses including pre-fabricated buildings which will need to be evaluated as part of the visual settings in towns and villages. Key things are affordable, warm and insulated, incorporating flexibility to include the elderly and young as well.

Proposal 12: To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making.

Whilst my council supports this view careful consideration to identify a Chief Officer for design and place making will be essential however does local government have the finance or capacity for such an appointment.

Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England's strategic objectives can give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.

We support this view

Proposal 14: We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences

My council has concerns over the emphasis of 'Fast Tracking' especially if we are looking for local character and high quality with no mention of what the infrastructure to support such schemes would look like. We see the local planning authority prior approval as being vital to the process especially the issues relating to infrastructure.

We do not support this proposal.

Proposal 15: We intend to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits.

Our council supports this proposal

Proposal 16: We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England.

Our council supports this proposal

Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century

Our council supports this proposal

Proposal 18: To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.

Our Borough Council has signed up to achieving Carbon neutrality by 2030 so whilst we are supportive of this proposal we believe the timescales should be reduced.

Proposal 19: The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished

There are distinct advantages of retaining Section 106 agreements as they can be directed more locally for the benefits of our village and residents, the biggest problem is the ability of the developer to return and get a reduction in their contributions which should be removed if these agreements remain.

Proposal 20: The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights

We see this as a reasonable position to take.

Proposal 21: The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision

Affordable housing provision has been an issue for some time and our Borough Council has proposed that the required rate for Planning Applications will be at a MINIMUM of 30% on green field sites, brownfield sites to be negotiated depending on the level of remediation require. We think the 'first refusal' rights for Local

Authorities to be able to purchase units is something we support, the 'elephant in the room' is still the right to buy which doesn't help replacement of housing.

My council would support the withdrawal of the developer's use of site viability as an objection to delivering affordable homes.

Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to local authorities over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy

We do not support the proposal to allow transfer of a portion of the CIL to Parish Councils to spend on local priorities in the area as the current system whereby Town and Parish Councils can precept for those schemes.

Proposal 23: As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements:

Relevant training and financial support for these new proposals need to be provided to Local Government.

Proposal 24: We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions

Our Council fully supports increased enforcement but local government must have the resources to implement them.

General Comments

The Parish Council fully support the proposal whereby developers can no longer apply for a reduction in their section 106 obligations due to viability of the site which has been abused for some time. Some developers stick to their commitments but others seem to 'land bank' as we mentioned earlier and this has been supported by the LGA.

As a small Parish Council we do value the residents being consulted on significant planning applications which should not be eroded by the necessity for speeding up the process, we still need to take our community with us.

(e) **External Audit**

Deferred – Report not yet received.

(f) **Parish Magazine**

RESOLVED that it be noted that the next magazine would be December 2020.

(g) **Christmas Biscuits**

RESOLVED that no Christmas biscuits be purchased this year due to the operational difficulties.

(h) **Budget process**

RESOLVED that it be noted that a report on the budget and precept would be considered at the next meeting.

(i) **Allotments**

RESOLVED that no charge be raised for allotment plots for 2020/21 and any tenant who had paid be reimbursed.

(j) **Car Park**

Council considered and agreed the arrangements for opening and closing the car park.

55/20 **Finance**

Accounts for Payment

RESOLVED that the following accounts for payment be approved and the bank reconciliation noted.

Cheque	Payee/Description	Nett	VAT	Gross
BACS 744429666	Clerk Stationery	31.61	0.00	31.61
BACS 207278031	Foodbank S137	150.00	0.00	150.00
BACS 914642781	Birch Website	30.00	0.00	30.00
BACS 728142140	Tudor ASDA Island	60.00	0.00	60.00
BACS 418844684	Purchase of Monitor	144.95	0.00	144.95
BACS 480555855	Purchase of Ethernet Cable	14.99	0.00	14.99
BACS 659427065	Shelter Maintenance	253.80	0.00	253.80
BACS 682216320	ASGARD Pottery Lane	172.50	0.00	172.50
BACS 575588999	Transfer to York's Bank	25000	0.00	25000
DD	RF O Lettings Rent	600.00	0.00	600.00
Cheque 300317	RBL Lamppost poppies	450.00	0.00	450.00
BACS 789819229	HMRC	135.68	0.00	135.68
BACS 295454474	CIR – PC Set ups	75.00	15.00	90.00

In addition monthly DD to D and D Transport, BT and salaries.

	£
Bal b/f at 1 April	100,529.89
	£
Add total receipts	90,326.00
	£
Less total payments	36,300.00
	£
Bal at 31 March	154,555.00

REPRESENTED BY BANK BAL 31

MARCH

	Sept
	£
Current	42,880.58

	£
Deposit	24,253.72
	£
U Trust	86,959.09
	£
Less uncashed cheques	461.61
	£
	154,555.00

56/20 **Planning and Licensing**

App ref	Address and proposal
AVA-2020-0890	9 George Street Langley Mill Derbyshire NG16 4DJ Alterations and extensions to form a five bed, two storey dwelling with attached garage and hobby room

RESOLVED that no comments or objections be submitted.

57/20 **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 22 October 2 November 2020.