



**Minutes of the Hanslope Parish Council Monthly Meeting held in
the Village Hall, Newport Road, Hanslope on
Monday 12th September 2016 at 7.30pm***

*The meeting was postponed until 7:45pm

Present: - Councillors: Jeannette Green (Chairperson) (JG)
Martin Palmer (Vice Chair) (MP)
Shelia Mobley (SM)
Eileen Price (EP)
Dorothy Courtman (DC)
Ben Wheeler (BW)
Simon Proctor (SP)

16.162 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Councillor R Green advised that he would be late for the meeting but unfortunately did not make the meeting. Councillor B Wheeler also advised he would be late and joined the meeting at 20:15.

16.163 MEMBERS DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST None received.

16.164 PUBLIC TIME A significant number of members of the public attended the meeting, hence the need to move to the larger hall.

Councillor J Green read out the following statement:

‘Before we discuss planning application 16/02106/OUT I would like to inform you that Councillor Richard Green and I have a personal acquaintance who works in an organisation owned by Simon Hill. I would like to stress that the person that I am referring to is not, directly or indirectly, involved in the planning application we are about to discuss. I have consulted with the appropriate authority who have confirmed that neither Richard or I have a pecuniary interest and therefore are not required to exclude ourselves from either the discussion or the vote on this issue. However, for the benefit of doubt, we have decided to participate in the discussion but abstain from the vote on this occasion.’

Councillor Proctor confirmed that as he was involved in a another development in the village that, although he would participate in the discussion regarding planning application 16/02106/OUT, he would abstain from the vote.

The session was then handed over to the public:

As specific detail of points raised is not relevant to the minutes of the monthly meeting they have been detailed separately below.

16.165 To approve the Minutes of the Meetings Monday 11th July 2016

It was **resolved** that the Council approve the Minutes of 11th July 2016 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

16.166 To discuss Matters arising from these minutes only.

No matters were put forward with regard to these minutes.

16.167 Planning: To discuss the following planning applications:

Application No	Property address	Details	Parish Council response
16/02106/OUT	Land Off Castlethorpe Road.	Outline application (all matters reserved except access) for residential development of up to 150 dwellings, estate road, open space and associated works.	Councillor J Green and Councillor S Proctor abstained from the vote on this planning application. All other councillors voted to object to this application. Full details of the objection submitted by the Parish Council can be found at the bottom of these minutes.
16/02247/ANOT	Forbes Barn Tathall End Hanslope Milton Keynes MK19 7NF	New timber clad machinery barn (Resubmission of 16/01347/FUL)	Postponed – Councillor J Green to visit the site.

16.168 Finance: To approve monthly Receipts & Payments –

Date	Cheque Number	Payee	Details	££
12/09/2016	2629	AH Contracts	Dog bins	£192.00
12/09/2016	2630	LCM Services	Caretaking	£1,266.00
12/09/2016	2631	South Central Ambulance Service Charity	Grant agreed - meeting 11/07/2016	£1,000.00
12/09/2016	2632	MYL	Rec ground maintenance	£1,430.00
12/09/2016	2633	J Lewis	Clerks Wages, expenses and travel	£1,143.12
12/09/2016	2634	Deluxe Developers Ltd	Installation of bins	£701.08
12/09/2016	2635	Anglian water	Rec Ground Water	£82.83
12/09/2016	2636	Murrays	Survey printing	£987.60
12/09/2016	2637	Broxap	Supply of Bins	£1,049.58
12/09/2016	2638	MKPA	Play sessions	£1,560.90
				£9,413.11

It was resolved that these payments be accepted in accordance with the Local Government Act 1982 and subsequent amendments.

16.169 Neighbourhood Plan: Update on progress (MP)

Councillor Palmer provided the following information regarding the Neighbourhood Development Plan survey:

- 417 valid responses were received
- 250 respondents were reluctant to see any development
- Of the 167 who agreed, 110 did not agree to significant development

Full analysis of section 3 should be available by the meeting in October.

The next steps in the process are as follows:

- The full set of analysis is received and presented
- The NDP group create a draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (the plan) using both the Parish Plan and the NDP survey results
- The draft plan is sent to the inspector for legal comment
- The plan is finalised and put to the Parish, a referendum is then held and the adult residents of the village will vote on if the plan is accepted

Reassurance that we are moving as fast as we can was given however as this is a statutory process it does need to be done properly, if for no other reason than it is less likely to be challenged. A warning was however voiced that if a plan is put forward with no development sites identified at all it is less likely to be approved. We need to work hard to identify suitable sites.

Finally Councillor Palmer made the point that the Working group is open to members of the public and advised that new recruits would be welcomed.

16.170 Recreation Ground redevelopment: Update on progress and approval of the instruction of an architect (JG)

We have obtained one quote from a local architect and have been in contact with others. We will endeavour to have a sufficient number of quotes to make a decision and instruct an architect after the next monthly meeting.

16.171 Rural NAG report (DC)

The following update was given by Councillor Courtman:

- The 30 signs have been replaced in Long Street
- The 40 signs in Forest Road are to be replaced and the hedge cut back, there was a delay caused by MK Council
- We now have our PCSO back however the PCSO's stationed in Newport Pagnell have 26 parishes to cover

- The NAG cannot respond to the report of a crime so the public should call 101 or 999 in case of an emergency
- Reminder to complete the Thames Valley online survey at <https://www.thamesvalley-pcc.gov.uk/survey/>

Cllr Philip Ayles (Castlethorpe PC) spoke regarding the purchase of 2 ANPR cameras at the cost of £6,300 + VAT to enable the capture of vehicles coming in and out of the area. They flag 'vehicles of interest' to enable them to be traced through the area. All records are deleted after 3 months.

The Parish Council voted, in principle, to fund one of the ANPR cameras, the other being funded by Castlethorpe Parish Council. It was **Resolved** to approved funding of £6,300 + VAT by unanimous vote.

16.172 Best Kept Village presentation arrangements (JG/DC)

Presentation of the DeFraine Cup will be made at 11am on the village green with refreshments in the village hall afterwards.

16.173 Footpath between The Globe & Glebe Lane (SM)

Sinkage in the path to be reported to MK Council by the clerk.

16.174 Allotments & Water leak update (MP)

Councillor Palmer stated that there were no current issues with the allotments and confirmed that the water leak has been resolved.

We have a waiting list for vacant plots. Councillor Palmer will be showing potential tenants the available plots within the next month.

16.175 Correspondence received by the clerk not covered above. None.

Email received from June Raynor regarding road safety was passed to Councillor Courtman who will contact her directly.

Reports of antisocial behaviour at the recreation ground have been received. Clerk to inform PCSO.

Reminder that we still have one vacancy on the Parish Council.

Meeting finished at 21:48

Next Monthly Meeting Monday 10th October 2016 – 7:00pm

Signed.....

Dated

Copies of all council papers are available on request. Please contact the clerk at least 48 hours prior to when they are required.

Points raised by the public:

To begin the public time session Councillor J Green then addressed recent activity surrounding the proposed developments in the village:

First we would like to address both flyers sent out by 'hands off hanslope' the second of which was forwarded to us by a concerned resident, the contents of which will be addressed shortly. The wording of the flyer we felt was misleading and it gave the impression it was from the Parish Council as it was delivered with the survey – this is why the PC acted swiftly. The survey was to ascertain the personal opinions of the residents and the delivery of such a flyer at the same time meant that the opinions of those completing the survey had been unduly influenced and calls into question the validity of the survey. Minimum cost was involved in the Parish councils flyer and the contents of and distribution was sanctioned by all council members.

It is our duty as a Parish Council to represent the views of all parishioners not just those who shout loudest or have the time / resources to deliver their opinions into every home in the village. The Parish council received several reports of residents feeling threatened and / or bullied on their own door steps. Enthusiasm is a great tool when used appropriately.

The Parish council, as we have stated previously, have no power to intervene / comment on or even view plans prior to submission to the planning department as a planning application. It has, in the past, encouraged developers to display their proposal in front of the public and be available to answer questions which enables everyone greater detail than can be gained by looking at a planning application on-line.

What is most troubling is the accusation that the Parish Council is not 'getting behind the people' because it appears that only refers to those who oppose it. It is our job as a responsible Parish Council to ensure that each planning application is considered and debated properly and a decision if an application should be supported or opposed made in full view of the public.

Finally, if a decision is made to oppose this development and / or any other development and the need for professional support is required – such as was the case when the wind farm proposal was put forward – then the Parish Council will debate and vote on if and how money will need to be put aside for the costs of such assistance.

Mr N Stacey asked if anyone would like to ask him any questions about the school's view of the proposed development. No questions were offered.

Mr D Cook passed a copy of the objection to planning application 16/02106/OUT and reiterated to the public and the Parish Council the points within the objection. The following points were made:

- Against all and every development
- No access roads
- Roads are inadequate for the current traffic levels even without the additional homes
- Please oppose this completely
- Have NO development not a reduced number

- This is a unique village, lets keep it that way

The Parish Council responded that each planning application would be considered as it is received and commented that it is there to represent all of the Parish and not just those that shout the loudest.

Mr Tim Lenahan made the following comments:

- The A508 is backed up with cars
- There are already cars parked all over the place along Castlethorpe Road even when there is only a 5 a side match on
- The view is stunning please don't let the village lose it
- Don't develop anything!

The Parish Council responded that they are aware of the parking issues within the village but re-iterated that we have to think long term and trying to enforce a blanket ban on any development is short sighted and ultimately very unlikely to succeed.

Ms C Goddard made the following comments:

- We do not have the infrastructure to support this size of development
 - Public footpaths
 - Doctors
 - Schools
 - Busses
- What is the big picture?
- Who is looking at the big picture?

The Parish Council responded that whilst 'the big picture' is being taken into account we can only deal with planning applications as they are received.

Ms Zosia Marsh read out three questions, these were not responded to at the meeting however the responses have been added here:

1. Explanation of which information contained in the Hands Off Hanslope flyer was factually incorrect and why? The references to the Parish Plan and its powers are incorrect and comments regarding MK Council being 'minded to allow large scale development on agricultural land outside village boundaries' are also not factually correct but merely the authors supposition. Further 'picking through' every comment such as effects on broadband / sewerage / drainage and even utilities is also misleading and does not address the funds that would be provided by large developers through section 106 in order to significantly improve the village infrastructure would not be constructive, we should be working together.
2. Explanation of the unnecessary defamatory language used in the PC notice pasted to all villagers especially the insinuation of bullying. Several telephone calls and conversations took place between residents and councillors in the days following the distribution of the initial Hands off Hanslope flyer, each stated they believed that it had come from the Parish Council and many referred to feeling intimidated and / or bullied, for example this is an extract from an email received from a resident:
"Hi Juliet,

I would like to highlight the level of hostility and bullying regarding the anti development campaigners.

I am not sure if the parish council have been made aware of the latest letter that was posted to residents today?

.....It is only natural that residents opinions will be divided on the development of Hanslope. Myself and many other residents are in support of the proposals but we are becoming extremely frustrated and irritated by the aggressive bullying tactics and constant 'moaning' by this action group via letter or the village facebook page.

I appreciate the parish council will not have the necessary power to prevent these actions and on balance there will always be a difference of opinion, to which the majority of us supporters choose to gracefully ignore.”

3. How was the notice sanctioned by a quorate committee and recorded? Justification of the parish resources invested in the notice? All councillors were contacted to sanction the flyer and the need for such was unanimously agreed as was the content thereof. Parish resources were kept to a minimum as the flyers were printed by the clerk and distributed at personal cost to avoid delay.

Mr A Gout asked why the Parish Plan cannot be included in the Neighbourhood Development plan > explanation was given by the Parish Council as to the process, it was stated that this, alongside the Neighbourhood Development Plan survey would be considered when developing the plan.

Unfortunately, the meeting became quite negative at this point and numerous people began raising their voices and becoming agitated. Councillor J Green made the public aware at this point that should the confrontational behaviour continue the public time would close and the public would be asked to leave.

The Parish Council reminded the public that they are all there in their spare time and without payment trying to do the best for the public they represent but that means representing the whole parish including young people who need starter homes and want to stay in the village they grew up in as well as older residents who wish to down size but are unable to find smaller properties within the village.

A member of the public then shouted 'you took the job on so don't cry over spilt milk'.

Mr Gavin Lancaster stood up and addressed the Parish Council with the following points / questions:

- Does the Parish Plan still stand?
- It should be consulted when any planning decision is made

The Parish Council explained that the Parish Plan is currently redundant and will remain so until the 5 yr land supply is achieved. The Parish Council is NOT a decision making body or even a statutory consultee and we therefore have no more weight than individuals in the

village. Milton Keynes Council will make each planning decision based on current policy and currently there is no protection for open countryside.

Mr Lancaster then shouted 'we need a parish council who will represent us' – this came across as particularly confrontational and prompted a member of the public to stand and make the points:

- (to the previous speaker) You do not represent the view of the whole village
- All the village are not represented in the room
- Only 1/3 of the people in the village responded to the survey and only 2/3rds responded that they did not want any development
- Nobody in favour of the development is in this room therefore this is a bias view

The Parish Council thanked the gentleman for his comments and confirmed that are doing there best to represent all of the Parish.

Mrs E Watson made the following comments:

- We need to make our opinions known to the Parish Council
- Unless you make them aware how can they act on them

Councillor Courtman stated the she is dismayed at the attitude towards the parish council insinuating that we don't care, she would like to stated that she, and all of her fellow councillors DO care, if they didn't they wouldn't be there.

Councillor Palmer explained the process of establishing the Neighbourhood development plan and suggested that the passion in the room would be useful in the Neighbourhood development plan working party and urged anyone who is interested to get in touch.

Mr G Lancaster again and made the following comments:

- We need your support to stop them wrecking our village
- YOU are our representatives
- We need to work together

The parish council responded by making the following points:

- We could not do anything until the planning application had been received
- The neighbourhood plan is a legal process and cannot be rushed through, the fact that the creation of the Neighbourhood development plan was raised several times in meetings over the last two years and each time was not actioned is not the fault of the current parish council but hose who were on the Parish Councils at the time.
- The 'action group' have still not identified themselves or approached the Parish Council in any form, if they had we could have worked together, after all we all want the same thing – the best for OUR village.

At this point the Chairperson Councillor J Green called an end to public time and a significant number of residents left the room.