



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL LIAISON MEETING HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - TOWN HALL ON 17 DECEMBER 2014**

**Members**

**Present:**

Councillor Joe Dobson, Helpston Parish Council  
Councillor Jason Merrill, Bretton Parish Council  
Councillor John Brookes, Thorney Parish Council  
Councillor Ian Allin, Orton Longueville Parish Council  
Councillor Roy Pettitt, Peakirk Parish Council  
Councillor Philip Thompson, Deeping Gate Parish Council  
Councillor Keith Lievesley, Ufford Parish Council  
Councillor Margaret Palmer, Barnack Parish Council  
Councillor Helen Dooley, Castor Parish Council  
Councillor Richard Perkins, Ailsworth Parish Council  
Councillor Sarah Rodger, Castor Parish Council  
Councillor Andy Goodsell, Eye Parish Council  
Councillor Richard Clarke, Wansford Parish Council

**Officers**

**Present:**

Cate Harding, Community Capacity Manager  
Nick Harding, Head of Development and Construction  
Julia Chatterton, Flood and Water Management Officer  
Dania Castagliuolo, Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from:

Cllr Vijay Patel  
Cllr Paul Froggitt  
Cllr Jane Hill  
Cllr Dennis Batty  
Cllr Richard Brown  
Cllr Olive Leonard  
Cllr John Bartlett  
Cllr Harry Brassey  
Sandra Hudspeth

**2. Minutes of the Meetings Held on 16 and 24 September 2014**

The minutes of the meetings held on 16 and 24 September 2014 were approved as an accurate record.

Councillor Joe Dobson was elected as Chairman for this meeting.

**3. Brief Feedback on 2014 Parish Conference**

Cate Harding advised the group that this item had been requested by the working group to give the Parish Council Liaison a chance to provide some feedback on the Parish Conference.

The following feedback was provided by the group:

- People at the back of the hall could not hear the presenters and could not see the slides on the screen.
- The conference was reasonably empty after the lunch break therefore, in future it would be useful to ensure people were able to stay for the whole day.

#### **4. Recent Changes to National Planning**

Nick Harding delivered a PowerPoint presentation to the group on the changes to the planning system. Key points highlighted within the presentation included:

##### The National Planning Policy & Guidance

- Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Applications should be determined in accordance with up to date planning policy, unless material planning considerations dictated otherwise.
- Where the development plan was absent, silent or the relevant policies out of date, required the application to be determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development unless material planning considerations dictated otherwise.

##### Relaxation of Planning Controls

- Increasing the amount of development 'as good as' permitted development:
  - Larger house extensions
  - Change of use from offices to residential
  - Conversions of barns to residential
- More likely to be on the way was conversion of general industrial buildings to residential.
- Quick fire changes to the planning system made via National Planning Practice Guidance e.g. use of tariff Section 106s on sites of less than ten units

##### Housing Land Supply

- All councils must be able to prove that they had a five year supply of readily developable sites.
- If this could not be evidenced then developers may get planning permission for development on sites that were not allocated for housing growth.
- Just having an up to date plan with sites allocated was not enough.

##### Neighbourhood Plans & CIL

- Ailsworth, Bretton, Castor, Deeping Gate, Glinton, Northborough and Peakirk had been designated as neighbourhood areas, each were now preparing their neighbourhood plans.
- Once a neighbourhood plan was in place, the parish would receive 25% of any CIL monies raised towards a new qualifying development in their parish.
- Self-build houses did not have to pay CIL. Government had announced that sites of ten or less units did not have to pay Section 106 tariff charges.

## Commenting on Planning Applications

- Reference should be made to the relevant planning policies.
- Some policy matters were subjective.
- Suggestions should be made for revisions if they would overcome objections.
- Other material planning considerations.

Questions and comments to Nick Harding included:

How did the criteria explained within the presentation apply to isolated barns?

*The barn was required to be a conversion in order for it to qualify for a permitted development.*

Did the relaxation of planning control apply in conservation areas?

*Yes it did apply in conservation areas, but to a lesser degree.*

What were the requirements with regard to a barn conversion?

*It was required that the barn was previously used for agricultural purposes. The Council would always carry out a site visit prior to making a decision.*

At present, according to Government regulation, solar panels were a permitted development. It would be a good idea to have a discussion with Cross Keys to stop including solar panels in certain developments.

When plans were sent back after review, where were the minor changes indicated, as they were often difficult to spot?

*The changes were usually indicated on the covering letter or within the drawing. If these changes were not highlighted then it was best to call in to the office and speak with the Officer who responded in the first instance.*

Could this planning process system be sustained?

*Sustainability would depend on the type of development and the location of the development.*

How did the consultation process include Parish Councils, were they statutory consultees and would they receive feedback?

*Parish Councils were not statutory consultees although, they were consulted with and their objections and comments were considered. The Council did not have the resources to exchange letters with all Parishes regarding applications although, if there were local concerns then correspondence would take place. All decisions and case officer reports could be found on the Council's website, where emails addresses could be registered to obtain auto emails regarding applications.*

Case officers did not give adequate time for responses regarding application reviews.

*The time allowed for responses on application reviews was always 21 days. If an applicant requested an extension then a case officer should agree to this.*

Were Parish Councils notified of developments which had been approved for adjacent villages?

*They were only notified of a major development with cross boarder impacts.*

What was a cumulative impact?

*This was relative to an application with special rules.*

## **ACTION AGREED**

The Parish Council Liaison agreed for Nick Harding to:

- Forward details of the five year land supply to parish councils and information on where this can be found on the Council website.
- Advise Parish Councils if the five year land supply included urban and rural or if it was split.
- Send copies of the slides to Parish Councils.

## **5. Peterborough Flood Risk Management Strategy**

Julia Chatterton delivered a PowerPoint presentation on the Peterborough Flood Risk Strategy. Key points highlighted within the strategy included:

- Lead Local Flood Authorities had a duty to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a local flood risk management strategy which must specify the following:
  - The level and types of flood risk in the area.
  - The flood management organisations and their responsibilities.
  - The functions the organisations carried out.
  - Objectives for managing the risks.
  - The costs of the actions and how these would be paid for.
  - The benefits of the actions.
  - How the strategy contributes to wider environmental objectives.
- Risk assessment.

### Action Plan

- A wide variety of action types within the action plan –
  - Maintenance
  - Asset improvement
  - Communication based
  - Hard and soft engineering
  - Investigations and feasibility studies
  - Development related
- A wish list including dependencies and risks.
- Schemes ought to be in the Flood Risk Management Strategy, especially if they required external funding.
- Many actions were high level and would change as further investigation occurred.
- Regular review and monitoring of the action plan.

### Funding

- Funding for flood risk management had changed.
- National funding required specific outcomes and significant partnership requirements contributions.
- Local Levy – prioritised with the region

- Lead Local Flood Authority funding – very few councils had any capital budget.
- Community and commercial contributions were harder to obtain but made a big difference.
- Anglian Water – had to be relevant to their completed business plan.

#### Consultation

- Formally ended on 19 December 2014.
- Would include the meeting minutes as comments.
- The document would be reviewed during early 2015 for full council approval.

Questions and comments to Julia Chatterton included the following:

Would risk assessments have implications on developments?

*Developments were not highlighted within the Flood Risk Management Strategy therefore, there would be no impact on developments. The developer would need to do research along with a flood risk assessment.*

How was a watercourse which formed a county boundary managed?

*This would be managed by the two watercourse boundaries working together. There would be separate responsibility for land owners of a river.*

Why were only 24 of the 61 items included in the action plan being dealt with?

*The reason some of the actions had not been started was because they were new actions and only recently added.*

Not all of the flood risks in Peterborough had been added to the action plan.

*The plan was based on existing issues. There would be a yearly review of the plan to add in actions for issues which arose within the year. A flood risk assessment would have to be carried out for a development, following this any issues could be added to the plan.*

Could a risk assessment be carried out for each ward?

*If the main plan was not sufficient for a ward then a flood risk assessment could be carried out.*

#### **6. Rural Vision and Opportunity for the Co-option of Members to the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities**

Cate Harding informed the group that the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities were in the process of developing a Rural Vision and Parish Charter. The Commission were very keen to work with Parish Councils on the development of this vision and therefore, requested that up to four Parish Councillors were co-opted on to the Commission to take part in discussions regarding the document and the supporting action plan.

Cate Harding requested nominations for co-opted members. The following Parish Councillors nominated themselves to be co-opted Members of the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities:

- Councillor Joe Dobson, Helpston Parish Council
- Councillor Keith Lievesly, Ufford Parish Council
- Councillor John Brookes, Thorney Parish Council

**7. Future Agenda Items**

The Parish Council Liaison Group were asked if there were any items they would like to be added to future agendas.

**Agreed Action:**

The Parish Council Liaison Group agreed to add Superfast Broadband for Rural Areas to a future agenda.

**8. AOB**

Cate Harding advised the group that there were details of Autism Awareness on the paper she had handed out at the beginning of the meeting.

Cate Harding informed the group that at the Parish Conference there was discussion on supporting Parish Councils with their local action plans.

**9. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chairman advised the group that the next meeting would be held on 25 March 2015.

CHAIRMAN

6:30 – 8.45pm