

# BARROW cum DENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES OF MEETING HELD VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM ON MONDAY 16<sup>th</sup> November 2020

**Present:**

Cllr Pearson Cllr M Howard Cllr Cousins	Cllr Holmes Cllr Kronbergs Cllr Rawlings	Cllr Ford Cllr Hudson  Clerk in attendance: Kat Bowe
---	--	---

Minute Ref		Action
5690	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> None, Cllr Wesley and Cllr Pettitt both absent.	
5691	<b>DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE</b> Cllr Rawlings signed his declaration of office in front of the clerk and other councillors on Zoom.  Cllr Bragg did not sign his as his internet connection was unstable.	
5692	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS</b> None	
5693	<b>PUBLIC FORUM</b> One member of public present, nothing to add.	
5694	<b>Neighbourhood Plan</b> a. Draft report on consultation results There were 375 responses. Cllr Howard collated the data and Cllr Kronbergs made amendments. The draft report was circulated before the meeting.  Concerns were raised over the number of responses compared to the size of the village. The response rate was approximately 23% and nearly 70% of those were over 45 years old.  Concerns were also raised over the inclusion of the question about where in the parish new development should take place. The response shows that most people would opt to have new development close to the A14. This has always been a contentious question. Cllr Howard confirmed that most Neighbourhood Plans do not allocate sites. To allocate sites, the question must be included. The Planning Inspectorate wants to see evidence to support site allocation. However, the Parish Council is not duty bound to follow what the consultation states providing there is a reason such as heritage, environmental etc.  Concerns were raised that if development were the A14 side of the village it could create a satellite village.	

	<p>54% of respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly that traffic congestion was an issue with 46% agreeing or agreeing strongly that it was. 41% of respondents agreed or agreed strongly that roads in and around the parish were adequate for current levels of traffic, with 59% disagreeing or disagreeing strongly</p> <p>The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the data. A selection of sites has come forward in the Call for Sites and a list of possible sites has been generated. Planning Direct will give recommendations on sites, these will be based on lots of data of which the call for sites will be one piece. Any variances made from the local plan must be backed up by a policy.</p> <p>Cllr Hudson raised the point that the greater populated areas are voting for development in the less densely populated areas.</p> <p>The responses are dominated by later life couples. It was confirmed that there was a fair match between the demographics of the respondents and the demographics of the parish. The younger population have not been heard through the survey, despite the outcome affecting them the most. The most recent census was 2011. Cllr Howard to confirm if the data is based on the 2011 census which was considered out of date due to the amount of new development.</p> <p>One observation noted was that the more opinionated people took part in the survey whereas people who were less opinionated did not.</p> <p>To move forward a revision C needs to be produced and approved. This will then be sent to AECOM and Planning Direct.</p> <p>Comments on survey</p> <p>Section 1.1 – Footnote to confirm what the data is based on.</p> <p>Q32 – Cllr Ford and Cllr Hudson felt the inclusion of this question was divisive. Cllr Pearson expressed concern over how the data was going to be used.</p> <p>89.5% of respondents prefer a section other than their own. Respondents wanted development outside of the village with 85% of people selecting S4 citing traffic as the reason why. Some Councillors were concerned about protecting people who live in S4.</p> <p>Planning Direct will use this alongside other data to make recommendations.</p> <p>Q33 under traffic/transport it should read was taken not as taken.</p> <p>b. Draft design code</p> <p>This could be a useful document to help avoid any outrageous designs. The document emphasises the good housing designs, both older and newer designs. There is lots of detail included. It refers to the steering group but should be referring to the Parish Council.</p>	<p><b>MH</b></p>
--	---	------------------

	<p>It was agreed that the design code should only cover new builds and not extensions/refurbishments.</p> <p>Questions were raised over what data was used within the document. If it is the 2011 census it is very out of date.</p> <p>There is a lot of jargon within the document that needs explaining and several errors and typos that need correcting.</p> <p>Cllr Howard to write to AECOM with corrections and request that the alterations are made.</p> <p>c. Housing need &amp; housing requirement The WSC housing needs calculations are flawed. AECOMS calculations are solid, these have been reviewed independently. AECOM will write a report to the Parish Council about the flawed calculations.</p> <p>The Housing need assessment report states that Barrow needs to accommodate the existing demographic with suitable housing for the elderly and affordable housing for the younger people. Thirty percent affordable housing to be included in the policy.</p> <p>Planning Direct will give their analysis on the HNA.</p>	
<b>5695</b>	<p><b>WSC SHELAA</b></p> <p>The Parish Council submitted a detailed response to the last consultation. Clerk to circulate previous response to all Councillors. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting.</p>	
<b>5696</b>	<p><b>Financial Matters</b></p> <p>a) Audit Conclusion It was confirmed that the audit had been completed and no issues arose. Information will be published on the website and notice boards.</p> <p>The £240 invoice for the audit was approved. This was proposed by Cllr Kronbergs and seconded by Cllr Cousins.</p>	
<b>5697</b>	<p><b>PLANNING</b></p> <p>DC/20/1856/HH 27 Green Farm Lane Barrow IP29 5DN Householder planning application - (a) convert garage into habitable space and store room (b) one window to front elevation and one door to side elevation.</p> <p>No objections.</p>	
<b>5698</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2020, virtual meeting via Zoom at 7.15pm.</p> <p>The meeting was closed at 8:55pm</p>	

Signed: ..... (Chairman) date.....

