

**An EGM of Great Alne Parish Council was held on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at 8pm**

PRESENT	Councillors Mr L Bowring, Mr P Clark, Mr I Millard, Ms H Mainwaring, Mrs D Francis
	Members of the public: 1 – Mr Melvyn Jenkins, on behalf of the residents of Millway Lodge, Great Alne Park.
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	None. Cllr Kerridge and Cllr Forman had not been invited.
2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST OF ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA	Cllr Francis declared an interest in relation to agenda item 3, planning application 21/04093/FUL. Cllr Millard declared a potential interest concerning agenda item 5 – review and renewal of the GAPC insurance policy for the next year (due to a remote connection to BHIB through his insurance company).
3. PLANNING APPLICATION 21/04093/FUL	<p>The councillors were asked to consider and determine next steps with regard to this planning application. The Clerk and Chairman provided a summary of the discussion that took place at the General Meeting on 12 May 2022, confirming that no decision was possible as the council had not been quorate due to Cllr Francis’ declaration of interest and absences of other councillors.</p> <p>Mr Jenkins started the discussion by explained that a meeting of Millway Lodge residents was scheduled for Mon 30<sup>th</sup> May at 2pm. The residents were hopeful for an extension to the time period for the application in order to decide whether to remove their objection. Mr Jenkins noted that SDC’s Planning Committee’s agenda for 8 June had not yet been issued yet so it was unclear whether this application would be discussed by Committee.</p> <p>The Clerk explained that the planning officer at SDC is extending the time period for responding to the application due to an internal process oversight at SDC when the case officers were switched, and we are still awaiting confirmation of that new date. IV has also been chasing for confirmation.</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that due to the uncertainty of the impact of the proposed additional cottages, if time permits, he suggests arranging a site meeting, before responding to Barton Willmore's letter - if that is deemed necessary at this EGM by the councillors.</p> <p>The councillors reviewed the Barton Willmore (BW) letter which was in response to the objections received. A lengthy discussion took place concerning what issues remained that were legitimately issues for GAPC under acceptable planning terms. Some of the issues raised in the BW letter would more appropriately be addressed between the residents and IV. One example is the parking concerns – this a general issue and does not specifically relate to this one application. It is not a significant issue for GAPC to complain about and the suggestions made by IV to address it are a positive development.</p> <p>Cllr Millard agreed that the question is whether the remaining issues were a planning issue or a commercial issue. He noted that this was unusual as it concerned an amendment to a new development plan; if it were a normal scenario where a developer wanted to build 3 houses instead of 1 elsewhere in the village, GAPC would more than likely object.</p>

	<p>The question from a planning perspective is whether there is enough evidence to suggest that the new proposal for 3 cottages instead of one is ‘materially worse’ or whether it is ‘materially significant’ in the overall scheme.</p> <p>ClIr Mainwaring agreed that if GAPC were going to object it would need to be on a solid ground.</p> <p>The councillors decided that they were still of the mind to object but needed the confidence of a site visit to assess the potential significance of the impact.</p> <p>The councillors suggested that Mr Jenkins should liaise with the Clerk to find a suitable date for a site visit, preferably after the residents’ meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> May. The Clerk will notify the residents when the site visit is taking place. The Chairman suggested the Clerk liaise with Stuart Garnet at IV and arrange for IV to also attend.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>The Clerk also suggested she inform the attending councillors on the updated position regarding the planning application for the advertising and site monoliths, along with the advertising flags. The Clerk confirmed that at the General Meeting on 12 May the councillors had agreed to remove GAPC’s objection to the advertising and site monoliths planning application on the basis it would be difficult to seek further changes and it would be unreasonable for GAPC to ask them to be removed altogether. The residents at East Lodge had also been directly consulted. <b><i>(Please refer to minutes of the General Meeting on 12 May for further details).</i></b></p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that she had received an email from the planning officer at SDC who confirmed that the advertising flags were permitted by deemed consent under the relevant Advertising Regulations. The Clerk had asked for clarification on the installation and time period permitted for the flags; as there was a subtle discrepancy between what the planning officer had set down was permitted by the Regulations, and IV’s explanation. <b><i>(The case officer has subsequently referred this query to the Enforcement Team in the Planning Department and will revert to the Clerk when she has a response).</i></b></p>
<p>4. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE AUDITOR’S REPORT FOR 2021-2022 AND AGREEMENT THE ACCOUNTS CAN FORM PART OF THE AGAR 2021-2022 DOCUMENTATION</p>	<p>The councillors had been sent the auditor’s report and AGAR documentation for review prior to the EGM. They were happy with the report and felt there were some helpful recommendations. The only query was the comment that GAPC had not been compliant with The Transparency Code. The Clerk said that all the relevant documents had been added to the GAPC website for the last audit (2021-2022) and that her predecessor had added the same documents the previous year. The Chairman said he was also confused by the auditor’s comment. Our understanding is that although it is best practice for a smaller authority to follow the Transparency Code, it is not a requirement.</p> <p>The Clerk said she would seek clarification from the auditor but would add every document to the website as suggested by the auditor – and for this year’s public rights of access exercise.</p> <p>The Clerk and Chairman will also arrange a separate meeting to discuss how best to record the VAT in the accounts spreadsheets for 2022-2023.</p>

<p>5. GAP INSURANCE POLICY RENEWAL</p>	<p>The councillors reviewed and approved all of the relevant documentation (including the exemption certificate and accounting statements) and agreed that the prepared accounts should form part of the AGAR 2021-2022 documentation.</p> <p>The relevant sections were signed and dated by the Chairman and the Clerk as RFO.</p> <p>The Clerk explained how difficult it had been to obtain three quotes this year due to various factors – which Cllr Millard supported was an industry-wide issue in the insurance sector currently. The Clerk had used best endeavours to obtain 3 quotations, but one provider was no longer accepting parish councils and one supplier did not respond to the Clerk’s request for a quote.</p> <p>There were therefore two quotes and policies to consider – the existing provider Hiscox and BHIB. The Clerk provided a summary of both policies and the premium information.</p> <p>After consideration, the councillors decided to go ahead with the BHIB policy which was better cover for a lower premium. They also decided to take out the three-year deal which was more cost effective and may offer a buffer against further price increases over the next year or so.</p> <p>The councillors also agreed that the Clerk should go ahead with the cyber insurance policy cover.</p>
<p>6. ASSISTING LITTLE ALNE WITH THEIR CSWG INITIATIVE</p>	<p>The Clerk summarised the issues regarding Little Alne: Aston Cantlow PC does not have an active PC currently and has stand-in councillors who are reluctant to commit to spending any significant sums from the precept – including for a speed detection device.</p> <p>The Clerk asked the councillors to consider whether GAPC would be prepared to share our equipment with Little Alne or whether to extend the Great Alne CSWG activities to incorporate Little Alne.</p> <p>The Councillors agreed to loan our equipment to Little Alne on certain provisos, including that one of the Great Alne CSWG volunteers, Kim Walker, should be the ‘lead’ person with responsibility for the gun ie it stays in her possession at all times; and also to ask the Clerk at Aston Cantlow if the PC would be prepared to contribute towards the annual recalibration/maintenance costs. If the Little Alne CSWG needs to go outside these terms, it should seek approval from GAPC beforehand.</p> <p><b><i>(The Clerk contacted Kim Walker and the Aston Cantlow Clerk following the meeting and both were happy to agree to the terms suggested by the Great Alne Parish Councillors. The Clerk from Great Alne will invoice Aston Cantlow PC for the share of the calibration costs around October time).</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>The Clerk mentioned that she had had an in-depth conversation with Ben Ling from IV regarding IV’s Community Hub initiative. The Clerk explained what this is, and how IV envisage GAPC may be able to help. The Chairman agreed that there could be a good overlap with the proposed Good Neighbour Group that GAPC is prioritising establishing this year. The Chairman</p>

suggested the Clerk arrange a call with Ben so that the Chairman could understand more about the initiative and agreed that we would discuss in more depth at the next PC meeting in July.

\*\*\*

At the end of the EGM, Cllr Mainwaring announced that she was tendering her resignation as a parish councillor due to increased professional and other commitments. The Chairman said he was very sorry to hear she was leaving, and thanked Cllr Mainwaring for her commitment and support to both him and the PC.

Cllr Mainwaring has agreed to stay until a replacement has been appointed. The councillors will attempt to co-opt a new councillor in the next couple of months – the Chairman is aware of one or two people who may be interested. The Clerk shall also advertise the post as previously to engage any interested parties.

The meeting ended at 9.45pm