Aspley Guise Parish Council

Minutes of the Extra Ordinary meeting of Aspley Guise Parish Council held on Monday 27th July 2020 via Zoom starting at 19.30.

Present: Cllrs S Bailey – Chairman, M Bird, T Raper, T Lee-Woolfe, R Davis, S Andrews, R Riley & B Plasom
In attendance: L Simons – Clerk, D Mosley (Countryside Properties) and 25 residents

Item No		Agenda Item	Action
1.		To receive apologies for absence: None	
2.		To receive declarations of interest in items on the agenda: • Declaration of member's interest of a non-pecuniary nature: (having membership of a club, charity etc. or close relationship) None • Declaration of member's interest of a pecuniary nature: (Having a financial bearing on a member or their spouse/partner) None	
3.		To consider requests for dispensations: n/a	
		The Chairman gave Countryside Properties the opportunity to share more details about their proposal. • David explained that Countryside Properties have an option to acquire the land if they obtain planning permission to develop it. • They see this as a locally led opportunity and fully recognise the land as greenbelt. They want to work in partnership with the community to develop this site, they do not operate a top down approach. • From reading the draft NP, they believe they understand the requirements of the community and the need for allotments and traffic calming. • They recognise this area is important locally for the views and the Clump. • The site covers 46 acres, covering 3 fields. Ideas for the development could include affordable housing, open market housing, retirement living for the over 55's (Inspired Villages) and would offer opportunities for local people to be able to stay within the village. • They are not expecting the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to take a sizeable chunk out of its greenbelt at this late stage but would like the NP to recognise future housing needs.	

		• At this stage they wanted to make their interests known to AGPC and CBC, to flag the opportunity and to promote the site through the Local Plan review.	
4.		Public Open Session (Max.15 Mins): Residents will have the chance to raise anything relevant to the agenda, but they will not be able to discuss the subject more than once. A maximum of 15mins is allowed for this, 3 mins per subject. Resident 1: the PC should ignore the letter and the developer's interest in the land. It is greenbelt and will not get planning permission. The PC should not have another Housing Needs Survey (HNS) and suggests the village doesn't need a NP, as it will get misused. It is the PC's duty to protect the character of the village and the greenbelt land within it. Resident 2: this is greenbelt land and a major landmark in the village. It is the logo of the Lower School. If this was approved for development, it would open up all greenspace for future development. They believe the land to the North of the railway line would be more appropriate for development. There is no road infrastructure to cope with this development. Resident 3: previous applications for this land have been rejected in the past because it is greenbelt. They are not convinced by the argument that inclusion of this proposal into the NP protects development plans for north of the railway line, the letter is disingenuous. Resident 4: we should protect our landscape for future generations, consider the pandemic and the impact this has had on communities. Resident 5: during the pandemic the community walked around this site in droves, development would be absorbed. How would the developer intend to make the roads accessible? Resident 6 (Ward Councillor Baker): questions the need for a NP. He has read the draft NP and thinks its mostly waffle. In 2017 he thought a NP was a brilliant idea, but not now. He thinks the only response to the letter from Countryside Properties should be "content noted". Resident 7: when you see the number of objections to the planning application for the old allotment site, it is ridiculous to consider building houses on the clump field. It would take the character of the village away.	

		D. Mosley response: • Countryside Properties are not envisaging a planning application at this stage, they are hoping to seek an allocation within the Local Plan, and it is an opportunity to tie the site to the future of the village. • It is too early to discuss road infrastructure, but they recognise the need for major transport upgrades to facilitate their proposal. Cllr Raper invited the Ward Councillor to attend one of the NP meetings. The Ward Councillor confirmed he would attend the next one.	
5.		Land North of Gypsy Lane: a) Proposed by Cllr Bailey, seconded by Cllr Bird it was unanimously agreed to leave the NP Committee to formulate the response back to Countryside Properties. b) A motion has been raised for the Council to agree to utilise monies from the Planning Reserve to fund consultant support with regards to this potential development. This motion was withdrawn, as there is nothing to consult on yet.	NP Advisory Committee
		Cllr Bird reiterated the need for the Planning ring fenced reserve, just in case these types of applications become reality. He urged residents to join the PC meetings, as the PC are there to represent the views of the community. Cllr Bailey thanked everyone for attending.	
		Meeting closed 21.10	
		Next Meeting: Full Council 3rd August	