

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Centre, The Park,
Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7LR
Telephone No: 01582 794832 / 07436 549584
E-mail: clerk@redbourn-pc.gov.uk



13th September 2024

Cllrs: D Mitchell (Chair), C O'Donovan (V Chair), I Caldwell, T Finnigan, A Hayes, V Mead, D Bigham, S Vegro, S Withers, T Finnis, W Bloisi and R Bullen

You are summoned to attend a meeting of **REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL** on **THURSDAY, 19th September 2024, 7.30pm**. This meeting will be in the Parish Council Office, Parish Centre.

If you wish to attend, please contact the Clerk on 01582 794832

CHRIS KENNY
CLERK TO THE COUNCIL

AGENDA

ITEM	TOPIC	PURPOSE/OUTCOME	TO LEAD
1	APOLOGIES	To receive and approve apologies for absence	Chair
2	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	<p>Members are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary and/or personal interests that they may have in relation to items on the Agenda. You should declare at this part of the meeting or when it becomes apparent your interest by stating:</p> <p>A. the item you have the interest in B. whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest and the nature of the interest, whereupon you will not participate in the discussion or vote on that matter, unless dispensation has been requested and granted C. whether it is a personal interest and the nature of the interest</p> <p>Members are also reminded of their obligation to report any amendment to their Register of Interests to the Clerk as soon as it becomes apparent.</p> <p>Declarations: Cllr D Bigham – Redbourn Village Hall (CM) Community Group (M) Cllr I Caldwell – FoNL (CM), AinR (M) Computer Friendly (M) Ver Valley Society (M) Cllr T Finnigan - Classics (M), Friends of High Street (CM) Redbourn Charities (T) Cllr V Mead – RinB (CM), AinR (M), FoTHS (M) Museum (Trustee) Cllr D Mitchell - Community Group (M) District Cllr, supporter of CPRE Cllr S Vegro – Active in Redbourn (CM) U3A (treasurer) Cllr T Finnis – Museum (CM) Cllr W Bloisi – Friends of St Mary's (T) Community Group (V) Cllr R Bullen – CPRE (M), Ver Valley Society (M)</p>	All
3	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	To receive questions, comments, or representations from the Public (3 minutes).	
4	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING	To receive the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 19th July 2024	Chair
5	ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES	To review actions from the previous minutes	Chair

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Centre, The Park,
Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7LR
Telephone No: 01582 794832 / 07436 549584
E-mail: clerk@redbourn-pc.gov.uk



6	CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS	To give formal/general announcements	Chair
7	MATTERS TO REPORT	To give notice of urgent items for the meeting to consider for discussion only	Chair
8	COUNTY REPORT	To receive updates on any County issues that may affect the Parish. <i>Cllr Wren will address the meeting</i>	County Cllr
9	DISTRICT REPORT	To receive updates on any District issues that may affect the Parish	District Cllr
10	COMMITTEES		
10.1	Commons & Green Spaces	To receive the minutes of the Commons & Green Spaces committee meeting held on 5th September 2024	Cllr O'Donovan
10.2	Planning	To receive the minutes of the Planning committee meeting held on 6th August and 27th August 2024	Cllr Mead
	10.2.1	To approve recommendation of Planning Committee for Cllr Bullen to respond to the NPPF reform consultation on behalf of Redbourn Parish Council https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system	
10.3	Management and Communications	To receive the minutes of the Management & Communications committee meeting held on 8th August 2024	Cllr Hayes
10.4	Finance and Policy	Nothing to receive – next scheduled meeting is 26th September 2024	Cllr Mitchell
11	WORKING PARTIES		
11.1	Christmas Market Firework Display Wild about Redbourn	To receive an update on the activities of the working parties.	Various
12	BUSINESS MATTERS		
12.1	Spatial development/local plan	To receive an update on Local Plan	Cllr Mitchell
12.2	Troy Planning	<i>This item will be dealt with as a confidential matter</i> To approve costs for Troy Planning to respond to the SADC Local Plan Reg 19 consultation on behalf of RPC	Cllr Mitchell
12.3	Cricket Club	To consider proposal from Cricket Club regarding easements by cricket boundary	Clerk
12.4	Leisure Centre	To discuss the lease for the Leisure Centre currently held between RPC and SADC	Cllr Mitchell

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Centre, The Park,
Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7LR
Telephone No: 01582 794832 / 07436 549584
E-mail: clerk@redbourn-pc.gov.uk



12.5	Community Group	To discuss developing issues within the work that RGC is involved	RCG representative
13	FINANCE		
13.1	Finance Report	To receive the latest Income & Expenditure report	Clerk
13.2	Invoices for payment	To receive the latest report on payments made	Clerk
13.3	Receipts	To receive the latest report on payments received	Clerk
14	MATTERS TO REPORT	For discussion only	All
15	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	Full Council Thursday, 17th October 2024 , 7.30pm, Conference Room at the Parish Centre	All

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Full Council meeting held on Thursday, 18th July 2024 at 7.30pm, held in the Parish Centre, Conference Room

PRESENT: Cllrs D Mitchell (Chair), C O'Donovan (V Chair), V Mead, S Vegro, D Bigham, S Withers, T Finnis, T Finnigan and R Bullen

IN ATTENDANCE: C Kenny (Clerk)
2 x representatives from St Luke's School

303/24 APOLOGIES: Cllrs A Hayes, I Caldwell and W Bloisi
These were received and duly noted

304/24 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
Nothing new to declare

305/24 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
No public

ITEM 314.1 brought fwd

St Luke's School

To consider and decide if the Parish Council should enter into a Community Use Agreement with St Luke's School

Cllrs welcomed the Headteacher and Chair of Trustees charity of St Luke's School to the Council meeting. They are preparing proposals for a new sports facilities at the School and are in discussion with Sports England. As part of these discussions, it has been suggested that they enter into a Community Use Agreement with the Parish Council. This would form part of the planning application process. A Community Use Agreement sets out what the school does and offers to the community. The PC would then be part of a review group each year to assess if the School is fulfilling these elements. The agreement also shows that the Parish Council is in support of the café initiative and a mechanism to hold them to account.

The rationale for the Agreement is to become more engaged with the community. Explained that they now host Men in Sheds; they work with private therapists; Scouts use the field for camping out activities along with letting the hall out to Judo, Little Kickers and the Food Club. The local school also have trips for children to visit the animals. The interaction helps the School so that there is not a stigma towards its students as well as giving the students opportunities that they would not otherwise have.

ACTION: St Luke's will include a clause stating that the Parish Council does not have any liability

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

Subject to the above amendment, RPC agree to sign the Community Use Agreement with St Luke's School and support the work that the School is doing

306/24 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

To receive the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 20th June 2024

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

*The minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 20th June 2024
were approved as a true record*

307/24 ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

291/24 – Clerk met with engineers from Highways to inspect the road repairs around the Common. They accept that the Lybury Lane road surface is not to standard in places so will arrange for remedial work to be completed.

308/24 CHAIR'S ANNOUCEMENTS

Malcolm Wickens, Chair of Neighbourhood Watch has passed away suddenly. RPC thank him for all his hard work and commitment to the village. Clerk has passed on condolences to the family.

309/24 MATTERS TO REPORT

Billboard at entrance to village

310/24 COUNTY REPORT

County Councillor Wren emailed a report which was read out by Cllr Mitchell:

'I am following up with the new PPC about his policy on average speed cameras. As he has no experience with policing he is having to investigate this before we can meet and I am hoping to do that next month.

Any extra monies would enable a better consideration of ways to modify driver behaviour along this road. I would make one promise - if you did provide some additional funds, I would ensure that they were returned if nothing better than signs can happen; in other words, I would only call upon the funds if they would ensure better means of achieving the desired outcome.'

Cllrs felt suggestions behind a change behaviour campaign will not be effective.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

RPC commit to a contribution of up to £5K to go towards safety measures on the A5183 subject to agreeable measures and costings. However, Cllr to have access to the assessment of the impact of the new speed limits before committing to and spend.

ACTION: Clerk to inform County Cllr Wren, explaining that RPC will have to budget for the £5K spend in next year's budget. Explain that RPC's ideal solution is to have variable speed cameras installed asap after the speed limit changes come into effect.

311/24 DISTRICT REPORT

- Work continues on the Local Plan and will be looking at site selection in October.
- Suzanne Jones, Head of Finance has resigned. There is a push to get income stream from parking on high usage areas which will raise approx. £25K - Redbourn is not affected.
- Grass cutting – SADC have received a lot of complaints regarding length the grass causing problems with footpath and sightlines.
- Planning enforcement – SADC are working in partnership with Watford Council and Watford have been given powers to enforce planning in St Albans district. This arrangement will be reviewed annually.

312 COMMITTEES

312.1 Commons and Green Spaces

The minutes were presented to Councillors.

Item 8.3 was discussed and in principle, Cllrs agree to improving the overflow car park entrance. It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The minutes of the Commons & Green Spaces committee meeting held on 4th July 2024 be approved

312.2 Planning

The minutes were presented to Councillors.

The date at the bottom of the document is incorrect.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved:

Subject to the amendment, the minutes of the Planning committee meeting held on 25th June 2024 be approved.

Cllr Mitchell attended the consultation for the potential creation of a community garden at the field by Hunter's Oak/Cherry Tree Lane (in Redbourn ward). The Crown Estate is partnering with a local charity, Sunnyside Rural Trust for this project. The benefits of the community gardens they believe will be:

- Educational
- Skills development (supporting wildlife, local environment)
- Volunteering opportunities
- Assets for the local residents

ACTION: Cllr Mitchell to respond to the consultation and will ask about the long term use of the land. To maintain the long term use of the land ask have they considered entering into a Community Use Agreement.

312.3 Management and Communications

Nothing to receive – next scheduled meeting is 8th August 2024

312.4 Finance and Policy

The minutes were presented to Councillors.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The minutes of the Finance & Policy committee meeting held on 11th July 2024 be approved

313/24 WORKING PARTIES

313.1 To receive an update on the activities of the working parties

Christmas Market has now sold 96 stalls

314 BUSINESS MATTERS

314.1 Spatial development/local plan

314.1.1 To consider an update on the Local Plan

Nothing to report

314.1.2 To consider commissioning Troy Planning to prepare response to Reg 19 for Local Plan when it has been published

Cllr O'Donovan questioned should we be responding to Reg 19 bearing in mind the change of Government and potential policy of building on grey belt. Cllr Mithcell explained there was still a need to have a response otherwise our views will not be known by the inspectors.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved:

RPC commission Troy Planning to prepare a response to the Regulation 19 on our behalf, subject to satisfactory contract terms being agreed

Cllr Bullen proposed that a meeting of RAGE be arranged.

ACTION: Clerk to arrange a meeting

314.2 Panhandle

To agree expenditure for work required to complete Panhandle clearance

Clerk explained that whilst a large amount of work had been completed at Panhandle, there was still some more work needed to be done to clear. There were trees that needed cutting back and brambles to be dug out properly. This will mean that we can maintain easily until such time as a decision is made on how to use the land.

It was proposed, seconded and resolved:

RPC approves a maximum spend of £5K to clear Panhandle to a point that it can be maintained easily.

314.3 St Luke's School

To consider and decide if the Parish Council should enter into a Community Use Agreement with St Luke's School

This item was brought fwd

314.4 Folk on the Common

To consider a request for use of land from organisers of Folk on Common

Cllrs considered the request to hold the event on 15th September 2024

It was proposed, seconded and resolved:

RPC grant permission for Folk on the Common to use the Common, at the front of the Cricket Pavilion on Sunday, 15th September between 2pm – 6pm

314.5 Museum Signage

To agree to brown sign to be installed on Common opposite the Museum

Although this has been discussed and agreed in the past, the matter has not been voted on. The Trustees of the Museum have requested a brown sign post to be installed on the triangle of land at junction of The Common and Lybury Lane – this is land owned by Parish Council and so RPC must give permission to install. As it is privately owned land, the County Council will not fund the sign.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

RPC grant permission for a brown information sign post be installed on Common land on the triangle of land opposite the Museum

315.6 PCSO Request

To consider a request for funding for initiative being run by PCSO Peduto

PCSO Peduto would like to hold a bike marking event and has requested some funding from the Parish Council to buy the marking labels. The event would be held in Redbourn.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

RPC grant £350 to buy bike marking labels.

ACTION: CK to purchase on behalf of PCSO.

316/24 FINANCE

316.1 Finance Report

To receive the latest Income and Expenditure Report

Clerk reported:

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The Income and Expenditure report reflecting Accounts for June 2024 received

316.2 Invoices for payment

To receive the latest report on payments made

The Clerk presented Cllrs with the list of payments (Current account – Cash Book 1) for June 2024.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The List of Payments (Current account – Cash Book 1) reports showing payments for June 2024 be received

316.3 Receipts

To receive the latest report on payments received

The Clerk presented Cllrs with the list of receipts (Current account – Cash Book 1) for June 2024.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The List of Receipts (Current account – Cash Book 1) reports showing receipts for June 2024 be received

317/24 MATTERS TO REPORT

Billboard – Cllr Mitchell questioned why there was commercial advertising on the planter at the entrance to the village. The understanding was that the wooden frame was to house banners for advertising local organisation’s events.

ACTION: Cllr Mead to ask Redbourn in Bloom if they have agreed to it and what the rationale was if they did.

318/24 DELEGATED POWERS

To grant delegated powers to the Chair and Vice Chair of Redbourn Parish Council

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved:

Delegated powers are granted to the Chair and Vice Chair of Redbourn Parish Council during the summer recess.

319/24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 19th September 2024, 7.30pm, Conference Room, Parish Centre

The meeting closed at 9.27pm

Chair Dated

Minutes of Commons and Open Spaces Committee Meeting held on Thursday, 5th September 2024 at 7.30pm, in the Conference Room at Redbourn Parish Centre.

Present: Cllrs C O'Donovan (Chair), T Finnigan (V Chair), D Bigham, I Caldwell, W Bloisi, V Mead, S Withers

In Attendance: C Kenny (Clerk)
 Representatives from Tennis Club
 Representatives from FoTHS

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and accepted from:
 Cllr Hayes

2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Cllr Caldwell Friends of Nickey Line (CM)
 Cllr Bigham Community Care Group (CM), Village Hall (M)
 Cllr Mead The Museum (T), Active in Redbourn (M) Redbourn in Bloom (CM)
 Cllr Finnigan Classics on the Common (M), Friends of the High Street (CM)
 Redbourn Charities (T)
 Cllr Bloisi Friends of St Mary's (CM), Community Care Group (V)

3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

TENNIS CLUB

To consider Tennis Club plans to install floodlighting

Item brought fwd

The Chair of the Tennis Club talked through the options they are considering for floodlighting at the Tennis Club. Currently, they are restricted to only playing tennis for 5 months of the year because of the lack of lighting. Most other clubs in the area have floodlighting so it will have an effect on attracting new members. They propose to install lighting but that playing would be up to 10pm. They are looking at 3 options, all of which are LED and would face into the courts.

- Lights mounted on pylons about 6-7 meters high which is standard height and would be visible about the hedge line Greyhound Meadows. This would require planning permission
- LED fence lighting – this would be mounted onto the current fencing and less light spillage than option 1. It only requires certificate of lawfulness and not full planning permission.
- Mobile lighting units. These are similar to option 1 but can be moved around and also run on diesel so not their preferred option.

Although the Club's preferred option is for number 1, they recognise this may cause the most inconvenience to their neighbours. Option 2 would be the best solution for all.

The Club are asking the Parish Council, as the Landlord, for permission to consult with the neighbouring organisations and residents.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

RPC as the Landlord of the Tennis Club agree to Redbourn Tennis Club consulting with their neighbours and the Village regarding their floodlight proposals.

FRIENDS OF THE HIGH STREET

To discuss issue of map, water fountain and planters outside Village Hall car park

FOTHS are working with RinB and AiR to regenerate the area in front of the village hall car park. The idea is to:

- Add a water fountain
- Remove the current tree and replace with something more suitable
- Install updated information map
- Improve litter bin offering
- Improve planting to be more environmentally friendly

A budget was presented, showing projections of potential sources of income from sponsorship, grants and fund raising. Initial costs are approx. £20K for the total project. RPC are supportive of the proposed work but asked that the working party confirmed who will pay for the water supply and standing charges.

ACTION: Working party to provide an article for the newsletter to be sent to the Clerk

ACTION: Cllr Finnigan to send template of plaques for heritage trail to Clerk

4 MATTERS FOR REPORT

Redbourn in Bloom – Cllr Mead

Cricket Club - Clerk

Panhandle - Clerk

Noticeboard - Clerk

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The minutes of the meeting held on 4th July 2024 are adopted as a true record of the meeting

6 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES NOT ON THE AGENDA

8.1 – Clerk responded to Cllr Mead's question regarding the bouncy castle by stating that the castle has not been put up in front of the Museum since requesting not to.

7 FINANCE

7.1 To receive the finance report on Commons expenditure

The Clerk presented the expenditure report for Commons and Green Spaces, highlighting the following:

1321 – Firework donation received

4500 – Deposit for firework display paid to Fantastic Fireworks

4795 - New zip wire chain and seat purchased to replace current one a plastic covering has split.

4802 – Hanging basket columns have been repainted

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved to:

***The Commons Income and Expenditure reported dated 30th June 2024
for the month of July 2024 be received***

8 REDBOURN COMMON

8.1 To receive an update on Common repairs

Clerk reported that the large commercial signage will be removed from Common outside Bees Nest Cottage by 6th September.

JHP repaired one of the entrances to overflow car park properly in time for the Classics on Common event.

Clerk had received a comment/complaint from an exhibitor at Classics event regarding the state of repair of the entrance onto the Common for cars. Clerk explained that it was a Common and not a car park and so there would be some uneven areas.

ACTION: Clerk to feedback to organisers of the event

Clerk reported that a large branch has broken off from horse chestnut tree by the Old Diary. Tree surgeon has been instructed to remove and survey the rest of the tree.

Clerk reported that new bylaw signs have been ordered and these will replace the current ones.
ACTION: Clerk to contact The Repair Shed to see if they can adjust current board to add protective cover.

8.2 To consider a request for a memorial tree for Ernest Leahy

The wife of the deceased has requested a memorial tree to be planted for Ernest Leahy. As per the memorial policy, the applicant scored 6 which means the criteria is met.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

RPC grant permission for a memorial tree for Ernest Leahy be planted on the Common proposed location to be by the three silver birch trees on corner of Lybury Lane and North Common. Tree will be a silver birch.

ACTION: Clerk to contact applicant and arrange for tree and plaque to be installed at the appropriate planting time.

8.3 To consider a request for a memorial bench for Alan and Betty Vickery

This item will be moved to the next agenda as relevant papers have not been received.

- 8.4 **To consider a request from Santos Circus to have use of the Common 22nd Sept - 6th Oct**
 Cllrs considered this request.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved:

RPC allow Santos Circus to have use of the Common from 22nd September to 6th October 24, at the same rate as previous years.

9 **FRIENDS OF THE HIGH STREET**

This item was moved fwd

10 **BENCHES**

To review condition of benches in Cumberland Garden

The Clerk reported that two of the benches in Cumberland Garden were in a poor state of repair despite being maintained as per the maintenance schedule, to the point that it is felt they are beyond economical repair.

Cllr O'Donovan has agreed to purchase a new bench to replace his family's current bench and the Clerk will write to the other bench owner explaining it is beyond the economical repair and so they would need to fund a replacement bench.

The bench in front of Cover Point was driven into and damaged – this was the bench for the 'Keeper of the Common'. The position will be offered to the first person on the waiting list and a suitable place will be found to place the plaque for the 'Keeper of the Common'.

11 **TENNIS CLUB**

To consider Tennis Club plans to install floodlighting

This item was moved fwd

12 **MATTERS TO REPORT**

Redbourn in Bloom – Cllr Mead informed the meeting that the Anglia in Bloom virtual awards evening is on 6th September where winners will be announced. Also, the Grand Autumn Show is being held on Saturday, 7th September.

Cricket Club – Clerk had received correspondence from the Cricket Club requesting that the easements across the Common to Old Pastures and Ashtons be looked at with a view to replacing it as the current materials are a cause for concern, as it is felt the metal edging is a trip hazard due to it not being flush with the grass surface.

ACTION: Clerk to add to Full Council agenda

Panhandle – Clerk informed the meeting that work will begin again at Panhandle over the next couple of weeks with the tree surgeon removing last of the unhealthy trees, allowing for the healthy trees to grow and have more light. Once this is completed, we will hire a digger to remove all the bramble roots, etc in an attempt to stop regrowth. The Community Payback team will then start again on 3rd October.

Notice board – The Repair Shed did an excellent repair on the notice board in Cumberland Garden and the Clerk will speak to them about refurbishing some of the other boards, notably in Cumberland Drive, Lybury Lane and Church End.

12 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting date is Thursday, 7th November 2024 at 7.30pm, in the Conference Room at Redbourn Parish Centre.

The meeting closed at 8.58pm

Chair *Date*

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee held on Tuesday 6th August 2024, 7.30pm In the Conference Room at the Parish Centre.

PRESENT: Cllrs V Mead (Chair), D Mitchell, D Bigham, T Finnis, C O'Donovan and S Withers

IN ATTENDANCE: Chris Kenny - Clerk

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs R Bullen and T Finnigan
These were received and duly noted

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 16th July 2024 were approved as a true record of the meeting.

4. NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Cllr O'Donovan – Barn on Crown Street
Cllr Withers – hedging by Maris Meadows
Cllr Withers – Signage at convenience store
Cllr Mead – Retail unit on junction of High Street and Fish Street
Cllr Finnis – Parking at the The George
Cllr Mead – Water leak at Lamb Lane
Clerk – Cllr training

4.1 Planning and Tree work Applications received after publication of the agenda
None

4.2 Other Urgent Business for consideration at the meeting
None

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
None

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS CALLED IN/ TO BE CALLED IN

Cllr Mitchell has called in application **5/2021/3631** - Land at Gaddesden Lane - If the Officer is of a mind to grant.

7. PLANNING POLICY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE

The next meeting is on Tuesday 12th September.

The Minister of State for Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Matthew Pennycooke, has written to the Planning Inspectorate setting out the Government's expectations on how examinations should be conducted. Pragmatism should be used only where it is likely a plan is capable of being found sound with limited additional work to address soundness issues. Any pauses to undertake additional work should usually take no more than six months overall. Pragmatism should not be used to address fundamental issues with the soundness of a plan, which would be likely to require pausing or delaying the examination process for more than six months overall. Local authorities should provide regular progress updates of their work to the Planning Inspector during any agreed pause. Basically, the plan should be sound and legal at the point of submission – it is not the Inspectorate's job to work on the Plan to make it sound and legal.

8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5/2024/1207 - Retrospective planning as built front boundary wall at Punch Bowl House, Redbourn Road, St Albans, Hertfordshire, AL3 6RP

RPC Comment: Objection based on the fact that the application does not provide justification for building a wall over 1 metre in height on greenbelt and on a highway

5/2024/1242 - Proposed single storey front and side extensions at 22 Crouch Hall Lane, Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7EQ

RPC Comment: No objection but note there maybe an issue with the boundary which should be resolved between both parties

5/2024/1265 - Demolition of existing detached two storey dwelling, and erection of replacement detached two storey dwelling, including roof-mounted solar panels and air source heat pump at Chandau, Lamb Lane, Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7BS

RPC Comment: No objection

5/2024/1267 - Replacement door and windows at 23 North Common, Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7BU

RPC Comment: No objection although note that the property is in the conservation area and so will need approval of the Conservation Officer.

5/2024/1268 - New windows and doors to front elevation at 22 North Common, Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7BU

RPC Comment: No objection although note that the property is in the conservation area and so will need approval of the Conservation Officer.

9. TREE APPLICATIONS

TP/2024/0350 TPO 1350 - Yew 1 and Yew 2: Raise low crown to 2m and reduce crown spread overhanging garden wall to 3m, pruning to suitable growth points. Growth of the trees over the wall restricts light and use of the main part of the garden at 4 Heybrigge Close, Redbourn, Hertfordshire, AL3 7DT

10. PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT) COMMITTEE

Last meeting was held on Monday 5th August 2024 but there were no items relating to Redbourn Ward.

11. REPORTS FROM SADC PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

None notified.

12. APPLICATIONS APPROVED

5/2024/0810 - Single storey rear extension with associated landscaping works at Oaklands Lodge 12 Meadow View Dunstable Road Hertfordshire Redbourn AL3 7QQ

Decision: DC3 Conditional Permission

RPC Comment: No objection

5/2024/0893 - Advertisement consent - Display of non-illuminated individual lettering sign, projecting sign and opening hours sign at The Priory High Street Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7LZ

Decision: AC3 Advert - Extra Condition

5/2024/0958 - Garage conversion with replacement of garage door to window, raising of roof and extension to rear, plus alterations to openings to side elevation at 13 Ben Austins Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7DR

Decision: DC3 Conditional Permission

RPC Comment: No objection

5/2024/0980 - Garage conversion at 20 Silk Mill Road Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7GE

Decision: DC3 Conditional Permission

RPC Comment: No objection

12.1 APPLICATIONS REFUSED

None notified

12.2 CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

None notified.

12.3 DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS

None notified

12.4 APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

None notified

12.5 INVALID APPLICATIONS

None notified

12.6 APPEALS

None notified.

12.7 PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

None

13. CORRESPONDENCE

None

14. COMMUNITY LED HOUSING

Cllr Finnis reported that still awaiting a response from SADC

ACTION: Clerk to chase

15. MATTERS TO REPORT

Cllr O'Donovan informed members that work has started on the old Barn in Crown Street.

Cllr Withers stated that the promised hedging at the boundary of Maris Meadows have not materialised and although the area had been cleared, vegetation is now growing back. Cllr Mead has been in contact with Officer at SADC who has said that the landscaping work would not be done until all of the building work has finished. Work appears to have finished.

ACTION: Cllr Mead to chase

Cllr Withers had been asked by the owners of Premier shop what they need to do to install a permanent sign (the current one is temporary). Cllrs confirmed that if the new sign is the same size as the original sign and that there is no illumination, planning approvals weren't required.

Cllr Mead raised concerns over the colour of the retail outlet on the corner of Fish Street and High Street. The issue was discussed at the last Planning meeting where it decided to wait and see if anything changed. It hasn't and concern that as it is in a conservation area and a grade II listed building, and so permission should be sought.

ACTION: Clerk to make Conservation Officer aware of situation

Cllr Finnis informed meeting that The George have installed CCTV cameras and are working with a parking company in an attempt to stop all day parking in their car park.

Cllr Mead updated the meeting on the water leak in Lamb Lane. Affinity Water have been contacted and repairs will be done on 8th September.

The Clerk gave information on training courses available relating to planning regulations/rules, asking if Cllrs would be interested. She felt it important that those sitting on the planning committee should be knowledgeable in this area.

ACTION: Clerk to obtain more information

16. DATE, TIME, AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 27th August 2024, 7.30pm, The Conference Room, Redbourn Parish Centre.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm

Signed: Date:

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee held on Tuesday 27th August 2024, 7.30pm In the Conference Room at the Parish Centre.

PRESENT: Cllrs T Finnigan (V Chair), D Mitchell, D Bigham, T Finnis, C O'Donovan and S Withers

IN ATTENDANCE: Chris Kenny – Clerk

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs V Mead & C O'Donovan
These were received and duly noted

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 6th August 2024 were approved as a true record of the meeting.

4. NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

4.1 Planning and Tree work Applications received after publication of the agenda
None

4.2 Other Urgent Business for consideration at the meeting
R Bullen – NPPF reform consultation

5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS CALLED IN/ TO BE CALLED IN

Cllr Mitchell has called in application **5/2021/3631** - Land at Gaddesden Lane - If the Officer is of a mind to grant.

7. PLANNING POLICY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE

The next meeting is on Tuesday 12th September.

8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

5/2024/1197 - Outline application (access sought) - Construction of two single storey dwellings at Land at the Stables Nicholls Farm Lybury Lane Redbourn Hertfordshire

5/2024/1199 - Construction of garden cabin and access ramp, associated landscaping works at Brooklen Chequer Lane Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7NH

5/2024/1242 - Proposed single storey front and side extensions - AMENDED PLANS

9. TREE APPLICATIONS

None

10. PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT) COMMITTEE

Next meeting will be held on Monday 2nd September 2024 but there were no items relating to Redbourn Ward.

11. REPORTS FROM SADC PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

None notified.

12. APPLICATIONS APPROVED

5/2024/0457 - Hip to gable roof extension to create first floor and addition of front and rear windows and rooflights at 22 Harpenden Lane Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7PB

Decision: DC3 Conditional Permission

RPC Comment: No objection.

5/2022/2432 - Change of use and conversion of workshop to one bedroom residential dwelling with raising of roof, alterations to elevations, fencing and associated works at Workshop Adjacent 13 Bassett Close Crown Street Redbourn Hertfordshire

Decision: DC3 Conditional Permission

RPC Comment: Redbourn Parish Council agree in principal to this application - with the proviso that the issue of parking is addressed and that the drawings have the datum point included.

5/2024/1030 - Listed Building consent - Removal of existing single glazed windows and replace with new slimline double glazed windows at 19 Fish Street Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7LP

Decision: DC10 Listed Building Conditional Consent

RPC Comment: No objection subject to the Conservation Officers approval

12.1 APPLICATIONS REFUSED

5/2023/2574 - Two detached chalet bungalows following demolition of existing bungalow at 4 St Marys Close Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7DD

Decision: DC4 Refusal

RPC Comment: No objection

5/2022/2293 - Change of use from takeaway to one dwelling with associated alterations, including new openings and rendering at 67a High Street Redbourn Hertfordshire AL3 7LW

Decision: DC4 Refusal

RPC Comment: Objection based on Policy 'Red 1' of the Regulation 16 Submission - Neighbourhood Plan Document. Policy 40 of SADC Local Plan, Parking Policy 54 of SADC Local

Plan, Shopping Development in Neighbourhood Centre's, and Policy 51 of the SADC Local Plan, Shopping and Service Uses, c) Neighbourhood Centres

12.2 CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

None notified.

12.3 DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS

None notified

12.4 APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

None notified

12.5 INVALID APPLICATIONS

None notified

12.6 APPEALS

None notified.

12.7 PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

None

13. CORRESPONDENCE

None

14. COMMUNITY LED HOUSING

Nothing to report

15. MATTERS TO REPORT

Cllr Bullen talked through some of the relevant points of the NPPF reform document. There is concern regarding the way the housing numbers are calculated particularly as it is implicit that housing figures are adjusted each year.

Areas of concern that RPC should address in their response to this consultation are:

- How housing numbers are to be calculated
- How the Green Belt is dealt with
- How social housing is dealt with

It was proposed, seconded and resolved that:

Subject to Full Council approval, Cllr Bullen respond to the NPPF reform consultation on behalf of RPC.

ACTION: Members of this committee to feedback any comments to Cllr Bullen for inclusion

ACTION: Clerk to add the link to the consultation onto Full Council agenda

ACTION: Cllr Bullen to send draft response to Clerk for inclusion in Full Council pack

16. DATE, TIME, AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 17th September 2024, 7.30pm, The Conference Room, Redbourn Parish Centre.

The meeting closed at 8.45pm

Signed: Date:

Consultation – Proposed Reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system>)

Table of Questions

Question 1 Do you agree we should reverse the December 2023 changes made to paragraph 61? (of the NPPF). **These changes were made to make it more possible for LPAs (local planning authorities, in our case St Alban District Council) to have a plan that does not use the standard approach to calculating housing numbers. Suggested answer – Agree**

Question 2 Do you agree that we should remove reference to the use of alternative approaches to assessing housing need in paragraph 61 and the glossary of the NPPF? **See above. Suggested answer – Agree**

Question 3 Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made to the urban uplift by deleting paragraph 62? **The urban uplift is not relevant to SADC and it will be replaced by other proposed changes to the NPPF. Suggested answer – Agree (or No Comment)**

Question 4 Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on character and density and delete paragraph 130? **Both character and density will be dealt with both in the revised NPPF and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). Suggested answer – Agree**

Question 5 Do you agree that the focus of design codes should move towards supporting spatial visions in local plans and areas that provide the greatest opportunities for changes such as greater density, in particular the development of large new communities? **The consultation makes it clear that increased densities are very important. In addition, it proposes that design codes should be at local rather than at LPA level. For example, there could be a design code specifically for Redbourn, Wheathampstead. The challenge is the last phrase. I am unaware of any current proposals for a “large new community” within SADC and I hope that no such proposal is made. Suggested answer – We agree with the proposed changed focus of design codes. We agree in particular to design codes for local communities in rural areas rather than such codes for an entire LPA area.**

Question 6 Do you agree that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be amended as proposed? **This presumption has been in every iteration of the NPPF. The consultation proposes to strengthen this further because of the large number of LPAs with no current plan. However, it also proposes that any developments made must be “high standard” and include affordable housing. What is not clear here is that such developments must not contradict the purposes of the Green Belt – such as the avoidance of urban sprawl and the coalescence of towns and villages. Elsewhere in the consultation document and in the proposed NPPF, support is set out for protection of the Green Belt, albeit alongside the requirement for “greybelt” and more housing. Suggested answer – Agreed subject to recognition of the benefits of the Green Belt, in particular that avoidance of coalescence.**

Question 7 Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to continually demonstrate 5 years of specific deliverable sites for decision making purposes, regardless of plan status? **Over the last 15 years something like 60,000 planning officers (those working for LPAs) have left. This is one of the reasons that so many local plans are out of date and many LPAs do not have a five year supply of land for development. The entire consultation is written as if there were no shortage of planning staff. Suggested answer – No comment as we are not a planning authority**

Question 8 Do you agree with our proposal to remove wording on national planning guidance in paragraph 77 of the current NPPF? The final paragraph of paragraph 77 deals with how the NPPG sets out how previous over or under supply should affect a current plan. The consultation includes congratulating LPAs who have over-supplied in the past but not permit them to use this to decrease current housing numbers. Another LPA issue. Suggested answer – No comment as we are not a planning authority

Question 9 Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to add a 5% buffer to their 5-year housing land supply calculations. The consultation states that the 5% buffer was in earlier NPPFs but was removed from the current (Dec 23) version. Suggested answer – No comment as we are not a planning authority

Question 10 If you agree, do you agree that 5% is an appropriate buffer, or should it be a different figure? Interesting that “different” is used rather than “higher”! Suggested answer – No comment as we are not a planning authority

Question 11 Do you agree with the removal of policy on Annual Position Statements? According to the consultation, these Statements are little used. Suggested answer – No comment as we are not a planning authority.

Question 12 Do you agree that the NPPF should be amended to further support effective co-operation on cross boundary and strategic planning matters? There is considerable emphasis in the consultation document for an increased amount of cross boundary co-operation and the establishment of strategic housing “authorities” (in quotes as exactly what will be put in place to oversee cross boundary planning is not clear). Suggested answer – Subject to any cross boundary “authority” is subject appropriately to democratic control, no further comment.

Question 13 Should the test of soundness be amended to better assess the soundness of strategic scale plans or proposals? The consultation document states that where plans include strategic scale proposals it is difficult to assess performance and deliverability. Suggested answer – no comment as we are not a planning authority.

Question 14 Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter? Suggested answer – No comment

Question 15 Do you agree that Planning Practice Guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is housing stock rather than the latest household projections? The household projections come from the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The current NPPG requires authorities to use the 2014 projection. However, the ONS produced further projections in 2016 and 2018, in both cases showing lower projected numbers. The consultation changes this so that it is a percentage of current housing stock that is the base line. There is a statement that this will serve to “rebalancing the national distribution to better reflect the growth ambitions across the Midlands and North”. Curious then that it is in the south that that will have to build more houses because of the much higher affordability ratios are in this part of the country. In addition, having asked the MHCLG on the matter, LPAs will have to uprate the housing stock number annually as more housing is constructed. Hard to see why housing stock is more stable than periodic ONS household projections. Suggested answer – Agreed

Question 16 Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio, averaged over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available to adjust the standard method’s baseline, is appropriate? It is not clear to me what “workplace-based median house price”

is. If it means that the ratio is made up of the earnings of those working in St Albans District should be compared to house prices in the District, I do not agree. Given that the car parks at St Albans City station and at Harpenden station are full by 10 at the latest Monday to Friday, at that there are at least 4 trains every hour outside the rush hour that are fast from St Albans City to St Pancras, I infer that a material percentage of people who live in the District work in London and earn London (that much more) than those working locally. Accordingly, it seems to me that greater clarity is needed. Suggested answer – given the proximity of St Albans City and District to London and the very good train service available at the two main stations in the District to and from the nation’s capital, The earnings used must take account of London “earnings” for a material percentage of the population. If only what is earned from employment in the District is taken into account, it is not appropriate.

Question 17 Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting with the standard method? Suggested answer – if public policy is to rebalance distribution to better reflect the growth ambitions across the Midlands and North, requiring LPAs in southern England, especially St Albans City and District, to plan for more houses than elsewhere because of the impact of the affordability ratio is counter-productive.

Question 18 Do you consider the standard method should factor in evidence on rental affordability? If so, do you have any suggestions for how this could be incorporated into the model? I heard recently that trying to find somewhere to rent in Manchester is about as impossible as anywhere else. So, it seems to me that a different “standard” model would have to be used. However, I have so little knowledge of renting etc. that I cannot comment further. Suggested answer- No comment

Question 19 Do you have any additional comments on the proposed method for assessing housing needs? Whilst it is not a specific housing matter, protecting the Green Belt is of great importance. Requiring huge numbers of houses to be built because of apparent unaffordability (how do you take account of the mythical person – using in this myth a woman, who gets off the train at Harpenden, goes into the nearest estate agent this person comes across and explains that their partner has just received her or his annual bonus and that they, the mythical person, wants to know what houses are available for £2 million) would almost require further coalescence between settlements in St Albans City and District and surrounding LPAs as well as within the District. Suggested answer – The proposed method should give weight to protection of the Green Belt, especially the need to avoid urban sprawl and coalescence. Outside of the principal urban areas, all of the land in the District is Green Belt

Question 20 Do you agree that we should make the proposed change set out in paragraph 124C, as a first step towards brownfield passports? The paragraph referred to is 124c of the 12/23 NPPF. It is 122c in the draft version and the amendment/change appears to be “proposals for which should be supported as acceptable in principle” (careless drafting!). It seems to me deeming any development as “acceptable in principle” is not acceptable. There must be some constraint in terms of density, housing mix and design. Suggested answer – agreed, subject to “acceptable in principle” requiring densities, housing mix and design determined in advance.

Question 21. Do you agree with the proposed change to paragraph 154g of the current NPPF to better support the development of PDL in the Green Belt? A PDL is “previously developed land”. The “restrictions” in the sub-paragraph refer to any PDL based development not have any greater impact on the Green Belt and is to be regarded as positive if it meets an identified affordable housing need. Because of this I see no merit in deleting these “restrictions”. Suggested answer – paragraph 154g seeks when PDL development takes place to protect the Green Belt and encourage the building of affordable houses. We do not agree to the proposed change.

Question 22. Do you have any views on expanding the definition of PDL, whilst ensuring that development and maintenance of glass houses for horticultural production is maintained? Suggested answer – No comment

Question 23 Do you agree with our proposed definition of grey belt land? If not, what changes would you recommend?

Question 24 Are there any additional measures needed to ensure that high performing Green Belt land is not degraded to meet grey belt criteria?

Question 25 Do you agree that additional guidance to assist in identifying land which makes a limited contribution of Green Belt purposes would be helpful? If so, is this best contained in the NPPF itself or in planning practice guidance?

Q26 Do you have any views on whether our proposed guidance sets out appropriate considerations for determining whether land makes a limited contribution to Green belt purposes?

The consultation makes it clear that land that makes a limited contribution to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt (first, the avoidance of urban sprawl, second the avoidance of coalescence) can be grey belt. One of the conditions that apply to the designation is that the land “makes no or little contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another”. It is not clear what this “no or little” contribution” means. Is it distance, topography, forestry, etc.? SADC considers that land between Dunstable Road and Redbourn By-pass cannot be developed because it is too close to Harpenden. That does stop land next to the boundary with Dacorum being developed of course. As such, I have no problem with the proposed definition of grey belt land but I consider that much more detail is needed to know when the contribution to the purposes of the green belt overrides a grey belt re-designation. Suggested answers

Q23 – Agree to the proposed definition.

Q24 - We strongly recommend that greater detail is provided as to when a parcel of land does or does not make a strong or unlimited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.

Q25 – Additional guidance would be helpful, indeed essential. We have no comment on where this guidance is contained.

Q26 – We do not consider that the proposed guidance sets out appropriate conditions. As noted by use elsewhere, the whole of the land outside of the four main settlements in St Albans City and District and so the whole area surrounding Redbourn, is Green Belt. Much greater guidance is needed to determine what land, if any should be degraded to grey belt.

Q27 Do you have any views on the role that Local Nature Recovery Strategies could play in identifying areas of Green Belt which can be enhanced? The consultation document recognises that LNRS could become important for nature recovery purposes. I am unaware that there is a LNRS locally. Suggested answer – No comment

Q28 Do you agree with our proposals support the release of land in the right places, with previously developed land and grey belt identified first, while allowing planning authorities to prioritise the most sustainable development locations? This is an extract from the consultation: “There is clear expectation that local planning authorities should seek to meet their development needs in full. However, we remain clear that the release of land should **not be supported where doing so would fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole.** We propose changes to paragraph 147 of the NPPF to achieve this approach.” (Bold print as in

original.) We need to know precisely what “fundamentally undermine” means. Do all of the 5 purposes have to be breached, for example, or just 1 and 2? Suggested answer – We agree with the approach.

Q29 Do you agree with our proposal to make clear that the release of land should not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole? Suggested answer - Our concern is getting detailed guidance on when it is appropriate not to release Green Belt land and what impact this is permitted to have on housing numbers.

Q30 Do you agree with our approach to allowing development on Green Belt land through decision making? If not, what changes would you recommend? The consultation document repeats that for Green Belt land to be released, development must not fundamentally breach the purposes for the Green Belt. In addition development has to meet its “golden rules”, presumably good design, appropriate density and suitable amount of affordable, and hopefully, social rented houses. In addition, if a site has not been included in a plan and is it the Green Belt, releasing the land (granting planning permission” requires “very special circumstances” to be demonstrated, as the current and all former NPPFs set out. Suggested answer – We agree with the approach and have no other comment

Q31 Do you have any comments on our proposals to allow the release of grey belt land to meet commercial and other development needs through plan making and decision-making, including triggers for release? The consultation makes it clear that non-housing development has to meet “golden rules”. Subject to that I suggest that we have no other comments. Suggested answer – subject to the release of land for non-housing developments must meet golden rules, we have no other comment

Q32 Do you have views on whether the approach to the release of Green Belt through plan making and decision-making should apply to traveller sites, including the sequential test for land release and the definition of PDL? I suggest that we support the release of Green Belt land in the structured approach set out. Suggested answer – we support the ordered and structured release of Green Belt for traveller sites.

Q33 Do you have views on how the assessment of need for traveller sites should be approached, in order to determine whether a local planning authority should undertake a Green Belt review? I take this to mean that if planning permission is sought outside of plan making, the need to demonstrate “very special circumstances” must be met. Suggested answer – subject to the usual need to demonstrate “very special circumstances” we have no other comment

Q34 Do you agree with our proposed approach to the affordable housing tenure mix? The consultation states that the Government is committed to delivering more genuinely affordable housing tenures, such as Social Rent. It is up to LPAs to determine the tenure mix on various sites, subject to delivery under the golden rules. The target is 50% affordable on sites released from the Green Belt. Suggested answer – WE agree.

Q35 Should the 50 per cent target apply to all Green Belt areas (including previously developed land in the Green Belt), or should the Government or local planning authorities be able to set lower targets in low value areas? Previously developed land – the infamous now closed petrol station, may be too small to sustain a mix of tenures including both aspirational and social housing. I suggest that having guidance in either the NPPF or planning guidance would be better than leaving every decision to LPAs. Suggested answer – the 50% target should apply where the site size makes this possible. PDL sites may be quite small. We support guidance in the NPPF.

Q36 Do you agree with the proposed approach to securing benefits for nature and public access to green spaces where Green Belt release occurs? The consultation states that the existing requirement for biodiversity gain will be increased. Also, that green spaces should be available within a short walk of the homes of residents. Also, LPAS will be required to have clear policies on these subjects and use guidance from Natural England and the National Model Design Code. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q37 Do you agree that Government should set indicative benchmark land values for land released from or developed in the Green Belt, to inform local planning authority policy development? The consultation proposes that the Government should set indicative land values and that these are used in viability assessments. These land values may take into account that agricultural land and previously developed site values will be different. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q38 How and what level should the Government set benchmark land values? The consultation states that agricultural land values are usually set between £20,000 - £25,000 per hectare. It goes on to state that various parties have suggested that these value rise when considered for development. A range of 3 times to 40 times is mentioned. CPRE suggested a few years ago that it was 192 times albeit when planning permission had been gained. The consultation states that Green Belt land, because of the restrictions on development, have a BLV at the lower end of this spectrum. I have no ability to comment. Suggested answer – No comment

Q39 To support the delivery of golden rules, the Government is exploring the a reduction in the scope of viability negotiation by setting out that such negotiation should not occur when land will transact above the benchmark land value. Do you have any views on this approach? The consultation makes it clearer that a LPA cannot require more than 50% affordable when land is bought for more than BLV and the purchaser/developer cannot require a lower level of affordable. Suggested answer - agreed

Q40 It is proposed that where development is policy compliant, additional contributions for affordable housing should not be sought. Do you have any views on this approach? “Policy compliant” includes 50% affordable. What is not clear, at least to me, is whether additional contributions can be sought for the building of affordable house elsewhere. Also, without having access to financial information about a development (AKA a viability assessment), it is not possible to know whether an addition contribution is warranted. Suggested answer – no comment.

Q41 Do you agree that where viability negotiations do occur, and contributions below the level set in policy are agreed, development should be subject to late-stage viability reviews, to assess further contributions are required? What support would local planning authorities require to use these effectively? The consultation document has the following “Government sets out that where development proposals comply with benchmark land value requirements, and a viability negotiation to reduce policy delivery occurs, a late-stage review should be undertaken.” From this, there has to be a viability negotiation at the start. Given that a previous question includes a reference to a reduction in the scope of viability negotiation. Suggested answer: This approach may put LPAs under huge pressure. Given that number of planning staff available and their skills, it is likely, at least, that considerable extra funding of LPAs would be required.

Q42 Do you have a view on how golden rules might apply to non-residential development, including commercial development, traveller sites and types already considered “not inappropriate” in the Green Belt? Suggested answer – no comment

Q43 Do you have a view on whether the golden rules should apply only to “new” Green Belt release, which occurs following these changes to the NPPF? Are there other transitional arrangements we should consider, including, for example, draft plans at the regulation 19 stage? For example, do we want the 50% affordable brought in straight away? The risk seems to me that once you open the door by 1cm, someone else comes along and pushes it wide open. Suggested answer – No comment

Q44 Do you have any comments on the proposed wording for the NPPF (Annex 4)? There is no Annex 4 to the consultation document. However, I have downloaded and printed the draft NPPF. Annex 4 is part of that document. It deals with “Viability in Relation to Green Belt release.” The first section is as follows: “1) To determine land value for a viability assessment, a benchmark land value should be established on the basis of existing use value (EUV) of the land, plus a reasonable and proportionate premium for the land owner. For the purposes of plan-making and decision-taking, it is considered that a benchmark land value of (xxxx) allows an appropriate premium for land owners. Local planning authorities should set benchmark land values by this, and by local material considerations.” Suggested answer – LPAs, in order to be able to avoid legal action by land owners, be allowed by law to set the benchmark. In addition, more guidance is needed on what are “other material considerations”.

Q45 Do you have any comments on the proposed approach set out in paragraphs 31 and 32. It appears from these two paragraphs that where land in the Green Belt is not sold voluntarily, the Government is considering how public bodies, including LPAs could use compulsory purchase to assemble sites for development. In addition, “hope value”, the increase in the price of land occasioned by the hope of development and planning permission, and the inclusion of this in the 1961 Land Compensation Act, would be excluded in order that social houses can be included. Suggested answer – As set out above, LPAs and other public bodies must have the law backing up their compulsory purchase actions.

Q46 Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter? Suggested answer – No comment

Q47 Do you agree with setting the expectation that local planning authorities should consider the particular needs of those who require Social Rent when undertaking needs assessments and setting policies on affordable housing requirements? LPAs are required by the current NPPF to consider the needs of different groups in the community. This does not include by specific reference those in need of social rent. The consultation proposes to amend this so that LPAs will consider the needs of such people and include the expectation of the delivery of properties for social rent in their Plans. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q48 Do you agree with removing the requirement to deliver 10% of housing on major sites as affordable home ownership? The current NPPF requirements on tenure refer only to home ownership. Public policy will change this (see above Q47). The first step is the removal of the 10% affordable houses for purchase. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q49 Do you agree with removing the minimum 25% First Homes requirement? First homes are a tenure form. LPAs will consider all types of tenure need according to the consultation. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q50 Do you have any other comments on retaining the option to deliver First Homes, including through exception sites? Exception sites are also known as community-led development sites and also, must be adjacent to existing settlements. Houses (homes) for purchase are allowed on such

sites. Suggested answer – We support community-led developments including different forms of tenure.

Q51 Do you agree with introducing a policy to promote developments that have a mix of tenures and types? The consultation states that the benefits of a mix include the creation of diverse communities and timely build out rates. This latter is delivered by a wider range of parties being involved in building various types on tenure related properties. Suggested answer – Agreed.

Q52 What would be the most appropriate way to promote high percentage Social Rent/affordable housing developments? I suggest that there are many ways of promotion. For example, working closely with Housing Associations, press releases and use of the local press to make it known the such developments are planned, use of social media and by contact with any other agents (charities and informal organisations). However, we not the planning authority. Suggested answer – No comment.

Q53 What safeguards would be required to ensure that there are not unintended consequences? For example, is there a maximum size where development of this nature is appropriate? LPAs are required to consider the needs of the various constituent communities within their areas. It seems to me that there should be a presumption in favour of mixed tenure developments. Otherwise, there is the risk that development sites and the resultant dwellings for those that need social rent, in particular, will be regarded less favourably as is claimed by the former residents of Grenfell Tower. Suggested answer – No comment

Q54 What measures should we consider to better support and increase rural affordable housing? The obvious answer I suggest is much improved public transport in rural areas and clear and safe corridors for active travel. I am equally sure that there are many other measures that should be taken that I have not mentioned. Suggested answer – Provision of effective local public transport and provision of high quality corridors for active travel.

Q55 Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 63 of the existing NPPF? These changes are in line with the forgoing. Paragraph 63 deals with the requirement for LPAs to consider the needs of different groups within the community. As it stands, it refers only to affordable housing. One of the changes brings in social rent. Also, at present only families with children are included. The changes include including children in care. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q56 Do you agree with these changes? The changes refer to community-led developments. It is proposed that groups set up other than for the provision of housing should be able to be included. Also, the limit on numbers is to be lifted, so that the LPA can include a higher number in a local plan. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q57 Do you have views on whether the definition of “affordable housing for rent” in the Framework glossary should be amended? If so, what changes would you recommend? The Glossary content on Affordable Housing for rent has three elements: (a) is accordance with Government policy or is at least 20% below local market rents (b) the landlord is a registered provider (c) the rent is to remain affordable for future eligible households. I have no suggestions for change. Suggested answer – No comment

Q58 Do you have views on why insufficient small sites are being allocated, and on ways in which the small site policy of the NPPF should be strengthened? The current NPPF sections 70 – 73 deal with this matter. Suggested answer – No comment

Q59 Do you agree with the proposals to retain references to well-designed buildings and places, but remove references to “beauty” and “beautiful” and to amend paragraph 138 of the current NPPF? Suggested answer – No comment

Q60 Do you agree with the proposed changes for upwards extensions? Suggested answer – No comment

Q61 Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter? All to do with upward extensions. Suggested answer – No comment

Q62 Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 86b) and 87 of the existing NPPF? This section of the NPPF is entitled “Building a strong, competitive economy”. This refers to LPA plans having policies referring to identify sites for commercial and industrial developments. The changes proposed include specific references to very up-to-date types of commerce and industry, such as data centres, gigafactories and such like. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q63 Are there sectors you think need particular support via these changes? What are they and why? Suggested answer – No comment

Q64 Would you support the prescription of data centres, gigafactories, and/or laboratories as types of business and commercial development which could be capable (on request) of being directed into the NSIP consenting regime? NSIPs are Nationally Important Strategic Projects. The aim seems to be to speed up consenting to such projects. Suggested answer – No comment

Q65 If the direction power is extended to these developments, should it be limited by scale, and what would be appropriate scale if so? Suggested answer – No comment

Q66 Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter? Suggested answer – No comment

Q67 Do you agree with changes proposed to paragraph 100 of the existing NPPF? This refers to faster delivery of public service provision – hospital, prisons etc. The change requires that “significant weight” should be placed on these when LPAs consider proposals for development. Suggested answer – No comment

Q68 Do you agree with changes proposed to paragraph 99 of the existing NPPF? This paragraph refers to education facilities. The proposed changes refer to early years and post-16 and their inclusion. Suggested answer – No comment

Q69 Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 114 and 115 of the existing NPPF? These are relatively minor changes on transport infrastructure. Suggested answer – No comment

Q70 How could national planning policy better support local authorities in (a) promoting healthy communities and (b) tackling childhood obesity? In both cases I suggest that LPAs can do little through the planning system. Having more local schools might help with the latter. However, only unitary LPAs have control over planning and education and no LPA has control over the NHS. Suggested answer – No comment

Q71 Do you have any more suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter. Suggested answer – No comment

Q72 Do you agree that large onshore wind proposals should be reintegrated into the s NSIP regime? (I think that the “s” is a mistake.) From my layman’s knowledge of these things, the east of England is not the place for large onshore wind farms. Using the NSIP means that LPAs are excluded from

planning decisions. Accordingly, I consider that we are best served by putting this into our response. Suggested answer – Subject to these large onshore wind farms being approved in those parts of the country that are shown by metrological statistics to be most appropriate, we agree.

Q73 Do you agree with the proposed changes to the NPPF to give greater support to renewable and low carbon energy? Having asked the MHCLG about allowing businesses to put solar panels on commercial properties, only to be told that this is up to each LPA to consider, it is not a planning issue that gets in the way, it is that the local authorities must allow solar panels to be installed without increased council tax, which would otherwise be charged because of the deemed increase value of the commercial premises concerned. So, this is not really a planning matter. Never-the-less, I see no reason to disagree. Suggested answer – Agreed

Q74 Some habitats, such as those containing peat soils, might be considered unsuitable for renewable energy development due to their role in carbon sequestration. Should there be additional protections for such habitats and/or compensatory mechanisms put in place? Not relevant to SADC or the rest of Hertfordshire so far as I know. Suggested answer – No comment

Q75 Do you agree that the threshold at which on-shore wind projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consent under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50 megawatts (MW) to 100MW? Suggested answer – Agreed

Q76 Q75 Do you agree that the threshold at which solar projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consent under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50 megawatts (MW) to 150MW? Suggested answer – Agreed

Q77 If you think that alternative thresholds should apply to onshore wind and/or solar, what would these be? Suggested answer – No comment

Q78 In what specific, deliverable ways could national planning policy do more to address climate change and adaptation? Building houses as far as possible from railway stations is the opposite as it makes travelling by car almost necessary for all. Accordingly, planning policy should encourage LPAs to identify locations as near as possible to effective transport links. Suggested answer – Planning policy should encourage LPAS to identify Green Belt sites as near as possible to effective transport links to needed infrastructure and employment.

Q79 What are your views of the current state of technological readiness and available tools for accurate carbon accounting in plan-making and planning decisions, and what are the challenges to increasing its use? Suggested answer – No comment

Q80 Are there any changes needed to policy for managing flood risk to improve its effectiveness? Suggested answer – No comment

Q81 Do you have any other comments on actions that can be taken through planning to address climate change? Unless there is recognition that building on the Green Belt a long way away from critical infrastructure – schools, hospitals and other medical facilities, retail and employment only has a negative impact on climate change and so should be discouraged, even if this means that mandatory housing targets cannot be achieved. Suggested answer – the whole planning system should give priority to combatting climate change. This may mean that LPAs cannot meet mandatory housing targets if they are able only to identify sites for development some way from critical infrastructure.

Q82 Do you agree with the removal of this text from the footnote? The footnote reads “The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside other policies in the Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development.” The consultation makes it clear that food security is very important and so proposes that this footnote is removed. I understand that the land around Redbourn is considered to be of good quality for agricultural purposes. Hence, land that is not used for agriculture should be identified as suitable for development. **Suggested answer – Agreed**

Q83 Are there other ways in which we can ensure that development support and does not compromise food production? I have seen another opinion piece clearly stating that it is in big cities that housing developments should take place. The same piece included that Turin and Liverpool are about the same size in population terms. In the Italian city 70% of the population can reach the city centre within 30 minutes of leaving home. Only about 35% of the population of Liverpool can do this. In this country we have focussed on building homes in the suburbs and beyond. We have prevented urban sprawl only by the establishment of Green Belts. So, my answer here is focus on house building and other suitable commercial in large towns and cities, not in the countryside. On a local level, park cars underground and let people live where these above ground car parks were, very close to St Albans and Harpenden city and town centres. **Suggested answer – focus developments in large urban areas.**

Q84 Do you agree that we should improve the current water infrastructure provisions in the Planning Act 2008, and do you have specific suggestions for how best to do this? The consultation here is headed Supporting water resilience. It notes there “is a growing gap in our water supplies that will rise to five billion litres a day by 2050”. There is nothing about the additional and perhaps more quickly felt gap in much of the whole of eastern England compared to the west. The main point is about putting water infrastructure projects into the NSIP regime. This would mean that if the still proposed new reservoir in the Thames valley near Abingdon were to go into the NSIP, the local authority would lose its planning rights as regards the proposal. This reservoir is not being built below ground. It will be surrounded by a 10 meter bund. Another proposal is to bring water from the River Severn via the Grand Union Canal. This would need a lot of infrastructure, albeit a lot less than the Abingdon Reservoir. **Suggested answer – We agree to the proposed change to the Planning Act 2008. On specific suggestions, no comment**

Q85 Are there other areas of the water infrastructure provisions that could be improved? If so, can you explain what those are, including your proposed changes? **Suggested answer – No comment**

Question 86 Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter? The suggestion that the Planning Act 2008 could be used includes looks to be reasonable restrictive. Three of the projects are those that designed to provide relief in droughts, are for water recycling and for drinking water transfers. The fourth refers to the construction, maintenance or operation of water infrastructure by a third party. So, Thames out-sources the construction of the Abingdon reservoir to a construction company and so avoids the planning system. **Suggested answer – we are opposed to any provision that allows a water company that wishes to avoid the usual planning system by using a third party contractor as regards a major water infrastructure project, by having this project transferred to the NSIP.**

Q87 Do you agree that we should replace the existing intervention policy criteria with revised criteria set out in this consultation? This chapter deals with the power that the Government has to intervene in local plans. The key sentences are “ The Government is committed to take tough action to ensure authorities have up-to-date local plans in place, supporting local democratic engagement

with how, not if, necessary development should happen. Where authorities fail, the law provides powers for the Government to take action to ensure that plans are progressed and are in place.” Two options are put forward: to withdraw the policy criteria and not replace them, or to revise the policy criteria. The power to intervene is set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and this is where the criteria are set out (a White Paper from 2017 is the basis for recent interventions). It strikes me that it makes virtually no difference as which of these options is selected. Intervention will occur if LPA is not keeping to the timetable and other requirements as set out in the consultation. **Suggested answer – No comment**

Q 88 Alternatively, would you support us withdrawing the criteria and relying on the existing legal tests to underpin future use of intervention powers? **Suggested answer – No comment**

Q89 Do you agree with the proposal to increase householder application fees to meet cost recovery? The consultation sets out that the planning fees do not cover LPA costs. **Some 80% of planning applications are from householders and the fee for each is £258. For full cost recovery this would have to rise to £528. As already noted, there is an acute shortage of planning staff at LPAs. So, by increasing the fees, the existing costs are covered and so would be those of any additional personnel. Suggested answer – agreed**

Q90 If no, do you support increasing the fee by a smaller amount (at a level less than full cost recovery) and if so, what should the fee increase be? For example, a 50% increase to the householder fee would increase the application fee from £258 to £387. **Suggested answer – No comment**

Q91 If we proceed to increase the householder fees to meet cost recovery, we have estimated to meet cost-recovery, the householder fee should be increased to £528. Do you agree with this estimate? **(the options are Yes, No – it should be higher than £528, No- it should be lower than £528 , No – there should be no fee increase, Don’t know.) As we are a planning authority, suggested answer – Don’t know**

Q92 Are there any applications for which the current fee is inadequate. Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be. **Again, as we are not a planning authority, Suggested answer – No comment**

Q93 Are there any application types for which fees are not currently charged but which should require a fee? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the fee should be. **Again, as we are not a planning authority, Suggested answer – No comment**

Q94 Do you consider that each local planning authority should be able to set its own (non-profit making) planning application fee? Please give your reasons in the text box below **(not clear if an answer is required here!) Not all LPAs are the same size and local authorities’ income varies so much, largely dependent whether they are in a fairly wealthy area or a rather deprived one, Blackpool being the leading contender I understand. So I suggest that we back LPAs having the ability to set fees locally and with full transparency.**

Q95 What would be your preferred model for localisation of planning fees

Suggest answer and reason – Local Variation. Reason – LPAs are not uniform in terms of size nor income distribution. Because of this, enabling LPAs to set their own fees along with nationally-set default fees is our preferred model. We urge that there should be full transparency where LPAs to set their own rates.

Q96 Do you consider that planning fees should be increased beyond cost recovery, for planning applications services, to fund wider planning services? The consultation makes the point that there are quite a range of planning services that do not have a fee attached. Enforcement is one of these, as is plan making. The cost of delivering these no fees services are estimated to have cost £384 million in 2022-2023. Suggested answer Agreed

Q97 What wider planning services, if any, other than planning applications (development management) do you consider could be paid for by planning fees? The examples, in addition to those mentioned above, are heritage and conservation and design services. The consultation makes the point that to cover all other activities, that is, to recover the £384 million, would mean the cost of a planning application would increase by 157% It is not clear whether this is from the fee today, £258, or the increased fee needed to cover the costs of planning applications, £528. If the latter, the fee rises to £829. It also makes the point that imposing much higher costs could risk some developments. Also, it could be argued that some services, plan making being the obvious one to me, should be funded from other budgets and so funded through Council Tax payments. We often recommend that a conservation officer looks at a planning application. So, perhaps this is the one that should be paid for separately. Presumably, all planning applicants would have to be told that there could be an additional charge in certain circumstances. However, as we are not a planning authority, suggested answer No comment

Q 98, Q99, Q100, Q101 and Q102 all deal with recovery of costs incurred in LPAs resulting from NSIP dealings. These are even less relevant to us as RPC then other matters dealt with is this consultation. Suggested response to all questions No comment

Q103. Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements? Are there any alternatives you think we should consider? There are a number of options for LPAs under these arrangements. Those that are able to get to examination no later than one month after the publication of the new NPPF may proceed as now. If an LPA is not able to achieve this, provided the LHN is within 200 of the figure from the new method set out in this consultation they may still proceed. However, if the proposed LHN is more than 200 less than the new figure, it must halt its progress and start revising in accordance with the (draft) revised NPPF. The briefing note from SADC reflects these two options. LPAs will be provided with direct funding to help with the additional work involved in redrafting a plan. Suggested answer No comment

Q104 Do you agree with these proposed transitional arrangements? There is no more material information in the consultation. Suggested answer – No comment

Q105 Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter? Suggested answer No comment

Q106 Do you have any views on the impacts of the above proposals for you, or the group or business you represent and on anyone with a relevant protected characteristic? If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how. Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impact identified? Suggested answer No comment

REDBOURN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Management and Communication Committee held on Thursday, 8th July 2024, 7.00pm in the Council Office at the Parish Centre.

PRESENT: Councillors A Hayes (C), V Mead (VC), D Bigham, S Vegro, W Bloisi

IN ATTENDANCE: C Kenny (Clerk)
Cllr T Finnis

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs I Caldwell, D Mitchell,
Apologies were noted and accepted

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Caldwell - Nickey Line (CM), Redbourn Village Online, Active in Redbourn (M) Commuter Friendly
Cllr Mead – Redbourn in Bloom (CM), Museum (Trustee), Active in Redbourn (M)
Cllr Mitchell – District Councillor, Community Group (M)
Cllr Vegro – Active in Redbourn (CM), Computer Friendly (V)
Cllr Bigham – Village Hall (M) Community Group (M)
Cllr Bloisi – Friends of St Mary's (CM) Community Group (M)

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that,
Amendment to Statement on Intent – add 'RPC as the Landlord'

Subject to amendment above, the minutes of the meeting held on 13th June 2024 are adopted as a true record of the meeting.

5. ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES NOT APPEARING ON THE AGENDA

None

6. MATTERS TO REPORT

Flag
Calendar

7. FINANCE

7.1 To receive the latest Management and Communications finance reports

The Clerk presented the income and expenditure report.

Items of note:

- 4286 – miscoding. Correct code is 4285 email addresses

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

The Income and Expenditure Report, dated 18th July 2024, reflecting Accounts to the end of June 2024 be received

8. PARISH CENTRE MANAGEMENT

8.1 Update on hirers

The Clerk presented the hirer report for June which was duly noted.

8.2 To approve the redecoration of the main hall

The Clerk presented quotation received from our preferred supplier, Dave Decorate, to paint the main hall as it starting to look tired – it was last repainted in 2022.

It was proposed by Chair and resolved that:

The main hall be repainted at a cost of £1,200 by Dave Decorate, our preferred supplier.

ACTION: Work to be completed on 2nd September – 4th September

9. PARISH COUNCIL MANAGEMENT

9.1 Officer Reports

Officer reports were duly noted with no further action required.

- Cllrs thanked the Clerk and Deputy Clerk for making the Music Festival such a successful event despite the rain.

9.2 Staffing Matters

FO returned to work on 24th June on a phased basis. Now working contracted hours. She will be undergoing further surgery at end of August.

Cllr Finnis joined the meeting to talk through the specifics of the Microsoft 365 upgrade, which this meeting had previously agreed to. Confirmed the following:

- Cllrs will be upgraded to Business Basic - £85 pa per user
- Office staff will be upgraded to Business Premium - £255 pa per user.
This includes Business Defender which would replace the need for an anti-virus solution.

The main advantage, apart from security of files, is that it gives us Teams – this will allow working party meetings to be held virtually. We will also have access to Share point which can be used as a secure place to store, organize, share, and access information from any device

Training will be given to all.

Cllr Finnis explained what Cyber Essentials is. This is a government backed security scheme that will help you to protect your organisation, whatever its size, against a whole range of the most common cyber-attacks. Gaining the Certification means that the appropriate action has been taken to ensure the IT system is secure. Cllr Finnis suggests that we roll out Microsoft 365 upgrade and use cyber essentials as our benchmark.

Pension matters

In accordance with Standing Order 68 and in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the press and public be temporarily excluded and they be instructed to withdraw.

9.3 To agree to the cost for Clerk to attend SLCC conference in October 2024

The Clerk requested that she attend the SLCC which is a good networking opportunity but also the key speakers were relevant to the Parish Council.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

***The Clerk to attend the SLCC conference on 8th and 9th October 2024
for a cost of £485 plus VAT***

9.4 To agree with wording for privacy notice to add to end of Councillor and Officer emails

The draft privacy notice was discussed, and some typos were noted and amended.

It was proposed by the Chair and resolved that:

***Subject to typo amendments, RPC adopt the privacy notice wording to be inserted
as part of the signature at end of Councillor emails.***

ACTION: Clerk to add privacy wording to website and create a link. Send to Cllrs for them to add.

9.4 To agree to lapel badges for Community Champions

Clerk did not have all the information required so will move to next agenda.

10. MUSEUM

To receive an update on Museum works

As the Statement of Intent has now been agreed (amended at this meeting as per item 4), the Clerk will forward to the Museum Trustees via the working party distribution group. Working was to be phased over 5 years but because of the nature of the works, it is more cost effective to do the roofing, the windows and then the render in the same schedule of works. We can phase the work over 2 financial years so that funds can be budgeted for 2025/26 financial year.

The Facilities Officer has secured the contractors and Clerk will advise Trustees of the planned dates, bearing in mind the rendering needs to be done during a specific time frame due to weather conditions. Another meeting of the working party will be organised in September.

11. MATTERS TO REPORT

Flag – Cllr Mead asked if RPC still required the Ukrainian flag to be flown as the Union Jack had been flying since June. Clerk to re-fly Ukrainian flag as per Councillors request.

Calendar – Cllr Mead requested an updated calendar to reflect the change of M&C meeting times. Clerk pointed out that all dates are on the website but would print off for those who required it.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Friday, 3rd October 2024 at 7.00pm, Parish Centre.

The meeting closed at 8.30pm

Signed.....

Date.....

MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT - CLERK

Month: June/July

ACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June/July payments • Salary payments • June reconciliations • Monthly pension data upload to LPP • Preparation for Full Council meeting and subsequent actions • Preparation for M&C and subsequent actions • Preparation for Commons and subsequent actions • Preparation for F&P and subsequent actions • General emails, correspondence • Weekly Round ups • AGAR submission to external auditor • Redbourn Festival • Holiday from 19th July – 6th August
ACHIEVEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful submission of AGAR to external auditor – on time
ISSUES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early retirement situation –
OFFICER'S COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT – Deputy Clerk

Month: June/July

ACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning – Meetings prep, meetings & minutes • Hirers – Emails, diary management, billing • Updating bookings calendar with regular hirer dates, • Credit control • General email/ day to day activity • Invoice entry • Social media posts – sourcing material and scheduling of posts • Monitoring social media comments • Compiling and sending E-Newsletter • Monitoring emails for community@redbourn-pc.gov.uk • Redbourn Festival – live music in evening • Liaising with AiR organisers for Festival •
ACHIEVEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite the weather the evening event was a success, particularly as managed to source a large screen to watch the semi-final of Euros
ISSUES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
OFFICER COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overtime for May - 13 hours • Overtime for June – 6 hours • Overtime for July - 9 hours

MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT - Facilities Officer

Month: June/July

ACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bench inventory – ongoing • Museum – ongoing • Weekly fire point testing and defib testing • Setting up digital play area inspection sheets -JHP testing • Roofer sourced to do repairs to Silk Mill House roof. Date booked in: 26th September • Quotations secured for work on windows and render at Silk Mill House and date set for March 2025 and May 2025 respectively • Information collated and sent to Solicitor for them to compose letter to owners of Totten Mews land ref ivy damage to Cumberland Garden Wall
ACHIEVEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
ISSUES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Museum rendering. • Cumberland Garden wall
OFFICER COMMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Returned to work at end of June

Briefing Note - Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system

NB: This Briefing Note focuses on key implications for the Local Plan – there are significant implications for Development Management and other areas as well

Overview

On 30 July the Government launched their proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other changes to the planning system, along with publishing a Written Ministerial Statement providing more detail on the Government's planning reform agenda.

The consultation runs until 24 September and seeks views on the proposed approach to revising the NPPF, along with views on a series of wider policy proposals in relation to increasing planning fees, Local Plan intervention criteria and appropriate thresholds for certain Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. In total there are 106 questions for consultees to answer.

The Government advise that they will publish the revised NPPF "in the autumn" or "before the end of the year", with the policies applying straight from publication date + one month.

The changes proposed are significant in their impact on St Albans District, particularly in terms of increasing the required housing figure by 75% to 1,544 homes per annum and the effect on progress of the new Draft Local Plan that is currently heading towards the Regulation 19 stage.

Proposed Changes to the Standard Methodology

The revised methodology means a new annual housing requirement for St Albans District, increasing from **885** to **1,544**, which is an increase of **660** homes, or **75%**.

As the draft new NPPF stands today, and with the acknowledged uncertainty about a number of factors, this would mean an extra 11,220 homes to 2041, all in the Green Belt.

As an initial approximation only, based on the Settlement Hierarchy, Spatial Strategy and existing population sizes, this would mean very roughly:

6,000 extra homes in the Green Belt around St Albans,

3,000 extra homes in the Green Belt around Harpenden,

2,000 extra homes (in total) in the Green Belt around London Colney / Redbourn / Wheathampstead / other settlements.

The **proposed new Standard Methodology** adopts a two-step approach:

1. Take 0.8% of the current housing stock of the area;
2. Apply an uplift, based on a three-year average of the median workplace-based affordability ratio.

It should be noted that the baseline stock figure will be adjusted upwards in areas where house prices are more than four times higher than earnings.

This generates a national total of around 371.5K net additional homes per annum.

In comparison the current Standard Methodology is based on a four-step approach:

1. Using the 2014-based household projections, take the 10-year average growth rate;
2. Apply an uplift, based on the latest median workplace-based affordability ratio;
3. Where the strategic policies for housing in the current plan are more than five years old, they cap the need at 40% above whichever is higher of the current plan requirement or household projections;

This generates a national total of around 305.7K net additional homes per annum,

Of all the authorities in Hertfordshire SADC is the most affected by the housing numbers change:

- **St Albans +75%**
- Hertsmere +31%
- Dacorum +29%
- Broxbourne +16%
- Three Rivers +15%
- East Herts +13%
- North Herts +9%
- Stevenage +6%
- Watford -6%
- Welwyn Hatfield -8%

But at a national scale many other authorities are affected far more than St Albans:

The 20 authorities that would see the biggest increase in housing need under the proposed standard assessment method

Rank	Planning authority	Homes needed per year (current method)	Homes needed per year (proposed method)	Extra homes per year
1	Kensington and Chelsea	1,381	4,271	2,890
2	Westminster	1,862	3,792	1,930
3	Cornwall	2,707	4,454	1,747
4	Wiltshire	1,917	3,476	1,558
5	Cheshire East	977	2,530	1,554
6	Cheshire West and Chester	532	2,017	1,485
7	Wandsworth	2,559	3,880	1,321
8	East Riding of Yorkshire	817	2,088	1,271
9	Northumberland	549	1,769	1,220
10	County Durham	1,129	2,210	1,081

...	County Borough
11	Wirral	728	1,755	1,027
12	Shropshire	1,070	2,059	989
13	Dudley	657	1,594	937
14	Sefton	578	1,466	888
15	Hammersmith and Fulham	1,580	2,467	887
16	Doncaster	525	1,388	863
17	Stockport	1,097	1,906	809
18	Wakefield	923	1,721	798
19	Elmbridge	653	1,443	791
20	Islington	1,465	2,231	766

Significant Changes to the NPPF

Significant Reversal of NPPF Changes introduced 19 December 2023

- Paragraph 62 (previously 61) deletion of the wording: ~~The outcome of the standard method is an advisory starting point for establishing a housing requirement for the area~~, confirming that the standard method is mandatory.
- Paragraph 142 (previously 144) deletion of the wording: ~~‘there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries...’~~, removing the potential for opting out of Green Belt boundary review if the circumstances require this.

Proposed Significant NPPF Changes

- Paragraph 142 addition clearly sets out the need to review Green Belt boundaries when the authority cannot otherwise meet its identified need:

‘Exceptional circumstances include, but are not limited to, instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for housing, commercial or other development through other means. In these circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that such alterations would fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole.’
- Paragraph 144 addition brings in grey belt land as a new element within the Green Belt to be considered before other Green Belt locations:

Where it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to previously-developed land in sustainable locations, then consider grey belt land in sustainable locations which is not already previously-developed, and only then consider other sustainable Green Belt locations.
- Glossary addition for grey belt:

Grey belt: For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the green belt comprising Previously Developed Land and any other parcels and/or areas of Green Belt land that make a limited contribution to the five Green Belt purposes (as defined in para 140 of this Framework), but excluding those areas or assets of particular importance listed in footnote 7 of this Framework (other than land designated as Green Belt).

- Paragraph 147 added sets out the requirements for development on Green Belt land through reference to paragraph 155:

Where Green Belt land is released for development through plan preparation or review, development proposals on the land concerned should deliver the contributions set out in paragraph 155 below.

- Paragraph 151 addition and deletion:

A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would *not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt*:

~~— not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or~~

~~— not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.~~

- Paragraph 152 addition sets out when proposals in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate. Note that parts a. and b. should be read together:

In addition to the above, housing, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- The development would utilise grey belt land in sustainable locations, the contributions set out in paragraph 155 below are provided, and the development would not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole; and*
- The local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with a buffer, if applicable, as set out in paragraph 76) or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years; or there is a demonstrable need for land to be released for development of local, regional or national importance.*
- Development is able to meet the planning policy requirements set out in paragraph 155.*

Key Questions:

- How will the concept to 'not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole' be assessed? This could be very broad.
 - How does part c. relate to the overall approach? Does the lack of 'and' and the full stop at the end of part b. mean that part c. should be read alone, and if so does that mean that a proposal meeting the requirements of paragraph 155 alone could be regarded as acceptable?
- Paragraph 155 addition sets out the contributions required for development on Green Belt:

Where major development takes place on land which has been released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt permitted through development management, the following contributions should be made:

- a) In the case of schemes involving the provision of housing, at least 50% affordable housing [with an appropriate proportion being Social Rent], subject to viability;*
- b) Necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure;*
- c) The provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. Where residential development is involved, the objective should be for new residents to be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces.*

Transition Arrangements

- Paragraph 226 addition provides for transition arrangements:

The policies in this Framework (published on [publication date]) will apply for the purpose of preparing local plans from [publication date + one month] unless one or more of the following apply:

a. the emerging annual housing requirement in a local plan that reaches or has reached Regulation 19 (pre-submission stage) on or before [publication date + one month] is no more than 200 dwellings below the published relevant Local Housing Need figure;

...

c. the local plan is or has been submitted for examination under Regulation 22 on or before [publication date + one month].

Where a, b or c applies, the plan will be examined under the relevant previous version of the framework.

Options for SADC Going Forward

- **Option 1** - continue with the current Plan by significantly accelerating the Regulation 19 timetable and the Submission timetable to allow Submission before the new NPPF publication date + one month
- **Option 2** - continue with the current Plan by adding housing capacity to reach 200 less than the requirement (1,344 units pa) and get to Regulation 19 before the new NPPF publication date + one month (this option is purely theoretical only for SADC as there is no way to introduce another 460 homes pa without a long period to work on necessary infrastructure requirements etc.)
- **Option 3** - recommence the Plan at an evidence gathering stage, effectively going backwards 2-3 years, to meet the full revised Standard Method by December 2026;

Local Plan Examination Considerations

The options set out above should also be considered in light of the letter of 30 July from Matthew Pennycook to PINS re Local Plan examinations:

- *We cannot ignore the fact that the length of examinations has been increasing, from 65 weeks on average in 2016 to 134 weeks in 2022.*
- *In 2015, the Government set out an expectation that Inspectors should operate "pragmatically" during local plan examinations to allow deficient plans to be 'fixed' at examination. This has gone too far and has perversely led to years of delays to local plan examinations without a guarantee that the plans will ever be found sound, or that the local authorities will take the decisions necessary to get them over the line. This has to end.*
- *Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that a local planning authority must not submit a local plan unless they have complied with relevant legislative requirements, and they think the plan is ready for independent examination by a Planning Inspector. Accordingly, an authority should not be submitting to examination a deficient plan believing the Inspector will use significant time and resource during the examination to 'fix' it.*

And the response from PINS on 1 August 2024:

- *I am making all examining Inspectors aware of this change. They will be briefed, and our procedure guide and other relevant material will be updated accordingly. It is inescapable that this fresh approach will lead to an increase in local plans being recommended for withdrawal from examination or being found unsound.*

Other Matters to be aware of

The Minister of State [interviewed on the BBC Radio 4 Today Programme](#) on 31st July indicated that the New Towns identified by the Task Force would be additional to the newly announced LHN numbers, saying:

“just to absolutely clear... our ambition on the New Towns front is over and above the planning changes we announced yesterday that 370,000 housing target so they're not crucial to that ... normal activity of local authorities bringing forward homes through local plans; they will be over and above”

The Deputy Prime Minister's Written Ministerial Statement sets out a number of important issues to consider, including directly addressing the Green Belt in a number of ways, including:

It is however also clear that brownfield land can only be part of the answer, and will not be enough to meet our housing needs – which is why a Green Belt designed for England in the middle of the twentieth century now must be updated for an England in the middle of the twenty first.

Key Links

Open consultation: Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes:

https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system?utm_campaign=14599261_01082024%20NPPF%20Consultation%20-%20England%20Members&utm_medium=email&utm_source=The%20Royal%20Town%20Planning%20Institute&dm_i=1L61,8OWV1,9AZBML,1035GT,1#contents

Letter from Rt Hon Angela Rayner MP, Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government
30 July 2024

To: all local authority Leaders in England Cc: all local authority Chief Executives in England

'Playing your part in building the homes we need':

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/66aa4849ab418ab055593105/Letter_from_DPM_to_local_authorities_-_Playing_your_part_in_building_the_homes_we_need.pdf

Written Ministerial Statement 'Building the homes we need' 30 July 2024 by Rt Hon Angela Rayner MP, Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government:

https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2024-07-30/hcws48?utm_campaign=14599261_01082024%20NPPF%20Consultation%20-%20England%20Members&utm_medium=email&utm_source=The%20Royal%20Town%20Planning%20Institute&dm_i=1L61,8OWV1,9AZBML,1035GU,1

Draft NPPF track changes document for consultation:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/66acffddce1fd0da7b593274/NPPF_with_fo_tnotes.pdf

New housing targets and revised Standard Method:

<https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fassets.publishing.service.gov.uk%2Fmedia%2F66a8d6a20808eaf43b50d9a8%2Foutcome-of-the-proposed-revised-method.ods&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK>

Launch of the New Towns Taskforce Chaired by Sir Michael Lyons:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/expert-taskforce-to-spearhead-a-new-generation-of-new-towns>

Letter from Matthew Pennycook, Minister of State, to Paul Morrison, Chief Executive, The Planning Inspectorate 30 July 2024:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/66aa157b0808eaf43b50dad5/minister-pennycook-to-chief-executive-of-planning-inspectorate.pdf>

Letter from Paul Morrison, Chief Executive, The Planning Inspectorate, to Matthew Pennycook, Minister of State, 1 August 2024:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/66ab6a39a3c2a28abb50db6d/Paul_Morrison_to_Minister_Pennycook_01_08_24.pdf

COPY OF EMAIL RECEIVED on 27th AUGUST 2024 FROM CHAIR OF CRICKET CLUB

I would like to discuss a proposal with the Council if possible regarding a change to the gravel drive on North Common.

As you probably know, some of our cricket matches are played across the road with the common to the west of North Common forming part of the outfield. Most of this area is grassed but there are two shingle driveways providing access to the houses on North Common. One of the driveways has been constructed using a plastic paving grid filled with shingle, bordered by a rounded concrete path edging. The other driveway, leading to Old Pastures and Greenleas, has been constructed using metal banding as a border with loose shingle in between.

The paving grid drive, while not as good as grass from a cricketing perspective, is reasonably level and safe for players. By contrast, the shingle on the other drive has now shifted exposing the metal banding, which poses both a trip hazard and injury risk for players. I would like to explore whether the Council would be open to the loose shingle drive being replaced with plastic grid paving and filled either with shingle or soil / grass. Hopefully, as this has already been used on the other drive, this would be acceptable.

Given that the Club would be the main beneficiary of the proposed work, we would not expect the Council to fund the work - we would be willing to bear the cost.

Could you let me know how best to take this proposal forward please.

All the best

Chairman, Redbourn CC

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 01/08/2024

Month No: 5

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>100 Income Precept</u>								
1076 Precept	0	136,292	272,583	136,292			50.0%	
Income Precept :- Income	<u>0</u>	<u>136,292</u>	<u>272,583</u>	<u>136,292</u>			<u>50.0%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Income	<u>0</u>	<u>136,292</u>	<u>272,583</u>	<u>136,292</u>				
<u>120 Income Other</u>								
1201 CCLA Property Fund interest	0	1,485	3,000	1,515			49.5%	
1202 Public Sector Dep Fund Interes	330	1,317	2,000	683			65.8%	
1203 Unity Trust Bank interest	601	1,197	0	(1,197)			0.0%	
1250 Miscellaneous Income	620	1,195	0	(1,195)			0.0%	
1260 Memorial Benches	0	(1,100)	0	1,100			0.0%	
Income Other :- Income	<u>1,550</u>	<u>4,094</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>906</u>			<u>81.9%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Income	<u>1,550</u>	<u>4,094</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>906</u>				
<u>130 Income Generated</u>								
1300 PC Letting - Main Hall	105	8,122	17,000	8,878			47.8%	
1301 PC Letting - Conference Hall	58	4,437	13,000	8,563			34.1%	
1330 Newsletter Advertising	0	1,171	2,000	829			58.5%	
Income Generated :- Income	<u>163</u>	<u>13,730</u>	<u>32,000</u>	<u>18,270</u>			<u>42.9%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Income	<u>163</u>	<u>13,730</u>	<u>32,000</u>	<u>18,270</u>				
<u>400 Employment</u>								
4000 Salary	3,266	16,328	42,146	25,819		25,819	38.7%	
4005 Salary	1,429	7,622	18,379	10,757		10,757	41.5%	
4007 Salary	648	3,241	8,296	5,055		5,055	39.1%	
4009 Community Officer	0	36	12,443	12,407		12,407	0.3%	
4010 National Insurance	439	2,264	6,191	3,927		3,927	36.6%	
4015 Pension	1,127	5,897	17,188	11,291		11,291	34.3%	
4025 Payroll Administration	0	344	1,500	1,157		1,157	22.9%	
Employment :- Indirect Expenditure	<u>6,908</u>	<u>35,731</u>	<u>106,143</u>	<u>70,412</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70,412</u>	<u>33.7%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Expenditure	<u>(6,908)</u>	<u>(35,731)</u>	<u>(106,143)</u>	<u>(70,412)</u>				
<u>410 Administration</u>								
4050 Audit Fees	0	(2,559)	2,560	5,119		5,119	(100.0%)	
4051 RBS End of Year	0	0	800	800		800	0.0%	
4055 Legal Fees	0	395	600	205		205	65.8%	

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 01/08/2024

Month No: 5

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
4065 Finance Software Support Fee	0	1,977	1,720	(257)		(257)	114.9%	
4070 Training	485	550	500	(50)		(50)	110.0%	
4071 Councillor Training	0	30	500	470		470	6.0%	
4075 Subscriptions	900	2,809	2,450	(359)		(359)	114.7%	
4080 Insurance	0	1,171	9,100	7,929		7,929	12.9%	
4085 Chair's Discretionary Budget	0	267	500	233		233	53.3%	
4090 Travel & Parking	0	0	100	100		100	0.0%	
4095 Councillor's Allowances	0	0	6,500	6,500		6,500	0.0%	
4117 Volunteer Event	0	2,025	3,000	975		975	67.5%	
4120 Bank Charges	5	29	100	71		71	29.2%	
4121 Kitchen Supplies	0	97	100	3		3	96.6%	
4122 Photography Competition	0	0	700	700		700	0.0%	
4123 Community Champion	0	28	100	72		72	28.0%	
4124 Remembrance Sunday	0	0	140	140		140	0.0%	
4265 Photocopier Hire	145	282	650	368		368	43.4%	
4270 Telephone & Broadband	153	764	1,500	736		736	50.9%	
4275 Stationery & Postage	12	80	500	420		420	16.1%	
4282 Domain name	0	0	150	150		150	0.0%	
4283 Equipment	0	333	1,000	667		667	33.3%	
4284 IT Support	0	0	650	650		650	0.0%	
4285 Email Addresses	48	877	1,215	338		338	72.2%	
4286 Public Sector Property Fund	0	700	0	(700)		(700)	0.0%	
4287 Website	0	0	400	400		400	0.0%	
4288 Communication Management tools	16	16	850	834		834	1.8%	
Administration :- Indirect Expenditure	1,764	9,871	36,385	26,514	0	26,514	27.1%	0
Net Expenditure	(1,764)	(9,871)	(36,385)	(26,514)				
420 Parish Assets - Maint & Expen								
4155 Buildings	0	0	7,500	7,500		7,500	0.0%	
4165 Electricity	77	310	450	140		140	68.9%	
Parish Assets - Maint & Expen :- Indirect Expenditure	77	310	7,950	7,640	0	7,640	3.9%	0
Net Expenditure	(77)	(310)	(7,950)	(7,640)				
430 Communications								
4200 Newsletter Production	0	2,035	3,200	1,165		1,165	63.6%	
4201 Newsletter Distribution	0	340	750	410		410	45.3%	
Communications :- Indirect Expenditure	0	2,375	3,950	1,575	0	1,575	60.1%	0
Net Expenditure	0	(2,375)	(3,950)	(1,575)				

Continued over page

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 01/08/2024

Month No: 5

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
440 Parish Centre								
4210 Parish Centre Marketing	0	0	150	150		150	0.0%	
4245 Security	0	196	2,000	1,804		1,804	9.8%	
4250 Fire Equipment Service	0	100	400	300		300	25.0%	
4251 Lighting Testing	0	0	150	150		150	0.0%	
4252 Wash Room Service	0	0	1,300	1,300		1,300	0.0%	
4253 Wash Room Consumables	0	26	250	224		224	10.3%	
4255 Electricity Supply	582	4,404	8,500	4,096		4,096	51.8%	
4260 Water and Sewerage	39	205	1,000	795		795	20.5%	
4276 Electrical Maintenance	0	150	300	150		150	50.0%	
4277 Heating Maintenance	0	1,384	2,500	1,116		1,116	55.3%	
4280 Repairs & Renewals - Internal	0	921	1,000	79		79	92.1%	
4305 Cleaning	909	3,519	12,000	8,481		8,481	29.3%	
4306 Hirer waste removal	64	348	750	402		402	46.4%	
Parish Centre :- Indirect Expenditure	1,594	11,252	30,300	19,048	0	19,048	37.1%	0
Net Expenditure	(1,594)	(11,252)	(30,300)	(19,048)				
450 Grants								
4380 General Grants	0	0	13,000	13,000		13,000	0.0%	
4395 Scouts	0	2,050	0	(2,050)		(2,050)	0.0%	
4405 Redbourn Players	0	1,500	0	(1,500)		(1,500)	0.0%	
4410 Redbourn in Bloom	0	4,000	0	(4,000)		(4,000)	0.0%	
4415 Allotments	0	500	0	(500)		(500)	0.0%	
4424 Citizens Advice	0	4,000	0	(4,000)		(4,000)	0.0%	
4427 Friends of St Mary's	0	1,000	0	(1,000)		(1,000)	0.0%	
4430 Care Group Running Costs	0	5,000	0	(5,000)		(5,000)	0.0%	
4431 Folk Club	0	1,500	0	(1,500)		(1,500)	0.0%	
4436 Fete du Velo	0	1,000	0	(1,000)		(1,000)	0.0%	
4439 The Woollams	0	250	0	(250)		(250)	0.0%	
4441 Redbourn Fun Run	0	1,000	0	(1,000)		(1,000)	0.0%	
4443 PCSO Basketball Activity	360	360	0	(360)		(360)	0.0%	
4444 Active in Redbourn	0	1,500	0	(1,500)		(1,500)	0.0%	
4445 Christmas Hampers	0	2,500	0	(2,500)		(2,500)	0.0%	
4472 Redbourn Community Food Club	0	520	0	(520)		(520)	0.0%	
Grants :- Indirect Expenditure	360	26,680	13,000	(13,680)	0	(13,680)	205.2%	0
Net Expenditure	(360)	(26,680)	(13,000)	13,680				

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 01/08/2024

Month No: 5

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
460 Community Support								
4470 PCSO	0	2,416	9,500	7,084		7,084	25.4%	
Community Support :- Indirect Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>2,416</u>	<u>9,500</u>	<u>7,084</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7,084</u>	<u>25.4%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>(2,416)</u>	<u>(9,500)</u>	<u>(7,084)</u>				
470 Fireworks								
1321 Fireworks Donations	0	35	0	(35)			0.0%	
Fireworks :- Income	<u>0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(35)</u>				<u>0</u>
4500 Fireworks	0	460	0	(460)		(460)	0.0%	
Fireworks :- Indirect Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>460</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(460)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(460)</u>		<u>0</u>
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>(425)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>425</u>				
480 Commons & Open Spaces								
4595 Cumberland Garden	0	1,200	0	(1,200)		(1,200)	0.0%	
4701 Major Tree Works	0	0	2,000	2,000		2,000	0.0%	
4705 Hanging Baskets & Bed Watering	0	2,500	2,500	0		0	100.0%	
4720 Skip Hire	0	158	450	292		292	35.2%	
4721 Skip Hire - St Marys	160	699	1,500	801		801	46.6%	
4722 Panhandle maintenance	0	0	2,000	2,000		2,000	0.0%	
4731 Moor Interpretation Board	0	0	1,500	1,500		1,500	0.0%	
4767 Cumberland Garden Maintenance	0	0	2,000	2,000		2,000	0.0%	
4768 Cumberland Gdn Electricity	0	0	500	500		500	0.0%	
4786 General Maintenance-Materials	49	1,023	3,000	1,977		1,977	34.1%	
4794 Play Area Inspections	175	905	2,544	1,639		1,639	35.6%	
4795 Play Area Repairs & Maint.	184	355	3,000	2,645		2,645	11.8%	
4797 Clock Maintenance	0	108	1,200	1,092		1,092	9.0%	
4801 Memorial Benches	130	520	2,760	2,240		2,240	18.8%	
4802 Other furniture	390	1,105	0	(1,105)		(1,105)	0.0%	
4805 Commons Miscellaneous	0	171	1,500	1,329		1,329	11.4%	
4806 Car Park Repairs	0	0	1,000	1,000		1,000	0.0%	
4809 Christmas Lights	0	0	1,500	1,500		1,500	0.0%	
4810 Storage yard	0	0	1,300	1,300		1,300	0.0%	
4811 War Memorial	0	152	800	648		648	19.0%	
4813 Flamsteadbury Lane Rent	65	130	260	130		130	50.0%	
4852 GM Grass Maintenance	3,480	12,058	24,500	12,442		12,442	49.2%	
4853 GM Garden Maintenance	303	1,376	2,470	1,094		1,094	55.7%	
4854 GM Trees	48	48	2,200	2,152		2,152	2.2%	
4855 GM Litter picking	825	2,805	11,400	8,595		8,595	24.6%	

Continued over page

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 01/08/2024

Month No: 5

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Current Mth	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
4856 GM Flytipping	0	0	300	300		300	0.0%	
4857 GM Litter bins	470	1,785	4,500	2,715		2,715	39.7%	
4858 GM Hard surface maintenance	0	0	600	600		600	0.0%	
4859 GM Hedges and boundaries	50	736	2,815	2,079		2,079	26.1%	
4860 GM Salt spreading	0	0	256	256		256	0.0%	
4861 GM Leaf collection	62	202	3,000	2,798		2,798	6.7%	
4862 GM General Maintenance	384	970	4,100	3,130		3,130	23.7%	
4863 GH General Hours	190	437	4,400	3,963		3,963	9.9%	
4864 GM Additonal works	0	0	500	500		500	0.0%	
4865 Wild about Redbourn	128	128	0	(128)		(128)	0.0%	
Commons & Open Spaces :- Indirect Expenditure	<u>7,093</u>	<u>29,571</u>	<u>92,355</u>	<u>62,784</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>62,784</u>	<u>32.0%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Expenditure	<u>(7,093)</u>	<u>(29,571)</u>	<u>(92,355)</u>	<u>(62,784)</u>				
600 Planning								
4881 Green Belt Defence	0	0	10,000	10,000		10,000	0.0%	
Planning :- Indirect Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Expenditure	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(10,000)</u>	<u>(10,000)</u>				
Grand Totals:- Income	<u>1,713</u>	<u>154,150</u>	<u>309,583</u>	<u>155,433</u>			<u>49.8%</u>	
Expenditure	<u>17,795</u>	<u>118,665</u>	<u>309,583</u>	<u>190,918</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>190,918</u>	<u>38.3%</u>	
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>(16,082)</u>	<u>35,485</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(35,485)</u>				
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(16,082)</u>	<u>35,485</u>						

Payments for Month 5

Nominal Ledger

Date	Payee Name	Reference	£ Total Amnt	£ Creditors	£ VAT	A/c	Centre	£ Amount	Transaction Detail
13/03/2024	Carter Jonas	159288	65.00	65.00		500			Rent for F/bury PA Qtr1
17/07/2024	PPL PRS Ltd	SIN2773258	1,038.24	1,038.24		500			Royalites of music licence
23/07/2024	Selecmark Plc	147510	432.00	432.00		500			Bike Marking for PCSO
25/07/2024	British Gas Parish Centre Elec	8278821	13.66	13.66		500			Electric bill P.Stores July
25/07/2024	British Gas Parish Centre Elec	6220295	53.28	53.28		500			Elect Cumber Garden
30/07/2024	HSBC	210824	5.00	5.00		500			Bank charges
31/07/2024	Eibe Ltd	90124336	220.80	220.80		500			Pendulum seat for zip wire
31/07/2024	Cawleys	679224/246	269.22	269.22		500			Waste collection from St Mary'
01/08/2024	Best Cleaning Ever	34	900.00	900.00		500			Cleaning for July
01/08/2024	Print Shop St Albans Ltd	21000	130.00	130.00		500			Printing for WaR
02/08/2024	J H P Horticultural	337	7,538.64	7,538.64		500			Maintenance contract July
03/08/2024	Smartest Energy Business	3735364	698.09	698.09		500			elect charge for P Centre July
05/08/2024	Castle Water	1003108694	42.57	42.57		500			water and waste July
10/08/2024	SCG Cloud Ltd	1419322	183.28	183.28		500			Telephone/bband July
12/08/2024	TBS Hygiene Ltd	5790	270.00	270.00		500			Dog waste collection August
12/08/2024	Society for Local Council Cler	485	557.00	557.00		500			SLCC conference CK
13/08/2024	Konica Minolta Business Sols (1201448345	90.00	90.00		500			P/copier rental Aug-Nov
15/08/2024	The Hertfordshire Garden Centr	287686	18.49	18.49		500			Materials for bench marking
16/08/2024	Konica Minolta Business Sols (1201466399	83.93	83.93		500			P/copier charges May-Aug
17/08/2024	ICO	ICOAUG24	35.00			4075	410	35.00	Data protection fee - 2024
23/08/2024	The Hertfordshire Garden Centr	288556	40.36	40.36		500			Repairs to o/f opening
25/08/2024	British Gas Parish Centre Elec	8553647	13.67	13.67		500			Elect PStore August
25/08/2024	Salary	SAL0824	2,422.04			4000	400	2,422.04	salary August 24
25/08/2024	Salary	SAL0824	1,364.30			4005	400	1,364.30	salary August 24
25/08/2024	Salary	SAL0824	612.33			4007	400	612.33	salary August 2024
25/08/2024	HMRC	NI0824	177.40			4000	400	177.40	NI contribution Aug 24
25/08/2024	HMRC	NI0824	30.49			4005	400	30.49	NI contribution August 24
25/08/2024	HMRC	IT0824	453.80			4000	400	453.80	IT contribution August 24
25/08/2024	HMRC	IT0824	-43.40			4005	400	-43.40	IT contribution August 24
25/08/2024	LPFA	PEN0824	212.26			4000	400	212.26	Pension contribution Aug 24
25/08/2024	LPFA	PEN0824	77.70			4005	400	77.70	Pension contribution Aug 24
25/08/2024	LPFA	PEN0824	35.64			4007	400	35.64	Pension contribution Aug 24
25/08/2024	LPFA	RPCPEN0824	1,126.51			4015	400	1,126.51	RPC Pension contribut Aug 24
25/08/2024	HMRC	RPCNI08042	438.64			4010	400	438.64	RPC NI contribution Aug 24
30/08/2024	C Kenny	CKEXPAUG2	42.67		6.07	4305	440	8.87	Cleaning products for P Centre
						4275	410	2.10	Postage - allotment lease
						4275	410	2.10	Posting - n/letter to advertis
						4275	410	5.72	Batteries
						4275	410	2.10	Postage n/letter to advertiser
						4288	410	15.71	Mailchimp Aug subscription

Continued on Page 3

Payments for Month 5

Nominal Ledger

<u>Date</u>	<u>Payee Name</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>£ Total Amnt</u>	<u>£ Creditors</u>	<u>£ VAT</u>	<u>A/c</u>	<u>Centre</u>	<u>£ Amount</u>	<u>Transaction Detail</u>
31/08/2024	Google Cloud EMEA Ltd	5053166798	48.00	48.00		500			G-Calendar subs August
Total Payments for Month			19,696.61	12,711.23	6.07			6,979.31	
Balance Carried Fwd			111,016.77						
Cashbook Totals			130,713.38	12,711.23	6.07			117,996.08	

List of Receipts Entered for Month 5

A/c Code	Name	Invoice Date	Invoice No	Amount Due	Discount	Amount Paid	Balance	Date Paid	- Led
SHERRARDS	Sherrards Solicitors	18/06/2024	AD392	165.00	0.00	165.00	0.00	01/08/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	165.00			Ref: AD392
		30/07/2024	1994	62.40	0.00	62.40	0.00	05/08/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	62.40			Ref: 1994
		31/07/2024	1996	42.00	0.00	42.00	0.00	31/07/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	42.00			Ref: 1996
STJOHNS AM	St John's Ambulance - PO00070559	09/07/2024	1981	864.00	0.00	864.00	0.00	09/07/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	864.00			Ref: 1981
LATIN MOVE	Latin Moves Dance Fitness	30/07/2024	1989	92.00	0.00	92.00	0.00	14/08/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	92.00			Ref: 1989
ABINGDON C	Abiding Care	13/08/2024	1997	23.00	0.00	23.00	0.00	15/08/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	23.00			Ref: 1997
ST ALBANS	St Albans & District Food Bank	20/08/2024	1998	126.00	0.00	126.00	0.00	21/08/2024	1
				Receipt Total	0.00	126.00			Ref: 1998
				Total Receipts Entered for Month 5	0.00	1,374.40			