

**St. George's Barracks-Parish Council's Liaison Group**  
**Notes of Meeting held at The Limes, Church Street, Edith Weston 13 February**  
**2019**

**Attendees:** N. Milne (EW); P. Cummings (NL); R. Camp (Manton); K. Bool (Normanton Ward); V. Pheasant (Empingham); N. Newton (Empingham); C. Bacon Clipsham/CPRE; A. Johnson (Morcott); G. Waller (Normanton Ward); M. Earnshaw (EW); E. Gilman (Pilton); J. Dejardin (Wing)

**Apologies:** S. Seed (South Luffenham); C. Renner (Normanton)

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion Points</b>	<b>Actions Agreed</b>	<b>Action By</b>
1.	John Dejardin was welcomed to the group and all present introduced themselves. A note taker was agreed.	Notes to be taken	GW
2.	The correspondence from Homes England, following communication with them, was discussed. It was noted that due diligence on the HIF bids would be undertaken by Cushman and Wakefield. The advice received from HE was contradictory. The group felt Sir Alan Duncan would need to make clear to the minister that there was significant resistance to c2000 houses (evidence: 12-11 vote at Council and outcomes from survey initiated by EG and other concerned residents). There was significant discussion of The Local Plan. <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan/">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan/</a> The Local Plan, as approved, runs to 2026 and the 2017 and 2018 consultation was on the extension to 2036. However, as this is not approved it cannot be used, at present, as planning policy although there are circumstances where it can be taken into account. The concept of Prematurity, also discussed, is explained in this link along with Local and Neighbourhood Plans <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/determining-a-planning-application">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/determining-a-planning-application</a>	Each parish (subject to local agreement) to write to Homes England along the lines of the letter from NL and stressing the 2011 approved Local Plan met the local assessed housing need without the additional houses at St. G's.	All parish Chairs
3.	There was much discussion about engaging with Sir Alan Duncan. There was also discussion about the flawed process for refreshing the Local Plan.	1. Letters to Homes England to be copied to Sir Alan Duncan	1. Parish Chairs

	<p>Specifically, the spatial strategy and methodology for the approved 2011 Plan had been “rolled forward” for the 2017 refresh consultation. This, amongst other things, established the scale of housebuilding required and the priority to build first in towns and then in larger service centres. The 2018 consultation has shifted this to having the majority of house building at St. George’s. However, there has been no review of the spatial strategy nor call for sites; a flaw in the process. There was also discussion as to whether Sir A supported the parishes on resisting c2,000 houses or approved the new town on St G’s. His views are not known. There was also discussion about opening this group to new members, particularly EW residents who have been doing an inordinate amount of work “behind the scenes”. It was agreed to extend an invitation to other residents to attend as observers as and when it would be useful for discussion.</p>	<p>2. Letter be written to Sir A from each parish (based on EW’s Letter but with no mention of Woolfox) emphasising the flaws in the planning process, subject to PC approval. Copy this letter to The Comptroller and Auditor General because of the issues it raises re. planning and the NAO’s recent report on housing. 3. Invite other residents to attend meetings of this group as and when their specific input would aid discussion.</p>	<p>2. Parish Chairs  3. NM/PC</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>RCC and transparency was discussed. Members of this group were still uncertain as to when the HIF bid is actually to be made, or whether the Advisory Group members would see the HIF bid. Members also queried RCC’s assertion that the St G’s development was necessary to attract younger people to Rutland. What evidence was there of this? What happened to younger people as they aged (did they stay/leave, for e.g.?) Why would/do younger people come to Rutland? How does Rutland’s demographic compare with the rest of the East Midlands/England (i.e. is this just a Rutland issue)? Does the population of Rutland “sign up” to the Council’s view? There was discussion about what would happen if the HIF bid was unsuccessful. The consensus was that the MoD would continue to want to</p>		

	develop the site, but crucially they would wish to continue to engage with the Council to do this.		
5.	There was concern about the lack of financial transparency for the project. What has been the cost of officer time? What work hasn't been completed because officers were working on this? How is the £130k received from Homes England accounted for if the bid isn't a success or the project doesn't go ahead? How is the potential cost of future legal challenge, for e.g. a judicial review, allowed for in the 2019/20 budget? In addition to financial risks there are also reputational risks to the Council and risks around being so absorbed in the St G's work that other work doesn't get done (the eye is taken off the ball).	1. Question on cost of St. G's and financial risk to the Council for Finance Council meeting 25 February. 2. Subject to the outcome of this question/response a question on risk be submitted for Audit and Risk Committee of 26 March.	1. PC (KB to help get the wording right) 2. NM to organise
6.	There was discussion on whether to continue supporting RCC's St. George's Advisory Group. The consensus was that it was not "advising" but being used as a one-way communication group. It was agreed members should be more intelligent customers and one way to do that was to place items on the agenda. The Advisory Group needs to be more proactive and, perhaps, be reconstituted to a smaller group of those parishes directly affected by the proposals. There was discussion about whether the Advisory Group should be putting forward proposals for the St. G's site. There was also discussion about whether members should put forward a detailed response to the Master Plan. There was a consensus that the minerals should be a clear element within future planning of the site, including the financial benefits of the minerals being included as part of the MoD's "profit" from the site. Members were clear that proposals for the site should be developed "bottom up". It was agreed neither the MoD nor RCC had adequately explained the rationale for seeing 2215 as the optimum number for the site, not least because we didn't	1. Request an item on Advisory Group's agenda for OH to explain the impact on the HIF bid of the very close Council vote. Will this vote be reported in the bid? Subject to the outcome of this a decision to ask the question at Full Council (March meeting) will be made. 2. Request an item on the agenda of the Advisory Group for MoD to explain the rationale for the 2215 houses.	1. NN. If question for full council then NM/NN 2. NN  2. PC

	know if the MoD were looking to cover actual costs of disposing of the site or making a specified profit (separate to the profit they will make on the minerals). Include on agenda for the Advisory Group		
7.	There was a brief discussion of the May elections, and whether this group should seek sympathetic candidates for key seats such as Ketton, Lyddington for example but no conclusions were reached.		
8.	PC Forum 4 March. It was agreed to raise St. George's.	In the parish feedback section of PCF St. George's to be raised	NM to organise
9.	Financing challenges. It was agreed not to send a legal letter to Homes England re. the HIF bid but to keep the legal challenge to the Local Plan process as necessary. Getting the message across to HE could be done by letters from parishes, hence there being no need to employ a lawyer at this stage. The issues over the Local Plan (was the 2017 refresh sufficient? What is the status of the 2018 informal consultation? Has the process been flawed? Etc. etc.) are more complex and thus may need legal challenge including potential judicial review. The group to consider post May election when RCC's intentions are clearer. There was also discussion over how to finance legal action. The options were that each parish council/meeting could contribute to a "fighting fund" or that public subscriptions could be raised for this purpose.	Include Local Plan on the agenda of this group post May elections.	NM/PC
10.	Future Council Meetings: See above.		
11.	Repetition of item 8.		
12.	Date of Next meeting: March, exact date to be determined		