

# NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING was held on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018  
Kings Langley Secondary School  
Love Lane, Kings Langley, WD4 9HN  
7.30pm – 9.00pm

## Item 1. Housekeeping

JM advised the attendees of housekeeping rules and fire exits; she explained that the fire alarm was not due to be tested this evening. She advised where everyone should congregate in the event of a fire. She explained that due to the meeting being called at such short notice the parish clerk was unable to attend. JM went on to explain that instead the meeting would be recorded and then minuted by the parish clerk.

## Item 2. Introductions

JM introduced herself as Vice Chair of Nash Mills Parish Council and the Dacorum Borough Councillor. She starting off by thanking several people, Roger Wakefield, Ray and Sheila Jarvis, Ray, James and Karen Bird for distributing leaflets around Nash Mills at such short notice and said that this could have been a stumbling block to holding the 'extraordinary meeting'. She also said that the same people had helped during the evening by taking names and addresses of all the attendees for the fire register.

JM advised that the reason the meeting was being held was to discuss the planning application for a new Mosque at the site of the former Methodist church (near to The Denes shops), which had been submitted to Dacorum Borough Council. She said that at the last Parish Council meeting over thirty members of public had attended. Some members of the public had subsequently voiced their concerns that they had not had enough information and felt that a public meeting should be held. JM said that at this point she wanted to be clear that the original public meeting that had been called had not been arranged by NMPC. She explained that evidently due to health and safety reasons she understood the proposed meeting had been cancelled after advice from the local police.

JM went on to say that this situation had left a lot of local residents feeling very frustrated. The Parish Council made the decision to hold this meeting and to find a large enough venue. She advised that they would have to follow the agenda quite tightly as they have to finish the meeting by 9pm and have to leave the building by 9.30pm.

JM advised that it had just come to their attention in the last five minutes that the representative here this evening, Mr Khan, is not actually from the Mosque committee but an independent barrister instructed by them. JM announced that he was here to read out a statement.

## Item 3: Representative of Hemel Mosque.

Mr Khan introduced himself and explained that he was an independent person who had been instructed by the Mosque committee to read out the prepared statement on their behalf. He said that he would not be able to answer any questions as he was not from the area and was not aware of the circumstances surrounding the planning application or the process. He then read out their statement:

'Thank you for the opportunity to attend your extraordinary meeting. However, due to the very short notice the Mosque members are unable to attend this date due to the prior engagements over the festive season. We are extremely grateful for the opportunity as this is the first time that any members of the parish council have invited members of the Hemel Mosque.

We appreciate that the Mosque application is a sensitive issue hence the Mosque secretary and the Mosque president have met with the majority of Parish Councillors on a group or individual basis. In total, there were three separate meetings with various councillors.

At the time, all the Parish Councillors who we met were extremely happy with the Mosque drawings and not a single councillor raised any concerns whatsoever. The Mosque application drawings are exactly the same ones that the councillors inspected and these were the same drawings submitted to the council.

The following is an extract from the Parish Council meeting minutes dated September 2017 'Councillor Lardi advised that he (and Councillor Gross) had met with representatives of the Mosque. He reported that an excellent set of drawings had been produced. Councillor Howard and Councillor Maddern added that they too were impressed with the drawings'.

At the time we offered to address any concerns that the councillors or their constituents may or may not have with the Mosque application, and it appeared that the councillors were extremely happy with the Mosque application and gave the impression that they were prepared to back the application. The Mosque secretary also offered to attend the Parish Council meeting, but this offer was later turned down.

## NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

We do not understand the purpose of this meeting today and what it will achieve, especially when the Parish Council have formally objected to the Mosque planning. It would have been wise and practical, if the Parish Council had the public meeting and then addressed any concerns with the Mosque before they arrived at their decision.

The public as well as the councillors have seen the drawings, which are freely available from DBC planning website and to date no councillor has bothered to liaise with the mosque or raised any concerns with the mosque.

Councillor Maddern who represents the Nash Mills ward was very happy with the drawings and had no concerns. The general secretary and the Mosque president went out of their way to meet with Councillor Maddern as she could not attend any of our meetings with the other councillors and yet we still arranged a meeting that would suit her. At that meeting, she was very impressed with the drawings and gave her full support to the application. To date, Councillor Maddern has not raised any concerns to the Hemel Mosque.

The Hemel Mosque do not wish to alienate any members of the public or for that matter any members of the Parish Council and hence have gone out of their way in welcoming and answering any concerns that may arise. But it appears that some members of the Parish Council are not willing to liaise with Hemel Mosque. At the time of meeting with various councillors it was pointed out that the Mosque facilities would be for the community at large and not just specific to the Muslim community. We also mentioned that people's views were considered, for example, the new Mosque building would not contain any minarets and would have a green roof that would blend into the environment and the visibility from the array of the building would be limited to the roof making the views pleasant.

We have also addressed some of the concerns which have been raised by the public. The concerns regarding noise and call of prayer, this will all be in house and there will be no external speaker system. Also, some of the concerns from the public relating to the capacity, the Mosque will be busy on two days of the year during Eid. The day to day use of the Mosque will be around 20 – 30 at each prayer time. The onsite parking facilities allows the parking of 35 cars which will be more than adequate. The other major concern was regarding Friday prayers. We have taken this on board and will be staggering the prayer times thus reducing the impact on traffic. Car share schemes will be deployed with parking marshals. There are also comments on the Dacorum Borough Council website regarding weddings on site and a school running from the site. We can assure you that there will be no weddings on the site. The Muslim community do not hold weddings in Mosque premises and we can also confirm that there will be no schools onsite. For those that are not aware of the history of the site, first the site can only be used as a place of worship it has covenants in place that restrict the use to only a place of worship. The site became available on the open market and it was decided by the Muslim community as the best possible site due to its proximities to most households. Members of the Parish Council encouraged and supported the purchase.

The Mosque committee are quite saddened that despite all of their efforts they have never been invited to attend any meeting whatsoever, to address any concerns by any members of the Parish Council until the most recent email, which sadly due to the late notice and prior commitments they were unable to attend.

The committee is still prepared to answer any questions on behalf of the Hemel Mosque that may arise at the meeting, and they would like you to forward them via email and will endeavour to give a full written response. Mr Khan apologised on behalf of the Mosque committee for them not being able to attend the meeting.'

JM thanked Mr Khan and then advised that she would like to read out the following written response from Nash Mills Parish Committee:

'NMPC were sorry to hear that the Mosque Committee were unable to attend the extraordinary meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> December but chose instead to issue a statement which contained many factual errors. NMPC did not invite members from the Mosque Committee to a parish council meeting to discuss the proposal since this was not usual practice. Members of the public are most welcome to attend Parish Council meeting or planning meetings. The dates of all full Parish Council and planning meetings are advertised well in advance on the parish council's website.

Some representatives from NMPC met with the Mosque Committee representatives informally to gather information; as a matter of courtesy as at that time drawings were not available. Some councillors thought that the proposed building of the Mosque appeared attractively designed but had many questions about parking and access issues. At no time did any Nash Mills Parish Councillors imply that they were in favour of the proposal. When all the planning application documents did become available it became apparent that the intended use and access issues in a densely populated and busy urban location made the plans unfeasible. In fact, this inadequacy is recognised by the Mosque applicants who are proposing in their supporting statement a voluntary scheme to ban parking in nearby streets and a park and ride scheme both of which are unenforceable.

Councillors understand that Mr Hussain and his colleagues are disappointed that Nash Mills Parish Council could not support their plans. However, these were considered 'fairly and impartially as with any other scheme'.

Mr Khan left the building and reiterated comments to be sent to the secretary. JM thanked Mr Khan for attending.

## NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

### Item 4. Planning Procedures

JM advised that just for everybody to be absolutely clear, she would run through what happens with any application. An application as in the case of the Mosque - an application was submitted in June; she advised that none of the councillors had seen anything at this stage and the first time they saw the plans was in August, and all they saw were the line drawings. JM explained that normally, plans submitted to the planning department at DBC would be verified within three to four weeks. This is when the planning officers are satisfied there is enough information to put forward a planning application. However, it wasn't until 24<sup>th</sup> October that the Mosque application was finally verified. It is then sent out to consultees; on this occasion 19 properties were consulted (adjacent properties to the planning application). It is then considered at the next available Parish Council planning meeting (in this case, November, and a lot of local residents here tonight came to that meeting). JM explained that everybody consulted, along with members of the public, would then give feedback. The original date for feedback was the 16<sup>th</sup> November but JM advised that after she had spoken to the planning department this was then deferred to the 29<sup>th</sup> November.

JM went on to explain that the next step is whether or not a planning application goes to a Development Management meeting. There are two ways a planning application can be approved or refused either through planning officers delegating it or in a case where the parish council object or the Ward Councillor can 'call it in' to the Development Management committee (where the committee is made up of a dozen Councillors) and they listen to the planning officer, applicants, supporters, objectors and councillors and they then vote on whether they approve or refuse, and this is when the final decision is made.

In the case of this planning application (the Mosque) it will go through a Development Management meeting, partly because the Parish Council have objected and partly (as JM explained) that in this case she had 'called it in'. She explained that she made that decision as it is a huge application and needs to be discussed properly and fully. The Development Management meetings are held every four weeks and the next one is scheduled on the 18<sup>th</sup> January. JM went onto explain that it doesn't necessarily mean that this application will be on that agenda and that they would have to wait and see. She said that it is possible to check whether an item is on the agenda by going onto the Dacorum Borough Council website.

### Item 5. Parish Council's Position

JM advised that the Parish Council met in November to consider the application and in order to be transparent and fair the planning committee members all wrote their notes independently prior to the meeting. The outcome was that everybody had virtually the same issues. JM advised that the objection document is available on the parish council website (see attached).

JM went through the major points of access, current parking issues (Pinecroft) and highlighted the fact that the local amenities already suffer as vehicles drive away, fed up with waiting to find a parking space. The infrastructure is not suitable, noise levels and the inadequate number of car parking spaces along with the street scene. She explained that there is currently another local planning application going through which will also have a huge traffic impact on the area.

JM highlighted that Mr Khan had actually said that the building had a covenant on it for 'religious worship' but as she advised it does not have permission for a dwelling on that part of the site. They want accommodation within the building itself; however, there is a residential building (manse) adjacent, that was purchased by the Mosque when the main site was bought. The original covenant was for 'Christian worship' and this has now been changed to 'religious worship'. JM said that she couldn't understand why the covenant could not be changed to something else as it has already been altered. She said she didn't think that the site was suitable for the Mosque as it is much too big.

### Item 6. Dacorum Borough Councillor's Position

JM explained that she was also the Borough Councillor for Nash Mills and said that she was very passionate about her role. She explained that she also sits on the Development Management committee and that with each Nash Mills application she has a choice either to stay on the committee for that application and have a small amount to say and vote *or* as Ward Councillor she can remove herself from the committee for that item on the agenda and speak for ten minutes to voice the concerns of local residents, but not vote. She explained that within the planning process there is a power point presentation by the planning officer. If there is one speaker objecting or supporting they would get three minutes, more than that would only get 5 minutes between them. In addition to that, the Parish Council has three minutes to speak and the Ward Councillor gets ten minutes. JM reported that at the last Parish Council meeting members of the public asked her to speak for 10 minutes and object to the application on behalf of the local residents. JM said she would be proud to do that on your behalf.

JM would now like to open up the meeting to the public. JM then suggested that as there were so many at the meeting they would like to give priority to people living in the parish/ward and adjoining roads (Oakdene, Fairway etc), to ask questions. JM then introduced Lisa Bayley the Chair, Cllrs Moubay, Gross and Lardi she gave apologies for the three who were unable to attend at such short notice.

### Item 7. Questions

JM opened up the meeting for discussion. She said that the Parish Council had hoped a representative from the Mosque would have been present but said they would help answer any questions from the public.

## NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

A member of the public said that the representative had said it was a place for worship and yet on the plans there was space for class rooms. The question was is the Mosque also going to be used for education and the study of the Koran? JM said unfortunately she did not know the answer to that but highlighted the fact that Bennetts End Councillor Suqlain Mahmood was in the audience and she directed the question to him. He said that he could only answer general questions but not on behalf of the Mosque committee. He said that he understands the religion and would like to help clarify general queries. He said that the main gathering was always on a Friday however, not all of the congregation would turn up on that one evening. He explained that basically, there were three or four prayers on a Friday. The classes are held for students learning Arabic in order to read the Koran. There are currently three different venues for children to go and study.

The original question was whether the proposed Mosque would be used for classes; as parents would then be driving the children to classes. Councillor Suqlain Mahmood said that during school time no children would attend the Mosque. One member of public asked whether there would be an agreement with parking as there is currently with the Snow Centre near St Albans Hill. Councillor Suqlain Mahmood said that with regards to the parking issues Barnacres Road was already a major issue and that noise and parking at The Denes was already a problem at The Denes and he confirmed that the site had 35 parking spaces.

LB said that there were already gates on to the car park and that this could cause a back log with vehicles queuing to get in. Councillor Mahmood said they were for security purposes only and not to keep the public out. Another question from a member of public was why build a Mosque for 500 people when they evidently aren't all coming at the same time. He also highlighted that Barnacres is already a nightmare and that it was more likely that a child would be knocked down. Then local council would have to install traffic lights costing a huge amount of money. JM said in her opinion parking was the main issue on any planning application at this site, whether it would be a Mosque or a fast food drive through. Another question was the development of the actual land - how much bigger is this proposed building going to be on the actual site as this looks like a substantial build – is this not over development? JM advised that the property would be three storeys high.

One member of public from Georgewood Road said that she didn't want a Mosque in the area and said that was her main reason. JM said that they shouldn't assume that is the only reason that people are complaining and that it was more to do with limited parking. Another local resident said that 'Bennetts End Circular' which is sent out periodically, one of the main issues published were parking issues and had asked for feedback on how to resolve these issues.

JM asked how many had read the traffic assessment within the planning application – a show of hands (not many) she said that she wanted to clarify that the owners of Apsley Mills Retail Park (who had been identified in the plans as a parking option) advised her that they *not* given permission for the Mosque users to park in their car park and were absolutely furious that this had been added in to the supporting documents. Another local resident from The Mallards said that her father had lived in the area for a long time and she had moved back only recently from Northampton. She said with the three Mosques in Northampton combined they are still not as large as the proposed one in Barnacres Road. She also commented that the idea of car sharing would not necessarily work as many people may come straight from work. How would this actually work? Another issue was the problem of safety in the evenings; it is a danger for children trying to cross the roads to attend the Mosque. She went onto ask was there a representative from Highways at the meeting?

A resident from Georgewood Road asked who had initially changed the covenant and how could it be changed back. A resident mentioned a previous application for the site; JM confirmed that this was the *first* application submitted. The resident went on to ask why had it taken so long for the public to find out about the proposed planning application.

Another local resident said that residents from Lime Walk had already complained about parking in their area and that in the event of an emergency an ambulance or a fire engine would be unable to get through. She said that she had found online 'character appraisals' from 2004 for Nash Mills and within the documents it had advised that buildings at The Denes should be no higher than two storeys.

JM asked the local resident to forward the link onto her at the Parish Council.

A consultee from a business and a dwelling located at 2 and 8 at The Denes (two of the nineteen consulted) said he looked at facts around parking issues. He advised that there was a Two Waters consultation, an open piece of information sourced from the Dacorum Borough website. He reported that it clearly states for a place of worship, the parking ratio is one parking space for 10 square metres of gross square footage (this is 1500) so there should be 150 spaces, that is not based on what may happen but that is pure facts. He went onto say that secondly, cycling - three people he knows ran a local survey and on three separate days at three different times and not one person cycled to the Mosque, not one cyclist as opposed to the published figure of twelve percent mentioned in the transport survey which contradicts itself also mentions other Mosques in different areas which is completely irrelevant. He went on to say that the information contravenes DBC's own stipulations around a place of worship and parking issues. On the basis of that it should be rejected purely for parking.

A resident from Georgewood Road said she had read all the documents on the website and she just questions the design and the plan for a capacity of 720 - two hundred on the upper floor and 500 on the lower two floors which she advised is stated on

## NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

the plan and had concerns with the relevance of all the data as it appears undersized. JM interjected and said that she thought it was 520 and had misread the information.

A resident from Great Elms queried the car parking issue and said he knows how bad it is but it's a council created problem because when the Dickinson's development was built not enough spaces were created. JM responded that she had not been a councillor at that point. She advised that the fault is not with local council but with central government. They give a quota of very strict rules about parking there is no minimum parking requirement on residential developments and there is a maximum of one and a half spaces per bedroom. She agreed with the resident that Great Elms gets the overspill from Apsley Lock. She went on to say that Mill Close has issues from overspill from Nash Mills Wharf. She said that the new development is a fantastic asset to Nash Mills but has created a parking issue. She has some ideas and is working hard to rectify the situation and currently working on the wording for a petition (which will hopefully go nationwide) to lobby the government's ridiculous rule on parking.

A resident from Belswains Lane who specialises in criminal misconduct, said he'd already mentioned Red Lion Lane's parking issues and that the police appear to ignore illegal parking. He also criticised the government's procedure on parking and offered to help with legal advice.

One resident asked whether there would be more of a police presence with parking issues if the application went through. JM responded by saying that she didn't think that the police had the capacity for them to get involved.

One resident from Georgewood Road asked if we are not allowed three storey buildings and supposed to have 150 car spaces then why is this going any further? JM advised that this was a good question and hoped that if this is the case it would be thrown out at the Development Management meeting. One lady questioned the public's safety if the Mosque was built and JM said that this was not the issue here and that public safety concerns can happen anywhere.

A gentleman from Chambersbury Lane said he had two queries - how did the covenant get changed? JM said she understood it to be an agreement between the Methodist church and the Mosque at the time of the sale. The second point the resident wanted to make was when JM said earlier that if she was to speak at the Development Management meeting she would lose her right to vote. The resident asked how many other committee members were there on the committee and JM explained that 12 members made up the committee. She said she had spoken over a previous planning application for the construction of hoarding around the Mosque. She went on to explain that each application has to be looked at individually but she was quite encouraged by applications that have been turned down in recent months with far less impact than this application.

A resident from Meadow Road said that when Mr Khan read out his statement it was very, very aggressive. He asked the Parish Council what had they done to make these people so aggressive. JM explained that the statement had been written by one member of the Mosque who had contacted the Parish Council to ask for it to be read out in their absence, they had sent their apologies for the meeting earlier. JM went onto say 'we have been in receipt of the statement for over a week so it came as no surprise when it was read out today. When Parish Councillors met with committee members earlier on in the summer one was quite aggressive and the other was perfectly charming - his name was Mr Khan and when we heard he was attending tonight we thought it was going to be him, and he is a really nice guy. Mr Khan this evening is a barrister and had been instructed by the Mosque committee to read out the prepared statement'. PL had advised JM to tell Mr Khan that the Parish Council did not agree with the statement.

A member of public said Mr Khan wasn't aggressive but that the tone of the statement was. JM said that she had advised Mr Khan this evening that the Parish Council would read out a statement refuting their claims. He had said he had no knowledge of the application as he wasn't from the area.

The resident from Meadow Road said to JM that she had 'come in for quite a lot of stick' and advised her that she should defend herself. The resident then asked whether the Parish Council had aggravated the Mosque committee. Councillor Peter Lardi advised that Mr Khan had left a pile of statements behind. PL assured the residents that much of the comment made in the statement read out by Mr Khan was incorrect and not true and he said if you take a copy of it you will become confused because it does not state the reality of the history of what action the Parish Council has had with the Mosque committee. He advised it was up to them and that he couldn't stop them and that they would be reading stuff that was not true.

JM wanted to clarify that some comments made in the statement read out earlier by Mr Khan had inferred that she had agreed to support the proposed application. She said that the prepared statement read out to refute the earlier statement had been written by Councillors Peter Lardi and Louise Gross. JM emphasised that she had never said that she would support the application. She said that she would never tell someone that she would be supporting an application, as that would be very unprofessional and that when she is sitting on the Development Management committee she always has an open mind and does not take sides. She recalled that the only comment she had made at that meeting in the summer was that the drawings were very nice and professionally done. She said that whether the gentleman concerned had read that as her supporting the application she didn't know. She advised that the drawings are a tiny part of the application and that all the transport assessment and travel plan etc. make up the application, not just the drawings. She said that there was no way she would support an application until she had seen the whole picture. She said that she thinks perhaps the gentleman in question may

## NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

still be angry with her as she had been rather forceful when objecting to the previous planning application (for the fence) over a year ago. She explained that at that meeting she had spoken for thirteen minutes (because of this speech the rules have now changed to only 10 minutes), objecting to the hoardings at the front of the property and ripping out the beautiful hedge and putting an ugly fence up. JM said that was probably the reason that the gentleman was still annoyed. A member of the public shouted out that JM was being passionate rather than forceful.

A member of the public from Pinecroft said with it not being a housing issue the planning inspector would not get involved as he noted JM had said earlier that parking allowances can be over ruled. JM referred back to her earlier comments about the minimum and maximum car parking spaces and reiterated that it really is not the fault of the local council. She explained that legally they are not allowed simply to refuse an application on dwellings due to lack of parking. The member of public said that in that case with the application not being a dwelling application then perhaps the parking in theory should be sufficient. JM commented that it's the parking that is going to cause a complete nightmare to everybody in Nash Mills.

A resident from Mill Close asked on the view point of being a 'Mum' queried whether there is somebody she can report issues to if she can't get her push chair through if the parking of cars gets worse. JM said that parking on pavements is her pet subject and that she is forever pinging email to the local PCSO. She explained that the way the Parish Council resolved the same issue on Belswains Lane was to get double yellow lines. However, it does push that problem into another road. Unfortunately, police have very limited powers on parking.

JM invited PC Chris Fisher, Hemel Hempstead East to speak. He introduced himself said he was the only one on duty tonight so that's why he was chosen to attend the meeting. He said that in relation to parking, police officers have limited capabilities in dealing with this issue. If a vehicle is blocking the pavement to the point a wheel chair or push chair cannot get through, the police can ticket it or attach sticky labels to the car advising them not to park like an absolute idiot. He went onto say that he then spends three hours dealing with all the feedback from all the drivers complaining about the sticky labels. He also said that he was sure that the public would rather he was chasing more serious crimes like drug users, rapists and murderers. He went on to say that in relation to parking on double yellow lines; that power has been taken away from the police by the council; that is for traffic wardens to deal with. He reiterated that the police have no powers at all to deal with parking on double yellow lines but will deal with obstructions of the highway and of the pavement. He said he couldn't answer for every single police officer but he is based in Grovehill, Woodhall Farm and does deal with it as it is one of the main issues that come up at neighbourhood meetings. He said he can't answer for the police officers in this area but is quite happy to pass on that feedback. A resident asked PC Chris Fisher whether the local emergency services have the facilities to deal with a venue of 500 people and PC Fisher replied no. The resident said in that case that is enough to stop the application.

A gentleman from Fairway said that in principle he has no problems with developments. However, his concern or question was why has it got to the situation now given that two to three years ago there was pre-consultation document from the Council which his understanding is that they are supposed to research and feedback to the applicants and tell them whether or not it is feasible, so if it is true they haven't got enough spaces for parking how has the same application gone through. JM responded by saying that it was a very good question, the response to that is, as a lady mentioned earlier thought that a planning application had gone in earlier, that was a mistake by a planning officer, where they had put it on their website, when it was in fact in pre-planning stage. JM went on to say that as a Borough Councillor, (in fact she corrected that it was before she was Borough Councillor it was actually Geoff Doole) but as a Borough Councillor, they are not allowed to see or know anything about a pre-planning application. The first they are allowed to see it is when it is uploaded onto Dacorum's website and was an error over a pre-planning application. She said in answer to the question from the resident in Fairway she said she didn't know and that it was 'bonkers'.

A gentleman from Ash Grove had a question for PC Fisher; and asked why are you blocking the emergency exit at the meeting? (Laughter).

PC Fisher said that in all seriousness, in relation to a venue, policing a venue of 500 hundred people entirely depends on what the venue is used for. If it's a large grouping especially in relation to traffic issues they have been called to those before. It all depends on what else is going on, the police prioritise all sorts of incidents that come into the police station. He went on to explain that Hertfordshire Police have over a thousand calls at least per 12 hours or something like that, it is quite extensive. He said if they are dealing with other incidents for example, (his radio was going off at the meeting) telling him of all incidents going on in Hemel Hempstead. If something such as a traffic issue in Belswains Lane near The Denes or anything like that, and they do not have the officers to attend, as they are too busy dealing with intruders, burglaries or road traffic collisions on the A41. They have the whole of Dacorum to cover including Tring and the A41, we have to prioritise that over other things, if they have spare units, which is extremely rare these days, to come and deal with parking issues, traffic issues around The Denes then they will send them but that would be a very rare occurrence for them to do that.

A resident from Stephenson's Wharf said based on what you have just said would the police be making representation when this comes to a meeting. PC Fisher said that it would be passed to the Safe Neighbour Sergeant and Inspector. A resident asked are they generally aware and he replied that they were aware that this meeting was going on. Another resident asked would the police have input on whether the application is accepted or not. JM said that this question was probably for her to answer; she said it was a very good question, and said she was not sure whether the police were consultees on every application. She

## NASH MILLS PARISH COUNCIL

said she would contact Andrew Parrish, the planning officer, the next day and ask whether the police were consulted, she asked Councillor Suqlain Mahmood, who replied that it was not automatic. She said would push that question the following day.

One gentleman said he was a long-time resident of Belswains Lane, he recalled that he used to go to the Methodist Church when it was used for pre-school. He said that on some occasions that someone had been parking on his driveway a while ago, when his girlfriend had called the police they had said that there was nothing that the police could do about it. He said that in that case, the 500 people could park on drive ways and the police would not be able to move them. The resident said in the end he had to tow the 4 by 4 and leave it further down the road. PC Fisher said that the police's powers in relation to parking are very limited; he reiterated that they would deal with obstruction of the highway and obstruction of pavements. In relation to that he asked the resident whether he had spoken to his local neighbourhood PCSO and did they try to find out who owned the vehicle. He also asked the resident if he had made a formal complaint as it would have been dealt with. The resident reiterated that he had towed away the vehicle on the third day. PC Fisher said that he would speak to him after the meeting.

JM said that there was only five minutes left and LB said that there were still a lot of people who wanted to ask questions about the application.

A resident in The Mallards, who had spoken earlier, said that she had dealt with a planning application in Northampton. She was working closely with planning and had concerns with regards to the parking. She said it was turned down by the borough council and it then went to appeal and it was turned down again and it then went to a national appeal and it was passed. She said that they had everything with regards to the fire service, the police service and the highways agency. It was still actually approved she said please don't think if this gets turned down it might not go any further. She said that her actual question was with regards to the staggering of services and worship her understanding was that it isn't possible because they have to worship at a particular time with regards to sun rise and certain times. She said she doesn't understand how staggering of services and worship would be able to happen and for them to be practising correctly. Another resident asked what was the answer to the previous question. JM said that they were running short of time so she asked Councillor Suqlain Mahmood to respond and he said that there were two prayers a year where it is maximum capacity. Every Mosque has prayers at 9pm, 10pm and 11pm depending on the people and that it was possible for the main prayers can be staggered.

A resident from Highbarns said that having dealt with a planning application with the planning department at DBC; which he said was completely inept and do not even follow their own guidelines. He asked JM how far do we have to turn round to push DBC to adhere to what is their key and their main policies, because they have overruled everything in this, how do we stop them overriding everything we know? JM advised that all she could say was that as a Parish Council and as a Borough Councillor, we can put through the strongest objection and hope that the Development Management committee agree. The resident said well let's speak about the Development Management committee because we personally had an issue where they conducted the meeting incorrectly and have suffered since; he went on to reiterate that the meeting wasn't conducted in the correct way. JM replied that she remembered as she had been there, she emphasised that it was slightly different now and would be done properly.

### **Item 8. Closure of Meeting**

JM said just to finalise that the closing dates for comment officially was the 29<sup>th</sup> November. She said however, that James Doe, Assistant Director of Planning (they don't have a director so he's the top man), has confirmed that they will receive and publish any comments in support or objection of the planning application until midday on the day that it's going to be heard at the Development Management meeting. She said that this may be the 18<sup>th</sup> January; if it is not it will be four weeks after that because the meetings are every fourth Thursday night. She explained that those meetings are not public meetings rather like the Parish Council, they are meetings held in public. She advised that you are allowed to attend, but only a maximum of two people can speak in objection and that two people can speak in support - that is excluding the Parish Council representation and the Borough Ward Councillor. The problem with that and it happens every time is you get two people who come along and they sit down and they have each written a speech that they may have timed and have been practising in front of a mirror (or they may not have timed), the first one will go to speak and they speak for four and a half minutes and the second person doesn't get their bit in, so the best way to do it is to get two people to speak together and the they each split it and they know exactly what they are doing; whether this is in support or objection.

JM said she would like to thank everyone for coming out on behalf of the Parish Council and herself as the Borough Councillor. She advised that they needed to close the meeting now. She advised that this was all being recorded and minuted and that they would make sure that the planning officers get a copy of the minutes of this meeting.

Meeting closed at 9pm.