



**MINUTES OF THE SIBLEBY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON  
THURSDAY, 6 FEBRUARY 2020 AT 7.30PM AT SIBLEBY COMMUNITY CENTRE**

**PRESENT**

Councillor Mrs J Jones (Chair)  
Councillor Mrs J Harris  
Councillor Mrs E Astill  
Councillor Mrs E Jones  
Councillor Mr C Hushon

Councillor Mr R Butler  
Councillor Mr B Richards  
Councillor Mrs V Marriott  
Councillor Dr S Haider  
Councillor Ms A Fearn

**IN ATTENDANCE**

County Councillor Mr R Shepherd (up to and inc Min No 322/19)  
Borough Councillor Mr P Murphy  
PC 653 Stu Davis  
Six members of the public  
Mrs R Richardson - Clerk

**315/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ACCEPTANCE BY COUNCIL**

Apologies were received and approved from Councillors Ms K Khan and Mrs F Hughes and Borough Councillor Mr A Paling

**316/19 TO RECEIVE DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS AND REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS**

None received

**317/19 CLERK'S REPORT**

The Mayor of Charnwood will be attending the Ladies Fellowship Meeting on the 10 March 2020 at St Mary's Church, Mountsorrel Lane. Open from 2.00pm, with the meeting starting at 2.30pm. All Councillors are welcome to attend.

**King Street Car Park**

(a) The Clerk contacted them about the marking of bays (short and long stay) Charnwood Borough Council replied that it is currently tied up with their Legal Department. The Car Parks & Civil Parking Enforcement Manager has asked if they could look at putting in an experimental order so that they can speed up the process. He hopes this is feasible, and will give an update in due course.

(b) Charnwood Borough Council has been approached by BP ChargeMaster regarding the installation of a 50kW 'ultra' fast electric vehicle charger at Sibleby. BP Chargemaster has been commissioned by Highways England to improve the infrastructure for electric vehicles on the national road network. They have highlighted the lack of Electric Charge

Point provision on the A46 and therefore, Sileby was identified as a potential site for a charger unit. Charnwood Borough Council are keen to support the improvement of the Electric Vehicle network as a greener travel option. At this time, the Council does not have the expertise or resources to install its own equipment therefore the benefits of this scheme seem to be a great opportunity.

The equipment is being paid for by Highways England, and will be managed by BP ChargeMaster. There will be no costs to the Council or any maintenance and operational responsibility. The term of the lease is a 7 year 'peppercorn' rent. The location will be immediately off the entrance (as they need to locate the electrical supply)

In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, notice is hereby given that Charnwood Borough Council formally adopted the Charnwood Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the 16th January 2020 (*emailed to Councillors*)

The cleaning position for the Community Centre has been filled and the successful applicant started work on Monday, 3 February.

**318/19 ADJOURNMENT FOR PUBLIC TO RAISE MATTERS**

A resident spoke about the Peashill Farm development and the conversion of the farm buildings; it now seems that the developer wishes to build a Health Centre - he is sceptical about a Health Centre and has concerns that they can change their minds. He was concerned that they also want to increase from 130 to 170 dwellings.

**319/19 TO CONFIRM AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 16 JANUARY 2020**

**RESOLVED** To accept as a true record and these were duly signed

**320/19 TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILLORS IF IN ATTENDANCE**

County Councillor Mr R Shepherd stated that he had nothing in particular to report about Sileby and asked members if they had any concerns. Councillor Mrs E Astill mentioned the traffic congestion at the top of Seagrave Road on the Millers Development and the safety aspect of things eg vehicles mounting pavement – this is a Highways matter. Councillor Mr Shepherd said he would look at the planning conditions and liaise with Councillor Mr P Murphy. Councillor Mrs E Jones mentioned that Highways said it was not their responsibility to clear away the debris that came from the road during the floods and which ends up in ditches, it is the landowner's. Councillor Mrs E Astill asked if he was able to put pressure on Highways to make a decision re 7 King Street as they had made only a partial response on the re-consultation application.

Borough Councillor Mr P Murphy reported that Sileby West has called in 7 King Street to Planning Committee and the remainder of the Members' Grants has been donated to Sileby Town Cricket Club. He and Councillor Paling met with Miller Homes on 24 January to discuss residents' and the Parish Council's concerns and issues.

Councillor Murphy mentioned the new planning rules: - *The Prime Minister is issuing new planning rules in an effort to speed up the pace of housebuilding. The rules are said to strip councils of the power to block new housing on land earmarked for development,*

*automatically giving developers the green light. A Government White Paper setting out the proposals to planning rules will be published before the Budget on March 11. Elsewhere, in an opinion piece in the Guardian, columnist Simon Jenkins has called on the Government to implement the findings of the Building Better, Building Beautiful report and that “communities should be empowered to vote down ugliness.*

Councillor Mrs E Astill asked Councillor Murphy who is the Lead of Planning at Charnwood Borough Council to which he replied Jonathan Morgan; she also enquired if he knew what was happening regarding the next stage of the Local Plan Consultation – Councillor Murphy replied that he will find out and report back.

### **321/19 TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON MEETINGS ATTENDED OR REPORTS RECEIVED – FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

Councillor Ms A Fearn had an email from Amanda Patterson of the Environment Agency saying that the Feasibility Study is due to start on 20 April.

Councillor Mrs E Jones met with Siobhan Woodward from LCC re the Wildflower Verges Scheme – she has approved the site on Brook Street and will let us know when we can start planting. Councillor Jones said she would like to invite the brownies, guides and youth club to help scatter the seeds.

Councillors Mrs E Jones and Ms A Fearn have completed the forms applying to be voluntary tree wardens.

Councillor Mr C Hushon met with the Bursar at Ratcliffe College and said the meeting went well; he confirmed that we can use their facilities and he will give available dates in due course (mainly swimming pool). Ratcliffe College has offered to ferry children to and from Sileby; this is all free. Once Councillor Hushon has the information he will make contact with the schools.

Councillor Mrs E Astill met with Sileby Juniors FC, Richard Shepherd from Sportsground Maintenance and Julian Morris from the Institute of Groundsmanship, who wrote the Pitch Improvement Programme Report. They spoke about the scheme and the Grant available. This was a really helpful and informative meeting and is a positive for the Football Club to improve the facility. Sileby Parish Council has to agree to this, as we are the landowner – details of the scheme to be discussed at the next meeting.

Councillor Mrs V Marriott attended a couple of events at Loughborough University to mark Holocaust Memorial Day (27 January).

Councillors Mrs J Jones, Mrs E Jones, Ms A Fearn and Mr R Butler met with Jane Hunt MP, the Environment Agency, the Police, Fire Service, Charnwood Borough Council and LCC on 24 January on Dudley’s Bridge to discuss the brook. It was agreed that the EA will de-silt it up to the bridge and discussion took place on whether any further action needs to be taken on the brook further downstream; upstream modelling is required on ways that water can be held further upstream to reduce the water flow through the village – the EA should complete by end April 2020. Discussion on who should maintain the banks of the brook – conclusion was that landowners next to the brook have riparian ownership and is their responsibility. The public meeting last November was mentioned and Matt Bradford will have a full response by

mid-February to the questions asked at that meeting. LCC to provide a cost to raise the level of Slash Lane to the A6. LCC to investigate the use of traffic modelling to assess the requirements on Slash Lane so that the most appropriate solution can be implemented. The EA to investigate whether the use of natural flood management techniques, to reduce the risk of flooding, is possible. Severn Trent to be asked whether there is a capacity issue with water/sewage infrastructure. Fly tipping issue on Slash Lane was discussed and both LCC and CBC to confirm who is responsible for clearing away rubbish.

Councillor Mrs J Jones announced there would be a Remembrance Group Working Party meeting at 6.30 pm on 20 February in the Wesleyan Room – all were welcome to attend

**322/19 TO CONSIDER AND AGREE COMMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS: -**

**P/19/0218/2 ERECTION OF 10 DWELLING AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING FARMHOUSE INTO 5 SEPARATE APARTMENTS – 7 KING STREET, SILEBY, LE12 7LZ. THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED AND THE AMENDMENT(S) COMPRISE THE FOLLOWING: *Amended site layout and house types, and amended scheme for No. 7 King Street***

**RESOLVED**

Our original comments still stand. Nothing has changed, please refer to our original response dated 22 March 2019. The Parish Council takes considerable interest in all development proposals submitted in our area and expends time and effort in responding to yourselves. However, Charnwood Borough Council has been aware of our concerns about the state of repair and the development proposals for 7 King St for over 18 months! As we have highlighted before, this issue is of considerable concern and interest to local people as demonstrated by the responses submitted to Charnwood Borough Council.

We are aware that there are legal obligations in respect of the redevelopment of a Grade II Listed Building but have not received the assurance we might expect that these obligations have been met.

1. Car parking spaces – insufficient for the number of dwellings. Also, it is unclear how the number of spaces has been calculated based on the limited content on the resubmitted drawings.
2. The applicants, whilst they have consulted a heritage consultancy, Lampro, a formal standing building survey and archaeological desk-based assessment have not to our knowledge been carried out.
3. **WALL** - The blatant misrepresentation of the facts by the architect  
The architect has put forward many statements of opinion which are there only to skew opinion away from the importance of heritage features such as the front wall. I enclose the photograph to show that many of the architect's claims are erroneous. Let me deal with a few of them. With regard to the wall the architect says: -
  - a) "There is no physical evidence to date there being a wall in the C18. Given the rural nature of the village at that time, No.7 may not have had a boundary wall when it was first built." Maps from c1758 and the early 19th century show the front boundary and the path to the front door. The house was described as a mansion house in the 18th century making it likely to have had a formal boundary. The architect's

statement is his 'professional' opinion and not based on documentary evidence or any archaeological discovery.

b) "The building material from the wall is mainly Mountsorrel granite in random rubble blocks. This dates the wall to the mid C19. This date would also fit with the need for a wall as King Street at that time would have become much busier with the growth of the village." Random rubble blocks in boundary and structural walls are not just a product of the mid-19th century. Many pre-19th century examples of this are seen in many other Charnwood villages. Even Sibleby Parish Church and churchyard wall (there are 17th century documents mentioning repairing the wall) shows this type of construction, so how can the architect dismiss the overwhelming evidence elsewhere unless he was skewing the evidence to dismiss the importance of the wall in the first place? Commentary from architect devalues the wall which remains a significant heritage asset and integral to the Grade II Listed Property. As resident Eric Wheeler has stated ..... "The sandstone copings do not actually fit the wall. They cannot have been the original copings and have been taken from a 9" brick wall. The modern wrought iron gate and recycled brick repairs to the gate returns and ends of the wall indicate the wall was rebuilt in the mid C20. This may have been when the second hand copings were introduced." Walls like buildings evolve over time. The front wall of 7 King Street reflects this. Again, the architect attempts to dismiss the changes, infills and repairs to the wall to make it appear less old and therefore architecturally less important than it really is. Photographs from the early 20th century show the copings in situ and they have been there for much longer than the architect supposes in his comments.

d) "Granite has no effective porosity and when water enters into a wall constructed of granite the water cannot evaporate. This keeps the mortar (which is more porous) in a permanently damp condition causing it to become uncemented –i.e. wet turning into aggregate. This has no binding and is liable to be washed out of the wall. The shape and size of granite blocks make it difficult to provide an adequate bond making the wall inherently weak. The lack of bond and the failure of the mortar caused premature catastrophic failure of the wall which led to it being taken down." The wall at 7 King Street needed maintenance. It only became an issue when the wall suddenly 'became weak' after the developer's purchased the site. The wall couldn't have been that poor as it took a team of men a whole day to remove it with sledgehammers, not exactly "premature catastrophic failure" as the developers/architect would have us believe.

e) "By any measure the option to repair and provide for the future viability of the C18 listed buildings outweighs minor alterations to a garden wall of no significant historic or architectural value." This is the real stand out point and one by which the architect and his clients wish to make us all believe in but it is a misrepresentation to assist in getting the line of the front wall changed and to facilitate in removing a strong highway and scene/site safety objection. They argue that the viability of the house is only secured by the re-siting of the wall. However, with the Listed status, the house, front wall, outbuildings and curtilage should be seen in one context with all components being an important part of a larger picture. Replacement of the wall on its original line and with the original materials will be the only way to keep the building contextually viable. The argument in saying that reconstructing the wall using the

original materials will result in its failure is another poor and unprofessional attempt to deride the value of the wall in the whole scheme. Under Policy CS 14: Heritage in the Charnwood Local Plan 2011 - 2028 - Core Strategy (adopted November 2015) proposed developments are encouraged to: 'protect heritage assets and their setting' 'incorporate Charnwood's distinctive local building materials and architectural details'

4. **TOP FLOOR OF HOUSE** – plans are more appropriate in splitting the house into two; however, the plans omit information regarding development of the second storey.
5. The **GARDEN** is part of the Listed Building and the context and scale is diminished with the proposal to develop two bungalows divorcing it from its heritage context.
6. **WINDFALL DEVELOPMENT** – The proposals are in conflict with Policy H2 of the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan regarding windfall development.

*Windfall Development -Small residential development proposals of up to 9 units on infill and redevelopment sites will be supported subject to proposals being well designed and meeting all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this Plan and Borough-wide planning policies and where such development: -*

- (a) Is within the Limits to Development;*
- (b) Retains existing important natural boundaries such as trees, hedges and streams;*
- (c) Does not reduce garden space to an extent where it adversely impacts on the character of the area, or the amenity of neighbours and the existing and future occupiers of the dwelling(s)*

The proposals do not respect the existing garden boundary and associated trees which form the historic context of the farmhouse and yard at Manor Farm (7 King Street) which date back to the Sileby Enclosures of 1760. The development of two units and associated parking would physically reduce the garden area associated with the main farmhouse, leading to a loss of amenity and adversely impact on the visual character.

The site of 7 King Street has been specifically identified for new housing as part of Reserve Site 22, combined with 9 King Street (see policy H1 Reserve Sites Sileby Neighbourhood Plan). The reserve sites would be released to remediate a shortfall in the supply of housing land due to the failure of existing housing sites in Sileby to deliver the anticipated scale of development required. As things stand there is NOT a shortfall in housing land, the service centres have exceeded levels of expected development. The amount of development across the whole combined site was anticipated to be 14 units. The proposal seeks to develop 10 units as well as convert the farmhouse with the amended plans suggesting two rather than five apartments. The scale of development is in excess of that anticipated for reserve allocation and windfall development.

7. **DESIGN** – The proposals are in conflict with sections (a) and (c) Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Policy G2 Design

*This policy will apply to all new commercial and residential developments, including one or more houses, extensions and replacement dwellings. The following criteria should*

*(a) New development should enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness and character of the area in which it is situated, particularly within the Conservation Area, and proposals should clearly show within a Design and Access Statement (where appropriate) how the general character, scale, mass, density and layout of the site is sympathetic to any neighbouring properties and the surrounding area. Development which would have a significant adverse effect on the street scene, or the character of the countryside will only be permitted where any harm is clearly outweighed by the wider benefits of the proposal should not have any adverse effect on the visual amenities of the street scene nor wider rural landscape views;*

*(c) Contemporary or innovative design will be encouraged and supported where it makes a positive contribution to the character of the area and is compatible with the surrounding historic context;*

The level of local comment supports the Parish council's view that the design of the scheme has failed to adequately consider the setting of the development and fails to mitigate the impact of development. Areas of particular concern are; the realignment of the front wall and suggested use of materials to rebuild this wall; the scale of development across the site, number of units proposed for the farmhouse garden and design of parking and landscape proposals.

**8. TRANSPORT** – As outlined in the Sileby Neighbourhood Plan Policy T1-

*.... New developments within the limits to development are to incorporate additional car parking spaces in accordance with the LCC Highways standards for residential and commercial development.*

The application has not included adequate car parking provision and it is unclear on what basis the number of spaces has been determined. Public car parking provision in the centre of Sileby is inadequate. Any development needs to meet the required standard for parking provision and needs to allocate sufficient parking for every unit as well as additional visitor parking spaces.

If this application goes to Plans Committee, we would like the opportunity to speak.

**P/19/0313/2 ERECTION 10 NEW DWELLINGS AND THE CONVERSION OF THE EXISTING HOUSE (GRADE II LISTED) INTO 5 SEPARATE APARTMENTS - 7 KING STREET, SILEBY, LEICESTERSHIRE, LE12 7LZ - THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED AND THE AMENDMENT(S) COMPRISE THE FOLLOWING: *Amended site layout and house types, and amended scheme for No. 7 King Street.***

**RESOLVED** Response is the same as P/19/0218/2

**P/20/0089/2 RESERVED MATTERS (APPEARANCE, SCALE, LAYOUT AND LANDSCAPING) IN RESPECT OF OUTLINE APPLICATION P/17/1578/2 FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE EXISTING FARMSTEAD AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDINGS FOR USE CLASSES B1(A), D1 AND D2 PEASHILL FARM, RATCLIFFE ROAD, SILEBY, LE12 7QB**

**RESOLVED** The Parish Council, is aware that two reserved matters submissions have been made for the Outline Application **P/17/1578/2**. Our earlier comments raised serious concerns about the validity of the application **P/19/1683/2**. One of the points made was that the submission did not include any proposals for the conversion of existing farm buildings or demonstrate any commitment to conversion of the existing farm buildings. As such the Parish Council failed to see how this submission provided ALL the detail necessary to be compliant with the second and third planning conditions set out in the outline application. As things stand no additional detail had been added to that reserved matters submission, so the Parish Council remain of the view that **P/19/1683/2** is invalid as a reserved matters submission in its own right. Even when taken together with this submission **P/20/0089/2** the Parish Council maintain that neither are consistent with the Outline Consent and as such are invalid submissions.

This reserved matters submission **P/20/0089/2** relates to the Outline Application **P/17/1578/2**, and in particular the details to be considered for the retention and conversion of the existing farm buildings to Use Classes B1 (a), D1 or D2 uses which was absent from the earlier submission. The Parish Council has grave concerns about the validity of this submission alone for the following reasons.

Proposal **P/17/1578/2** sought permission as an;

*Outline application for up to 170 dwellings with associated open space, landscaping, extension to cemetery, new allotments, access, surface water attenuation and associated works including demolition of 94 Ratcliffe Road and conversion of existing farm buildings.*

The third condition of the permission for the above proposal states;

*The Reserved Matters submission shall be in accordance with the principles set out on the indicative masterplan on drawing number EDP3418/06f. The Reserved Matters shall include the following principles:*

- *A development of up to 170 dwellings in a housing mix to be agreed.*
- *Retention and conversion of the existing farm buildings to Use Classes B1 (a), D1 or D2 uses....*

The reserved matters submission **P/20/0089/2** is described on the application form as being for

*... the construction of a Health Centre, Office building and associated landscaping on land forming part of Peashill Farmstead, Sileby.*

The description of development in the outline planning proposal and associated conditions clearly refers to the **CONVERSION** of existing buildings at the Peashill Farmstead, whereas the reserved matters submission describes the **CONSTRUCTION** of new buildings at the farmstead. In planning terms conversion and construction are two very different matters and require the wording of applications and permissions to reflect this. The plans submitted as part of this application also reflect this discrepancy as they identify the construction of a new health centre and business centre. It may be a technical matter but it remains pertinent and central to the validity of the reserved matters as being consistent with the terms of the



outline permission. It is the view of the Parish Council that the demolition of existing buildings or construction of new buildings should be dealt with in an outline or full planning application and not sought as part of reserved matters submissions.

The Parish Council has major concerns that demolition of some existing buildings and construction of new buildings deviates from the terms set out in the outline application and the issues debated during the decision-making process. Officers will be aware that the original outline application was determined on the basis of information contained in Committee Reports. The Officers Report published prior to the Plans Committee Meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2018, described Peashill Farmstead in the following terms.

*The farmstead is located in the southern part of the site adjacent to the access, within a rectangular curtilage bound by trees and hedgerows, and consists of a farmhouse, brick outbuildings and corrugated iron vaulted barn. (Ref. Charnwood Borough Plans Committee Report Committee Report 04/01/2018 p. D.3)*

It went on to describe how development of the site may impact on the local character of the area.

*Having established the sensitivity of the site, it is appropriate to consider the impact of the development and any mitigation proposed. At local and site level the effects would be high as the development would alter the site character from rural agricultural field system to a residential development (a negative impact) but this is balanced with extensive public open space, landscaping and open space, including new planting of trees and hedgerows (a positive impact of the development).*

*The retention of the former farm buildings is also a positive contribution with the inclusion of ponds, swales and other natural drainage features that also have a positive impact in the landscape setting. The positive impacts of the proposals and the mitigation are therefore considered to outweigh the negative impacts from the proposals. (Ref. Charnwood Borough Council Plans Committee Report 04/01/2018 p. D20-21);*

The report then explained

*The indicative layout includes a number of key features:*

- • *Provision of bungalows (1.5 storeys) on the boundary with Peashill Close and Ratcliffe Road*
- • *Retention of the farm buildings for community/employment use*
- • *Landscaping, play areas and sustainable drainage proposals*
- • *Footpaths to Ratcliffe Road and up to the boundary with Cemetery Road*
- • *Extension to the cemetery and additional allotments*
- • *The use of long gardens giving space for existing hedgerows. (Ref Charnwood Borough Council Plans Committee Report 04/01/2018 p. D.21)*

The report concluded that

*It is considered that the indicative layout would be capable of delivering a high-quality development in accordance with the aims and objectives of saved policy EV/1 of the Local*

*Plan and Policies CS2, CS3, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS16, and CS17 of the Core Strategy. (Ref Charnwood Borough Council Plans Committee Report 04/01/2018 p. D.21)*

In addition to the positive contribution made to the landscape character by retaining the farm buildings further benefits from conversion were alluded to;

*Healthcare - West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group seeks a contribution of £104,381.76 towards Healthcare enhancement at the Banks Surgery & Highgate Surgery which have capacity issues that would arise from the development. As an alternative the proposed conversion of the farm buildings also presents an opportunity to deliver a further surgery/healthcare facility on the site. Having carefully considered the assessment and request this contribution request is considered to be compliant with the CIL Regulations. (Ref Charnwood Borough Council Plans Committee Report 04/01/2018 p. D.34)*

In summing up the Officer added;

*As an alternative the proposed conversion of the farm buildings also presents an opportunity to deliver a further surgery/healthcare facility on the site. (Ref Charnwood Borough Council Plans Committee Report 04/01/2018 p. D.35)*

Members of the Parish Council and local residents who were present at both of the Plans Committee Meetings recall the debate about the retention of the buildings being material to the decision the Council came to. We were led to understand that the existing farm buildings would be converted or refurbished, there was NO reference made that any of the buildings would be demolished. In fact, the retention and conversion were made out to be a benefit of this scheme, something to weigh against the negative impact of development in the open countryside. The subsequent reserved matters submission is based on the premise that parts of the brick outbuildings and the distinctive black corrugated iron barns will be demolished and replaced with new buildings. This is significantly adrift from the development proposal that the local community expected to be delivered by the outline proposal. At no point in the decision-making process was any reference made to demolition of buildings or the construction of new buildings and is reflected in the planning conditions. This submission does not provide detail for the outline permission but seeks to alter the terms of that consent. If incorrect advice has been given in pre app consultations about the demolition of the existing farm buildings, then we would be grateful if the Council could acknowledge this rather than continuing to waste any further time and money at the expense of the Applicants and the Parish Council. The Parish Council considers that it is critical that the Council come to a view on the question of validity of both reserved matters applications

There remain questions about the viability and deliverability of a new healthcare facility and we await comments on this from the West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group. In the event this application progresses then the Parish Council support the Borough Councillors call in request and would like the opportunity to speak at the Plans Committee Meeting.

**P/20/0111/2 ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLING 106  
COSSINGTON ROAD, SILEBY, LE12 7RT  
RESOLVED No objection**

- 323/19 TO CONSIDER FORMING AN HR COMMITTEE AND TO APPROVE THE TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**RESOLVED** To form an HR Committee and to approve the Terms of Reference
- 324/19 TO ELECT THREE MEMBERS TO JOIN THE HR COMMITTEE AS PER THE JOB DESCRIPTION**  
**RESOLVED** that the members on the HR Committee will include the Chairman, Deputy Chair plus Councillors Ms A Fearn, Mrs V Marriott, Mrs F Hughes and Dr S Haider.
- 325/19 TO APPROVE THE REVISED EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT**  
**RESOLVED** To approve the revised Employment Contract
- 326/19 TO APPROVE THE STAFF HANDBOOK**  
**RESOLVED** To approve the Staff Handbook
- 327/19 TO CONSIDER A DATE FOR AN HR COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**RESOLVED** To take place on Thursday, 5 March at 6.00 pm in the Wesleyan Room
- 328/19 TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF A NEW COMPUTER FOR THE OFFICE AT A COST OF £954.00**  
**RESOLVED** To approve the purchase of a new computer for the office
- 329/19 FUTURE PLANNING**  
 ❖ Sileby Junior Football Club – Pitch Improvement Programme (Councillor Mrs E Astill)

The meeting closed at 8.37 pm

Chairman's Signature: .....

Date: .....