

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY FULL COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD ON TUESDAY 25<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

**Present:**        **Cllr Mumford**                **Cllr Harwood**    **Cllr Fenby**  
                      **Cllr Boulton**                **Cllr Dallow**        **Cllr Sanford**  
                      **Cllr Hing**                        **Cllr Wardle**        **Cllr Muir**

**In attendance:** **Roz Capps (Clerk)**

**331    13/14    To note apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from **Cllr Roberts Cllr Winney Cllr Bowen Cllr Cumpstey**

**332    13/14    Declaration of Interest in items on the Agenda**

None declared

**333    13/14    To approve the Minutes of the Full Council meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

Councillor Wardle asked for an amendment to 325 – should read “.....so would not have an impact on the precept”. Change proposed by Cllr Hing, seconded Cllr Boulton, All in Favour. It was **RESOLVED** to approve the Minutes of the Full Council meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> March, with the agreed change - Proposed Cllr Sanford, seconded Cllr Hing – All in favour

**334    13/14    To consider and agree appointing Ashburn Planning to prepare and present the case for the Town Council at the Appeal by Gladman Developments**

The Council can either represent itself, be represented as an ‘Interested party’ by a planning consultant, or be represented as a Rule 6 (6) party by consultants and barristers. Following on from a meeting with Rob Megson (Ashburn Planning) and Cllrs Mumford, Cumpstey & Wardle the recommendation is to be represented as a Interested party. The cost for this is £5000 plus disbursements & vat. This will allow FTC to put their case forward and bring up points regarding matters other than simply the reasons given by CDC for refusal. It also limits the financial liability of the Council as there is no risk of having to pay costs. Although FTC would not be able to cross examine the appellants witnesses our representative could be cross examined. If the Town Council chose to be a Rule 6 party there is a risk of liability for costs if objections are considered unreasonable.

Discussion took place.

Cllr Harwood raised a concern over spending £5k when there is no guarantee of winning the appeal and suggested that as we have already raised our objection it should be left to CDC to make their case.

Cllr Wardle explained that CDC can only argue on the reasons already given for refusal, but as an interested party FTC can bring additional concerns to the fore e.g. sewerage capacity.

Cllr Hing stressed the point that if FTC is serious about fighting overdevelopment in Fairford, we have to use all the resources we have at our disposal to try to stop the development.

Cllr Fenby asked if by being represented as an interested party at the appeal, FTC is setting a precedent for future appeals.

Cllr Mumford & Wardle responded that FTC's response to each application/appeal would be judged on its own merits.

Cllr Dallow said that the fact that we might not win is not an issue, the scale of the development is such that FTC must act to try to prevent it.

Cllr Hing proposed that Fairford Town Council appoint Ashburn Planning to prepare and present the case for the Town Council at the Gladman Appeal. Proposed Cllr Hing, second Cllr Boulton. 8 in favour. 1 against.

**ACTION: Clerk to write to Ashburn Planning to engage them for this work.**

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.50pm

.....Chairman

.....2014