



Clerk of the Council
John Boston
8 Chester Close
Newbury
RG14 7RR
e-mail:
clerk@greenham.gov.uk
www.greenham.gov.uk

☎ 01635 529900

14 May 2009

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GREENHAM PARISH COUNCIL
HELD IN ST MARY'S CHURCH HALL, GREENHAM
ON 13 May 2009 AT 7.30PM**

PRESENT:

Mr T Forward (Chairman) (from Item 2)
Mr P Planterose (Vice-Chairman) (from Item 3)
Mr A Agutter
Mr C Austin
Mr P Barnett
Mr A Beal
Mr D Hale
Mrs S Huxtable
Mrs D Smith
Mr J Swift-Hook (from 7.35 pm)

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Boston (Clerk)
7 members of the Public

1. Apologies for Absence. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mr B Drummond, Mrs P Hay and Mrs T King.

2. Election of Chairman. It was proposed by Mr Beal and seconded by Mrs Huxtable that Mr Forward be re-elected as Chairman. Mr Forward said he was happy to continue as Chairman and the proposal was carried unanimously.

3. Election of Vice-Chairman. It was proposed by Mrs Huxtable and seconded by Mr Beal that Mr Planterose be re-elected as Vice-Chairman. Mr Planterose said he was happy to continue as Vice-Chairman and the proposal was carried unanimously.

Although not requiring a formal vote at this time it was confirmed that councillors representing GPC on outside bodies continue in those offices.

At this point Mr Swift-Hook joined the meeting.

4. Declarations of Interest.

Mr Swift-Hook stated that:

"Any views that I may express about planning matters and other business before this Council tonight are in my capacity as a member of *this* Council (Greenham Parish) and are based on the limited information before me tonight. If and when I consider any of the items at any future time in my capacity as a member of West Berkshire District Council, I will consider each item on its merits at that time, taking full account of all the facts and information which are put before me at that time, as a result of which **I may well form a different view from any view I may express tonight**".

5. Minutes of the Previous Meeting. The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2009 were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

6. Matters Arising. At the February meeting the Council discussed the provision of allotments. The Clerk has been in correspondence with a local resident who wished to address the Council on this matter. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Alan Lane addressed the Council from the Public. He formally deposited a petition of 6 Greenham residents which under the Allotments and Smallholdings Act 1908 requires the Council to consider the request. Mr Swift-Hook pointed out that as this was not an agenda item no decision could be made although general discussion could be undertaken. Mr Swift-Hook declared an interest as a member of NTC which owns the allotments and as the Ward Member for Pyle Hill in which the allotments are situated. Mr Barnett declared an interest as a member of NTC and a member of the NTC Community Services Committee which administers Southbys. Mr Agutter declared an interest as a Southbys allotment holder. Mr Lane stated that there are currently 27 Greenham residents with allotments at Southbys and a further 11 on the waiting list. There was clearly a need within Greenham for the provision of allotments. He suggested land within the proposed Racecourse development and produced scale plans showing that land to the size of Southbys was available and also suggested compulsory purchase of land within Greenham. Mr Swift-Hook said that compulsory purchase was not easy nor was it cheap; a commercial rate still had to be paid for any land acquired and this did not seem feasible without an excessive increase in the precept; Southbys had been passed to NTC by a deed of gift. He also suggested that if allotments could be provided then NTC be approached to administer them on Greenham's behalf as it already had the infrastructure in place. The Chairman said that land acquisition would be difficult as most within the Parish was owned or optioned by developers. It was confirmed in answer to a query from Mr Agutter that GPC would have liability for any allotments and this would have insurance implications; GPC would also be responsible for the security of the site. Mr Beal fully supported the concept as did Mr Barnett who cautioned that it could take some time to achieve, he also favoured a central location to make access by foot/cycle easier. Mr Austin also spoke in favour and suggested approaching local landowners for any unused or unremunerative land. He also said that any site should not be too far south as approaching the Common the land became very stony and difficult to work. Mr Swift-Hook suggested consideration of the open space at the Chase but Mr Austin said the area was prone to become waterlogged and consisted of heavy clay. The Chairman and Clerk had also investigated the circumstances relating to the 'methane field' on which there was a covenant barring house building. However, the field is in the ownership of Rivar and it was thought unlikely that they would be willing to release it at a price GPC could afford. Additionally, there were concerns over site security as the field was in an unbuilt area not surrounded by housing. Mr Lane thought that

Lottery funding of up to £300,000 might be available. It was also stated from the public that land had recently been made available for allotments in Hungerford. The Clerk commented that he understood that the land in question had been leased for a limited number of years from a local farmer and the cost to allotment holders was in the region of £12 per pole per annum which while still good value was around 3 times the cost of Southbys. To allow time for comprehensive enquiries this will be an agenda item in July.

The Clerk has been in contact with Mr Gary Blake, MD of English Provender following his offer at the last meeting to host a visit to his facility. Mr Blake said that the best time for a visit would be between 5pm and 6pm and any day in June should be acceptable. The Clerk therefore asked councillors for a selection of suitable dates. After discussion it was agreed that a Monday in the second half of June would be most suitable and the Clerk will advise Mr Blake accordingly.

7. Abbotswood/Pinchington Lane. It was proposed by Mr Swift-Hook and seconded by Mr Barnett that Clause 35 (b) of Standing Orders be suspended under the authority of Clause 71 of Standing Orders in respect of this Item only. Mr Austin and Mr Hale declared personal interests as neighbouring landowners to Deadman's Lane. On being put to the vote 2 voted in favour, 6 voted against with 2 abstentions. The previous decision not to part-fund an acoustic fence therefore stands. Mr Swift-Hook said that he regretted the Council's decision. He had arranged a meeting with the Deadmans Lane residents for 14th May to discuss an acoustic fence to minimize noise from the A339 but due to the absence of the Chairman of the residents' action group this had had to be postponed to June or July. He said there was a clear distinction between the road noise and the noise from the HWRC which was still subject to investigation. The Chairman referred to the ACCON report prepared by consultants for WBC which indicates the benefit of the existing garden fencing so he was unsure of the benefit of an acoustic fence. Mr Swift-Hook said that as GPC had voted not to reverse its earlier decision this was not a proper matter for discussion. The Chairman also referred to the fact that many residents had moved fences without planning permission and enforcement action has been documented but not completed. There had originally been 2 fences and Mr Austin, who owns the neighbouring land said that many homeowners had removed the inner fence without planting screening trees as required by the deeds and had possibly thereby increased the noise. Mr Swift-Hook said that any acoustic fence would be the subject of a planning application. The Chairman said that GPC would be interested in assessing the benefit of any proposal. Mr Beal asked for clarification of the 2 noise sources. Mr Swift-Hook said that there had always been 2 separate problems and it was important to keep a clear distinction. The noise from the HWRC is solely the responsibility of the operator. When Permission was granted one of the conditions was that noise be kept within defined limits. A post-implementation survey was now being conducted as noted above. Any amelioration that was found necessary would be the responsibility of the operator. Mr Swift-Hook agreed that the residents did not all speak with one voice which complicated addressing the problem.

8. Racecourse Development. It is understood that the Racecourse had been advised by WBC to withdraw the current application as part of the development site lay outside the settlement boundary and this might be re-drawn. The Chairman was concerned that this indicated a desire by WBC to see the application succeed given the pressure from the

Government to increase house building but Mr Swift-Hook said that it did not imply any pre-agreement. Mr Austin repeated his previous position that people should be given access to sufficient good quality homes.

9. Planning.

The Chairman said that GPC understood that when No Objection was made to applications any supporting comments were not given sufficient weight and this was the reason that so many applications were objected to. The Clerk will write to WBC to clarify their position.

08/02237/FUL	Newbury Racecourse S.73 – Removal of conditions of 05/02095/COMIND	Application withdrawn
08/02345/COMIND	Nationwide BS NGP	Amendments to external plant enclosure and elevations
09/00242/OUTMAJ	1 Dalby Cres RG14 7JR Demolition of existing building and erection of 14 flats	Application withdrawn
09/00379/HOUSE	36 Montague Drive Erection of conservatory	Revised plans have been submitted to reduce the roof pitch and add hip to reduce the bulk of the design. Object unless there is no loss of amenity on the neighbouring property.

(a) Applications

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
09/00583/COMIND	Land off Communications Road NGP Change of use to B8 open storage	Object See below

- The level of storage both in height and volume has not been identified.
- As no indication of levels of activity or use has been provided so all consultees are unable to comment on the impact making the application flawed.
- Hours of operation not discussed or known.
- No indication of traffic levels is given to ascertain impact on road network.
- Proximity to the SSSI common and the impact on it has been underplayed or under stated and even ignored or denied on the application form despite a quote from ECON6 in the supporting statement.
- Despite the fact the ground is already contaminated there is concern that the regular use of the hard standing will exacerbate pollution problems from run off from vehicles as there is no drainage infrastructure since the closing of the air base on this site which is in existence or in good repair.
-

- Having said yes to contamination there should be an assessment which has not been supplied.
- No figures for employment. There will need to be some provision for secure access to the site at minimum which will need manning as will maintenance and cleaning of the site.
- No discussion has taken place on the use of refrigerated units the impact of noise from them and the non-eco-friendly fact that no on site power supply from the national grid is provided or proposed to power units. GPC suggest no refrigeration should run from its own power while parked.
- Section 19 of the application says yes and has zero for all boxes - what does this mean.
- GPC is of the opinion that B8 without a building has greater potential to create impact as none of the operation is shielded. Only the visual impact is likely to be less unless cranes etc. are used or storage over a certain height allowed.

09/00680/FUL

Land SE of Venture West NGP
S.73. Vary hours of operation of
08/00324/FUL
Driving Standards Agency

Object See below

It is our duty to preserve the Common and the amenity value of it. By extending the hours this is obviously impacted. To permit unlimited testing will bring more damage to the Common and the amenity value of it. We are worried that PP has ignored this point. We find the suggestion that as residences are more than 500m distant Public Protection has seen fit to recommend approval. What of those working at NGP and using the Common. No attempt has been given to ascertain the level of noise and the transient nature of test braking and how it would affect residential amenity. It should be noted that LGV brake testing is conducted on site by accelerating to a high speed and then braking heavily, not under normal driving conditions on a public road as with car licence testing. Similarly, testing of reversing ability is conducted on site and as vehicles are fitted with an audible reversing alarm this will create continuous noise pollution.

The Chairman stated that it had become clear to him that he had a prejudicial interest in this matter as a nearby householder and he withdrew from the meeting until the end of consideration of this application

The applicant seems to want us to believe that operations on the park make their operation insignificant but no other site on the park is adjacent to the Handpost Gully nesting site and this site has no bund between it and the common. The combination of the gully which allows noise to travel further and the transient noises from testing are likely to impact the common. We feel that Natural England, BBOWT and the Commons Commission should all be consulted as the operation is now unencumbered by any limits if the permission is granted and the impact is therefore unlimited.

GPC is also concerned that Highways seem to feel the traffic will be minimal and set no limit on it. To allow unrestricted testing will allow the test operation to grow to a point when it could have a real impact.

Highways need to consider the impact on local roads due to instructors who are independent of the examiners taking their pupils out onto local and other roads to familiarise them with likely test routes. How many practice runs and tuition runs are made before one test is carried out.

The point that other operations generate more traffic is irrelevant as any extra traffic exacerbates the problem.

No mention is made of PSVs which are different from LGVs.

GPC has concern that the permission already granted is bad enough for the potential impact as described above.

GPC wishes to put on record that a Government agency and its agents would seem to have got the requirement very wrong to need to put in such an amendment so soon after permission had been granted and would like to ask why. To suggest that without relaxing the condition it will make the operation unviable suggests the application should not have been made at all. This step-wise erosion of conditions inevitably leads to unacceptable operational levels.

09/00684/FUL <i>adjacent Parish</i>	Park House School Andover Road RG14 6NQ Construct artificial turf pitch and construct 2 x MUGA The Governing Body of Park House School	Object. See below
--	--	-------------------

Mr Barnett declared an interest as a Governor of the School

* The accompanying design and access statement states 'The (current) playing fields have poor drainage and so there are many occasions when disruptions to the delivery of the outdoor curriculum occur. This development will overcome this issue'. However the plans submitted give no details as to how this will be overcome apart from application section 13 (flood risk) which indicates surface water will be disposed of via soak away. We feel more details are required such as consideration of greater run off due to artificial pitch and also consideration of SUDS.

* Although the design and access statement states 'to mitigate against light pollution a lighting scheme has been designed to minimize both the horizontal and vertical light spillage' we are not lighting engineers and therefore seek assurance (independently from applicant by West Berks planners?) that the selected lighting columns (15 m high) will not cause undue light loss upwards (light pollution).

Mr Austin said that he was opposed to all artificial surfaces as they were likely to increase the risk of injury.

09/00810/COND1	Nationwide BS, NGP Reserved Matters – Condition 6	Object. See below
----------------	--	-------------------

Approval of Construction Management Plan

Greenham Parish Council

14 May 2009

Application form description is incorrect as it describes original application 08/02354.

The real description is on the observation form which describes this being for approval of construction management plan condition 6.

The application form says construction not started. Document application construction plan which is seeking approval says construction started 16th February. Natural England said no construction in nesting season. Construction is taking place without permission and contrary to Natural England requirements. This is not something that can be regularised routinely as it is clearly in breach and should not be allowed to continue.

The document construction plan makes much of cut and fill but the supplied and approved plans show we have been hood winked as there is little to be cut but a lot to be filled hence the very large number of lorries bringing soil in. More than one per minute. This application should be rejected as the development has started and should be replaced by a section 73 to vary the condition as they are in breach of condition 6.

This application has been used as an excuse to slip in “minor” changes but in reality only the ones described are minor but looking at the plans there are very many significant differences. Roof plant has become much more prominent. More plant is shown. In fact it is worrying to note that air inlets have become exhausts, natural vents have also become exhausts which could make more noise and many details on the sides of the building have changed. Louvers’ have been removed and replaced elsewhere. Accesses both doors and shutters have been changed. We have only looked at one plan but the changes do not seem minor and could result in totally different noise issue which need addressing.

A new drawing 517-AL[0]500 rev B shows external plant enclosure not seen before. This is a major change/addition for which more information such as noise information is required. Where is the plant enclosure to be built? No site layout plan is supplied which includes this.

Five of the seven plans supplied are incorrectly named AP or A when the plans say AL.

This application should therefore be rejected as it is used as a cover for significant revisions and seeks to hide the fact that they are in breach of condition 6 of the original permission.

(b) Decisions

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal.</u>	<u>Decision.</u>
08/02345/COMIND	Nationwide BS New technology centre NGP	Granted
09/00215/COMIND	MC Autos Deadman's Lane Construction of new workshops	Granted

09/00227/FUL	Drake House Bishops Green	Granted
Greenham Parish Council		14 May 2009
	Re-instate subsided ground levels	
09/00271/HOUSE	62 New Road RG14 7RU Replace garage flat roof with pitched	Granted
09/00308/HOUSE	13 Pyle Hill RG14 7JJ First floor rear extension	Granted
09/00311/TELE56	Land at The Triangle Mast and cabinets	No objection
09/00373/FUL	Unit 11 Fulton Court NGP Installation of mezzanine floor	Granted

10. Finance & Accounts for Payment.

Following the Internal Audit of the GPC accounts for 08 – 09, the Clerk had completed the Annual Return for submission to the External Auditor. The GPC Income and Expenditure Account had to be formally approved before submission of the Return. The I& E Account had been scrutinised and checked against source documents by Mr Planterose, Chairman of the Finance Working Group and had previously been circulated to Councillors and a copy is attached to these Minutes. It was proposed by Mr Agutter seconded by Mrs Huxtable and carried unanimously that the Accounts and the Annual Governance Statement be approved. Mr Swift-Hook asked the Clerk if the I&E account could be expanded to provide a self-balancing analysis. The Clerk explained that the current format was that requested by the Internal Auditor but it would be a simple matter to revise it, which he undertook to do.

The following cheques were presented for payment:

Mr J Boston – Clerk's salary & expenses	£1271.28
Includes expenses of £97.39 and pay rise arrears	
HM Revenue & Customs – Tax & NI	£598.62
Includes Clerk tax/NI £451.50 GPC NI £147.12	
BALC	£25.00
Planning Training Day	
Allianz Insurance plc	£490.14
Annual Insurance Premium	

It was proposed by Mr Austin, seconded by Mrs Huxtable and carried unanimously that the cheques be approved for payment

11. S.106 Monies Since it has been several months since the last information from WBC on the spend of S.106 monies the Clerk has asked for an update. As this had only just been received and was differently presented to the previous list it had not been possible to make a full analysis. It seems at first sight that there is a total of £428,344.99 included in the holding account in respect of Highways alone, however investigation with

WBC reveals that £154,074.23 has been spent but details have not yet passed from
Greenham Parish Council **14 May 2009**

Accounts to Planning. Two sums of money - £50,000 for cycleways at NGP and £800 as a Highways contribution for 23 Warwick Drive – had been spent or allocated for spend since the last list in January. WBC has advised that the £50,000 was spent on cycleways across the Common by Countryside and the £800 was put towards the Pinchington Lane/Greenham Road roundabout. There was some doubt that these were proper uses for the developer contributions and this may be the subject of further correspondence with WBC. The Clerk noted that Thatcham, Chieveley and Newbury had asked for similar S.106 information. The Clerk had been in touch with a total of 9 Councils regarding the spend (or non-spend) of S.106 contributions. With the exception of NTC they are all supportive of the Greenham initiative although because of varying responsibilities and situations the specific perception of the problem varies from Council to Council. Additionally, some Councils have advised that while informal contact with their members suggests support they are unable to take a formal position until their May meeting which will be held later in the month. It was agreed that the Clerk would draft a letter to WBC which would be circulated to the other Councils for their endorsement.

12. Parish Plan. Mrs Huxtable reported on Parish Plan progress. The questionnaires for Business and Youth had been analysed but due to a software failure processing of the main questionnaires had been delayed. The public exhibition on 30th May would still go ahead as it would be of value even if all the data was not available. There would be a youth meeting at the Racecourse on 26 May. The Chairman thanked her and all members of the Steering Group for their sterling work.

13. Web Site and Contract. Deferred to next meeting.

14. Newsletter. Deferred to next meeting.

15. Notice Board. During 2007 GPC had discussed the replacement of the 2 notice boards. At the time it was decided that the cost was not justified in the light of the financial position. The notice board on Greenham Road was refurbished by Mr Agutter and is still in good condition. However, the New Road board is now very dilapidated and consideration should be given to its replacement. The Clerk has researched various notice board suppliers but most do not quote cost on their web sites and the Clerk did not want to make detailed enquiries without the authority of the Council. The one web site that does quote costs suggests £650 - £1000 depending on size and quality. Mr Agutter volunteered to construct a new board for New Road similar to the one in Westwood Road. Mr Forward proposed, Mr Swift-Hook seconded and it was carried unanimously to spend £100 on the new board to reimburse Mr Agutter for materials and time. Mr Agutter asked that the payment be made direct to the Children with Diabetes charity in Newbury. The location of a new board also needed to be discussed. The present New Road board is fixed to the Racecourse chain link fence. It might be possible to sink posts into the grass between the fence and the pavement although space is limited. An alternative would be on Stroud Green, perhaps adjacent to the play area but it might be more susceptible to vandalism here. Other locations will be considered. The use of the Tesco community board will also be investigated.

16. District Parish Conference. The next District Parish Conference is planned for

Wednesday 27th May at 6.00 pm at the Holiday Inn Bath Road (A4) Padworth. Topics
Greenham Parish Council **14 May 2009**

include Maintenance of Highways and Pavements, Planning Enforcement and Crime Prevention in Villages. Mr Beal, Mr Barnett, Mr Planterose and Mr Forward will attend.

17. Speed limit variations. WBC has published a Notice of Proposal for revised speed limits in Greenham. The overall effect will be to remove the short sections of 40 mph

limits on Greenham Road, Burys Bank Road and Water Lane. The measure was approved by WBC's speed limit review panel on 28th November 2008 and had previously been supported by GPC.

18. Exchange of Information. There will be a Ramblers' Work Party undertaking voluntary clearance of public rights of way in Greenham commencing 25th May and continuing on alternate Fridays until complete.

Mr Planterose, Mrs Smith, Mrs King and Mr Swift-Hook will attend the Sustainable Newbury meeting on 16 May. Mr Swift-hook may have some spare tickets if anyone else wishes to attend.

Mr Austin said that there will be a Common Commission meeting of 20 May. The new Wardens which are largely funded by BBOWT are now in place.

Mrs Smith drew attention to the lack of a pedestrian crossing on Pinchington Lane near the new roundabout; this was removed from the original plan due to space issues. She had attended a site meeting with WBC and the Ranger. It was assessed that the best position would be near to the southern end of New Road where it would also be available for people using the Bridleway. Others voiced the view that a crossing at both locations was required.

Mr Swift-Hook announced that there will be a Carnival Disco on 13 June at the RAFA Hall. Tickets cost £5.

Mr Agutter drew attention to the College traffic lights. Before the reconstruction of Pinchington Lane there had been a sign warning drivers of the presence of the lights immediately to the left of the roundabout. This sign had been removed during the roadworks and never replaced. The Clerk will write to WBC.

Mr Barnett said that the Newbury Town newsletters delivered to houses on Westwood Farm had been delivered in error. The area was still in Greenham.

Mr Forward said he was concerned about some of the sponsored roundabouts. While they looked attractive there was a danger that they could obscure vision for pedestrians. He particularly drew attention to the Albury Way/Bishops Green roundabout where the foliage was extensive and high. The Clerk will write to WBC.

19. Date of Next Meeting. The Meeting closed at 10.00pm The date of the next meeting is on 10 June 2009 at St Mary's Church Hall at 7.30pm.

Abbreviations

GPC - Greenham Parish Council
WBC - West Berks Council
NTC - Newbury Town Council

A J Forward
Chairman
10 June 2009