



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

☎ 01635 529900
11 June 2009

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GREENHAM PARISH COUNCIL
HELD IN ST MARY'S CHURCH HALL, GREENHAM
ON 10 JUNE 2009 AT 7.30PM**

PRESENT:

Mr T Forward (Chairman)
Mr P Planterose (Vice-Chairman)
Mr C Austin (from 7.55pm)
Mr P Barnett
Mr A Beal (to 8.55pm)
Mr B Drummond (from 7.55pm)
Mrs P Hay
Mrs S Huxtable
Mrs D Smith
Mr J Swift-Hook (from 7.55pm)

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

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming Mr Ifor Sheldon, Leader of Newbury Town Council, as a member of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mr A Agutter, Mr D Hale and Mrs T King.
2. Declarations of Interest. There were no declarations of interest at this time.
3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting. The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2009 were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chairman.
4. Matters Arising. The proposed visit to English Provender is confirmed as 22 June at 5pm. EP can accommodate a maximum of 10 visitors and so far 9 Councillors have indicated attendance.
5. Abbotswood/Pinchington Lane. Mr Forward said that he had spoken to English Cogger, who would be willing to meet with WBC if required, at a cost of £116 + VAT per hour (no charge for travel time or cost of travel) to discuss the road noise issue. The

Chairman recalled that GPC had originally recommended to DML residents that noise levels should be established before construction of the HWRC in order to establish a baseline. The noise monitoring had revealed that planning permission should not have been granted as noise levels were above PPG 24 guidelines and the original purpose of the monitoring had been forgotten. A discussion followed regarding the content of various reports and the timescale of reports and HWRC construction. It was clear from both the English Cogger report and the ACCON report commissioned by WBC that WBC had been remiss in granting planning permission without properly screening the application and therefore requesting noise readings from the A339, which at the time had a speed limit of 60 mph and so would have been even noisier. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to WBC to ask why permission had been given for the site in the light of these reports and why the screening failed to consider road noise. It was also agreed that the clerk would write to WBC proposing a meeting of GPC, WBC, English Cogger and possibly ACCON in order to discuss the issues.

Following Mr Swift-Hook's arrival following this item the Chairman presented a summary of matters pertinent to him but already discussed, Mr Swift-Hook then made further comments on this Item which are also recorded here under this heading. Mr Swift-Hook referred to the previous proposed meeting which had been cancelled due to Mr Beasley's absence. He had offered Mr Beasley 4 possible dates for a new meeting and asked for alternatives should these not be convenient. He had not been contacted by Mr Beasley since May and so he intended to go ahead with a new meeting anyway as there were other residents to consider. The Chairman and Mr Swift-Hook agreed to further discuss the matter separately. The Chairman said that Environmental Health Public Protection intended to monitor the noise from the HWRC over a coming weekend, including from upstairs windows. There had been allegations that since this decision had been taken the operator had changed working practices so that most noise was generated at times when monitoring was unlikely. Mr Austin said that the baffle and reflective effects of houses should be remembered; from his nearby paddock the road noise was so loud that it masked the HWRC noise. The Chairman pointed out that within the development English Cogger felt the road noise would be baffled but the noise from HWRC would very likely be more pronounced in the absence of road noise.

6. Racecourse Development. The original application (08/02201/OUTMAJ) has now been withdrawn and a new application submitted in the last few days. However, as the Planning Working Group has not had the opportunity to scrutinise the new application, detailed discussion was deferred to the July meeting. See also Item 7 below

7. Planning.

(a) Applications

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
09/00836/ADV	Gowrings of Newbury Ltd Unit A, The Triangle Various Signage City Newbury (Renault)	No objection

09/00851/HOUSE 9 Westwood Road RG14 7LD Objection. See Below
Rear conservatory
Mr Nicholas

The application from the perspective of the neighbour in number 11 is not a conservatory but a brick extension with a glazed roof. The whole of the side parallel and very close to the boundary

with number 11 is of brick cavity construction. There is therefore real concern about loss of light and amenity to the neighbour especially from midday onwards given position in relation to the path of the sun. Given the rise to Dalby Crescent behind the neighbouring property the impact on light will be more marked as most will come from the west from midday onwards.

The materials to be used in the roof are either to be glass or polycarbonate but not yet decided. Polycarbonate will block more light but there is a possibility of blinds being installed given the southern aspect which will further block light.

09/00918/COMIND Marshalls Mono site, NGP See Comment below
S.73 variations – extend time period
Nationwide Building Society

It was clear that the developer had disregarded the Condition that no construction should be undertaken during the nesting season, on which great emphasis had been placed by Natural England. Construction had started in February and WBC could have taken enforcement action at an early stage. Mr Beal observed that changes in planning law should have given officers more time to deal with such matters and WBC had been warned in good time from local knowledge. GPC had initially been most supportive of the Nationwide application and felt that it had been let down by subsequent events. It was agreed that the Clerk would write accordingly to Mr Lugg at WBC and the Chief Executive at Nationwide with its concerns. It was considered that as the work done could not be undone no purpose would be served by entering a formal objection.

09/00942/HOUSE 127 Boundary Rd RG14 7NT No objection
Adjacent Parish Single storey side extension
Mr Nick Seymour.

At this point Mr Austin, Mr Drummond and Mr Swift-Hook joined the meeting.

Mr Drummond 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**".

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**".

09/00971/OUTMAJ	Newbury Racecourse Redevelop to provide up to 1500 housing units and improved facilities Newbury Racecourse plc and David Wilson Homes	No decision taken. See below.
-----------------	--	----------------------------------

The application had only been received by the Clerk on the day of the meeting and GPC had not had time to consider the application. The Clerk has received one copy of the complete application on disc and had negotiated with the agent, Terence O'Rourke, for a further CD showing only the changes from the previous application which he thought would be beneficial to Councillors. The Clerk will endeavour to obtain further copies of both discs, failing which the Chairman will produce some locally.

It was noted that as the LDF was still evolving, such matters as overall traffic flows, schooling needs etc could not be properly assessed. The opportunity should also be taken to ensure that the development met the latest green standards and the Racecourse Station developed into a proper second Newbury station.

As part of the site lay outside the settlement boundary the application could be refused which would give adequate time to consider these points. It was proposed by Mr Forward and seconded by Mr Planterose that the Clerk should write to WBC accordingly. Mr Swift-Hook said that he thought it likely that the site would be preferred under the LDF but he agreed that such detail should be considered. Mr Drummond and Mr Swift-Hook abstained pending further detailed information; all others present voted in favour of the proposal.

09/00972/TELE56	Newbury & Crookham Golf Club Install 15m telecom mast Orange Communications	Object. See below
-----------------	---	-------------------

Mr Barnett said that there had been a complete lack of consultation and involvement with local bodies and that the applicant was intent on imposing its will on the community. The Chairman felt that WBC were being pressured into making a decision before August to avoid WBC being held responsible for a reduced Orange service. Mr Swift-Hook said that Orange's commercial considerations were not a planning matter and that the relevant WBC officer should be pressed to consider each point of objection in depth. Mr Beal produced a copy of the MTHR report which confirmed that there had been no assessment of the long-term health effects of base stations. Mr Swift-Hook agreed and said that Government advice was that health matters should not be a planning consideration; this weakened that applicant's case that the mast was sited away from population centres.

It was proposed by Mr Forward, seconded by Mr Planterose and carried unanimously that the application be objected to as follows:

GPC response to consultation which was not considered before the application was submitted.

The Parish would like to formally record its concern that lip service only would seem to have been paid to pre-application consultation. Greenham Parish Council has the following concerns about the

pre-application BRK0342.

- Section 1 of the information sheet discusses managing growth by providing more base stations yet section 2 discusses relocation due to redevelopment of the existing site. The existing location could cope with expansion so we feel it should be made clear the proposal is only about finding a replacement location. There is no evidence supplied to show the existing location is unsuitable for existing and future traffic.
- The area to the west of the existing mast is not only predominantly commercial but up to the A339 has a considerable proliferation of masts already. A recent application was made recently within the land of a car dealership. This would be not only GPC's preferred location which is also devoid of the tall trees which seem to dictate high mast heights.
- The existing location is approximately 118m AOD with the new location about 120m AOD yet the mast is required to be 5m taller than location 6 or 7. The land round the retail area and the A339 is about 120m AOD which, due to the absence of tall trees, would from you own information require a less high mast. Visual inspection of this area shows how much can be seen with a direct line of sight from a 10m mast being able to cover a very wide and densely populated area.
- GPC can think of many locations where land may be obtainable in this preferred position.
- Your proposed location with the mast rising some 4m above the tallest trees will spoil the skyline which becomes more precious as you move from the existing location to the east. The water tower is the only object currently visible but it is accepted generally partly due to its location in amongst trees and its form. There is talk of it being listed.
- Your proposal will not only be visible from the SSSI common which is part of WB and BBOWT's living landscape area but over a wide unspoiled area unlike those in GPC's preferred area. To build this would set a dangerous precedent.
- Your plans in drawing 1 give no detail of cable routes but drawing 2 shows both the electricity and BT cables leaving the site and running right beside the trunk of an adjacent tree. The cables should leave from the side and go straight onto the track. This brings the issue of ownership of the track and what rights will be needed.

In summary the location is not only totally detrimental to the visual amenity of the area but requires considerable works to bring services into the required location. There will clearly be one or more trees needing removal and the root structure of surrounding ones severely compromised. GPC's preferred locations have all services on tap and are already hosting masts. There are a few pockets where residential use is found but with care impact on these can be avoided or not compounded.

Flawed consultation process and issues arising.

Rollout consultation is stated to have taken place with David Mackins of WB on 23rd October 2008. WB was also in pre-application discussion with Planning Officer Brian Conlon in February of this year. Despite the inference on page 2 of 10 in the Supplementary Information that consultation was required by the officer at that time it is extremely disappointing to find that consultation did not actually take place until 6th May 2009. Greenham Parish Council was not consulted until prompted by residents on 19th May 2009.

The consultation is flawed for the following reasons:

- GPC was given until 3rd June to respond but the covering letter for the application was already written and sent on the 29th May so no input from GPC was considered or received by that date.

- The consultation discusses 7 sites yet the application considers 12.
- If these five further locations were prompted by consultation then no attempt has been made to allow proper time to enter into two way dialogue or re-consult which would have ensured all those consulted were aware of all options before a planning application was submitted.
- Delaying the consultation for all others until just before the application was made, with at best only 9 days to process any alternatives or issues raised, showed no intention allowing real consultation dialogue.
- The consultation states the objective is to replace an existing mast but the nature of the rejection of location 12 in the application partly fuels the opinion that the real game plan is to provide additional coverage including 3G elsewhere.
- The absence of a coverage diagram of the existing BRK0182 site to be compared with fig.2 which shows the area without BRK0182 in the application has further hidden important facts about the objective of the application from those consulted.
- No attempt has been made to consider a mast at location 12 as tall as the 15m proposed for the new site. This site is extremely close to the existing site where a coverage diagram could well show a perfectly good replacement location even perhaps removing the need for location 11 (BRK7007) which could be shut down.
- To dismiss location 12 while only considering a 10m mast yet discussing BRK7007 which with its 11m mast is considered too close confirms the application is not seeking like for like.
- The consultation is devoid of any evidence of pre-application consultation with operators as stated in the application DA&SS at 6.1. The application makes it clear that Orange has no intention of working with other networks at this time and that it already has masts in the search area yet fails to consider the option of improving an existing one or choosing a replacement location for an existing one such as position 12.
- To give so little time between consultation and submitting an application shows no intention of working with consultees to find a mutually acceptable solution and would indicate that Orange are determined to erect a mast where they want it despite the views of others.
- Finally to leave the consultation date so close to the application date which leaves only time to process the application before the old site closes in August forces the hand of the planning authority. It wrongly puts the planning authority in a position of perceived blame where if permission is refused then Orange customers will suffer. It also ensures no real attempt can be made to find an alternative site in answer to adverse consultation response.

Additional planning issues.

There other points that GPC wishes to make in addition to those in the pre-application response also submitted:

- The application does not describe the poor condition of the trees claimed to mask the mast. It is our belief that the height is required to achieve the extra coverage that is behind this application with or without the trees. Pictures are supplied.
Much is made of the mast being natural wood. The trees are said to be 11m and the mast 15m. Looking at the diagram the top 2m is the main transmitter, the next meter is the support for the transmitter and other appendages. This means only 1m of wood will be showing but this will also be partly obscured by the OPCS dish which is some .6m in diameter. The wooden mast is therefore just a selling trick as from some vantage points 3.6m of masthead paraphernalia will be visible when only .4m of wood will be showing as the dish masks yet more. If we add on the (lightening) spike of .5m sticking up above the mast we have 4.5m above the trees with only .4m of wood. the dish in its own way will be visually intrusive.
- Being mounted such that it sticks out from the side and the mast is really 15.5m high with the spike.

- Although the Provender building at NGP is some 12.395m above ground level there is concern that this will be the only tall but less bulky construction in an otherwise open area. Recreational flying and regular tree top buzzing by military aircraft that use the area round common could make this construction give rise to safety concerns which the CAA may need to be consulted on.
- The improved 2G and 3G coverage to the south and east is largely covering open space which has little or no population. To move the location further to the north could move the mast from nearby houses although remain a visual blight.
- In the application positions 9 and 10 being at the old control tower and NGP are dismissed as being unnecessary as mast HAM0447 already serves the area yet figure 6 in the application makes it clear no 3G coverage is provided by HAM0447. Either one tall mast at NGP or an improved one there which coupled with a much lower mast considerably north of the application site would give wide 3G coverage without such visual impact.
- In discussing sites much is made of suggestion that WB may not approve. Little or no evidence has been supplied to show that certain sites would not find favour and why. The water tower is the only one with a proper response. The application seems to seek to prove certain locations GPC would find more acceptable would not find favour without providing evidence to that effect.
- Section 6.1 discusses paragraph 8 of the Appendix to PPG8 and makes much of pre-application consultation it is GPC's view that the true spirit intended by such guidance and not been entered into.
- Section 6.1 paragraph 3 says "Please find response enclosed" which we assume, although poorly worded, means the response from Brian Conlon to the Chief Planning Officer but GPC has not found this enclosed. The additional concern is that 5 more sites are presented with the application than in the "consultation" to which this response therefore cannot refer.
- Sites have been rejected by the applicant on proximity to housing etc. This is not a planning issue per say following government guidance. Paragraphs 29-31 of PPG8 discusses that health matters can be considered material but the weight has to be assessed by the planners. Paragraph 30 concludes that planning is not the place to determine how to protect public health.

Summary.

In all we are disappointed with the way this application has been handled as stated above. We would ask the planners to require Orange to show what is really required when compared with a proper diagram of current coverage. We can then compare options including other locations when proper heights are considered. Proper mapping would show what is, what is wanted and where this could be achieved. This will distinguish between like for like as originally claimed and network expansion hiding behind this application. This application seems to be considering the most affordable location to the operator to support unclear objectives at the cost of the amenity and general detriment of the area with only lip service being paid to consultation to achieve a tick in the box despite clear reference to.

(b) Decisions

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal.</u>	<u>Decision.</u>
09/00258/FUL	Just Learning Nursery RG14 7TD Increase car parking spaces	Granted

09/00346/OUTD	The Sanctuary, Basingstoke Road Replace mobile home with bungalow	Refused
09/00379/HOUSE	36 Montague Drive RG19 8XR Rear conservatory	Granted
09/00703/CERTP	6 Mandarin Drive RG14 7WE Install French Doors in existing window position.	Refused

8. Finance & Accounts for Payment.

The Clerk has received notification that a revised version of Local Council Administration by Charles Arnold-Baker & Paul Clayden will be published on 30 June. Copies can be pre-ordered at £56.95 (retail price £62.95). The Clerk sought approval to purchase 2 copies. It was proposed by Mr Swift-Hook, seconded by Mrs Smith and carried unanimously that 2 copies be purchased at a cost of £113.90.

Applications for Grants. There were 3 applications for grants to be considered.

West Berkshire CAB. The CAB only records new applicants; it keeps no records of the number of 'return' consultations carried out. In FY 07/08 there were 228 new clients from Greenham; in 08/09 there were 237 new consultations; an increase of 5%. The FWG thought it highly likely that the current economic climate will lead to a greater demand for CAB's services and recommends a grant of £600 (in FY 08/09 it was £550). Mr Beal was concerned that nationally CAB has annual funding of around £18m but this is not filtered down to local branches but Mr Swift-Hook said that the national body does in fact provide IT support and a national data base. Mr Barnett said that it was essential to ensure that this organisation is able to function properly.

It was proposed by Mr Swift-Hook seconded by Mr Barnett and carried unanimously that the grant of £600 be approved.

Relate. Relate has conducted 220 consultations with Greenham clients. Each consultation costs Relate £45 and the average that each client paid was £40. There is therefore a shortfall of £1100. The FWG considered that it was appropriate to recommend a grant of £350, the same as last year. Mr Swift-Hook said that Relate provided a very valuable social service and Mrs Smith was of the opinion that the current economic downturn would place greater pressure on its resources. She thought that for this year the grant should be increased to £500.

It was proposed by Mr Forward, seconded by Mr Drummond and carried unanimously that a grant of £500 be approved. Relate should however be advised that this level of grant might not be maintained in the future and was in recognition of the pressures generated by the current economic conditions

Berkshire County Blind Society. The BCBS supports 7 sight-impaired people within

Greenham. The FWG recommends a grant of £100, unchanged from last year. Mr Barnett
Greenham Parish Council **10 June 2009**

said that the Society provides a very valuable resource to clients who need a lot of support. It was proposed by Mr Swift-Hook, seconded by Mrs Huxtable and carried unanimously that the grant of £100 be approved.

Mr Swift-Hook suggested that as well as ensuring that people in Greenham were directly supported by applicants for grants, the applicants' overall financial standing should be investigated. Mr Beal suggested that an application form be produced and agreed to construct one. Newbury Town Council already uses such a form which could be used as a template.

At this point Mr Beal left the meeting

The following cheques were presented for payment:

Mr J Boston – Clerk's salary & expenses	£1075.28
HM Revenue & Customs – Tax & NI	£415.15
Mr A J Forward – ink cartridges	£53.31
CCB membership	£30.00
West Berkshire CAB	£600.00
Relate	£500.00
Berkshire County Blind Society	£100.00

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

9. S.106 monies. A total of 10 local parish and town councils had been consulted by the Clerk regarding the letter to WBC and of these, 9 had indicated support. However, in many cases these councils asked not be formally associated with GPC's letter; either because the support was based on informal internal consultation and had not yet been ratified at a full meeting or because the council's own assessment revealed that further investigation into their particular circumstances was necessary. The letter had therefore been sent to Mr Carter, Chief Executive at WBC copied to Cllr Jones' Leader of WBC with the active support of Lambourn and Tilehurst PCs. Mr Swift-Hook said that it was a matter of regret that WBC has reported incorrect information and has made incorrect allegations about the local press. The Chairman said that GPC should be proud that it raised the issue but he was appalled at the attitude of WBC in refusing to acknowledge any problem or cause for concern. There was a general feeling that WBC would be better advised to accept that sometimes things go wrong and to focus its attentions on putting them right.

10. Parish Plan. Mrs Huxtable gave an update on the Plan. There had been 2 events; one for local youth which was only attended by 4 out of 50 potential attendees and one for the local population when attendance was again patchy. There was now a growing acceptance that Greenham could not be compared to a closely-knit rural community and that the level of response achieved by the PP Steering Group was in fact very good. There had been continuing problems with data retrieval from the questionnaires which was caused by a software problem and New Greenham Trust had now had to pay for the

problem to be fixed. It was hoped that the data would be available shortly but there would

Greenham Parish Council **10 June 2009**

be an inevitable delay to the timescale and the final report would not now be available in November as originally intended. There is already an identified need for a community facility. Mrs Huxtable also has information on the Locality Project and Adult Learning. The problem lies in identifying who does what within the Parish. The Steering Group is looking for ways of drawing the community together.

11. Web Site & Contract. The Chairman had had a meeting with Mr Burgess and hoped to have another which would include Mr Swift-Hook. Mr Burgess suggested a link to the www.greenham.org.uk site. The website now has an events page and links to other sites and it is hoped that people would use it as a gateway to all local points of interest. Mr Burgess agreed that some items were out of date and needed some updating.

12. Newsletter. As GPC does not have and does not aspire to Quality status there is no requirement for the publication of a newsletter. Nationally 84% of the population has access to the Internet and the level in Greenham is probably higher. It was agreed that a Newsletter would in future only be published when a specific need arises.

13. Allotments. The provision of allotments was discussed at the May meeting under Matters Arising. However it was not an Agenda Item and the assessment of suitable sites therefore needed to be formally approved. It was suggested that a working party be created to investigate options more fully. It was proposed by Mr Swift-Hook, seconded by Mrs Hay and carried unanimously that a Working Party be formed. This would consist of Mr Drummond, Mr Austin and The Clerk. Others, including Mr Ken Neal who had a similar interest, would be invited to join as appropriate. Councillors could still take all appropriate steps to investigate the availability and cost of suitable land within the Parish.

14. CCB Annual Conference The CCB Annual Conference will be held at Newbury Racecourse on 14 July. Cost is £70 but this is reduced to £35 for CCB members. The time of the conference is still uncertain but Mrs Smith said she would attend on behalf of GPC if timing permitted.

15. McDonald's Licensing Application. McDonald's has submitted an application to open from 23.00 to 05.00 on Friday and Saturday nights. It was noted that GPC had previously objected to a similar proposal and the lapsing of the Dispersal Order at the car park made potential problems worse. Mr Forward proposed, Mr Planterose seconded and it was agreed that the letter of objection used for the previous application, suitably amended, would form the basis of a new objection. Mr Barnett abstained with all others present voting in favour.

16. Local Development Framework Consultation. WBC has issued a consultation document 'Options for the Future' which sets out the preferred options for the Core Strategy. The Clerk has a printed copy and it is also available to download from the WBC website. The consultation period runs until 3 July. Mr Swift-Hook advised that WBC was also arranging road shows.

17. Exchange of Information. The AGM of ReadiBus will be held at 8pm on 2nd July in the Kennet Room of the Civic Centre, Reading. Any Councillor wishing to attend is

asked to inform the Clerk. Berkshire Scouting and Girlguiding Royal Berkshire will be
Greenham Parish Council **10 June 2009**

holding an event entitled WINGS (the Windsor International Guide and Scout event. Councillors are invited to attend on either 5 August from 10am to 1pm or 6 August from 2pm to 5pm. Thames Valley Police is holding an open day at Sulhampstead on Saturday 8 August for which the Chairman will scan and circulate the flyer. Mr Drummond advised that he had received a number of complaints of excessive noise from the Racecourse following the recent Madness concert although only 3 had been received by WBC. It was noted that within its licence the Racecourse can mount 3 events per year and the concert had finished by 10.45pm. WBC had monitored the noise levels and they were within guidelines. It was thought that most of the noise may have been generated by people attending the concert. Mr Barnett drew attention to the danger of cars and vans parking on the bend at the top of Westwood Road. They frequently obscured motorists' view and caused a road safety hazard. He had reported flooding in Pinchington Lane and Basingstoke Road after recent heavy rain.

It was understood that ALDI was consulting over plans to build a store at the former Renault dealership in London Road. It was felt that this should be supported although caution was expressed as plans had not yet been submitted. Mr Swift-Hook recommended that GPC writes to WBC expressing support in principal and welcoming an opportunity to comment on the plans when submitted.

Mrs Hay drew attention to the large amount of litter in Haysoms Drive, much of it generated by McDonald's. She also reiterated previous concern about the size of the roundabout at the junction with Pinchington Lane. The Clerk explained that he had taken up previous concerns with WBC but Highways officers had not been supportive of a request to have the profile changed. The Clerk will investigate unspent S.106 money to see if it is a potential source of funding for improvements.

Mr Austin reported that Flying A had granted permission for military helicopters to land within the GAMA site. This had caused a great deal of damage and disturbance, particularly to ground nesting birds. Strictly speaking the GAMA site lay outside the SSSI and AONB and it was thought planning permission was not required. The Clerk will write to Natural England drawing their attention to the problem and suggesting that they take the matter up with the military authorities.

18. Date of Next Meeting. The Meeting closed at 10.00pm. The date of the next meeting is on 8 July 2009 at St Mary's Church Hall at 7.30pm.

A J Forward
Chairman
8 July 2009

Abbreviations:

GPC - Greenham Parish Council
WBC - West Berks Council
DML - Deadman's Lane