



Clerk of the Council

John Boston

8 Chester Close

Newbury

RG14 7RR

e-mail:

clerk@greenham.gov.uk

www.greenham.gov.uk

☎ 01635 529900

15 October 2009

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GREENHAM PARISH COUNCIL
HELD IN ST MARY'S CHURCH HALL, GREENHAM
ON 14 OCTOBER 2009 AT 7.300 pm**

PRESENT: Mr T Forward (Chairman)
Mr P Planterose (Vice-Chairman)
Mr C Austin
Mr P Barnett (from 8.30 pm)
Mr A Beal
Mr B Drummond (to 9.00 pm)
Mr D Hale
Mrs S Huxtable
Mrs T King
Mrs D Smith

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Boston (Clerk)
1 member of the Public

1. Apologies for Absence. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mr A Agutter, Mrs P Hay and Mr J Swift-Hook. Additionally, Mr Barnett had advised that he would be late arriving due to an afternoon appointment in Watford.

The Chairman apologised to Mr Beal for failing to pass on his apologies for absence at the last meeting. It was agreed that all apologies should be made to the Clerk copied to the Chairman.

2. Declarations of Interest.

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 Beal observed that the use of the word 'limited' in the statements made by members who were also members of other councils was misleading and ambiguous. It was agreed that the Clerk would take advice from BALC and WBC and that this word would be omitted in future if permissible.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting. The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2009 were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

4. Matters Arising. The Chairman has received an approach from WYG on behalf of the promoters of the Sandleford Park project. WYG has suggested making a presentation to GPC to update them on their proposals at a future GPC meeting following the original event at Newbury Town Hall. WYG has also suggested that in order to avoid disrupting normal business, the presentation could start at 6.00 or 6.30 pm. After discussion it was agreed that the best option would be a short, time limited brief followed by a stakeholder meeting, if such a need is identified, which GPC would be willing to assist in organising. The Clerk will advise WYG accordingly.

Mrs Smith and Mrs Huxtable had attended the Landscape Partnership meeting on 8 October. Mrs Smith reported that BBOWT was seeking the support of GPC in the stated objectives of the Partnership, a letter of support to be forwarded to the Lottery Fund and as supporting Partners. It was proposed by Mr Forward, seconded by Mr Drummond and carried unanimously that GPC would support all objectives. A copy of the letter to the lottery would be forwarded to Jacky Akam at BBOWT. Mr Drummond and Mr Austin declared Personal Interests as members of BBOWT.

5. Abbotswood/Pinchington Lane. The Chairman reported that the Residents had submitted a further complaint to the Ombudsman regarding road noise. The Chairman explained that the complaint was not out of time as the residents had been in dialogue with WBC. The Ombudsman had now revised his earlier decision that the 12 months time limit started from the initial complaint to the local authority as it would be possible for a Council to obstruct a complaint simply by spinning out the dialogue. The Ombudsman had agreed that the complaint would be heard by a different officer to that who had heard the original complaint. The Chairman and Vice Chairman had visited the chairman of the Group representing some of the residents to discuss the matter. Mr Beal asked what outcome was possible. The Chairman said that the Ombudsman can only direct the payment of limited compensation and advise on further courses of action. Mrs King observed that if people bought a house next to a main road they should expect it to be noisy. Mr Forward responded by saying that most residents bought their houses when the estate was still a building site so much of the noise was masked, and that often the effect was cumulative over a period of time. Also, this did not affect WBC's failure to apply PPG 24. Mr Drummond said that he understood one resident had been given a discount of £20,000.00 on the initial purchase price.

6. Nationwide Data Centre. Earlier in the year, Nationwide had proposed a site visit later in the year by GPC to review progress. Nationwide has written to the Clerk suggesting a visit at GPC's convenience. The building should be weather proof by November and external landscaping will be done next spring. After discussion, it was agreed that 2 visits would be ideal; one after weatherproofing but just before the building

being made a secured area and one when sufficient representative landscaping was in place.

7. Racecourse Development Mr Goddard of WBC Highways had notified the latest position on traffic modelling for the Racecourse development. While some problems had been resolved, there were some significant difficulties still to overcome. In particular, traffic at the Hambridge Road/Hambridge Lane roundabout was likely to result in traffic from the Racecourse queuing back over the bridge. No amelioration had been made for traffic build up at the Burger King roundabout and Mr Goddard could not recommend the proposed one-way system in Boundary Road. It was noted that the noise from the railway line and the implications of PPG 24 in this respect did not appear to have been considered. The Clerk will write to WBC on this point for inclusion in the public file

Mr Austin noted that there were now 3 potential large developments in Greenham and he doubted if WBC needed all 3, or that the local infrastructure could support them.

8. S.106 update. The Chairman, Mrs Smith and the Clerk attended a meeting at WBC offices on 21 September to discuss GPC's concerns over S.106 monies. The meeting agreed a number of weaknesses in the retrieval of data from the website in the current system. On 23 September the Clerk received an updated spreadsheet giving details of the money due, received spent etc for Highways and Countryside. The Chairman and Clerk had assessed the information line by line and had raised a significant number of queries with WBC. A further meeting to discuss the WBC response had been requested.

9. Planning.

The Clerk has received revised drawings for the LGV Test Centre (09/01694/FUL), endorsed by the WBC ecologist, which have been raised by the applicant in response to previous concerns by GPC. The Chairman announced that he had a Prejudicial Interest in respect of this matter and another application. Discussion on the revised plans was therefore deferred until later in the meeting.

(a) Applications

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
09/00522/FUL	NGP Construction of illuminated sculpture Greenham Common Community Trust Ltd	Object See below.

GPC has serious concerns at the location of this sculpture. As you approach the roundabout from the west such a large set of objects is very likely to catch the eye of drivers as it not something normally programmed into the brain to ignore. Being in such a prominent location and likely to distract there is concern for road safety. This is compounded by the objects being lit which further adds to the level of distraction at night when it becomes more obvious in artificial light. The sculpture is much larger than previously applied for.

09/01606/FUL <i>Adjacent Parish</i>	New Warren Farm RG14 6NH New crop store, hard standing & track Mr & Mrs Norgate	Object. See Below
--	---	-------------------

GPC objects to application 09/01606/FUL for the following reason - that the farm basically lays quite far from the location of the proposed barn which is quite close to the wetlands and land that we believe has designated status. It seems more appropriate to have the barn closer to the farm. It also seems unnecessary for the farm to actually have a crop store when the farm is basically fallow. The barn is in an area of Wetlands and seems to be in an inappropriate location for the proposed use.

Mrs Huxtable said that she wanted to make it clear that her comments in respect of the application in internal correspondence were general comments relating to planning applications and were not directed at the applicant or this application specifically.

At this point Mr Barnett joined the Meeting.

Mr Barnett 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 Newbury Town 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**".

09/01719/HOUSE <i>Adjacent Parish</i>	Christmas Cottage Pinchington Lane Garden BBQ building Mr & Mrs C Phillips	Object. See Below
--	--	-------------------

GPC has the following concerns regarding application 09/01719/house. The building is quite large enabling obviously quite large barbecues but there seems to be no chimney or provision for the smoke to escape from the roof. Therefore there is a concern that any flaring of the barbecue could set light to the structure. GPC is also concerned for emissions in the area from a quite large barbecue. The BBQ was also very close to a hedge owned by a neighbour.

09/01730/HOUSE <i>Adjacent Parish</i>	36 Hambridge RD RG14 5TA Conversion of house to 2 x 1 bed flats Mr J Pryer	Object. See Below
--	--	-------------------

- 1) There has been no neighbour or local community consultation.
- 2) Main concern is existing parking provision which is 2 spaces, this remains UNCHANGED when conversion completed.
- 3) Post conversion floor plans show both living rooms will be moved from rear of main house into rear extension with view to the side hence directly overlooking other properties. The access to the bathroom/toilet is in both cases directly off the living room.
- 4) Overall the conversion may improve the visible exterior of the property BUT does not compensate for parking issue and other issues.

The Chairman announced that he considered that he has a Prejudicial Interest in the next application and would leave the room during discussion on this and the LGV Test Centre. The Vice-Chairman therefore took the Chair.

LGV Test Centre.

The proposed bund will be formed from locally sourced and dug gravels (it is anticipated that this will come from the dug ponds). Additionally, if after 3 years there is insufficient vegetation; seed will be collected from the adjacent SSSI and spread. The surface will be checked annually to control potential weed and invasive species. The Vice-Chairman reported that a site visit had revealed clear evidence of potential pollution and an oil pit on the site of the proposed bund. Notwithstanding WBC ecologist's support GPC resolved to submit an objection on the grounds of land contamination and the failure to address this.

Why were plans not produced in the first place that showed that the whole site had to be built up. This application only discusses the embankment so where are the plans that actually show the rest of the infill. GPC feels that the detail of this infill should be supported by a proper application. Since the infill raises the site by some 2.52 m there is concern that impact on the SSSI may occur and possible noise impact on residential amenity is also likely due to the raised plateau. GPC urges that Natural England, the Environment Agency, and public protection are consulted:

09/01765/FUL	Drake House Bishops Green Construct replacement dwelling by demolishing existing 4-Tune Property Ltd	Object. See Below
--------------	---	-------------------

History

The supplied documentation says the application conforms to ENV23, it does not in many ways. The existing property was constructed post 1971, as proved by photographic evidence. ENV23 makes it clear the date 1948 is pivotal in considering the suitability of applications. The original building on the application site was constructed after 1971 by the then owner Mr. Pearson as a stable and was probably permitted later as a dwelling through a change of legal use. West Berks records should show when this was granted. Some additions have been made to this building through the years. ENV23 in section 3.3.1 makes it clear that only additional buildings that existed prior to 1948 should be considered and only then if they were within 5m of the dwelling. Therefore the area of the original building has to be considered to be no more than 225 m² and maybe less if the plans for the change of legal use show what was there at the time. The land and building were conveyed to Mr. Drake during the 80s. Much has been constructed since with little permission, mainly retrospective permission and using permitted rights.

Replacement building size and ENV23

Using the applicant's own plans it is clear that the total or gross area of the proposed dwelling, garage and summerhouse is 524.12 m². This represents an increase of 133% on the original building not the 50% maximum advised. ENV23 at section 3.3.1 also advises that:

In assessing size, all measurements are to be external, and will include any areas covered by a permanent roof, i.e. porches or verandas (as these can be infilled without planning permission, unless this has already been excluded by condition).

Therefore overhanging roofs have to be considered as part of the original and proposed area as permitted rights could allow them to be infilled. In this case the total for the proposed dwelling, garage and summerhouse is 596.5 m² which is a 153% increase on the original building. This proposal is therefore grossly outside of the guidelines contained within ENV23.

Other Buildings

All but the garage/factory and residential use of the annex would be allowed today through permitted rights. They also cannot be considered as extensions to the original dwelling and they can be retained or rebuilt regardless of any permission that may be granted unless conditioned which will be very difficult to enforce. Regardless of any attempt to interpret this in favour of the

applicant, ENV23 shuts the door firmly as it states in 3.3.1:

The floorspace of the “original” dwelling will be taken to be the dwelling as it was originally built, and excludes any subsequent extensions or any outbuildings. Where the building was built before 1 July 1948, the floorspace of the original dwelling will be taken as comprising the dwelling and any outbuildings or structures which existed on 1 July 1948 and which were situated within 5 m of the dwelling.

The applicant says the gross area of the buildings to be removed from the site as part of the proposed application is 482.3 m². ENV23 on considering outbuildings makes it clear:

Additional volume will not normally be allowed for the removal of existing buildings which are not part of the “original” dwelling.

Departure from ENV23

It is sad that in so few years the site has changed from an open field to the home of the “original” building, an annex and garage/hobby room. Luckily the scale of these current buildings is such that they largely fit into the current landscape and planting as it exists. It will set a very dangerous precedent if a departure from the general principle of ENV23 is allowed. Had there been a few fairly large and visually intrusive outbuildings then the landscape might be considered better if these were replaced by a better form. This is clearly not the case here.

To permit this application will create a precedent by allowing the building of buildings permitted but not requiring permission as such and then using their replacement to permit the construction of a larger than desired extension to the “original” dwelling. The outbuildings are used in part to support the adjacent fishing lakes where there is no condition possible preventing such a similar range of sheds being built there so getting us back to where we started.

The planners have within their powers the ability to stop the erosion of the area by moderating the extension to the dwelling to the 50% recommended over and above the “original” dwelling of 225 m² as defined by ENV23.

Scale and Height

The application goes on to say the new building is of an appropriate scale and in keeping with the properties in the area. One only has to examine properties in the area to see that this application proposes by far the largest property in the area. ENV23 also makes it clear that excessively large properties should be avoided as they prevent an appropriate mix of properties including appropriately sized dwellings. ENV23 also warns that even if the site is well screened the rules still apply. It also says that the height of the new building should not significantly exceed that of the original which the application building clearly does.

Impact of the adjacent fishing lakes being split

It is perhaps important when considering this application that the complete site that existed prior to the application site being sold off and the permissions on it should be considered to get the context right. Highways have already pointed out that the application extinguishes parking facilities permitted as part of the application to retrospectively approve the fishing lakes and requires plans to be supplied showing where they are to be relocated. It is possible that other facilities necessary to support the fishing lakes have also been removed such as public conveniences and other buildings that might supply first aid and stores. As previously stated permitted rights could allow more out buildings on the land retained by the previous owner.

Landscape

At section 3.1 of policy ENV23 in item F there is a requirement for an acceptable landscape scheme to be provided which is to retain and improve the rural nature of the locality. This should require a landscape scheme to be provided with the application which then needs to be put before West Berkshire's landscape consultants Kirkham PLC before considering the application. This has not been done as the plans amount to only two A4 pages and limited narrative. The plans are suspect in that

the previous owner thinks he still owns the row of conifer trees to be replaced. They are further suspect in that they seek to replace a fence not in the ownership of the applicant and replace it with a hedge which is shown going most of the way across the entrance.

Controlling the landscape is especially important as only the western boundary is mainly in the control of the applicant with all other landscape planting which the application depends upon being in other owner ship and therefore out of their control. Views from the south are through trees owned by at least two land owners before reaching the application site. Some of the trees are beside the river where the Environment Agency periodically seeks to control the impact on the river by removing them altogether. Views can be had from Sydmonton Common which is a Site of Nature Conservation (SNCI).

Floor levels & Flood Plain

The applicant has indicated that the AOD of the finished floor will would be similar to the existing property but has not been precise with this information. The rest of the application area which is doubtless some sort of garden is on an area subject to planning consent 09/00227/FUL and is clearly on the flood plain despite what the applicant says. This permission was granted retrospectively following infill of part of the floodplain where the environment agency requires some remedial work to take place recover the flood plain.

It is therefore very important that the application is precise about AOD levels and contours for the dwelling and proper consideration for the nature of the area round the floodplain and the floodplain itself. To not do so could result in a permission which compromises the flood plain and the intentions of 09/00227/FUL as this permission would overrule the previous one.

Drainage issues

There is no foul water sewer in the area as confirmed by Thames Water [copied to plan apps]. Provision will have to be made on site for this and other water collection. No details have been provided. The sustainability report is difficult to read and see how water recycling, storage etc. has been considered. There will also be no provision for drainage or facilities for the adjacent fishing lakes as a new water supply would be needed to comply with Thames Water conditions. No public conveniences etc. will exist for the fishing lakes either as those currently used will be removed by

this application.

Planning application form issues

GPC has serious concerns about the validity and accuracy of comments made on the planning application form itself:

- Item 7 sees the plans do not include areas to store the waste for collection. This application will remove any area currently used for waste storage as part of the fishing lakes which like the parking will need to be provided elsewhere.
- Item 11 has already been discussed as it extinguishes parking for the fishing lakes.
- Item 12 is of great concern as it says the disposal of foul sewerage is unknown. A previous application for a bait shed was recommended for refusal by the environment agency through concerns for pollution of the neighbouring ponds and the floodplain. This site does not currently have access to mains sewerage and it is believed that no sewer is in the nearby road. The environment agency should be consulted.
- Item 13 says the area is not within a flood zone yet the application 09/00227/FUL and dialogue with the environment agency confirmed that the pond which is part of the application area is within the floodplain. As such a flood risk assessment is necessary and it should be made clear the proximity of the lakes to the application site.
- Item 14 needs to consider the advice previously given by Natural England when considering application 09/00227/FUL that the proposal site which includes this application site is in close proximity to the Sydmonton Common and Lower Burnoak Copse Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) which itself is within the AONB in neighbouring Hampshire. Local knowledge also recognises the existence to many bats, slow worms and newts in the area close to the application site. Ticks in the appropriate boxes should be reconsidered as a result.
- Item 15 says the site is currently vacant but persons are often witnessed on the site and it is believed that some occupation of the dwellings still exists. Pictures in the Design and Access Statement shows washing on the line which either shows evidence is out of date or property is occupied. The land is arguably contaminated due to unsuitable infill as documented in 09/00227.
- Item 16 is wrong to say no about trees and hedges on land adjacent as the landscape documentation supplied by the applicant makes it clear the site is unlikely to be seen due to vegetation yet this is almost wholly on neighbouring land except for the Western boundary of the application site. Again West Berks' landscape consultants should be consulted.
- Item 17 should consider any extinguishing of disposal capabilities to the nearby fishing lakes.
- Item 19 has avoided discussing the previous granted permission to use a large outbuilding as a factory. In previous pre-application consultation Mike Butler expressed concern that this useful business building would be removed as a result of the proposal to the detriment of employment in the area.
- Item 25 says that the site can be seen yet in the landscape discussion document much is made about how the site is obscured by planting. This box is therefore wrongly ticked.
- Item 26 needs to be reconsidered for the sake of accuracy as the application site on the whole of the original site which has planning permission on it for fishing which is probably not agricultural use but nevertheless is perhaps an important material consideration for this application. Some element of agricultural use may remain.

Mr Drummond declared that he would ask for the application to be called in by WBC for discussion by the Western Area Planning Committee.

At this point the Chairman returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.

09/01981/MINE	Newbury Concrete Hambridge Lane Temporary extension of time for concrete batching plant. Tarmac Ltd	Object. See below
---------------	--	-------------------

It was noted that the application is for an extension of use for 2 years. However, the land would be needed for the access bridge to the Racecourse development and it is GPC's position, in accordance with government policy, that the bridge should be built first if the development is permitted. It was therefore agreed that an extension should initially be granted for one year only; GPC would have no objection to a further extension if this did not conflict with construction of the bridge.

(b) Decisions

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal.</u>	<u>Decision.</u>
09/01225/FUL	NGP Temporary coated stone plant	Granted
09/01298/FUL	MC Autos Deadman's Lane Revised workshop plans	Granted
09/01590/HOUSE	Trees, Water Lane RG19 8SH Rear and side extensions	Granted

10. Finance & Accounts for Payment.

The following cheques were presented for payment:

Mr J Boston – Clerk's salary & expenses	£1007.59
HM Revenue & Customs – Tax & NI	£415.15
JDRF (on behalf of Mr Agutter – May 2009 Minutes refer)	£100.00
Sovereign South & West – Neighbourhood Wardens	£6750.00
Greenham PCC - Churchyard Maintenance -	£600.00

It was proposed by Mr Forward, seconded by Mrs King and carried unanimously that the cheques be approved for payment.

The Clerk had investigated the availability of sheet-feed scanners as agreed at the last meeting. A range of scanners is available from around £300 to £800. The Clerk felt that he lacked the technical knowledge to advise the Council on which machine met GPC's requirements at the best cost. It was agreed that the Clerk and Chairman would assess the machines available outside the meeting. The Chairman also referred to the previous decision not to proceed with a toner printer. He felt that such a machine was available considerably cheaper than anticipated. He will obtain details and if appropriate the matter will be reconsidered. Members were concerned that to do bulk printing might save money but the need to distribute the final result would indicate the whole job should be outsourced.

The Chairman of the FWG reported that details of the 2009/2010 pay rates as agreed between NALC and SLCC had been received. For the Clerk's pay scale and hours of work the award is for slightly less than 1% and results in a gross increase of approximately £12 per month. It was proposed by Mrs Huxtable seconded by Mr Beal and carried unanimously that the revised pay scales be adopted. Discussion turned to a formal appraisal for the Clerk, where a provisional date had already been identified. The Clerk had been unable to find an exemplar appraisal form on either the NALC or SLCC websites and had therefore asked NTC if it had a suitable form. There was some doubt if a formal appraisal was necessary in view of the lack of any guidance by NALC or SLCC. However, several members noted that appraisal was a 2-way street and that there were benefits to both the employee and the employer. Mrs Smith proposed, Mrs King seconded and it was agreed unanimously that a formal appraisal system be set up. Mr Drummond undertook to pursue the provision of an exemplar form with NTC or WBC

The Chairman thanked the Clerk for all his commitment and hard work, much of which was not visible to members. All present endorsed this.

11. Parish Plan. Mrs Huxtable gave an update on the Parish Plan. The Steering Committee had been meeting frequently to finalise the Plan with the next meeting on 15 October and was moving towards the production of a draft Plan by the December GPC meeting. There was lack of clarity with the template provided for production of a Plan and this caused some delay. There was discussion over the inclusion of desirable S.106 spend within the Plan which Mrs Huxtable emphasised must be supported by evidence from the questionnaires. Mrs Smith recalled that at the WBC S.106 meeting (Item 8 above) it was requested that a preliminary S.106 spend list be provided to WBC by November even if this was in advance of publication of the Plan. Mrs Huxtable and Mrs Smith will liaise over this and involve the Chairman as required, perhaps at a meeting with WBC.

12. Web Site & Contract. The Chairman suggested and it was agreed that a pointer be provided on the website to Newbury Sound. The Clerk will arrange this on receipt from the Chairman of precise details.

13. Allotments. There is nothing further to report. The next meeting of the Allotment Working Group is on 21 October.

14. Youth Counselling in West Berkshire. On 1 October a number of Councillors and the Clerk attended the Greenham Common Trust Annual Celebration. Unfortunately the event was curtailed due to the illness of one of the Trust speakers. Before the beginning of the event the Chairman and Clerk spoke to a Counsellor from '14-21 Time to Talk', a free independent organisation that offers counselling to young people in West Berkshire. The Clerk has also given details to Mrs Huxtable in case there is any benefit to the Plan. The organisation appears to offer a valuable service to local young people and would be willing to give a short talk at a future meeting. It was agreed that there should be a pointer to this organisation on the website and that it should be invited to address GPC in the New Year.

15. District Parish Conference 24 November 2009. The next District/Parish Conference will be on 24 November at WBC offices in Market Street. The Agenda has not

yet been issued.

16. Exchange of Information. The Chairman said that he realised that all members had other demands on their time and some were better placed than others to give time to GPC and the community as a whole. Nevertheless he wished to draw attention the sterling work by Mrs Huxtable and Mrs Smith on the Parish Plan and the outstanding commitment by Mr Planterose with the assistance of Mr Hale to the Planning Working Group. He also emphasised that the continued criticism of the new roundabout at the Burys Bank Rd/Greenham Rd/Pinchington Lane junction was directed at WBC's failure to keep to the published plans (eg no raised roundabout, no central refuge, poor road layout) and should not be seen as a criticism of Mr Drummond who had been instrumental in getting this badly needed roundabout installed.

The Chairman said that Hampshire County Council had plans to improve the A339 but had not been effective in contacting interested parties. He had only been made aware as a member of JAG and had subsequently written to the 2 MPs. It had been suggested that with improvements to the A303/A34, the A339 could be banned to through HGV traffic. Mr Forward will inform GPC of any further information through the JAG.

The Chairman has received details of a proposal by Rivar for the construction of 500 houses within Greenham under the LDF. It was agreed that detailed assessment would be undertaken by the Planning Working Group and their recommendations discussed at the next meeting.

Mr Planterose referred to the mini roundabouts at Racecourse Rd/Boundary Rd and Burys Bank Rd/Greenham Rd. He felt that they would continue to be traffic hazards until they were raised as at present traffic drives over them at speed. GPC will continue to press WBC to raise their surfaces.

Mr Beal asked about the ID card proposal. Mr Barnett said he had asked NTC and would follow this up.

Mr Austin referred to the conflicting advice regarding the cutting back of verges along Burys Bank Road. Current DoT advice is that wide verges lead to speeding. However, lack of vision causes many accidents with valuable livestock. In the New Forest verges have been cut back significantly and this had greatly reduced the number of accidents. He also drew attention to Hungerford Common which was open and had very few accidents, mainly as a result of fog. This will be an agenda item at the next meeting with discussion of the proposal that WBC discuss the issue with their counterparts in the New Forest. The Chairman also drew attention to the scattered nature of the SSSIs on the Common which Mr Austin confirmed. This was because initially Natural England had not designated the areas of the runway/hard standings. However he thought that the issue could be revisited because the position has changed since the SSSIs were first established. This will also be an agenda item at the next meeting.

Mr Hale reported that the lack of planting along the bund fronting the HWRC had resulted in it becoming an unofficial walkway. Also around 15 of the trees planted had died. Mr

Austin said that it was notoriously difficult to establish trees on bunds because in dry spells the ground lacked sufficient water to sustain them. Similar problems had been encountered on the Common. The Chairman reminded the Council of the requirement by the Ombudsman that WBC should consult with them over landscaping which had not done.

Mrs Huxtable reported on the Greenham Action Plan from 19 – 25 October. It would be focussing on Pigeons Farm and the Nightingales and would include such items as football, fire safety and cycle security. Mrs Huxtable has further details for interested Councillors.

Mrs Hay had passed via the Chairman complaints regarding the Tesco car park, which was now allegedly a centre for car racing and drug taking at times. Tesco's continual failure to secure trolleys or to collect them which put an unnecessary strain on Warden resources was also mentioned. The Chairman will seek further information from Mrs Hay and the Clerk will then seek a meeting with the manageress and write to Tesco head office accordingly.

13. Date of Next Meeting. The Meeting closed at 10.10. The date of the next meeting is on 11 November 2009 at St Mary's Church Hall at 7.30pm.

A J Forward
Chairman
11 November 2009

Abbreviations:

GPC - Greenham Parish Council
WBC - West Berks Council
PCC - Parochial Church Council
NGP - New Greenham Park
BBOWT - Bucks, Berks & Oxon Wildlife Trust