



Clerk of the Council

**John Boston**

8 Chester Close

Newbury

RG14 7RR

e-mail:

[clerk@greenham.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@greenham.gov.uk)

[www.greenham.gov.uk](http://www.greenham.gov.uk)

☎ 01635 529900

10 December 2009

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GREENHAM PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD IN ST MARY'S CHURCH HALL, GREENHAM  
ON 9 DECEMBER 2009 AT 7.30 pm**

PRESENT: Mr T Forward (Chairman)  
Mr P Planterose (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr A Agutter  
Mr A Beal (to 9.00 pm)  
Mr B Drummond  
Mrs S Huxtable  
Mrs D Smith  
Mr J Swift-Hook (from 7.35 pm)

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

1. Apologies for Absence. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mr C Austin, Mr P Barnett, Mr D Hale and Mrs P Hay.

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 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**".

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting. It was proposed by Mr Beal, seconded by Mrs Smith and carried unanimously that the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2009 be accepted as a true record. They were signed by the Chairman.

4. Matters Arising. NTC has confirmed its willingness to produce the ID cards at no cost. The Clerk will arrange for digital photos to be sent to NTC; they will be inserted on the cards, returned for signature and then completed by NTC. The Clerk has written to

Ann Santry of Sovereign and has had a letter in response. She apologised for the confusion caused by the wording of the previous invoice and confirmed that the introduction of trading names for different units had no effect on the spend of GPC's grant. She also thanked GPC for its continued support of the Warden scheme.

5. Abbotswood/Pinchington Lane. The Chairman reported that the HWRC was continuing to operate as the operator, Veolia, had appealed against the Noise Abatement Order. A date for the Magistrate's Court hearing was awaited.

At this point Mr Swift-Hook joined the Meeting. His apology for late arrival was accepted.

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 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 or 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**".

6. Nationwide Data Centre. The Chairman, Clerk, Mrs Smith and Mr Austin will be visiting the Centre on the afternoon of 10 December. The Clerk has negotiated a further evening visit for those who can not attend during the day. A trawl of Councillors had failed to find a common suitable date and it was now necessary to decide when the visit should be. After discussion it was decided that any further action on this should be deferred until after the visit on 10 December; it might be that there was no necessity for the whole Council to make a visit.

7. Racecourse Development There was general satisfaction that GPC's previous statements that the Racecourse development should not be considered until after the publication of the LDF had at last been heeded. It was felt that the LDF should inform the development and not the other way round. The Chairman reported that in discussing the Racecourse development with the Clerk they had identified a number of apparent shortcomings in WBC's processing of applications (not Racecourse specific). There was particular concern about the extent to which Outline Applications gave almost Full permission since legislative changes in 2006 with only matters of fine detail Reserved. It was clear that some WBC Officers did not understand this. They had therefore written to Mr Swift-Hook as their Ward Member and to WBC. The reply from WBC was felt to be unsatisfactory and the Clerk had written again. The Clerk emphasised that there was no disrespect to GPC in this action; rather he and the Chairman had felt that the matter was too pressing to defer until the next GPC meeting and they were unwilling to act on behalf of the Council when the matter had not been discussed. Mr Swift-Hook suggested that it would be beneficial to circulate the correspondence to all Councillors and this will be done. It was felt that previous concerns over the quality and reactivity of the WBC website had not been overcome. For example, Mr Swift-Hook reported although the Racecourse application had been deferred, the website still said on entry that no more

representations would be entertained. It is only later in the fine detail that it becomes apparent that this is not the case.

8 S.106 – Highways Improvements. The Clerk had forwarded a list of GPC's preferred areas of spend. A copy of the full reply had been circulated to councillors but briefly the WBC position is: (*Individual GPC comments after individual items*).

Safe pedestrian crossing of Burys Bank Rd to the Common. Insufficient usage observed. Insufficient visibility to use the islands at the New Rd junction. Small Common access gate east of New Rd could be improved at cost of around £13,000. S of S permission required for access over Common land.

*It was considered that the assessment made over 2 lunchtimes was hardly indicative of pedestrian usage. It was agreed that Mr Winstanley be invited to make a site visit with some Councillors on a Saturday morning. Visibility and sight lines at the proposed location were assessed as very poor.*

Adjust phasing of Pinchington Lane crossings. Being investigated by signal supplier. Eastern crossing has old controller which may need updating.

*Mr Drummond made the point that the problems here are a reflection of the commercial success of the Retail Park, Tesco and The Triangle car dealerships*

Traffic Calming in Westwood Rd. No accidents in past 5 years so no need perceived.

Raise height of mini roundabouts – Racecourse Rd; Pyle Hill. Could be done at cost of £5,000 each subject to safety audits.

*Discussion with local residents suggests that the Pyle Hill mini roundabout should not be raised due to perceived increased noise problems. It was observed that if the cost of raising the surface was only £5,000 then this could have been done during construction at a much lower cost.*

Safer crossing from Common to Bridleway to the hide. Funding approved, start date not yet known.

*The Clerk will follow this up.*

Increase Grasscrete parking; install more bollards on Stroud Green. Could be done but requires S of S consent

WBC states that it lacks manpower to negotiate with S of S which would need to be done by the Clerk. The Clerk is happy in principal to undertake this but would need copies of previous correspondence or other guidance from WBC.

*This statement by WBC was met with incredulity. While the Clerk's willingness to do WBC's work for it was applauded it was considered that this should be a fairly*

*straightforward WBC action. WBC had been very supportive of GPC in the past and similar action had already been taken on the western side of Stroud Green so it appeared that duplication of the letters already sent to the S of S were all that was needed. Mr Drummond and Mr Swift-Hook will take this up within WBC. Discussion turned to exactly what was needed and where. Major problem areas were seen as near the Play Park, along Racecourse Rd and in the area of Vine Court. The area by the Play Park was seen as very dangerous as the road makes a sharp bend here and parked cars reduce visibility to almost nothing. There was doubt that bringing cars nearer to the play park was sensible as it might increase danger to children. A better solution would be to introduce bollards and double yellow lines. Parking should be formalised on the metalled area on the opposite side of the road near the Racecourse entrance. This might have to be done as part of changes to the entrance if the development is permitted. The Vine Court area is seen as a matter of particular concern as it is used as an unofficial car park by residents. It seems not to be realised that the area north of Racecourse Rd is still part of Stroud Green and subject to its Byelaws. In response to a suggestion that the Commons Commission should become involved, the Clerk stated that although Stroud Green was a Public Common it did not fall under the Greenham and Crookham Commons Act and therefore the Commissioners were not involved.*

*Mrs Smith said that after the Hennessy she had seen a coach travelling up New Road, presumably in the belief that it could carry on up the bridle path to the southern part of New Road and so to Burys Bank Rd. It had been forced to make a multi-point turn and travel up Lingfield Road. None of these roads is suitable for LGVs/PCVs and some form of warning sign should be placed at the northern end of New Road (not suitable for large vehicles, weight limit except for access?)*

*After discussion, Mr Forward proposed, Mr Swift-Hook seconded and it was carried unanimously that the Clerk be authorised to pursue these options and to report back to GPC on progress.*

## 9. Planning.

Application 09/01765/FUL in respect of Drake House, Bishops Green has been withdrawn.

### (a) Applications

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
09/02191/HOUSE	Tilia, Water Lane RG19 8SH New attached garage/office above, new driveway, rear kitchen extension, existing Garage converted to family room.	No Objection subject to no objection from neighbours
09/02204/FUL	Newbury Rugby Club, Monks Lane Construct all-weather playing surface on re-contoured land using imported inert fill with ancillary landscaping and adjustment of under 15s practice area to more appropriate	Object, see below

levels.  
Newbury Rugby Football Club Ltd

### **General Observations**

Although presented as a straightforward construction of all weather playing surface using necessary infill to achieve a level surface this is not really the case. It is a hidden inert landfill operation requiring approximately 43,500 cubic metres of inert landfill. This is confirmed by NWN article on P61 of 26<sup>th</sup> November as a project in conjunction with Swindon-based Earthline to fund NRFC debt to taxman. Heavy lorry movements are to be 7:30 – 16:30 Mon-Fri and 7:30 – 13:30 Saturday over a period of approximately one year. The applicant does not consider wind blown debris to be a problem as used for landfill only. The effect on local properties of blown dust from dry soil had not been considered. It is quoted that there were no adverse comments at a public meeting but neither Greenham nor Newbury as the immediately adjacent Parish were invited or even made aware of the meeting. Highways states traffic would be acceptable without making any reference to access routes. Application states should non-inert material be found, it will be removed from site and taken to a licensed disposal site. After this the Environment Agency (EA) will be informed. This is wrong as the EA should be informed before moving it or contamination may be spread. Overall the application is very light on specifics and relies too much on vague statements. More detailed information should be supplied with the application such that any permission can be checked for compliance with the final infill and pitch construction. There are too many references in the design statement to things already discussed and agreed with officers yet none of this detail is actually put down in such a way it would be bound as part of the Conditions with any permission.

### **Specific Objections**

- 1) There was NO consultation with either GPC or Newbury Town Council which is jointly an immediately concerned Parish
- 2) Are there any regulations concerning waste transfer from Wilts to Berks?
- 3) There is a huge carbon footprint associated with trucking 43,500 cubic metres involving 60 mile round trips. (2175 journeys assuming 20 cubic metres per truck). It is noted that there is no specific statement regarding the number of movements and types of vehicles in the application. The number of movements quoted here is worked out from the volume of infill to be moved and the known capacity of LGVs.
- 4) The effect of 60 movements per week 07:30 – 1630 M-F and 07:30 - 13:30 Saturday i.e. right in busy times, on both local roads and the local population has not been considered.
- 5) The reduced hours during construction recommended by George Lawrence should be Conditioned as part o any permission
- 6) The vehicles involved are NOT light goods vehicles as stated by Stephanie Edwardes (Highways) but are heavy trucks as used in major motorway works and developments such as Parkway. It is assumed that a previous reference to LGVs (Large Goods Vehicles) has been erroneously interpreted as Light Goods Vehicles.  
Only immediate site access has been considered by Highways. There is no fixed route specified and incoming/outgoing haul routes are not available on the WBC

- website. The lorries may therefore travel from Swindon via any route they choose! The three obvious routes are a) M4->A339->through town, b) M4->A34->Andover Road c) M4->A34 ->Tothill->Swan Roundabout. None of these routes is without significant difficulties, particularly given the times of operation
- 7) What is legality of above ground landfill? WLP34 states no waste to be land filled on rising height.
  - 8) The site is in Groundwater Protection Zone 2 and the area is considered as a high quality aquifer by the EA (see their comments on the recent Gilson application). What are the implications of landfill here especially if there is inadvertent contamination? Comment by the EA is essential.
  - 9) Where does the water run off go, the surface and fill could be less porous than existing. The permeability of the all-weather surface is not clear.
  - 10) What is the technical constitution of the inert landfill? e.g. heavy clay could cause water run off and even land slip from high ground in extreme circumstances. Chalk might affect the local habitat. The source and constitution of the infill must be stated
  - 11) There are historic woodlands nearby; could there be any adverse effects on these by this application? (Particularly in respect of the effect on natural water courses).
  - 12) No hours of usage are given. Is the pitch for training or replacement for main pitch when there is adverse weather? Noise would be closer to houses as would floodlighting if retrofitted.
  - 13) The applicant does not consider wind blown debris to be a problem as the site will be used for landfill only. The effect on local properties of blown dust from dry soil has not been considered. Some form of dust mitigation during the summer months is required
  - 14) In effect the site must be considered as a dump for a year.
  - 15) If just an all-weather pitch is required this could be done using cut and fill from existing site. Unless a commercial operation and profit are involved there can be no economic justification for moving such large amount of material simply for an all weather pitch.
  - 16) Policy WLP21 refers to the option of dumping any contaminated landfill at Pinchington Lane! It is clear that the policy document is out of date but it is of concern that it has been included without change in the public documents, suggesting a lack of scrutiny on the part of WBC.
  - 17) Although there is reference to contaminated landfill, there is no indication of how this will be identified, either at source or during the infilling process. Simply dumping and grading would not be acceptable.
  - 18) Item 16 in the application form requires a full tree survey if either box is ticked. As one box is ticked a full tree survey should be attached but is not. This should be a binding condition. The plan supplied with the Broadmead Estate Services report does not show each tree and its position. There is a comprehensive list of trees with each given a number but no plan shows the location to enable enforcement etc. Their resident area is shown but not the position in it. The number of these areas is at odds with the number on the topographical survey as stated before.
  - 19) The topology plan shows five birch plantations but the document and plan from Broadmead Estate Services shows only four. The document does not consider that one or more of the birch plantations will be destroyed or part destroyed.

- 20) On page 38 reference is made to WLP 31 and sets out points 1 to 6. GPC is not satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to show compliance with these points.
- 21) On page 39 WLP 34 is referenced and again GPC is not convinced that points 1 and 2 are addressed properly. It is hard to see that point 1 justifies this particular location over and above any other. Point 2 and the compliance of the scheme with it seems to be clutching at straws because the benefit of the scheme is clearly financial to the rugby club and not to the wider area. The tenuous reference to raising the level of the pitch earlier in the design statement to prevent leaves etc fouling the site seems inappropriate as comprehensive fencing is proposed which will stop these drifting.
- 22) Highways states that the use of lorries is already permitted under existing permission. This permission is not identified and is not understood. If it was for the original construction of the rugby club then that construction has concluded and the permission must have lapsed; otherwise it sets a dangerous precedent that permission for one permission can be carried over without scrutiny to any future application. If the alleged existing permission is for some other purpose then it should be explicitly stated so that the grounds for and limitations of that permission can be scrutinised.
- 23) The storm drain route is marked as presumed. More precise information should be supplied given route where topsoil is to be removed and a retaining wall to be built. Also new access roads will need to be built over the drain.
- 24) If drawing 9009 is scaled and laid over the topographical plan 7481-500-001 then it becomes clear the top west corner of the new pitch and the exit road encroach onto one or more of the birch plantations.
- 25) It is now clear that Newbury TC has not been consulted but their status should be raised from neighbouring parish to actual parish as the temporary access roads and part of the proposed pitch lie in the adjacent parish of Newbury Town.
- 26) A wheel wash is shown but no indication of how the debris will be collected and remove to avoid contamination of existing drainage.
- 27) The plans do not consider the location of the fuel oil tank and bund, the PortaCabin or equivalent and the portaloos or equivalent with any parking lighting etc. that would be required. The potential impact of these therefore cannot be considered.
- 28) The new access from Monks Lane will destroy part of the established hedgerow so timing of its removal should be carefully determined to protect wildlife. Reinstatement has not been discussed in any detail leaving a gap potentially in the current buffer.
- 29) Copying the plan 9009 onto the topology plan would indicate little room to construct the temporary access. The scope for error is great and the resultant impact would prejudice the existing planting beside the road.
- 30) The new retaining wall and its closeness to the boundary planting and possible encroachment on the birch planting needs to be considered. The birches provide a progressively maturing screen for neighbours.
- 31) The requirement of the "sporting association" in the submission is for the site to be elevated to prevent drifting leaves etc. The fence round the site should prevent that but if not then the existing birch trees have not been considered as a potential problem indicating the application either pays lip service or is lacking in detail.
- 32) As this application is really "infill" should the JSPU or others be consulted?
- 33) Does this "infill" affect the overall quotas for WBC?

- 34) The LGV exit is too close to the entry road to the surgery/pharmacy and the car park here plus the overflow car park are often full, leading to parking on the access road.. This road is also used as an unofficial drop off/pick up point for Park House School. If there is to be only 10 movements per day, why are separate entrance/exit necessary? This volume of traffic could be handled by one entry/exit. This single entry/exit could be placed at a point nearer to the area to be filled in which would reduce the impact and need for the current long routes within the site.
- 35). The location of the proposed all-weather pitch is inappropriate. A suitable position would be the existing pitch at the south east corner. This is already flat, appears little used, already has floodlights, is distant from housing and is close to the car park and changing rooms. GPC would support the principal of converting this pitch to all-weather use.

*Note: GPC recognises that some of these points have been addressed by Stephanie Edwards in her memo to David Mackins dated 9 December. However, it feels that they should remain as part of the objection in order to ensure that they are fully assessed during the evaluation process. GPC also understands that Newbury Town Council is now to be consulted as a directly concerned Parish rather than adjoining.*

Mr Beal declared a personal interest as a member of the Rugby Club gym. Mr Swift-Hook confirmed that NTC would be discussing the application on 14 December. The Chairman said it was important that there should be no suggestion that GPC was trying to influence NTC in any way. However, GPC had assessed the application in considerable detail and it was right that NTC should have the benefit of that research if it wished. It was agreed that the Clerk would email the final objection to Mr Swift-Hook, Mr Barnett and the Chief Executive of NTC for internal distribution if it wished. It was also agreed that GPC should be represented at the NTC meeting as a member of the public in order that any uncertainties could be clarified.

09/02293/HOUSE	Tetbury, 26 Burys Bank Road RG19 8BZ Single storey side and rear extension Mr Barry Sturgess	No objection
09/02307/XFUL	Woodlands Cottage, Basingstoke Rd Extension of time for app 04/02294/FUL – Demolish existing bungalow, erect new house Mr K Welch	Object, see below

There may have been considerable changes over the past 5 years, both in respect of local conditions and building policy/construction requirements. The proposal should therefore be resubmitted as a full application. The Clerk has already written to WBC comparing this application with the previous new application in similar circumstances for 1 The Cedars

It was proposed by Mr Beal and seconded by Mr Forward that the above comments be made on the applications listed. This was carried unanimously except that Mr Swift-Hook abstained in respect of the Rugby Club application. Mr Beal queried if this was necessary in view of Mr Swift-Hook's statement. Mr Swift-Hook said he agreed with the principal behind the query. However, he was mindful that as a member of the WBC Western Area Planning Sub-Committee his actions were under particular scrutiny. He therefore thought it sensible where major or potentially contentious applications were concerned that he should not be seen to have prejudged any matter or to have taken a prior position.

## (b) Decisions

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal.</u>	<u>Decision.</u>
09/00522/FUL	Construct sculpture 'changes' at NGP	Granted
09/02119/NONMAT	Amendments to approved app 09/00918 Marshalls Mono Ltd NGP	Approved
09/02241/CERTP	33 Dalby Cres Erect conservatory General Permitted Development Order	Refused (Planning Permission required)

10. Finance & Accounts for Payment.

The following cheques were presented for payment:

Mr J Boston – Clerk's salary & expenses	£1031.47
HM Revenue & Customs – Tax & NI	£420.33
SLCC – Annual Membership	£135.00
Greenham PCC – Church Hall Hire	£64.00

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

Mr Planterose reported on the November FWG meeting. The Clerk has received applications for grants from Newbury Family Counselling Services (NFCS), Sue Ryder Care and the Birds of Berkshire Atlas Group. The Clerk has written back to this organisation outlining the requirements that must be met before GPC can consider a grant. This application was not considered further at this time. NFCS has previously been supported by GPC. It has supplied the necessary financial data but the Clerk was awaiting confirmation of the number of clients within Greenham. There was also some concern that there appears to be no email address or website for the organisation. However, a subsequent Internet check revealed that it is visited and assessed annually by Ofsted and so may therefore be taken to be a legitimate organisation. The Clerk will copy all correspondence to Mr Drummond in order that he can advise NFCS on procedural requirements. The Sue Ryder hospices provide long-term and end of life care for a variety of serious and terminal illnesses. It is rare for more than one patient to come from Greenham at any one time but the Clerk advised that guidance stated that S.137 grants should not be made to the benefit of one individual but could be made to organisations that potentially benefit everyone even if the uptake was varied at any particular time. The cost of palliative care at the Nettlebed Hospice is £480 per day and the average stay 10 – 12 days. The FWG was minded to support Sue Ryder Care but felt that it needed more information in some areas including the criteria for entry to the hospice and directors' and others' remuneration levels. It noted that Mr Philip Cook, the Community Fundraiser for the Nettlebed Hospice had offered to attend a future meeting of GPC to speak about the organisation. The FWG felt that if GPC was to make a grant available then the level necessary was such that it should be decided by GPC as a whole. It therefore recommends that Mr Cook be invited to the January meeting. This recommendation was accepted and

the Clerk will write to Mr Cook accordingly.

Comment has previously been made that at the July FWG meeting only 2 members were able to attend. This is regulationally acceptable; as the FWG only makes recommendations it need only have one member. However it was felt that too few members inhibits full discussion and the FWG recommended that the Clerk be co-opted as a full member. This is also regulationally correct as an advisory group need have no Council members at all. Mr Swift-Hook said he thought this would be an excellent idea although he observed that there would be some occasions (eg discussion of Clerk's remuneration levels) when he would have to absent himself. Following a request from the Chairman for any dissensions to be made public, the recommendation was approved unanimously.

11. Budget 2010/2011 & Precept 2010. The Clerk had prepared a draft budget for 2010/2011 which had been scrutinised by the FWG and was presented to GPC for discussion. The end of year balance at 31 March 2009 had been £14.3K and this was expected to rise to approximately £30k at 31 March 2010. GPC had therefore achieved the level of reserves required by the external auditor. It would be possible to reduce the budgeted amount for either Newsletter/Publicity or for Contingency and so reduce the precept this year. However, GPC faced significant uncertainties in the coming year in respect of the LDF, the Racecourse development and possibly the Sandleford and Rivar proposals. These could well generate a requirement for publicity, leaflet drops, hall hire for public meetings etc. There might also be a need to engage a consultant. Further, there might possibly be a requirement to further fund the Parish Plan. The FWG therefore recommended that the precept remained unchanged at £54,000. It also recommended that the line entry for Newsletter/Publicity be changed to Consultancy/Publicity/Parish Plan to better reflect the possible areas of expenditure.

Mr Swift-Hook observed that there was a conflict between the level of expenditure during 09/10 and the opening and anticipated closing balances. The Clerk accepted this and will research and advise members as necessary. (*Clerk's note: There was an unfortunate typo. The anticipated end of year balance should read £23k*). It was agreed however that this did not affect the draft budget and therefore the precept for 2010/2011. Mr Swift-Hook said he considered that the reserves were now at their correct level and it was right to consider if the precept could be reduced. However he accepted that the degree of detailed investigation required in the large planning applications likely over the next year suggested that the employment of consultants might well be necessary. Mrs Huxtable said that one of the clear messages from the Parish Plan questionnaire was that people felt they didn't know what was happening locally. She therefore felt it important that the publicity line entry be retained. After considerable discussion it was proposed by Mrs Huxtable, seconded by Mrs Smith and carried unanimously that the draft budget 2010/2011 and the precept for 2010/2011 of £54,000 be accepted.

12. National Needlework Archive NGP. The Chairman reported that the National Needlework Archive, in which Mr Agutter was involved as a volunteer helper, had recently opened at The Old Chapel at NGP. It includes a Library, records and 'The Country Wife' tapestry conservation project. The Chairman had visited the project and had been most impressed. He said that Greenham Common was emphasised in the publicity and suggested that the presence of such a National project could only reflect well on

Greenham. He suggested that it might be worthy of consideration for S.137 grant aid. The Archive had acquired the original tapestry shown at the Festival of Britain and is conserving this. After discussion it was agreed that a visit by GPC to The Old Chapel would be very useful. Mr Agutter undertook to progress this.

13. Local Transport Plan. WBC is currently preparing a new Local Transport Plan which will run from 2011 to 2026 and will be consulting on the LTP from 30 November 2009 to 15 January 2010. Details have previously been circulated to Councillors. Mrs Smith had previously observed that firstly: the map for the plan (on the WBC web site) is at least 3 years out of date. It does not include the newest estates: Mandarin Drive, Deadman's Lane et al. and secondly: it isn't offering any real change. A sustainable transport strategy should be part of the LDF design. Since the school run is one of the major sources of congestion (witness the effect of school holidays), the LDF and LTP should be both be planning on how to reduce car usage in the school run for both existing and new developments. This should be a design and S106 consideration for all large developments. Where is the joined -up thinking? She was also concerned that the underlying message in the consultation document is that the future of urban bus services in the district is bleak. So what of the promises by David Wilson Homes and Rivar that new developments will be served by buses? (in fairness to Rivar, they only promised that their homes would be within so many metres of a bus stop - they didn't promise any buses). These are just so much hot air. It was agreed that Mrs Smith's observations would form the basis of GPC's response to the consultation which the Clerk will submit.

14. Parish Plan. Mrs Huxtable gave an update on the Plan. She said that separate groups were now writing different parts of the Plan. When these were completed final editing would be undertaken by herself and Mrs Smith. When the original consultations had taken place a number of people had expressed interest and volunteered future assistance. It had been decided to hold a meeting on 21 January 2010 in the Church Hall at 7.00 pm at which all these people could be updated on progress to date. All available members of the Steering Group would be present and she asked that as many Councillors as possible attend. Transport might also be required. The Chairman endorsed this and said that he thought it extremely important that Councillors attend unless there were over-riding reasons to the contrary. A list of those able to attend would be compiled at the January meeting. Mrs Huxtable said that once the Action Plan has been completed GPC will be able to view it before it is submitted to WBC

15. Web Site & Contract. The Clerk had received an email from a Clerk in Gloucestershire complimenting GPC on its website and asking for details of the provider. The Chairman had replied and copied the reply to Mr Burgess. The Chairman drew attention to the fact that an SLA has not yet been agreed. The Clerk was asked to pursue this with Mr Burgess. In particular the following were considered important questions to be answered before an SLA could be drawn up:

What does GPC pay?

What does it get?

What would it like?

What should it pay for this?

What should be included in core actions without additional cost?

The Clerk was authorised to use his discretion in pursuing these and any other related matters that seemed appropriate.

16. Allotments. The Clerk reported that he would soon be calling a meeting of the Working Group to discuss the way forward. He recalled that NTC had recently abandoned efforts to acquire more allotments due to cost and lack of availability. The Clerk feared that GPC might be faced with a similar decision despite the best efforts of the Working Group. Mr Drummond had achieved a verbal undertaking that Greenham Common Trust might be willing to consider buying agricultural land for use as allotments but a search for suitable land had been fruitless. The requirement was for soil of reasonable quality, fairly level with good road access, near to water supplies, not overshadowed by trees and preferably south-facing. Additionally he had been in touch with members of the public who had previously asked him about allotments. All wanted a central location and none would be willing to travel much more than about a mile. Mrs Smith raised the possibility of Sandford and the Chairman confirmed that the promoters had already confirmed that allotment land could be made available within the public areas if that was what the public wanted.

17. Exchange of Information. The Clerk and Chairman have been in contact with Janet Haines of the SLCC. Ms Haines is a former Clerk to Winnersh and now acts as a training officer. BALC and SLCC regularly provide training courses for Councillors and those who have been able to attend have found them very valuable but many have not been able to take up the training. It has been negotiated, subject to GPC agreement, that Ms Haines will attend the February meeting and give a talk (probably lasting 30 – 40 minutes) on Roles and Responsibilities. The cost would be in the region of £100 but as training days cost around £65 per delegate this is seen as reasonable. If Councillors wished for further talks on specific topics in the future this could no doubt be arranged. Mr Swift-Hook said he thought this would be very worthwhile. It was proposed by Mr Agutter, seconded by Mr Planterose and carried unanimously that Ms Haines be asked to address the February meeting. It was noted that there is no specific allowance for training within the budget. The Clerk undertook to amend the budget accordingly.

The Chairman had received a letter with some raffle tickets from Children 1<sup>st</sup> West Berkshire, which is based in the Slater Centre. It was thought that this was an inappropriate way of fund-raising and that some guidance might be necessary. There was also doubt if the organisation was involved in the Greater Greenham Project, The Chairman will scan the letter and circulate to Councillors in order that what further action should be taken can be considered.

Mr Planterose was concerned at the number of drains that were blocked and causing flooding during the recent heavy rain. The cause was seen as the introduction of 'letter box' type drains which were more difficult to clear and the lack of any apparent planned cleaning regime. Particular problem areas were seen as outside Greenacres, outside the College by the A 339/Monks Lane roundabout, near Water Lane, and the A339 from The Swan roundabout towards NGP. The Clerk will write to Streetcare.

Mrs Smith has been appointed to the Local Access Forum which deals with matters

relating to footpaths and rights of way. The Chairman drew her attention to the footpath to  
**Greenham Parish Council** **10 December 2009**

the bridge at Thornford Ford. The part within Hampshire was in good repair but the Berkshire side had collapsed and might need heavy engineering. Mrs Smith had also received complaints from residents of The Chase regarding property management charges. It is alleged that the property management company is raising charges unnecessarily, is unresponsive and does not provide clear accounts. The Clerk commented that he understood that in certain circumstances tenants could opt to change their company and he will research this, passing any information to Mrs Smith directly.

Mr Drummond reported that on the evening of 10 December Mrs Appleby (previous past Chairman of GPC) was receiving an award for services to both WBC and GPC at the WBC Council Chambers. The Chairman reported that space was extremely limited but he would be representing GPC. The Chairman thanked Mr Drummond for pursuing this much deserved award.

Mr Swift-Hook confirmed that NTC had deferred a decision on the proposed Pavilion in Victoria Park.

18. Date of Next Meeting. The Meeting closed at 10.00 pm. The date of the next meeting is on 13 January 2010 at St Mary's Church Hall at 7.30 pm.

A J Forward  
Chairman  
13 January 2010

Abbreviations:

BALC - Berkshire Association of Local Councils  
GPC - Greenham Parish Council  
HCC - Hampshire County Council  
NGP - New Greenham Park  
NTC - Newbury Town Council  
PCC - Parochial Church Council  
S of S - Secretary of State  
SLCC - Society of Local Council Clerks  
WBC - West Berks Council