



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

11 February 2010

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GREENHAM PARISH COUNCIL  
HELD IN ST MARY'S CHURCH HALL, GREENHAM  
ON 10 FEBRUARY 2010 AT 7.30 pm**

PRESENT: Mr T Forward (Chairman)  
Mr P Planterose (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr P Barnett  
Mr D Hale  
Mrs P Hay  
Mrs D Smith

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr J Boston (Clerk)  
Mrs Janet Haines (Item 3 only)  
2 members of the Public

1. Apologies for Absence. Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Mr A Agutter, Mr C Austin, Mr A Beal, Mr B Drummond, Mrs S Huxtable, Mrs T King, and Mr J Swift-Hook.

2. Declarations of Interest.

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 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**".

3. Councillors' Roles and Responsibilities. The Chairman was pleased to welcome Mrs Janet Haines. Mrs Haines is the SE Regional Training Manager for SLCC and had kindly agreed to give a short presentation. Mrs Haines gave a highly interesting and informative talk on Roles and Responsibilities of the Chairman, Councillors and Clerk together with an outline of the respective legal positions. Other areas covered were professional training, the roles and constitution of the Standards Board and declaration of Personal and Prejudicial Interests. Mrs Haines was warmly thanked by all present.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting. The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2010 were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

5. Matters Arising. The Clerk had received from NTC Councillors' ID Cards which now needed to be individually signed, countersigned by the Clerk and returned to NTC for completion. This would be done outside of the meeting.

6. Abbotswood/Pinchington Lane. The appeal against the Noise Abatement Order served on the HWRC site operator will be heard on 7 June 2010. The Chairman said that he thought it would be sensible for the residents to be represented at the hearing although ultimately it was their decision. Since the site was only recently approved and was built and operated to WBC standards it was difficult to see where any fault lay. The Chairman reminded the meeting that in the original Rivar noise report 5 out of 6 signatories were not qualified acousticians. Mr Hale reported that the operator seemed to have a new compacting machine which was very noisy. From the Public, Mr East confirmed that it could be heard at the top end of Westwood Road. Mr Hale recalled that GPC had made several representations to WBC over the dangers caused by lack of fencing at the site, particularly in the area of the balancing ponds. It was agreed that the Clerk should write to HSE on this matter and should use his discretion regarding any follow-up action. The northern side of the site is still awaiting landscaping. The Chairman recalled that the Ombudsman had advised WBC to liaise with GPC over the landscaping which had still not been done.

7. Nationwide Data Centre Nationwide had offered to notify local residents of potential noise from generator and equipment testing. The Chairman said he had had difficulty arranging this because most people were unwilling to release their email addresses. It was suggested that times and dates could be put on the GPC website and copied to Public Protection.

8. Newbury Racecourse – The Way Forward. The Planning application for the Racecourse Development had been granted by WBC. The Clerk had been in contact with GOSE which advised that if GPC was minded to ask for the application to be called-in, this should be done with the minimum of delay. The Clerk and Chairman had therefore raised a draft letter to GOSE which had previously been circulated to Councillors for their individual consideration. The letter asked for the application to be called in on the grounds that the site is nearly 50% outside the settlement boundary, the application contravened Regional and National Guidelines and was contrary to the Public good in that access to the Racecourse Station would be worse than it is now. After discussion it was agreed that the Clerk and Chairman should submit the final form of the letter to GOSE. It was also agreed that GPC should consider the implications for the Parish in the event that the S of S did not overturn the planning consent. The Clerk had been in touch with Mr Cooch at Sovereign Housing to discuss resource implications for the Warden scheme. At least one additional Warden would need to be recruited. However, this person should ideally be in post when the houses began to be occupied whereas additional Precept income would only be received after properties were occupied.

The Chairman recalled that the traffic figures presented with the application were deficient as they did not include any traffic emerging from New Road/Westwood Road. He suggested employing a consultant to record and assess this traffic. The Clerk said that the application had now been granted and he could not see the benefit of paying to see if traffic figures were correct. The Chairman thought it important to establish a correct baseline as any development at Sandleford could impact on this area. After discussion it was agreed that WBC be asked to confirm exactly what traffic was included in the report. It was also agreed to set up a Racecourse Working Group including Mrs Smith (Chair) Mr Forward and Mr Planterose to advise GPC on future issues concerning the Racecourse. This would include liaison with the Racecourse, NTC, and the Wardens. It was understood that the Racecourse had requested a meeting with Mrs Huxtable and it might be confusing the Parish Plan with GPC.

9. S.106 Improvements. The Clerk reported that he has now received guidance from WBC on the submission to the S of S of an application for bollarding/grasscreteing Stroud Green. He hopes to complete the necessary paperwork within the next 2 weeks. Further advice on the proposed pedestrian crossing to the Common and changes to the Pinchington Lane traffic lights is awaited.

10. Planning.

(a) Applications

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
09/02625/COMIND	NGP Change of Use to B8 for temporary 5 yr period ProLogis	Object. See Below

- GPC does not agree that the Prologis site has a complex planning history in the way implied in the covering letter. The Walon position does seem to be extant while the Sainsbury's permission for the whole site has lapsed. Other temporary permissions did exist that have since lapsed. We have today just three permissions on this site being the Walon, DOKA and Prologis as granted at appeal.
- The applicant seeks to simply extend the Walon permission but is silent on the conditions in that permission which required information to be supplied and approved on such matters as treatment of the hardstanding, lighting and boundary treatment before any use takes place. At minimum this should be required here although this may be considered dangerous and setting a precedent for what may not be acceptable should the Walon permission be considered today.
- The applicant says one of the sites as part of this application is where there was an old hangar. This is important to address as it was not open hardstanding but a building meaning that drainage for this area needs to be replaced by something more suitable. It is likely that during demolition the drainage that supported the building has been compromised and that nothing is being put in place to support the open use. Both vehicles working within the site or entering the site have the potential to allow oil etc. to find its way onto the hardstanding which more recent applications dealt with more robustly as should occur here.
- The applicant says that the item at (a) in **ECON6** for sporting and waste use has not been impinged. This is not true. As was stated at the ProLogis appeal the whole of the New

Greenham Park site excluding the Prologis site has permissions on it that have the potential to exclude waste and sporting use (except for perhaps the small Slater centre). Therefore with the ProLogis permission granted at appeal there is no room to place a waste operation complying with the dimensions of the waste area as defined in the waste local plan. This often used point needs to be suppressed once and for all and not used to justify applications.

- Criterion (e) of ECON6 does need dealing with as other Prologis' applications have considered that the drainage has fallen into disrepair which is potentially exacerbated by the demolition. On that point and above about oil run off drainage must be dealt with.
- Demolition is likely to have punctured the existing surface or exposed old ground through drainage removal which is known to be contaminated. Care must be exercised here to make sure this contamination cannot be added to or allowed to leak.
- The applicant also says the Walon permission does not have a height limit imposed on it. However this is outside of that area and recently the landscape consultants even expressed concern when a height of 5 m was being considered. Therefore a dangerous precedent will be set in perpetuity even if the height of 6 m proposed by the applicant is agreed. Even if masked by existing storage there is nothing to say that in future the planning authority has a chance to regularise this point.
- The applicant says S.106 contributions should not be paid yet in the supporting documents makes it clear this temporary use is as a precursor for the intended use. As such it seems reasonable that a pro rata sum should be required now to mitigate against this proposal with the rest being collected when the full scheme is implemented.
- The Walon permission and associated legal agreement make it clear the access to that part of the site is up Second Street near hangar 303. This application does not seek access this way so it would seem it is across areas subject to other permissions that have not been fulfilled or built in accordance with the plans such as communications road, DOKA and Prologis. How is access being used to the existing site and to these proposed new areas? Surely permission is needed for this with additional contributions as a result. This could be an opportunity for the local authority to consider that access to the existing site needs regularising and the permission brought up to date with contributions being sought.
- Previous Prologis's permissions have recognised the need for mitigation to protect residential amenity. For open storage an acoustic fence of some 2.5 m was required with an additional one running at the base of the bund. This needs to be seriously considered here as this is open storage again.
- There is no discussion of facilities needed to sustain the one worker identified. Any building would therefore be in breach of the Walon which requires all buildings to be removed in 2008. There is no provision for parking or any services such as waste water disposal for the worker.
- The applicant says no consideration is needed in respect of nature or biodiversity. Just because there might be storage in between does not mean the impact of this additional use could be not be felt on the sensitive areas and the application form should have made this clear.
- No hours of operation had been given here and the opportunity should be taken by WBC to control this.

West Berkshire Council has a golden opportunity at this time to redress un-suitable use being achieved through the Walon permission. If the applicant wants to use an extended area and seeks access other than as has previously been approved and over land not built in accordance with other approvals this should be subject to proper application and consent.

09/02651/FUL

33 Burys Bank Rd  
Relocation of entrance door/window  
Newbury and Crookham Golf Club

Object. See Below

This application on the face of it is to relocate window and door furniture but in reality it is a revamp of the inside of the building that requires this. The store room and shop are to be interchanged with shop being considerably increased in size. Given the proximity of the shop to housing and that the application is silent on hours of use/opening GPC objects until these concerns are dealt with.

09/02660/FUL <i>Adjacent Parish</i>	Park House School Single storey detached pre-fabricated building for 'Wellness Centre' The Governing Body	No objection in principle, but see Below
--	---	--

Concern that need for Sunday opening has not been substantiated and should be resisted as it was with the all-weather pitch to protect residential amenity. Also concern that ENV 27 requirement that no other existing building is suitable has not been explored.

09/02605/HOUSE <i>Adjacent Parish</i>	10 Adeys Close Demolish shed and extend kitchen Ms C Rawson	Recommend. This will improve appearance and reduce overlooking.
--	---	---

09/02703/HOUSE	10A Night Owls 2 storey and single storey extensions Mr C Fisher	Object. See Below
----------------	--	-------------------

- This application is a gross over development of the site. There is concern over overlooking due to closeness to boundaries.
- There is no information on design and access to describe how scheme will work especially turning areas and additional parking.
- If approved a strict condition should be placed on the garage not being turned into other uses.

10/000048/FUL	Regulation 4. Single storey special needs education facility for Castle School WBC	Object. See Below
---------------	---	-------------------

(Mr Barnett declared a Personal Interest as a School Governor).

GPC considers that there is ample room to build the facility at Castle School. To split one educational facility, with the same Headteacher, between 2 sites and embed one within an establishment with a different principal is inefficient and not in the best interests of the pupils or staff. GPC also doubts that a site between the A339 and the HWRC is the best location for a unit dedicated to children with special needs. It is noted that one of the College objections to the HWRC as the noise and pollution issue, particularly as the College buildings do not have air conditioning which would lead to windows being open. It is clear the windows and doors in the new building can be opened and as it is nearer the road and the amenity site than the college the problem must be worse. The amenity garden area faces the amenity site

No consideration appears to have been given to the fact that a large number of children at the school suffer from Autism and hearing problems, several of these children regularly visit Mary Hare, School for the Deaf. Deep concern was expressed by the Vice Principle of the School [now Principle] before the construction of the A34 Newbury bypass:

*The vice-principal of a school for the deaf close to the route of the bypass yesterday expressed his "deep concerns" about the bypass. Many deaf people can still hear low frequencies sounds. The bypass will sweep within 500 metres of the school. Tony Shaw, of Mary Hare Grammar, fears that the deep rumble of heavy trucks may swamp the residual hearing of the deaf children at the school. The Highways Agency says they have assessed the noise impact on the school. Mr Shaw said the techniques used by the agency were inadequate because they only measured the sound detected by people with normal hearing. "If you can hear only at low frequencies then you're damned," he said. "*

As a result of these concerns, Quiet Tarmac was laid on the road surface, Earth Bunds and Acoustic fences were constructed. The new Castle School building will be much closer to the very busy A339 than Mary Hare is to the A34 and to add to that there is the Newtown Road HWRC. The noise emanating from the HWRC, which has already been subject to a Noise Abatement Order, seems to have been totally disregarded. GPC can see no protection measures of any consequence having been allowed for here.

GPC notes that the noise assessment was undertaken on 25 August 2009 – ie during the school holidays when traffic is known to be much reduced. To have any significance and relevance a noise assessment should be taken during a school day.

The application validation check list says landscaping plans lighting assessment and travel plan information is either indicative or in draft form. Given the application location it is imperative that this information is made available now before the application is decided. It is thought that the college doesn't actually own the land and it's debatable whether they have either leased it in whole or part or if the application area is excluded. If this is the case the application form is wrong as it says the college is the owner.

The application site location will be very prominent and makes much of the extensive views from the site. Conversely it therefore follows the views of it must be quite extensive. The landscaping that is said to already be in place is very sparse in reality. As you approach near the new amenity site this building will be quite prominent it is clad in wood and look very different from the existing college. ENV 27 makes reference to many issues that this application seems to breach or not comply with. Further points are:

- No indication is made to the Ridge height relative to ground levels.
- Given the open location and that it is widely visible landscaping information must be supplied.
- The design must be more like the college if it is to fit in at all.
- A perimeter fence is shown that it is not clear if it is open or closed. Visually it needs to be transparent but closed would give a noise benefit for teaching.
- The existing hedge and trees are alarmingly close to the new building requiring them to be protected by condition even though they do not provide the protection implied.
- Given the location and the lighting scheme the impact of any dispersed lighting is vital before the application is considered.
- Little information is supplied about sewer, utility and other services. Surface water needs to be dealt with quite robustly especially the possibility of any oil run off from the proposed parking area.
- Only one disabled place proposed which seems far too few.
- ENV 27 particularly points D and F are not satisfied
- Farm traffic uses the access road that passes the site and this gives a free passage to the area containing the balancing ponds so there is concern about safety for pupils.

- Splitting the operation of the current Castle School into two on opposite sides of Newbury makes any sense at all.
- No justification is given why the unit could not be built at Castle School.

**Greenham Parish Council**

**11 February 2010**

- It is accepted that re-streaming must be achieved at some stage in the childrens' development. However, there is doubt that this is the best age to achieve this and no evidence that the desirability of relocating at this age has been assessed. Streaming to the displaced unit from streams remaining at Castle School will be impacted during formative years.
- Much is made of the existing site being muddy and needing to be used for boot sales which does not have anything to do with this application.

09/02204/COMIND      Newbury Rugby Football Club. Additional drawings/amended plans have been received by WBC in respect of the previously submitted application. The main changes are: provision of 5m fence adjacent to Monks Lane for highway safety; proposed all-weather width of pitch reduced by 2m and amended levels to NW corner of all-weather pitch resulting in removal of retaining wall. In addition the entry and exit haul roads will be retained. The exit tarmac route will be used for access to the pitch and the hardcore entry route allowed to grass over and used for emergencies.

GPC Comment: The visual intrusion of the 5 m fence needs to be seriously considered by the landscape consultants. The retention of what were to be temporary access/exit routes is understood but confirmation is requested that the grassed-over entry route will remain sufficiently stable for heavy emergency vehicles. GPC still has concern over the drainage given the change of surface over a significant area and how water finds its way to any existing drainage. Now the access ways are to be retained a permanent solution to the drainage has to be agreed.

(b) Decisions

<u>No.</u>	<u>Proposal.</u>	<u>Decision.</u>
09/02293/HOUSE	Tetbury, 26 Burys Bank Rd single storey side and rear extension	Granted
09/02307/XFUL	Woodlands Cottage Basingstoke Rd Extension of time – 04/02294/FUL	Granted
09/01730/FULD	36 Hambridge Rd.	The applicant has appealed against refusal of permission to convert house to 2 x 1-bed flats. The appeal will be heard by and exchange of written statements together with a site visit by the Inspector.

11. Finance & Accounts for Payment.

The following cheques were presented for payment:

Mr J Boston – Clerk's salary & expenses	£1062.38
HM Revenue & Customs – Tax & NI	£420.33

It was proposed by Mr Planterose, seconded by Mrs Smith and carried unanimously that the cheques be approved for payment. It was necessary to appoint an Internal Auditor for

## **Greenham Parish Council**

**11 February 2010**

the coming year. Mr Weir, who has provided an excellent and cost-effective service in the past, is willing to continue. It was proposed by Mr Forward, seconded by Mr Planterose and carried unanimously that Mr Weir be appointed as the Internal Auditor for 2009- 2010.

At the January meeting it was resolved to buy 14 copies of the book 'The Parish Councillor's Guide' at £12.75. The Clerk has not yet purchased the books as further research indicates that 'The Councillor' at £11.95 is more suitable for individual councillors; with copies of 'The Parish Councillor's Guide' being purchased for the Clerk and Chairman. It was also suggested that the Clerk be provided with one copy of 'the Clerk's Manual' at a cost of £45.00. It was proposed Mr Forward seconded by Mr Barnett and carried unanimously that 14 copies of The Councillor 2 copies of The Good Councillor's Guide and one copy of The Clerk's Manual should be purchased. Carried unanimously.

12. Parish Plan. Mrs Smith reported that there had been some progress with the Plan. The Fun Event planned for 6 June would now be simpler than originally envisaged Due to lack of time to properly prepare. Additionally, the Steering Group was aware that this was the last day of half-term and it did not want to cause too much disruption to local families. Therefore the event would run from 4.00 pm to 7.00 pm on the Diamond. There was still the question of car parking and toilet facilities to resolve. The Clerk reported that he had been in touch with Mary Hare Junior School. A decision was awaited on use of the school's parking and toilet facilities (the School will be on half-term).

13. Web Site & Contract. The Clerk has been in contact with Mr Burgess and is awaiting some further information before raising the first draft SLA.

14. Allotments. The Clerk reported that despite a lot of work there had been little practical progress. This was because of the lack of availability of suitable land. In his view it was unlikely that land owners would consider making land available until the LDF was finalised. He also reported that NTC had recently told allotment holders that the total cost (direct and indirect) of running the NTC allotments came to £62,000. Even if land were to become available GPC might still be faced with difficult decisions.

15. WBC – Salting/Gritting. The WBC Adverse Weather Plan will be discussed at the District/Parish Conference on 17 March. Two requests had been received for the provision of additional grit bins. It was known that one of the problems facing WBC was that grit bins located in hilly areas had been emptied by local residents for their own use. Nevertheless, the Clerk had asked WBC if sponsorship of additional bins by Parish Councils was possible and if so what would be the cost. A response is awaited. It has also been suggested that supplies of salt/grit might be stored on private property to prevent theft and avoid the cost of street bins.

16. Burys Bank Road – Verges. Due to the absence of Mr Drummond, this Item was

held over to next month.

17. Exchange of Information. WBC has announced that it has prepared the final version of the Sore Strategy. Consultation runs until 9<sup>th</sup> April. WBC will be holding a **Greenham Parish Council** **11 February 2010**

District Parish Conference on 17<sup>th</sup> March. Topics will include a discussion on the adverse winter weather conditions and the influencing of implementation of the Planning Policy. There will also be an opportunity to discuss the Core Strategy. The Clerk reported that free swimming was available in WBC pools for those aged 60 and over under the National Free Swimming Scheme. WBC was keen to promote the initiative. The Clerk has more details.

Mrs Hay commented on the cold conditions in the Church Hall. The heating seemed not to be operating earlier in the evening but the radiators were very hot and the boiler running when the meeting closed. GPC had in the past paid for the central heating system and was aware that it should work efficiently if properly run. It might be that there was a fault in the timer. The Clerk will contact the PCC.

18. Date of Next Meeting. The Meeting closed at 10.15 pm The date of the next meeting is on 10 March 2010 at St Mary's Church Hall at 7.30pm.

A J Forward  
Chairman  
10 March 2010

Abbreviations:

GPC - Greenham Parish 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