

HIGHCLERE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Highclere Parish Council Meeting held remotely, via Zoom.app

Tuesday 09 February 2021 at 7.30pm

Members Present: Cllr Norton (Chairman), Cllr Jenkins, Cllr York, Cllr Stoker, Cllr Smith, Cllr Easton, Cllr Dierks, Cllr Leeson.

In attendance: Cllr Falconer (until 8pm), Cllr Thacker (until 8pm)

Clerk: Amy White

The Chairman, Brad Norton welcomed everyone to the virtual meeting.

1. 155/20 Apologies for Absence

No apologies received.

2. 156/20 Declarations of Interest

No declarations made.

3. 157/20 To agree and sign the Minutes of the Council Meetings of 12 and 27 January 2021

It was unanimously resolved that the Minutes be accepted as an accurate record. They will be signed by the Chairman, Cllr Norton once current Covid restrictions allow.

4. 158/20 Matters Arising from 12 January 2021

104/20	Cllr Norton will respond to Member of the Public regarding their concern raised about the Common Farm site in Enborne. Not actioned but not necessary anymore. Considered complete.	Cllr Norton
142/20	Clerk to ask Cllr Thacker for more info on grant monies available. Actioned. The Clerk will disseminate info after the meeting.	Clerk
143/20	Clerk to ask additional info from Kevin Hyde re CFI project. Actioned. See Item 7.	Clerk
144/20	Clerk to research whether it would be possible for HPC to have a permanently mounted SID and to confirm the pole locations used in Highclere (some are not used, although part of the licence agreement, due to being easily knocked by traffic). Actioned- see item 7, 163/20. Clerk to action CSW signage info to Kevin Hyde. Actioned.	Clerk
151/20	Clerk to complete and send precept request form to BDBC by 30 January 2021. Actioned.	Clerk

5. 159/20 Public Participation

No members of the public were present.

6. 160/20 Reports from Borough and County Councillors

Borough and County councillors were not present at the meeting.

7. Roads and Transport

161/20: Community Funded Initiative Update

The clerk has received information back from Kevin Hyde answering the council's questions (in blue):

Q: Is it worth getting the road painted with dragon's teeth with regards to the need for continual maintenance and whether the current surface can even be used?

I have to remain neutral and I am unable to advise you either on a positive or negative approach on this question but generally it is not every year that a road is resurfaced when markings are installed and if a road is re surfaced generally any associated lining will be re introduced. However I do know that there is a tendency to steer away from the red patches on the carriageway so they may not be reinstalled

Q: What the 20% maintenance fee covers, for how long, and by whom?

The maintenance fee is to cover the costs to the County Council should we be required to make reactive emergency repairs or removal, and cover the increased routine maintenance works costs to us such as strimming of grass etc. It wouldn't cover the cost of full replacement. The maintenance period is valid for the lifetime of the project ? The maintenance fee is usually included within the final invoice and you would be made aware of this amount during the quotation phase.

Q: Who holds the 20% contingency money?

The 20% contingency is added generally to help ensure that when we advise you that a scheme will be £x.xx you will report back to the committee with this value. When the work has been complete unless there has been additional works requested or material price increases then that 20% will not be used. Generally invoices will be two fold the first an initial invoice say the amount will either the professional fee of £250 (as indicated on the CFI form) or a portion of the total value.

Q: What happens to the redundant signage (assuming there will be some)?

Any redundant signing that is removed will then be disposed in the correct manner. The contractor will be authorised to work on the highway by HCC. A nominated contractor that has been issued with a scheme will be accountable for the removal of any redundant signing within that scheme and also it will be their responsibility to dispose of that street furniture in the correct manner.

162/20 The council asked for answers to the following:

- a. Can we have two new village gateways, not one (and reusing our current one).
- b. Is it possible to not have the 40mph repeater at the humpback bridge, rather a "Welcome to Highclere" and perhaps a Community Speedwatch sign.
- c. It is possible to get a 3,2,1 countdown signage to the 30mph?

Once these questions are answered, the council is, in principle, satisfied to go ahead. Highclere Society will be contacted to ask for any feedback about the proposals before the project kicking off from March 2021 onwards.

Action: Cllr Norton to contact Patrick Hedgeland of HS to garner interest and feedback for the CFI.

Action: Clerk to write to Kevin Hyde with current questions listed above.

163/20 Update on SID

The SID continues to be working sporadically. It is likely the batteries need replacing again. Cllr Easton has found other devices which may be more effective. **Move to next meeting.**
Community Speedwatch: Cllr Easton will check with Brian Harling on their requested sites for signs, although it is considered that 4 signs along the A343 will be satisfactory.
Action: Cllr Easton to confirm sign locations with Brian Harling.

8. Environment

164/20 Footpaths, stiles etc

Cllr Dierks has researched some basic footpath arrows to be placed on gates/stiles in Highclere Parish. She will buy 10 and HPC will use these to experiment along a few paths as to whether it is worthwhile buying more.

Action: Cllr Dierks to purchase 10 footpath markers.

9. 165/20 Recent Planning Applications:

- 20/03524/OUT at Land At Westridge Andover Road Highclere Hampshire: **OBJECT**
- 20/03577/OUT at Falkland Farm, Penwood Road Wash Water: **OBJECT**

Please see the objections for both applications at the end of the minutes.

Action: Clerk to send Objections to relevant case officers at BDBC.

10. 166/20 Neighbourhood Plan update

Please see the update from Colin Wall at the end of the minutes.

Action: Cllr York will ask Colin Wall if HPC can provide an update of the stage the NP is at on the website.

11. 167/20 Broadband update

Cllr Norton has still not received an outline cost from Openreach. The current voucher scheme ends on 31 March but as Highclere is already registered and sits within a relevant postcode, we will be eligible for the new voucher scheme which will open up from April 2021.

12. 168/20 website update

Cllr Dierks has continued to make changes and improvements to the website. Google analytics shows there has been a significant increase in the volume of web traffic to the site. HPC will keep updating the community engagement page to encourage participation.

13. Financial Matters

169/20 Accounts for Payment, February:

The Clerk presented the following items for payment via email to all councillors.

Date incurred	Expenditure	Purpose	Ex VAT	VAT	Total	Payment Method
			£	£	£	

11/01/2021	HMRC PAYE	Clerk Tax & NI			221.48	online
23/12/2020	Cllr Expenses	Cllr Leeson Facebook advertising- VAT (unpaid from last invoice)		4.90	4.90	online
27/01/2020	Litter Warden Salary	February Salary			432.64	online
11/01/2020	Litter Warden Expenses	Travel expenses for January	13.95		13.95	online
27/01/2020	Clerk's Salary	February Salary			797.00	online
11/01/2020	Clerk's Expenses	ionos mail storage (Jan) and Zoom.Pro (Dec), Moneysoft Payroll	90.99	18.20	109.19	online
18/01/2021	Councillor Training	2 x councillor development courses for Leeson & Dierks	190	38	228.00	online

Total 1807.16

Bank Balance as at

09/02/2021:

Community Account:

£1,230.00

Business Account:

£50242.71

Latest accounts are available on the [website](#) alongside these minutes.

14. 170/20 Councillor Roles and Responsibilities

With two new councillors on board, all councillors have an opportunity to decide if they wish to continue in the roles they currently have, or whether they would like to change. Everyone has been asked to consider if they want to do something different. The aim of this item is to encourage councillors to take responsibility for certain projects. Over the next few months, and ready for the Annual Parish Meeting in May 2021, HPC hopes to have a list of objectives/ and / or projects to share with the Parish, to be able to create a priority plan.

Action: All councillors to consider their role and to let the Clerk know if they wish to make any changes.

171/20 This led to a discussion on the accessibility of the council documents. The Clerk as Proper Officer has overall responsibility for stored documentation.

Action: Cllrs Dierks and Leeson and the Clerk to consider shared drive options.

15. 172/20 Correspondence/ Clerk update

The Clerk reported that she had been contacted by the owner of Falkland Farm (regarding the above planning application) and has responded appropriately.

16. 173/20 Items to carry forward to next meeting

- Budget confirmation for 2021/2022
- Shared Drive for councillor access- Dierks/Leeson/Clerk
- CFI
- Broadband
- Cllr roles
- SID upgrade proposals

The meeting finished at 9:40pm.

17. **174/20 Date of the next Council Meeting:** 09 March 2021

18.

Signed _____ Position _____ Date _____

Actions from January Meeting

162/20	Cllr Norton to contact Patrick Hedgeland of HS to garner interest and feedback for the CFI. Clerk to write to Kevin Hyde with current questions listed above.	Cllr Norton Clerk
163/20	Cllr Easton to confirm sign locations with Brian Harling.	Cllr Easton
164/20	Cllr Dierks to purchase 10 footpath markers.	Cllr Dierks
165/20	Clerk to send planning objections to relevant case officers at BDBC.	Clerk
166/20	Cllr York will ask Colin Wall if HPC can provide an update of the stage the NP is at on the website.	Cllr York
170/20	All councillors to consider their role and to let the Clerk know if they wish to make any changes.	All Cllrs
171/20	Cllrs Dierks and Leeson and the Clerk to consider shared drive options.	Clerk/Cllrs Leeson & Dierks

Update from Colin Wall, Neighbourhood Plan, February 2021

In our last report in January we signposted the Housing Needs Analysis being undertaken for us by AECOM.

The preliminary data outputs we had hoped for around the end of January did materialise, but were not particularly dramatic, which is good. We await the final report which will appear around the end of February and will enable the NP to initiate a search for development sites which might deliver against that statement of need.

The possibility of asking PlanET to initiate a site search remains dependent on the detailed nature of the HNA output as and when that arrives. The option to commission further Technical Grant support from Locality for AECOM or PlanET to perform Site Assessments on any proposed sites also remains. We are assured that the progression of HNP activities into this area of work might have a material bearing on planning applications despite the absence of a five-year land supply in the B&D Local Plan. This is supported by the recent Burghclere decision where a developer appeal against refusal was rejected on the basis of prematurity; the Burghclere NP was deemed sufficiently advanced to carry weight which allowed the refusal decision to stand.

We are very grateful to the PC for the budget allowance for 21/22 as this will allow us to make much better progress and, hopefully, allow us to reach a "Burghclere situation" faster.

Outline planning Application 20/03524/OUT response by Highclere Parish Council
Decision: Object

1. Highclere is a small rural village within the North Wessex Downs A.O.N.B. and this large development would be totally out of character with the rest of the village. This conflicts with the criteria defined in the local plan and National Policy Planning Framework. In accordance with the NPPF Paragraph 172:

“Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas.... The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.”

The NPPF goes on to outline these circumstances in sub-paragraphs a) and b). When considering a “test of exceptional necessity” this application fails to meet these requirements.

HPC notes the Court of Appeal ruling last Thursday for a development near Haslemere, in an AONB. This application was not a major one; the JPP application has been declared major by BDBC so it is hard to understand how this development can be justified.

<https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2021/74.html>

2. The Parish Council would not consider the proposal to be sustainable on any economic or social service measure. Highclere is a village that does not have a settlement envelope and is, therefore, considered as countryside. Basingstoke and Dean considers Highclere as a Tier 5 settlement and, as such, is considered to be the least sustainable when planning for new houses is considered. In fact, the Local Plan has no requirement for housing in Tier 5 settlements. As such, BDBC has no planning need for 26 houses to be built in Highclere.
3. The proposal is a disproportionately large expansion of a parish the size of Highclere. It is recognised that the development has been identified in the Dec 2020 SHELAA Appendix 5: Sites outside Settlement Policy Boundaries, Reference H1004. That review judged that " ... due to its location in the countryside its development would not be in line with the borough’s current planning framework".
4. The NPPF guidance should focus on development in locations that are, or can be made, sustainable: Most journeys (over 95%) require the use of a car to access needed facilities in Newbury and beyond. The closest location for a very limited number of facilities, Woolton Hill, does not lend itself to cycling or pedestrians with a lack of pavements, lighting, narrow lanes etc.

5. The application is contrary to the Local Plan policy SS6 – Housing in the Countryside as well as SS6, SD1. In the most recent projections of the population of Highclere Parish, it shows that there will be a very small decrease in numbers over the coming years. Therefore the Local Plan shows no identified need for a housing development like this. Although the Borough does not have a 5 year housing supply, this does not go against the primary aim of policy SS6. It should be given due consideration alongside other policies that define the location of new developments in the Local Plan. The Borough’s spatial strategy focuses developments adjacent to Basingstoke and larger settlements as reinforced by policies SD1 and SS1.
6. Out of character for the village main thoroughfare. Properties along Andover Road are predominantly of individual character. Adding a 26 new housing development along the main road within the village will have a strong impact on the character and style of the village.
7. Lack of infrastructure to cater for the increase in population 26 houses would require. There is already significant traffic and congestion along this road adding yet another entrance will not help the flow of traffic in conjunction with the recognised issue of speeding along this stretch of road. Additionally the village has a significant broadband issue (bandwidth, no fibre). The addition of 26 dwellings would multiply the issue.
8. Highclere village has developed organically over its history, largely through infill and small developments. In fact, within the last twelve months, there have been various planning applications submitted for small-scale development. Permission for six houses has already been granted and there is P.I.P. for a further 3 houses. Therefore, an estate of 26 homes would represent the biggest single development in this village. This is more than excessive and would damage the rural character and begin a process of urbanization by adding at least 10% to the current housing stock.
9. The proposed common in the application is considered by the Parish Council as unnecessary, given the fact that there are large areas of open space in Highclere, demonstrated by the low-density housing. So, there is no demonstrable need in this application.
10. With regards to the local engagement reported in the “Statement of Community Involvement” in the application, it should be noted that the number of responses received should **not** be considered statistically significant. Only 21 responses were received, from a village of 344 properties in Highclere Ward (670 persons on the electoral role or 640 and 1263 for Highclere and Penwood combined). Eight people expressed a positive view- 1.2% of the electorate of the Highclere Ward or 0.6% of Highclere Parish. Any feedback from this engagement should **not** be considered as reflective of the local view.

Application 20/03577/OUT, Outline planning application for the redevelopment of existing caravan storage site / removal of existing structures and the erection of 5 no. residential dwellings and associated access works, parking and landscaping, Falkland Farm Wash Water.

Decision: Object

1. Access:

The application states that access will be via a track through Oakley Farm which is a 160 acre active farm of both arable and cattle. Also, Oakley Farm has a caravan/camping site at the junction with Penwood Road. We consider this proposed access to be dangerous. Oakley Farm owns the track and there is no onus on it to maintain it to residential standards. There is likely to be a clash between farm vehicles, delivery vehicles and in summer users of the camping/caravan site. A key danger is the 90 degree bend near Falkland Farm. Further, there is an access from Falkland Farm direct to the A343 which is dangerous and we suspect that the new development would use that access and not the one through Oakley Farm because it is significantly longer and avoids the 90 degree bend.

2. Policy SS6

Falkland Farm is only about 7 acres and the proposed site is currently used as a storage area for caravans and there is an industrial unit. However, any development would be isolated with no access to facilities and it would be entirely car dependent. It is in the middle of an area of farmland and it has no proximity to any residential settlement.

3. Policy SS6:

This development would be out of context as it is too close to the River Enborne and too close to farms and farm buildings.

4. Policy SS6

This application is not small scale as it is greater than 4 and neither does it meet an agreed local need.

5. Flood Zone:

The site appears to be very close to and adjoining a Flood Zone 2 area. The council is aware that this water course floods on a very regular basis and, as such, the proposed development is likely to lead to increased flooding due to an increased run off.

Acknowledging that the site will not have access to the main foul water system, the use of septic tanks is noted. In line with the above comment regarding an increased risk of flooding and the already established adjoining Flood Zone 2, there is concern about the high potential of an environmental impact of flooding in a site with septic tanks from 5 houses.

In summary this would be an isolated, inappropriate development with substantial risks to people and vehicles due to the nature of the single-track access.