

AWBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Awbridge Parish Council meeting held on Zoom Video conferencing on Thursday, 6th August 2020 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllrs Jackson (Chair) (**GJ**), Seymour (**KS**) (Vice Chair), Adams-King (**NAK**), Coggon (**DC**), Sheppard (**AS**), Allen (**PA**).
In attendance: Fred Tucker (**FT**), All Saints Church, Awbridge, and 18 members of the public.
Apologies: Cllr Legon*
Clerk: Ian Milsom.

PROCEDURAL ITEMS

Action

1. **53/20 Welcome**
GJ welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2. **54/20 Apologies for absence**

***PL** had advised that he was attending a family event and hoped to join the meeting later, provided he was able to gain access to an internet connection. In the event, **PL** did not attend the meeting.
3. **55/20 Declarations of interest**
 As a resident of Church Lane, **AS** declared an interest in agenda item 59/20 2.
4. **56/20 Reports and presentations**
 To receive Hampshire County Councillor, Test Valley Borough Councillor, Awbridge Members', Clerk's, and Test Valley Association of Town & Parish Council delegate's reports.

Test Valley Borough Councillor

NAK's report covered:

1. *Decision on ongoing closure of The Hundred in Romsey.* Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) will have to decide on the continued closure of The Hundred, introduced as a measure to help control the spread of Coronavirus in the town. Opposition to closure from Romsey Chamber of Commerce. It would be useful if people have any feedback which they can convey to **NAK**.
2. *Nitrate neutrality and the Planning Process*
 No further news.

3. *Master plan for development of south of town centre, Romsey.* This will be brought forward on 2 September 2020. Crosfield hall will be moved. New hall will be built before existing one demolished. There will be a consultation on the location of the new Crosfield Hall. This will be focused on the users of the existing hall.
4. *Audit of community facilities*
TVBC is to carry out an audit of community facilities in and around Romsey, and their level of usage.
5. *Government Planning White Paper (WP) 2020.* The WP contains the Government's proposals for the overhaul of the planning system and is likely to go through in the forthcoming parliamentary session. **NAK** suggested that whilst there are some positive aspects, for example localities can decide which areas are protected, there is a risk that existing powers for local councils and residents to influence what goes where will largely be taken away.

Borough/District councils may be given new housing targets, even where a local plan is in place and previously agreed housing targets are being met. Places with higher housing prices will be targeted for more housing on the premise that more supply will reduce prices.

Under the WP proposals an employment site that is commercially unviable will be designated as a brownfield site and available for development, even where it is not in the development envelope. This could conceivably affect the nursery site in Church Lane. Additionally, where sites are adjacent to a settlement boundary and form a natural extension, development of social housing will have to be considered.

6. *Impact of Coronavirus on town centre shopping*
Retailers report that footfall is down by 50 per cent, but takings down by only 20–30 per cent. This seems to suggest that people are shopping in town only for what they specifically need. **NAK** urged people to support local retailers.
7. *Parking charges*
These have been reintroduced in Romsey town. However, it will cost only £1 for two hours parking.
8. *(Question)*
How should the Parish Council make their views on the WP known?

NAK suggested that it would be better for individual councillors to write to our local Member of Parliament

with their concerns, rather than responding as a parish council.

9. *(Question)*

Has there been any move on 'land banks', where developers sit on planning permissions until housing market conditions are most favourable?

No.

5. **57/20 Public observations/questions on agenda items**

There were no observations or questions from the public on items on the agenda.

At this point **DC** asked that discussion of items 58/20 1. and 59/20 2) be deferred until **PL** joined the meeting. **GJ** was mindful to proceed with the order of the agenda. However, **GJ** agreed to deal next with item 58/20 4. to allow **PL** more time to join the meeting. The remaining items under 58/20 were discussed in the order 1, 2,3,5.

6. **58/20 Minutes**

1. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 25th June 2020

DC proposed that the following amendment to the minutes be made:

Item 47/20 11. First bullet point. Line 2, change 'style' to 'stile'.

RESOLVED

2. Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 25th June 2020

Cowleas cottage signs. The quotation for signs originally obtained by the clerk were based on a standard A4 paper size. **GJ** had felt that these were too large and had asked the clerk to establish the price for signs approximating to A5 paper size. This size of sign is not supplied as standard by the suppliers previously approached and would require bespoke signs at a much higher cost.

Action: Alternative sources of signs to be explored by **KS** and the clerk.

KS/Clerk

Bench repairs and stile repairs have not been completed.

Action: **KS** to chase.

KS

Low water hydrant pressure. Lack of progress on this matter was discussed. Council has pressed Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service to pursue matter with Southern Water, and Caroline Noakes MP and County Councillor Roy Perry have previously met with the water utility company.

Action: **FT** to approach Caroline Noakes' secretary to 'hand over' the community petition which he has organised. This to be followed by a request for a Zoom call with Caroline Noakes, perhaps including **NAK** and Hampshire County Councillor Roy Perry. **FT**

3. To discuss and agree corrections to Item 4. (25/20)
No.3, paragraph four of the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd April 2020

DC claimed that the said paragraph, reproduced below, is not correct and is misleading to the public.

Given the postponement, in March, of the Annual Parish Meeting due to Covid-19, members of the public did not, as the developer intended, have an additional opportunity to comment on the proposed development. The planning authority would like the public to be consulted further when lockdown measures allow the Annual Parish Meeting to go ahead.

According to **DC**, what the planning authority wanted to see was more evidence of consultation.

NAK challenged **DC**'s view, saying at the time the minutes were signed off as correct by the full council, which was in the early days of the pandemic lockdown, the paragraph in question was correct. At this time, the length of the lockdown could not have been predicted. If the Parish Annual Assembly had gone ahead this would have provided an opportunity for the public to be consulted further.

GJ called a halt to further discussion of this item and the motion failed.

4. To discuss and agree corrections to the minutes of the planning meeting held on 28th November 2019.

DC proposed that the following amendments to the minutes be made:

Page 2, paragraph 4, last line, change 'affected' to 'effected'.

Page 2, penultimate paragraph, line 2. Delete 'if'.

Page 2, penultimate paragraph, last two lines 'change 'would wish to completion of the proposed works in good time' to 'would wish the proposed works to be completed in good time'.

There was confusion over the date of this planning meeting (the full council also met on 28th November), and two members indicated that they had not received a copy of the draft minutes of the planning meeting. It was also unclear whether the proposed amendments related to discussion of the Church Lane application, or to the application for the Squab Wood Landfill Site, Salisbury Road, Shootash, although **DC** sought to clarify this. In view of the confusion it was proposed that confirmation of these minutes be held over until the September meeting. **Resolved.**

Clerk

5. To confirm the minutes of the planning meeting held on 21st July 2020.

DC proposed that the following amendments be made to the minutes:

- 1) Page 2, paragraph 3, line 5. Opening inverted comma should come earlier, i.e. "in principle support"
Resolved

Clerk

- 2) Following paragraph, line 1, insert comma after 'application'. **Resolved**

Clerk

- 3) Following paragraph should start "**DC** noted that paragraph 4.17 of the applicant's Design and Access Statement said that in June 2020, the Chairman of the Parish Council had consulted his members, and it was agreed that the application did not need to be delayed. **DC** said that he was not aware of any such consultation with Council members, and **GJ** agreed that there had not been a full consultation with members of the Council. He explained that a conversation had taken place between the developer's agent and two representatives of the Parish Council when community concerns ..." **Resolved.**

Clerk

- 4) Page 3, paragraph 7.
Take out 2 "No motion was proposed or seconded, and no vote was taken". **Motion failed.**

NAK felt that this text accurately recorded what happened at the meeting and should remain.

The motion relates to a discussion at the July meeting concerning a questionnaire that the developer intended to circulate to parishioners. **DC** felt that this would not provide the information that the Parish Council needed to make an informed decision about the planning

application. An alternative questionnaire and covering letter, prepared by **DC**, and issued by the Parish Council was discussed and it was agreed to proceed on this basis. After the meeting, having sought advice from the clerk and **NAK**, **GJ** took the decision to proceed instead with the developer's questionnaire.

There was a protracted discussion around the reasons for **GJ**'s change of plan. **DC** asked the clerk for details of the advice he had given to **GJ**. The clerk informed that he had advised **GJ** that as the parish council questionnaire had not been specifically identified as an agenda item (motion) in advance of the meeting, a decision linked to this would be unlawful. **NAK** clarified that his advice to **GJ** was given in his role as TVBC councillor, Deputy Leader of TVBC and TVBC Cabinet Member for Planning. He felt that **DC**'s proposed questionnaire and accompanying letter was not appropriate, and in any case would have had to be circulated wider than the parish.

DC questioned the validity of the clerk's advice. In response, the clerk suggested that the matter be referred to the Hampshire Association of Local Council's for adjudication. This was formally proposed by **DC** and seconded by **PA**. There was not a majority in favour and the **motion failed**.

NAK proposed that a way forward might be to add the following text to the minutes of 21st July 2020.

"Subsequent to the meeting, **GJ** sought advice from the clerk and **NAK**. Based on the advice received, **GJ** decided upon a different way forward, this being that the developer should issue a questionnaire, which, when completed by recipients, will be returned to the Parish Council for opening, sorting, and collating of the responses".

This was proposed and seconded and there was a majority in favour. **Resolved**

Clerk

There was a discussion about how to ensure that the questionnaires were circulated to, and returned, by individuals residing in the parish (and who receive copies of ADVA news), or who identify with the parish, for example those living in Old Salisbury Lane and in Newtown. **FT** felt that this would be achieved through the numbering of the questionnaires.

6. Matters arising from the minutes of the planning meeting held on 21st July 2020.

There were no matters arising.

STANDING ITEMS

7. 59/20 Planning

1) **Applications**

To consider planning applications notified by the planning authority, Test Valley Borough Council and detailed at Appendix 1

Clerk

See appendix 1

2) **Church lane development**

To receive an update on progress and to consider further action by the Parish Council as appropriate

NAK updated on an issue raised outside the meeting by **AS** about the change in planning officer for the Church Lane application. **NAK** explained that this was purely for reasons of planning officers' workloads.

NAK provided an overview of the viability assessment which would be carried out by an external consultant to determine if the Church Lane development will provide sufficient value to the community compared with the developer's profit.

Nothing further was discussed in relation to action by the Parish Council.

3) **Awbridge Neighbourhood Plan**

To receive an update

In response to a question from **GJ**, **NAK** suggested that the Government's Planning White Paper would make Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) even more important.

NAK outlined what he saw as the necessary stages in moving forward the Awbridge NDP:

- Obtain the survey responses from two-years ago and consider feedback in relation to a significantly changed population. This exercise may have to be revisited.
- Recruit a volunteer group to gather information and ideas prior to engaging a consultant to write the NDP. **NAK** will write an appropriate explanatory piece for ADVA News.

**NAK/GJ/
Clerk**

**NAK/GJ/
Clerk**

- Contact Action Hampshire regarding completion of the housing needs survey, which was halted due to the pandemic lockdown.

**NAK/GJ/
Clerk**

8. 60/20 Fire Hydrant Water Pressure

To receive an update on progress and to decide further action by the Parish Council as appropriate.

This was discussed under item 58/20 above.

9. 61/20 Financial and administrative

A. Bank reconciliation for June 2020

The clerk confirmed the bank balances at the end of July.

Action: Bank reconciliation to be presented at September meeting together with second quarter financial reports.

Clerk

B. To approve payments detailed at appendix 2

It was proposed that the payment detailed at appendix 2 be approved. **Resolved.**

Clerk

At this juncture **PA** asked what had happened to the costing for the replacement of the Speed Limit Reduction (SLR) sign with one with a smiley face. The clerk reminded Members that Simon Nightingale, who maintains the existing SLR, had previously circulated a quotation for a replacement sign.

Action: Clerk. To recirculate email mentioned. Approach Broughton Parish Council, who currently share the cost of the existing sign, to determine if they would be prepared to provide fifty per cent of the cost of a new sign.

Clerk

10. 62/20 Date of next meeting and suggestions for agenda items.

Clerk

The next meeting was confirmed as Thursday, 17th September.

No suggestions for agenda items were put forward.

BUSINESS ITEMS

11. 63/20 Village signs

Following receipt of information from Hampshire County Council Highways Department, to agree if, and how, this should be taken forward.

Nothing received back from Wellow Parish Council (PC) about the cost of their Village Gateway/traffic calming project.

NAK/Clerk

Action: **NAK** will approach Wellow PC chairman for information about cost. Awbridge proposal needs to be discussed in further

meetings. **The clerk** to contact Hampshire County Council and request an outline cost for Village Gateway signs and associated road safety measures.

NAK expressed the view that Council should engage Hampshire County Council Highways (HCCH) to act as a consultant in drawing up a specification and carrying out the work. **NAK** also suggested Council apply for an HCCH Community Grant to part-fund the project, with the remainder coming from an application to TVBC for a Community Infrastructure Levy grant.

Clerk

Action: Clerk to place the above as motions for the September 2020 meeting, when information about likely costs should be available to Members.

12. 64/20 Cowleas cottages signs

To receive an update on the purchase and installation of 'Please do not park on or cross the verge' signage.

This was covered under agenda item 58/20 above.

13. 65/20 TVBC CIL bidding

To discuss and agree what action, if any, should be taken by the Parish Council in response to the recently received information that Test Valley Borough Council will be accepting bids for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding between 1st September and 30th November 2020.

Action: Link to proposed Village Gateway/Traffic Calming Project, see item 63/20 above. Also submit CIL bid for grasscrete at Cowleas Cottages.

Clerk

14. 66/20 Emergency plan

- a) To agree to the creation of an emergency plan and to allocate areas of work required to complete this.
- b) To agree that the Emergency Plan should be a standard agenda item until its completion

It was proposed and seconded that these items be carried forward to the September meeting. **Resolved.**

Clerk

15. 67/20 Public engagement/Raising the profile of the PC

To discuss the following suggestions:

- a. Young people's competition to design a logo for the PC
- b. Pen profile and image for each councillor on the PC website

The above proposals were well-received.

Action: Take forward to September meeting for further discussion.

Clerk

16. Closure of meeting

Meeting closed at 9.30pm.

Appendix 1**Planning Applications**

20/01593/TPOS Radclyffe, Saunders Lane. Works to trees as per schedule received.

Refers to trees at rear of Cowleas which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Applicant wishes to trim branches that are touching the roof of his property and interfering with light reaching his property. Some of the tree branches also present a threat to overhead power lines.

It was proposed and seconded that Council's response be that any decision be deferred to TVBC Tree Officers. **Resolved.**

Appendix 2**Payments for authorisation**

<u>Payee</u>	<u>Payment Amount</u>	<u>Reason</u>
S. Nightingale	£78.95	Management of SLR sign - July 2020

RESOLVED