

Minutes of the Meeting of the Selborne Parish Council held at Blackmoor Village Hall, Honey Lane, Blackmoor, GU33 6BS on Wednesday 18 October 2017 commencing at 7.30pm



PRESENT: Cllr Dr Ravenscroft in the Chair, Cllr Mrs Palmer (Vice-Chair), Cllrs Ashcroft, Mrs Bardino, Mrs Bennett, Mrs Briggs, Miss Clay, Earney, Rooke and Smith. **Also present:** three members of the public, Reverend Alice Wood and Mrs Sue Hobbs Locum Clerk.

17/154 TO RECEIVE AND ACCEPT APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Mrs Irwin-Brown and Masson for personal reasons. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of accepting the apologies for absence received.

RESOLVED: That the apologies for absence received be accepted.

(Power used: Local Government Act 1972 s85)

17/155 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS ON ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

No declarations of interest were received.

(Power used: Localism Act 2011 and the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulation 2012)

17/156 TO APPROVE DISPENSATIONS FOR DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS UNDER SECTION 33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

The Locum Clerk advised this item was not required for this meeting.

17/157 TO RECEIVE RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND STANDING ORDERS TO ALLOW MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS ON ISSUES NOT INCLUDED IN THE AGENDA

A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of suspending Standing Orders to allow the members of the public present to speak.

RESOLVED: That Standing Orders be suspended to allow the members of the public present to speak.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

An enquiry was received as to the progress of grass cutting at the Oakhanger play area. Cllr Mrs Bardino confirmed that she had visited the site and that the play area included a grassed section. The Locum Clerk advised the quotation received to cut the grass would be included in the next meeting's agenda.

17/158 TO RECEIVE RESOLUTION TO RESUME STANDING ORDERS

A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of resuming Standing Orders to allow the meeting to continue.

RESOLVED: That Standing Orders be resumed to allow the meeting to continue.

17/159 TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 20 SEPTEMBER 2017 (COPIES TO ALL COUNCILLORS 28 SEPTEMBER 2017)

The Chair itemised the minutes for accuracy. Cllr Miss Clay advised that item 17/127 should read 17/135 (i), (ii) and (vii). In addition, Cllr Miss Clay advised that item 17/135 (vi) should include the lack of affordable housing and the application being outside the settlement policy boundary. Cllr Miss Clay also commented that item 17/141 should read to ask HCC to progress the Blackmoor Atkins project as soon as possible. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of accepting the minutes as a true record of the meeting, together with the amendments made.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2017, together with the amendments, be accepted.

(Power used: Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12 Para 41(1))

17/160 TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 OCTOBER 2017 (IF AVAILABLE)

A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of accepting the minutes as a true record of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2017 be accepted.

(Power used: Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12 Para 41(1))

17/161 TO RECEIVE CLERK'S REPORT WITH UPDATED INFORMATION REGARDING ONGOING ISSUES (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

The Clerk's Report had been circulated to all Members prior to the meeting and was noted.

17/162 TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------|----------|
| Selborne Recreation Ground | Grass cutting 2017 season | Chq 300135 | £1050.00 |
| Selborne Recreation Ground | Play equipment repairs | Chq 300135 | £ 127.25 |
| Selborne Village Hall | Hall hire July 2017 | Chq 300136 | £ 24.00 |
| Mrs S L Hobbs | Locum Clerk Sept 17 Admin services = £870.00 Mileage = £27.00 Postage = £1.50 Mobile top up = £15.00 | Chq 300137 | £ 898.50 |
| P J Grace | Grass cutting Sept 17 | Chq 300138 | £ 319.20 |
| Royal Mail Retail | PO Box renewal | Chq 300139 | £ 171.00 |
| South Downs National Park Authority | Hard copy SDNPA Local Plan document | Chq 300140 | £ 33.27 |

A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of accepting the accounts as presented.

RESOLVED: That payment of the accounts as presented between 21 September 2017 and 18 October be approved.

(Power used: Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12 Section 151)

17/163 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Cllr Ashcroft highlighted that he would not participate in this item, as he is a dual-hatted Councillor as a Member of EHDC's Planning Committee.

(i) SDNP/17/04442/HOUS – Myrtle Cottage, Hastards Lane, Selborne, GU34 3LB. Porch. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of raising no objection. **No objection.**

(ii) SDNP/17/04749/TCA – The Plantation, Huckers Lane, Selborne, GU34 3JN. Works to ash and beech trees. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of raising no objection. **No objection.**

(iii) SDNP/17/04565/HOUS – The Queens Hotel, High Street, Selborne, GU34 3JH. Change of use and extension of the existing A2 barn to form a single residential dwelling. Cllr Mrs Palmer suggested the following wording of objection:

Firstly, the Use Class description of the barn as A2 is misleading. We are convinced that the barn remains in A4 Use and not in A2 Use as per the information provided in the planning application and its supporting documents, and we say more on this later in this objection letter.

Secondly, the use of the barn beside The Queens has traditionally been subservient to the use of the pub. For the purposes of any planning application, the barn should be considered alongside any plans for the future of the use of the pub building. It is our belief that in planning terms a site must be treated as a whole. We therefore believe that a planning application for a Change of Use would have to apply to the whole site. If the barn is developed separately and becomes a separate entity, the pub building could become a white elephant with almost no car parking, the only remaining access to Selborne High Street being from Huckers Lane, the exit from which allows almost no visibility at all towards the south, to the left.

The 'Planning Statement' submitted in support of the application

Section 3: The Planning History and Permitted Development Rights claims that a Change of Use of the Queens has been successfully achieved through PD rights: *"change of use from Use Class A4 to Use Class A2 was undertaken between 30th March 2016 and 7th November 2016, the conversion being completed by then. "*

With regard to Savills' Legal Opinion in relation to the current use of the Queens, Selborne Parish Council would urge the SDNPA & EHDC to seek their own Counsel's Opinion on this matter. We question whether the claimed Change of Use can legitimately be done either under PDR in a National Park, where the rules

are different, or via existing legislation. For as much as Savills insist the building is now in office use, we strongly dispute that the building can legitimately be described as “offices and premises”.

In reality, the building is completely derelict inside. No lights have been seen to be on; loose electric wires hang down from the ceiling inside the front door; damp wallpaper is falling from some ceilings; there are no carpets or furnishings; some of the internal doors are off and leaning up against walls. In short, it is uninhabitable and unsafe. There is no obvious entrance to the building, unless you were to climb over the Heras fencing or approach the building from the back by squeezing through a gap in the hedge and going through a very overgrown garden (gumboots recommended). There was no obvious tracked pathway through the garden until the scaffolding went up in the last week or so. The “display window” referred to in the applicants’ Legal Opinion consists of several A4 sheets of paper typed up and stuck onto the window, giving a mobile telephone number to ring to book an appointment. The offices for the company called 221 Limited are in fact in Chippenham, Wiltshire.

Selborne Parish Council strongly believes there has been no formal Change of Use from A4 to A2 Use. Although the application documents describe the building throughout as ‘a former pub’, the only possible rationale for this statement is that Derek Warwick Developments bought the working pub, then closed it and stripped the building of all its internal pub features and assets, gutting the building. But it was clearly not converted to offices in November 2016 as claimed. Thus our understanding is that a material Change of Use from A4 to A2 has not taken place and that it cannot now take place under PDR since the changes introduced on 23 May 2017.

Section 4. Pre Application and Community Engagement

Paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 of the Statement imply that members of Selborne Parish Council had no problem with the content of Savills’ presentation of their proposals to the Council. This is not the case. We gave no opinion at all and remained totally impartial. In any event, the presentation given related to a different application.

Section 6. Planning Policy

The Planning Statement seeks to justify the planning application to extend the barn with an argument that is based first and foremost on the NPPF and its guidance, with the policies in the adopted Local Plan Joint Core Strategy as also-rans. The Statement repeatedly places emphasis and reliance on the NPPF guidance as regards ‘sustainable development’ rather than on the policies of the adopted Local Development Plan. This is an error of law. In *East Staffordshire Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Barwood Strategic Land II LLP* (October 2016), interpreting Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and paras 12, 14 and 15 of the NPPF, the High Court concluded that where an application is inconsistent with the Local Plan the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development is rebutted. A presumption of refusal then arises, and the LPA cannot then grant the application on the basis that the proposed is “sustainable” or “in a sustainable location”. The contrary view of some Inspectors is no longer permissible in law. Judgment also

made clear that, while there remains discretion to grant the application on the basis of 'other material considerations' it must be the exceptional case. The Court of Appeal in approving the judgement of the High Court made it clear that the "presumption in favour of sustainable development" in the NPPF is not a statutory presumption, unlike the presumption in favour of the development plan in s.38(6) of the 2004 Planning Act.

Notwithstanding this legal position, the applicants' Planning Statement takes the NPPF and its guidance on sustainable development as their starting point in justification of their application. The Statement relies heavily on paragraph 14 of the NPPF as regards 'sustainable development'. Yet, as a result of Footnote 9 of the NPPF, the restrictions within the National Park prevent the application of paragraph 14 and so the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in this case. This point was made by the SDNPA's barrister at appeal public inquiries in relation to other sites in Selborne and was accepted by the Inspectors.

We say that the application is inconsistent with the Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy Policy CP30 and inconsistent with 'saved' Policies HE4 and HE5 of the EHDC Local Plan Second Review (2006).

With regard to the status of the SDNPA emerging Local Plan, the Statement at paragraph 6.12 claims that: "at the current stage it is a material consideration of negligible weight in regards to this planning application." This is incorrect. The Pre-Submission Local Plan document is now published; it is out for consultation (until 21 November 2017) and it will be submitted to the Inspectorate in March 2018. At the consultation launch in September 2017, the SDNPA told parish council and local planning authority members that the policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan should now be taken into account as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Heritage

The Planning Statement claims that the proposals for converting the barn comply with JCS Core Policy 30 (Historic Environment).

We say it does not comply with Policy CP30. The design of the new rear addition does not reflect the requirements of that policy and would not preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area let alone enhance it. Policy CP30 reflects s.72 of the 1990 Act; it specifies that new development must reflect policies in respect of design; it must use good materials of appropriate scale, finish and colour; and it is required to take account of local conservation area appraisals and town and village design statements where they exist. The proposal has taken no account of the **Selborne Village Design Statement** at all; it is not even given a mention. Had the applicants had regard to that document and its guidance on design and materials, it is likely that their approach would have been rather different. For a start, the proposed windows to the front, as viewed from the High Street, give an urban appearance at odds with the Conservation Area.

The application proposal would extend the barn by attaching a new building to the rear, the design and materials of which conflict with the original barn and do not

reflect the need to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Whilst the existing horizontal timber cladding on the barn would remain, the elevations of the new extension are proposed to be black vertical 'hit and miss' cladding. It is said that the use of *'contrasting materials and contemporary design will provide a clear distinction from the original building'*. It is not claimed that providing a clear distinction from the original building is a design feature that would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, probably because it is quite plain that it would not do so.

Saved **Policies HE4 and HE5** of the EHDC Local Plan Second Review (2006) apply to the application but there is no proper consideration of these policies:

Policy HE4 'New Development in a Conservation Area' stipulates that development will only be permitted where it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. To that end, this policy requires that the scale, design and proportions are sympathetic to the characteristic form in the area and compatible with adjacent buildings and spaces, that the use and application of building materials and finishes respects local traditional materials and building techniques, and that trees and other landscape features contributing to the character or appearance of the area are protected.

Instead, the scale, design and proportions of the extension are not sympathetic to the characteristic form in the area nor are they compatible with adjacent buildings and spaces – the building in fact would overdevelop the site and would occupy 'space' that contributes to the character of the area; the building materials contrast with and are distinct from local traditional materials and building techniques, rather than reflect these things; and a tree is to be felled instead of being protected.

Policy HE5 'Alterations to a Building in a Conservation Area' states that an alteration or extension of an unlisted building in a Conservation Area will not be permitted unless it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area by reflecting the scale, design, and finishes of the building, and it requires that materials that are traditionally characteristic of the area should be used.

The application proposal plainly does not comply with these policy requirements.

There is also an issue between the Heritage Statement and the Tree Survey that accompany the application: both documents appear not to have been updated. The information given in each (e.g: with regard to the number of trees to be felled) appears to conflict with the other. This is confusing. Both statements also relate to an earlier planning application that was withdrawn.

Landscaping

Paragraph 6.34 acknowledges that any proposed development within a National Park must adhere to The English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010. The application fails to do so. The 2010 Circular focuses on achieving a National Park's statutory purposes and makes it clear that new housing in National Parks is expected to focus on affordable housing for their local

communities. We are under the impression that the proposed conversion of the barn refers to a market housing development.

It is claimed that the site is visually well contained with minimal public views into the site, that only two properties with a direct aspect immediately adjacent to the site (Honeysuckle Cottage and Plum Tree House) will be visually impacted by development, but that this will not be significant. This is challengeable as it will also be directly visible from the High Street. . We also note that the garage is very close to the Settlement Policy Boundary published in the emerging SDNPA Local Plan; care would have to be taken to ensure that the garage did not cross the SPB if the application were to be allowed.

Knotweed.

We would wish to draw the attention of the LPA to the issue of knotweed. There is knotweed on the site, immediately beside the Heras fencing beside the cherry tree. The knotweed here could potentially interfere with both the proposed barn extension and the proposed garage. In September 2016, the applicants published a Knotweed Survey in connection with an earlier planning application. The survey required the area to be fenced off and isolated from any activities on the site and the knotweed treated. As far as we can ascertain, this has not been done; the knotweed remains in situ and it is not isolated.

Highway safety.

We would also wish to express our concern regarding the exit from the new narrow driveway from the garage onto the High Street. The sight lines on the ground here need to be measured against standard sight lines. A wall and a hedge obstruct the visibility to the right, northwards in the direction of Alton, as a result of which there is minimal visibility in this direction.

Lighting

The application claims at paragraph 6.47 that it is not considered that the proposed development would give rise to any significant adverse effects in regard to light impact. This judgment is based on residential amenity but it should instead be based on the potential impact on the International Dark Night Sky Reserve. Now that the SDNPA Local Plan Pre-Submission is published, it must be taken into account as a material consideration.

Strategic Policy SD8 applies across the **International Dark Sky Reserve** that now covers the entirety of the National Park. The policy applies to any proposals where the design of developments may result in light spill from internal lighting, The amount of glazing and of roof lights proposed, both on the original barn and on the extension and the link to it, will cause a degree of light spill that would be in conflict with Policy SD8 of the emerging SDNPA Local Plan.

The Conclusion to the Planning Statement suddenly departs from the remit of the planning application for conversion and extension of the barn; a throw-away phrase relating to “the provision of six dwellings’ is suddenly and unexpectedly introduced. It would be most unsatisfactory to develop the site via a number of separate, discrete, applications instead of through a comprehensive plan for the whole site.

In conclusion, we say that the proposal is inconsistent with the Local Plan because it is inconsistent with **JCS Policy CP30**, and inconsistent with saved **Policies HE4 and HE5** of the EHDC Local Plan Second Review (2006). No amount of pleading that it is consistent with the NPPF as regards sustainable development or anything else can make any difference to the legal position as clarified in the High Court and approved by the Court of Appeal that the “presumption in favour of sustainable development” in the NPPF is not a statutory presumption, unlike the presumption in favour of the development plan in s.38(6) of the 2004 Planning Act. Nor will it make any difference to the fact that Footnote 9 to NPPF paragraph 14 prevents the application of paragraph 14 in a National Park. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of objecting to the application as per Cllr Mrs Palmer’s suggestions. **Object as per Cllr Mrs Palmer’s suggestions.**

(iv) SDNP/17/04753 – The Queens Hotel, High Street, Selborne, GU34 3JH. Demolition of the contemporary single storey extensions. Cllr Mrs Palmer suggested the following wording of objection:

1. Even though the current owners have stripped the building of its pub features and assets, the Use of the building remains as a pub. We believe that the A4 Use Class remains unchanged. The alleged conversion to A2 (offices), which we dispute, did not take place before the change in legislation in 2017. The applicant claims that the conversion to offices was completed by November 2016. However, even today, the building remains unused and uninhabitable for that or for any other purpose. There is loose wiring from the ceiling, the ceiling paper is falling in, there is no access to the building, no lights have been seen to be on, the place is full of dirt and dust. It is not in office use. It is a building site. The areas to be demolished include the restaurant and the kitchen, both of which are essential to the running of a pub.

2. The information provided by the applicant states that: “There would be an enhancement to the conservation area through the building’s refurbishment, removal of the unsympathetic single-storey additions and tarmac hardstanding, and the introduction of traditional boundary treatments.” A covering letter submitted to the LPA states that consent is sought for the demolition of contemporary single storey extensions. No details are given about potential landscape restoration or whether a replacement building is to be proposed. There is no explanation as to what “the introduction of traditional boundary treatments” might mean or what “tarmac hard standing” is to be removed.

3. It is also stated that: “Proposals for the redevelopment of the site were presented to Selborne Parish Council on 1 June 2016, with an exhibition held on site on 12 July 2016. Following these events, the feedback was reviewed and plans were produced. These were then presented at Selborne Parish Council’s meeting on 28 September 2016.” The implication here is that SPC provided comments that were then fed back in and reviewed and that these helped in the production of their plans. This is not the case. In any event, the presentation related to a different application.

4. The Heritage Statement submitted in support of this application relates to an earlier and completely different application that was “In respect of Proposed Redevelopment of former hotel and outbuilding to provide six dwellings”. The Heritage Statement does not relate to this application. No other relevant supporting evidence has been submitted to explain why it is necessary to demolish the restaurant and kitchen building.

5. Planning Policy

Saved Policy HE7 requires that demolition in a Conservation Area will only be permitted if:

the structure to be demolished makes no material contribution to the character or appearance of the area; and

acceptable detailed plans have been approved for the re-use of the land and will usually be conditioned to the effect that the redevelopment or reinstatement of the site should take place within a specified period of time. Demolition may not take place until a contract for redevelopment has been let and outstanding planning conditions complied with.

In this case, no detailed plans have been submitted, let alone approved, for the re-use of the land. There is no indication at all as to what would take the place of the demolished part of the building, no indication as to whether it is to be landscaped or converted to anything else. There is no information at all about these or any other details. For these reasons, the application as submitted is defective and contrary to policy. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of objecting to the application as per Cllr Mrs Palmer’s suggestions. **Object as per Cllr Mrs Palmer’s suggestions.**

(v) 52232/003 – 7 Plantation Way, Whitehill, GU35 9HD. Lawful Development Certificate proposed – side extension. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of raising no objection. **No objection.**

(vi) 52232/004 - 7 Plantation Way, Whitehill, GU35 9HD. Fell two Scots pine in rear garden. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of raising no objection. **No objection.**

(vii) SDNP/17/04079/CND – Greystones, Fountain Road, Selborne, GU34 3LH. Variation of condition 5 of planning permission SDNP/16/00805/HOUS to allow clear glass roof lights on south elevation. Cllr Mrs Palmer suggested the following wording of objection:

The reason for the imposition of Condition 5 to planning permission ref. no. SDNP/16/00805/HOUS was “*to protect the privacy of the occupants of the adjoining residential property.*” The neighbour’s objection letter submitted online provides clear and convincing evidence demonstrating that the privacy of the occupants of the adjoining residential property would not be protected should Condition 5 of planning permission SDNP/16/00805/HOUS be varied. If the neighbour’s privacy is to be protected, then Condition 5 must stand.

The Design & Access Statement for the original application itself stressed the need for obscure glazing “so that there will be no loss of privacy to Rillet Cottage and retention of the obscured glass can be conditional any approval to main (sic) this situation”.

A variation of the Condition would have the potential to increase the amount of artificial light spill into the International Dark Night Sky Reserve. The published Emerging SDNPA Local Plan is now a material consideration to be taken into account.

Strategic Policy SD8 applies across the **International Dark Sky Reserve** which covers the entirety of the National Park. It applies to any proposal where the design of the development may result in light spill from internal lighting, as in the case of Greystones.

The sub-text to Policy SD8, at paragraph 5.57, recommends amongst other things: “Appropriate use of glazing to reduce light transmittance;

Paragraph 5.61 states: “The spill of lights from large open glass windows and sky lights often presents a greater source of light pollution than externally mounted lights. Consequently, it is important to control the lighting coming from these types of developments. The design of buildings should reduce the impact of light spill from internal lighting or suitable mitigation measures should be put in place.”

Summary

In the light of the reason for the imposition of Condition 5, the evidence from the neighbours that their privacy would no longer be protected were Condition 5 to be varied, and in the light of the guidance in the merging SDNPA Local Plan, Policy SD8 and its sub-text, that the use of glazing with obscure glass helps to reduce light transmittance, a fact that is important to the International Dark Night Sky Reserve, Selborne Parish Council objects to the application for Variation of Condition 5 of planning permission SDNP/16/00805/HOUS to allow clear glass roof lights on the southern elevation of Greystones. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of objecting to the application as per Cllr Mrs Palmer’s suggestions. **Object as per Cllr Mrs Palmer’s suggestions.**

(viii) SDNP/17/05121/TCA – Coneycroft House, Gracious Street, Selborne, GU34 3JF. Tulip tree – tip reduction by 1 – 2 metres from 22 metres height to not less than 20 metres and from 12 metres width to not less than 10 metres. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of raising no objection. **No objection.**

(ix) 57278/001 – 33 Plantation Way, Whitehill, GU35 9HD. Pine – reduce crown by 2 metres to points shown on photograph. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of raising no objection. **No objection.**

17/164 TO RECEIVE PLANNING DECISIONS REPORT

- (i) **SDNP/17/02914/LIS – The Courtyard, 3 Blackmoor House, Sotherington Lane, Selborne, GU33 6DA.** Listed building consent – removal of stud wall between kitchen and dining room. **APPROVED.**
- (ii) **SDNP/17/03644/LIS – Jasmine Cottage, Gracious Street, Selborne, GU34 3JB.** Two storey rear extension with single storey flat roof area. **APPROVED.**
- (iii) **SDNP/17/04023/HOUS - Jasmine Cottage, Gracious Street, Selborne, GU34 3JB.** Two storey rear extension with single storey flat roof area. **APPROVED.**
- (iv) **SDNP/17/04157/TCA – Wheelwrights, Gracious Street, Selborne, GU34 3JB.** T1 – Lawson Cypress – fell. **RAISE NO OBJECTION.**
- (v) **SDNP/17/04380/TCA – The Old Mill, High Street, Selborne, GU34 3LG.** Beech – reduce tips by 3 – 4 metres to leave a finished height of approximately 24 metres and finished spread (radius) of approximately 13 metres, crown thin by no more than 10% and remove dead wood. **RAISE NO OBJECTION.**

17/165 TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF SDNPA PRE-SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION (COPIES TO ALL COUNCILLORS 27 SEPTEMBER 2017, RESPONSE REQUIRED BY 21 NOVEMBER 2017)

Selborne Parish Council had agreed at the meeting held on 16 August 2017, that Cllrs Mrs Bennet, Miss Clay and Mrs Palmer would form a working party to prepare a response to the consultation and a series of meetings had been programmed to fulfil this function.

17/166 TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND (LGBCE) CONSULTATION ON DRAFT WARD BOUNDARIES IN EAST HAMPSHIRE (COPIES TO ALL COUNCILLORS 4 OCTOBER 2017, RESPONSE REQUIRED BY 11 DECEMBER 2017)

A proposal was received, second and voted in favour of Cllrs Mrs Bardino, Earney and Mrs Palmer forming a working party to prepare a response to the consultation, together with its likely impact on Selborne Parish Council and that this item be referred to the next meeting. It was noted that Cllrs Ashcroft and Smith could not participate in the discussions, as they are also EHDC Members. **RESOLVED: That Cllrs Mrs Bardino, Earney and Mrs Palmer form a working party to prepare a response to the consultation, together with its likely impact on Selborne Parish Council and that this item be referred to the next meeting.**

17/167 TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF SDNPA LOCAL GREEN SPACE DESIGNATION CONSULTATION FOR SELBORNE RECREATION GROUND (COPIES TO ALL COUNCILLORS 4 OCTOBER 2017, RESPONSE REQUIRED BY 21 NOVEMBER 2017)

Selborne Parish Council had received the notice, as the landowner of Selborne Recreation Ground and the designation affords protection from land development. Further information would be received when the consultation period had closed on 21 November 2017.

**17/168 TO DISCUSS DOG BIN PROVISION AT OAKHANGER PLAY AREA
(REFERRED FROM COUNCIL 20 SEPTEMBER 2017)**

It was noted that Cllr Mrs Irwin-Brown had offered to source stickers for the existing bin. A suggestion was received that HCC be approached to provide a bin at Shortheath Common, to replace the bin removed some while ago. It was highlighted that a dual-purpose bin is provided near the bus shelter and that the play area bin is monitored by a local resident on a voluntary basis and emptied by EHDC as a favour. Cllr Ashcroft commented that he had spoken to EHDC Environmental Health officers, who advised that Selborne Parish Council would be required to pay for the emptying of a new bin. Discussion took place regarding potential health hazards of irregular emptying of the bin and dog owners failing to pick up after their pets. Cllr Mrs Bardino agreed to take some photographs of the site. It was noted that a dual-purpose bin was provided at Selborne Recreation Ground, but it was not known who emptied it. The Chair agreed to speak to Andy Pead, Chair of the Selborne Recreation Ground Committee regarding this issue. It was requested that this item be referred to the next meeting for further discussion.

**17/169 TO DISCUSS AND APPROVE APPLICATION FOR HCC MATCH FUNDING
FOR SUPERFAST BROADBAND PROVISION**

As Cllr Masson was not present at the meeting, a proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of deferring this item to the next meeting.

RESOLVED: That this item is deferred to the next meeting.

**17/170 TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDING FROM
ST MATTHEW'S CHURCH, BLACKMOOR**

The Chair invited Reverend Wood to speak about the project to restore the church clock. The clock had been traditionally used by Blackmoor Estate workers for timekeeping and is part of a number of projects to improve the church's accessibility. Some internal fund raising had been conducted and other sources of grants had been explored. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of Selborne Parish Council making a grant of £500.00 towards the clock restoration. The Chair thanked Reverend Wood for attending the meeting.

RESOLVED: That Selborne Parish Council makes a grant of £500.00 towards the restoration of St Matthew's church clock.

(Power used: Parish Councils Act 1957 s2)

**17/171 TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE QUOTATION FOR PARISH-WIDE TREE
SURVEY (COPY TO ALL COUNCILLORS 10 OCTOBER 2017)**

A quotation had been received to conduct the tree survey, at a cost of £1140.00 plus VAT, to survey the trees in situ at Selborne Parish Council's open spaces. A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of accepting the quotation from MJC Tree Services Limited.

RESOLVED: That the quotation received from MJC Tree Services Limited to conduct a tree survey at Selborne Parish Council's open spaces, at a cost of £1140.00 plus VAT, be accepted.

17/172 TO DISCUSS LENGTHSMAN'S TASKS

The Locum Clerk advised that she had attended an informal EHAPTC Clerk's meeting recently and enquired about the Lengthsman scheme. It appeared that Clerks undertake the monitoring of the Lengthsman's works, which could become the responsibility of Selborne Parish Council's new Clerk, when appointed. It was noted the Lengthsman was due to work in the parish earlier in the day, but no other tasks were highlighted to be conducted in the near future.

17/173 TO RECEIVE TRAFFIC WORKING GROUP UPDATE, TO INCLUDE THE FUTURE FUNDING OF SELBORNE TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS (REFERRED FROM COUNCIL 20 SEPTEMBER 2017)

The Chair invited Cllr Miss Clay to lead on this item. Cllr Miss Clay advised that the faulty flashing light to south of Selborne school has been replaced and is working. In addition, letters to residents with postcard to HCC re Atkins proposals has been finalised and is ready to be distributed. Letters to businesses on the B3006 were being prepared by Cllr Masson and the progress of the same would be known in the near future. Further outstanding issues for TWG to consider included bollards and the speed limit reminder, with a meeting date to be fixed shortly.

Cllr Miss Clay advised that Cllr Mrs Briggs is now the liaison person for Oakhanger between the ORTG and the TWG. A meeting will be held on 13 November 2017 to present new plans to the village, although the plans are not yet available and it is unclear how comments will be analysed and the next steps for action. It was hoped that Cllr Mrs Briggs would be in a position to provide an update when information was received.

Cllr Ashcroft spoke about the prioritisation of projects which may attract Transport S106 funding from prospective developers, which could contribute towards traffic calming projects. Discussion followed regarding how Selborne Parish Council could legally contribute to traffic schemes, which is usually the preserve of HCC as the highways authority. Selborne Parish Council could consider these issues at budget-setting in the future.

The Chair thanked Cllr Miss Clay for the information received.

17/174 TO RECEIVE CLLR MRS BRIGGS' REPORT RE: PURCHASE OF SPEEDWATCH EQUIPMENT FOR OAKHANGER RESIDENTS' TRAFFIC GROUP (COPIES TO ALL COUNCILLORS 11 OCTOBER 2017)

Cllr Mrs Briggs was invited by the Chair to present a resume of her report to Councillors present. Cllr Mrs Briggs highlighted that there was a view the equipment could be damaged in transit between locations in the parish, although it was noted that some parishes successfully share equipment. A comment was received that when the original equipment for the Selborne Speedwatch group was purchased, it was with the intention that it would be shared parish-wide. A suggestion was received that the purchase of additional equipment be considered at budget-setting, after assessing the experience of sharing the equipment within the parish.

A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of suspending Standing Orders at 9.40pm, to allow the meeting to continue.

RESOLVED: That Standing Orders be suspended to allow the meeting to continue.

17/175 REPORTS AND ISSUES (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

- (i) **To receive notice of EHDC consultation on the revised Statement of Principles under the Gambling Act 2005 (copies to all Councillors 4 October 2017, response required by 31 October 2017).** This item was noted.
- (ii) **To receive notice of extension of deadline for SDNPA Infrastructure Projects consultation to 27 October 2017 (copies to all Councillors 10 October 2017.** Cllr Ashcroft commented that a 'wish list' would help inform which projects might attract funding in the future and the Locum Clerk was asked to send an e-mail to Councillors to ask for their suggested capital projects.
- (iii) **To receive notice of HALC's 70th Annual General Meeting to be held on Saturday 4 November 2017 at Thornden School, Winchester Road, Chandlers Ford, SO53 2DW, commencing at 10.00am (copies to all Councillors 11 October 2017).** This item was noted.
- (iv) **Laying of poppy wreaths on Remembrance Sunday.** Cllr Miss Clay asked for volunteers to lay the poppy wreaths on Sunday 12 November 2017. Cllr Mrs Palmer agreed to lay the wreath at Blackmoor church and Cllr Miss Clay agreed to lay the wreath at Selborne church on behalf of the parish council.

17/176 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

A special Council meeting was scheduled to be held on Tuesday 14 November 2017, at a venue to be advised. The next regular meeting was due to be held on Wednesday 15 November 2017 at Selborne Village Hall, Selborne, GU34 3JW, commencing at 8.00pm.

17/177 TO RECEIVE RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS FROM CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED 'THAT IN VIEW OF THE CONFIDENTIAL/SPECIAL NATURE OF THE BUSINESS ABOUT TO BE TRANSACTED, IT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT THE PUBLIC AND PRESS BE TEMPORARILY EXCLUDED AND THEY ARE INSTRUCTED TO WITHDRAW'

A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of excluding the public and press from the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting.

(Power used: Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 s2)

(Cllr Mrs Briggs left the meeting at 9.55pm)

17/178 TO RECEIVE UPDATE ON CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

The Chair read from the report received from EHDC Monitoring Officer, which recommended no further action should be taken with regard to the Code of Conduct complaint made by Selborne Parish Council against a Councillor in July 2017.

17/179 TO RECEIVE HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE APPOINTMENT OF PARISH CLERK

The Chair briefed Members present on the recent interview process undertaken to appoint a new Parish Clerk. It was highlighted that Selborne Parish Council offers membership of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). A proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of appointing the selected candidate, subject to receipt of satisfactory references, that the starting salary should be set at SCP 24 pro rata and that a six-month probation period should be served, as per the Model Contract.

RESOLVED: That the selected candidate is appointed as Clerk to Selborne Parish Council, subject to receipt of satisfactory references, that the starting salary should be set at SCP 24 pro rata and that a six-month probation period should be served, as per the Model Contract.

(Power used: Local Government Act 1972 s112)

A further proposal was received, seconded and voted in favour of continuing to engage the Locum Clerk for a maximum of 20 hours over a period of three months, to provide support for the newly appointed Parish Clerk.

RESOLVED: That the Locum Clerk is engaged for a maximum of 20 hours over a period of three months, to provide support for the newly appointed Parish Clerk.

The meeting closed at 10.30pm.