

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SELBORNE PARISH COUNCIL, VIRTUAL MEETING,  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 20<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2021 AT 7.30PM**



**Present:** Cllr D Ashcroft, Cllr S Bennett, Cllr E Briggs, Cllr H Carter, Cllr J Clay, Cllr M Irwin-Brown (part), Cllr G Masson, Cllr C McMeekan, Cllr N O'Donnell (part), Cllr N Palmer, Cllr L Roberts

**Also present:** Jane Ives, Clerk  
1 member of the public

**The following are draft minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021 and are subject to approval at the next Council meeting due to be held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2021**

20.199 **Apologies for Absence:** Cllr M Smith

20.200 **Declarations of Interests:** There were none

20.201 **Approval of Minutes:** It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020

*The meeting was adjourned for public questions*

20.202 **Public Questions:**

A member of the public raised a number of questions relating to blocked gullies in the High Street, planned road works in Selborne and queries regarding the Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) data. The Traffic Working Group will respond to questions regarding the VAS data and the Chairman advised that the other items would be dealt with later in the meeting.

A member of the public had written to the Clerk with a number of questions regarding the VAS data and these will be responded to in writing once the Traffic Working Group have considered them.

*Cllr Irwin-Brown joined the meeting at 7.35pm during public questions*

*The meeting was reconvened*

20.203 **Planning Applications:** It was **RESOLVED** to submit the following responses to planning applications:

**SDNPA/20/05624/TCA The Old Vicarage, High Street, Selborne GU34 3JQ**

Sycamore – pollard at 3.5m leaving a finished height of 3.5m.

**Response: NO OBJECTION**

**21876/060: Land to the rear of The Old Stables, Oakhanger Farm, Oakhanger Road**

Outline application: Extension to existing employment area comprising the reception of up to 2,820 sq.m. of employment space within Class E with associated parking and landscaping (all matters reserved except access)

**Response: OBJECTION.** The full response is at Appendix 1.

**56230/006 Red Lion Public House, Oakhanger Road, Oakhanger GU35 9JQ**

Installation of 10 metre pole, 8.5-9 metres above ground level following removal of two existing poles

**Response: NO COMMENTS**

**33619/007 Development of an Energy Recovery Facility & Associated Infrastructure at Alton Materials Recovery Facility, A31, Alton GU34 4JD** Additional information provided by applicant

**Response:** The Council's previous **OBJECTION** stands but additional comments submitted. The response is at Appendix 2.

20.204 **Financial Report:** The Clerk provided balances and receipts since the last meeting in December as follows:

**Bank Balances as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020**

Current Account	£ 8,937.40
Deposit Account	£72,520.22
<b>Total at bank</b>	<b>£81,457.62</b>

**Receipts since last meeting**

EHDC CIL contribution	£ 3,980.47
-----------------------	------------

**Bank Transfers**

Deposit to Current	£0
--------------------	----

**Earmarked Reserves**

Traffic Projects	£11,000.00
Play Equipment	£10,000.00
CIL	£ 3,980.47
Village Projects	£ 3,000.00
<b>Total EMR</b>	<b>£27,980.47</b>

**Total General Reserves £53,477.15****Bank Reconciliations**

The bank reconciliations were checked and agreed by Cllr Ashcroft for December 2020.

**20.205 Payment Schedule:** It was **RESOLVED** to approve the following payments:

Invoice date	Payee	Description	Net	VAT	Gross
	<b><u>PAYMENTS MADE</u></b>				
17/12/20	Liphook Bakery	St Thomas Bread loaves	£74.52	£0.00	£74.52
	<b><u>PAYMENTS TO BE MADE</u></b>				
04/01/21	P J Grace	Plestor/High Street leaf clearance	£345.00	£69.00	£414.00
21/12/20	Idverde	Bin emptying Oct-Dec 2020	£139.23	£27.84	£167.07
31/01/21	Clerk	Salary January 2021	£966.24	£0.00	£966.24
31/01/21	HMRC	Tax/NI liability mth 10	£311.33	£0.00	£311.33
31/01/21	Hampshire Pension Services	Pension mth 10 'EE & 'ER	£304.51	£0.00	£304.51
		<b>TOTALS FOR MONTH</b>	<b>£2,140.53</b>	<b>£96.84</b>	<b>£2,237.67</b>

**20.206 Grant Application:** It was **RESOLVED** to approve a grant application (payable from reserves) for King's World Magazine for £240.00. The Council agreed that although this is a second grant request in this financial year it was felt necessary to support the magazine with ongoing delivery issues during the current Covid-19 pandemic.

**20.207 Planning Chairman:** It was **RESOLVED** to appoint Cllr Masson as the Chairman of the Planning Committee until the next Annual Meeting in May 2021.

**20.208 Tree Works:** It was **RESOLVED** to appoint Liphook Tree Surgeons to carry out tree works identified in the tree survey carried out in September 2020 at the Plestor, Selborne Recreation Ground and the land at Well Head Stream. The cost of the works is £5,625 + VAT. The Council are keen for the work to be carried out prior to bird nesting season.

*Cllr O'Donnell joined the meeting at 8.25pm*

**20.209 Traffic Working Group:** It was **RESOLVED** to adopt revised Terms of Reference for the working group (Appendix 3). It was further agreed that 2 members of the Speedwatch teams would be invited to join the working group in an advisory capacity.

- 20.210 Risk Management Schedule:** The schedule was reviewed and agreed and actions will be carried out by the Clerk.
- 20.211 B3006 High Street Selborne Carriageway Resurfacing:** The planned works have now been postponed. The Clerk will write to Hampshire County Council to request that the works do not take place at night as they will cause too much disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- 20.212 Footpath Maps:** It was **RESOLVED** to purchase 650 copies of a Parish Map from Yellow Publications which councillors will deliver to all households in the Parish. The cost for the maps was agreed at £1,537.48 with an additional cost of up to £150.00 for any letter printing costs. The Clerk will discuss with EHDC whether there are any grants available to cover the costs and will also make a formal approach to Cllr Ashcroft in his District Councillor role. If this is not successful the amounts will be funded from Council General Reserves
- 20.213 Broadband:** Cllr Ashcroft reported that the information the Clerk had circulated prior to the meeting was sufficient and therefore no further action was required by the Council.
- 20.214 Road Gullies B3006:** It was noted that many of the road gullies along the High Street are blocked and the Clerk will report this to Hampshire County Council. Additionally, the Clerk will chase HCC and the Environment Agency regarding the meeting held last year regarding flooding issues in Selborne generally.
- 20.215 Action List:** The updated action list was noted. Cllr Roberts noted that the quotation for the map was being resolved and the replacement playground at Selborne Recreation Ground would be on next month's agenda as agreed by the Clerk.
- 20.216 Reports from Representatives on Working Groups/Outside Bodies:** There were none.
- 20.217 District Councillor's Report:** Cllr Ashcroft reported that a Council meeting was held last week and a new Code of Conduct introduced which he hoped the Parish Council would adopt in due course. He advised that there was currently a backlog of enforcement issues exacerbated by the requirement for officers to work from home during the current Covid-19 pandemic.
- 20.218 Date of next meeting:** The Chairman advised that the next Council meeting will be held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2021, and a Planning Committee meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2021 (subject to planning applications being received).
- 20.219 Exclusion of Members of the Public and Press:** In accordance with the provisions of Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 it was **RESOLVED** to exclude the press and the public from the meeting by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.
- 20.220 Clerk's Employment Contract:** The Staffing Committee had considered the issue of the Clerk's contract and made recommendations to the Council. The following was resolved:
- a. The internal auditor's comments on the report dated November 2020 regarding the Clerk's employment contract were noted
  - b. The Chairman of the Staffing Committee confirmed that the issue with the employment contract was discussed with the Clerk at their meeting held in December 2020
  - c. The Council reviewed the internal auditor's comments and **RESOLVED** that the previous Staffing Working Group made a mistake when issuing the employment contract to the Clerk as it was not in accordance with the resolution made by Council in November 2019
  - d. It was **RESOLVED** that the Council will adopt the HALC Employment Contract for future use

**The meeting closed at 9.30pm**

## **Appendix 1: Response to 21876/060: Land to the rear of The Old Stables, Oakhanger Farm, Oakhanger Road**

Selborne Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the above application.

The Flood and Water Management Engineer has already pointed out that the applicant has not provided sufficient information on drainage. Selborne Parish Council would like to point out that there are already surface water flooding problems in the local area.

Selborne Parish Council submits that the proposed development is in the countryside, outside any Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) and fails to comply with policy.

### **CP3 Employment**

The Planning statement makes reference to this policy. It is acknowledged that the proposed development will provide employment, but CP3 is only about employment “*within main settlements*” and it goes on to list them. This development is not on that list; it is in the countryside and outside those specified towns.

CP6 Rural economy and enterprise

This policy protects the countryside as development is only permitted for farm diversification or conversion of existing buildings. The proposed development cannot comply with the first two sections of CP6 as it is not for an agricultural or tourism need. The only part that could possibly be considered is section c. “*c) For the reasonable extension of existing firms in the countryside and new smallscale employment uses within the settlement policy boundaries of rural settlements.*”

However, the developer has not provided any information on his existing client base to demonstrate any need for them to be in a countryside location. There is no current information provided as to the need to extend.

It is not a “small scale” development as it provides for a floorspace of 2820m<sup>2</sup>, the buildings will be two storey high and it will almost double the floorspace of the existing industrial site.

It is not “within the settlement policy boundaries of rural settlements”. For all these reasons Selborne Parish Council believes that it would be in contravention of CP6 section c.

It is also noteworthy that there are a number of other industrial units nearby. In addition to the existing businesses on this site, there are three in Oakhanger itself (Coomers old yard and Hartley Mauditt Industrial Yard and at The Old Station). There are also industrial units already available, or being built, close by in Bordon which would provide a more appropriate location. The developer has not shown any need for this potential expansion of his own units which may put at risk the economy of the other sites nearby.

### **CP19 Development in the countryside**

This application is in the countryside and outside any SPB. The Planning Statement 2.2 says that the intention is for the expansion of existing tenants “in addition to new businesses”. There is no indication that any of the new businesses would have a genuine and proven need to be based in the countryside, as required by the policy. The developer has not listed his existing tenants, so has not provided any evidence to demonstrate that they have any link to the countryside or whether the rural location is essential for their business. The only letter he has supplied from a tenant is over a year old from a company called Servero. This is an IT hardware sourcing company, which has no countryside connection and could just as easily be based within an urban setting. Their website says “they have fast access to motorways so our engineers can get to your site fast”. There is no necessity for this business to be based in the countryside. Selborne Parish Council considers that the proposed development should be refused under CP19 as it is not essential that this business is based in a rural location and the developer has not supplied any other supporting evidence.

CP20 Landscape

The development is an expansion to an already large industrial site in the countryside. It is very close to the boundary of the South Downs National Park, and will have a detrimental impact upon the designation through light, noise, traffic and appearance. The immediate surrounding countryside is generally flat and open, so the development will be visible from some distance around. The proposed new industrial area will be incongruous and cannot be disguised because of its mass, length and height in the landscape. There is a footpath close by to the north east of the existing site. This development will bring the built environment much closer to the footpath, to the detriment of users.

### **CP29 Design**

The plans suggest that the buildings are to be designed to look like converted farm buildings. The height, size, density, and mass, together with the amount of fenestration to the front (it is not clear what windows are proposed

to the rear) would be too large to resemble farm buildings. There are already a substantial number of buildings on the site, and the new development would add to this and create an inappropriate amount of mass and density of built environment in this countryside location. The mass and bulk of the new two storey blocks will dwarf the existing U shaped single storey courtyard building (K in previous applications). The view from the nearby footpath will be a large solid expanse of the rear of the industrial units. It is inappropriate and unsympathetic in this location and does not comply with CP29.

### **CP31 Transport**

It is not a sustainable development in this location as:

There are no pavements to the nearest settlements;

The narrow rural roads have a 60mph limit and no cycle lanes so are not conducive to safe cycling;

The nearest bus stop is over one mile away and can only be reached on roads without pavements. The bus service from there is sporadic and stops at 1pm thereby not allowing people to travel home.

Therefore the site is unsustainable as workers, clients and deliveries will all come by vehicle. This will be contrary to CP31. The amount of vehicles will detrimentally impact upon the rural road network including unclassified lanes through Blackmoor and Oakhanger villages, and potentially causing damage to the historic sunken lanes.

There appears to be woefully inadequate car parking provision at the proposed site. The existing site has a requirement for 96 car parking spaces, which included the area in front and to the side of the U-shaped building (unit K on the block plans in previous applications). The existing car parks are already often full and overflowing. This new development appears to double count and use many of those existing spaces, so in reality, it will fall far short of the car parking required for the size of new development under CP31.

### **Additional information**

Although it is not stated on the application, it is noted that Cllr Richard Millard is the sole Director of Purple Beaver Holdings Ltd, the applicant.

### **Conclusion**

Selborne Parish Council considers that there is no evidence of justifiable need for this development in this countryside location, that it is inappropriate, that it will cause harm to the setting and that the proposal fails to comply with policy.

## **Appendix 2: Response to 33619/007 Development of an Energy Recovery Facility & Associated Infrastructure at Alton Materials Recovery Facility, A31, Alton GU34 4JD**

Selborne Parish Council submitted an objection to this application on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020. Having reviewed the further documentation submitted by the applicant in December 2020,

Selborne Parish Council continues to **STRONGLY OBJECT** to this application and comments as follows:

### **1. Landscape**

Our objection to the proposal on landscape grounds has not been changed by the new information and still stands. The buildings remain the same as in the original proposal, so it is still a vast bulk mass, 40m high with chimneys 80m high, which cannot be hidden and will clearly be visible for miles around. It remains an industrial development of excessive scale which will be prominent in the landscape for many miles around.

Hampshire's Mineral and Waste Plan (policy 13) states that development "should not cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact and should maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the landscape". The additional information does not satisfy this, as clearly a building of this height and bulk in the open countryside must cause an unacceptable adverse visual impact.

The developer has now supplied a number of photographs taken from footpaths, but it is difficult to determine which ones are relevant, as some look away from the development. There are no artist's impressions to show the effect of the proposal on public footpaths. The photographs do however, show a gently undulating rural landscape, often with long views unimpeded by urban or industrial development. For example, there is a photograph taken from the top of the internationally famous Zig Zag path in Selborne showing unspoilt country views into the distance and another from Northfield Hill, but neither show the effect of the proposed site with its high chimneys and plumes.

### **2 Transport** – The B3006 has been removed from the HGV routes in the new Highways Technical Note on Transport. On the initial Transport Assessment it stated that 18 HGV's would come through Selborne village every day. The new Technical Note does not explain which routes those lorries will now need to take to access the site instead of using the B3006.

In the Highways Technical note 2.4.3 it states that "*many of these routes eg B3004 and B3006 for example will by their nature deter large vehicles.....*". It goes on to say that "*nonetheless, and as a way to provide additional comfort to HCC and other commentators that development-related HGVs will not travel along unsuitable routes through villages close to the site, it is suggested that this can be regularised through a S106 Agreement, whereby a routing strategy is imposed to prevent HGVs using these routes*". The map included in the Technical Note shows a blue cordon around the site to show the proposed routes that will not be used by HGV's. Although the B3004 is included within the cordon, the B3006 is not.

Selborne Parish Council submits that the B3006 should be included within the s106 and the blue cordon to prevent HGV's use of the unsuitable rural road through the heart of the historic village of Selborne.

It is also noted that 12% of HGV's appear to be accessing the proposed site from "other routes". This is a high percentage to be just called "other routes". The applicant should give further explanation of how the 12% of lorries are to access the site if they are not using the specified A roads. Assurance must be given that those HGV's will not be using unsuitable roads.

The application appears to make no provision for a safe and unobtrusive holding area for lorries which may arrive before operating times.

### **3. Environment**

- a) Lighting: the new information shows the main lighting being on from 7am – 7pm. In the autumn and winter many of these operating hours will be dusk or dark, so there will be light spillage which will reflect and be clearly visible in the sky from within the South Downs National Park, so damaging the Dark Night Skies. It would seem that as the first lorries are expected to arrive from 7am, the lights will need to be on earlier than specified in any event.
- b) In spite of the information provided there remains the very real possibility of contamination of the River Wey and / or the principal aquifer from the operations at the site.

- c) The high level of HGV movements will create contaminants for the whole length of their journey. The possible pollutants from the chimney stacks is still of concern, as is the visual contamination of the sky by the plumes. Neither of these aspects have been adequately addressed by the new information. The height of the chimneys and the visual impact of the plumes will be immensely damaging to the countryside of northern Hampshire and southern Surrey, on the residents and the recreational users of the area for many miles around.
- d) There appears to be still no comprehensive study on the impact on the provisions for recycling in this area if the Alton site were to become an incinerator instead.
- e) It is not clear that the waste for the proposed incinerator will not consist of materials that could actually be recycled, or where the sorting of the waste will take place.

#### **4. Alternative sites**

The developer has only given minimal consideration to a very few existing waste sites within Hampshire. The applicant has not considered alternatives such as major brownfield sites within Hampshire/Surrey or indeed anywhere further afield which might be closer to the source of the waste. A significant amount of HGV traffic is shown as coming from Surrey and beyond. The maps in the new Highways Technical Note reach to the borders of Greater London, and there is detail on waste coming from Farnham, so it is to be assumed that a considerable amount of waste will come from outside Hampshire. As there has been no provision of a full and comprehensive study of all possible alternative sites in the south east, Selborne Parish Council considers that the application in this very sensitive setting, should be refused.

**Selborne Parish Council reaffirms its objection to this application and recommends that it is refused.**

**Jane Ives, Clerk**

**For and on behalf of Selborne Parish Council**

**29<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

### **Appendix 3: Terms of Reference for Traffic Working Group**

1. The Working Group will consist of at least 3 councillors determined by the Council. Membership is to be determined by the parent body at its Annual meeting or at a normal full Council meeting.
2. The working group may invite up to 2 members of the public to attend meetings in an advisory capacity on an ad-hoc usually temporary basis.
3. Parish Council members not elected as part of the working group may attend any meeting of the working group.
4. At its first meeting of the working group members shall appoint an elected member as Lead Member who should ensure the entire working group's members are kept informed and involved with progress and act as the primary reporting channel back to the Council.
5. In accordance with Standing Orders, members of the working group are not permitted to act on behalf of the Council and can only act in accordance with resolutions made by the Council.
6. In line with the task set by the Council, the purpose and remit of the working group is to:
  - a. Formulate proposals for highway improvements, including the Community Funded Initiative Scheme, with due regard to planning criteria and existing commitments, and submit them to the Parish Council for approval
  - b. Research potential sources of funding streams for traffic projects
  - c. Review the data from the Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) placements throughout the Parish and provide data to the Council on a regular basis
  - d. On an annual basis, make recommendations to Council for placement of the VAS throughout the Parish
  - e. Identify other means for the monitoring of speed and volumes of traffic throughout the Parish and make recommendations to the Council
  - f. Liaise with the Speedwatch teams and the Oakhanger Residents Traffic Group as and when appropriate
  - g. Identify any individuals or groups or bodies that may be able to assist in the implementation of traffic alleviation measures in the Parish and submit the names of these to the Council for consideration and agreement of next steps
  - h. Review previous traffic studies/reports on a regular basis to ascertain if they can be brought forward for further consideration or implementation
7. The group does not have delegated powers to make decisions on behalf of the Council nor should exceed its purpose and remit (above) without the parent body's sanction to a change to this Terms of Reference.
8. The group reports to the Council.
9. The group shall provide timely reports to the parent body in the following manner:
  - a. Minutes of meetings shall be reported to full Council
  - b. Reports containing details of any activities of the group separate from meetings should be made to Council on a monthly basis
10. Meetings of the working group are not usually but may be public meetings