

**OWSLEBURY PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
15th NOVEMBER 2016
COMMENCING AT 7.30PM IN THE MAIN HALL, OWSLEBURY PARISH HALL**

PRESENT.

Parish Councillor John Chapman (in the Chair).

Parish Councillors: Paul Bowes, Mark Egerton, Will Martin, Paul Phillips, Roger Page, Gerry Tull.

IN ATTENDANCE.

Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer (RFO): Michael Cleary.

City and County Councillor Rob Humby (left after 168/16(a)).

District Councillor Amber Thacker (..... ditto.....)

Approximately 60 members of the public were present (all left after item 168/16 (a)).

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

District Councillor Laurence Ruffell.

168/16 DRAFT EASTLEIGH LOCAL PLAN AND POTENTIAL IMPACT ON OWSLEBURY.

a) **Discussion.**

The Council agreed to the Chairman's request to change the order of the agenda items so as to discuss first the options under consideration as part of the draft Eastleigh Local Plan. The Council invited members of the public to comment.

The Chairman outlined the concerns the Council, other local councils and the campaign group, Action against Destructive Development (ADD) have in relation to Options B & C currently under consideration by Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC). There was a wide ranging discussion involving parish, district and county councillors and members of the public lasting about an hour – the main points are summarised in Appendix 1. Following the discussion members of the public left the meeting and the Council continued with the business set out on the agenda.

b) **Advisory Committee**

The Council **Resolved** unanimously to appoint an Advisory Committee to (i) advise the Council on matters affecting the parish in connection with the options under consideration as part of the draft Eastleigh Local Plan, and (ii) to act as a link/co-coordinator with ADD. The Council approved the membership of the Advisory Committee: Councillors Chapman (Chair) and Phillips and lay members, Richard and Niki Dale, Hugh Petter and Locket Ward. The chairman noted he had in mind other lay members to join the Advisory committee. The committee would report its activities and recommendations to Council on a regular basis.

c) **Grant.**

The Council noted the strength of feeling shown during the public discussion about the serious traffic implications for the parish in the event Eastleigh chose to adopt Options B & C of the draft Eastleigh Local Plan. Overwhelming support was also apparent in the on-line survey conducted by the Council with 86% of the 87 respondents supporting the Council opposition to Options B & C and 88% supporting the proposition the Council should provide a grant to the umbrella group, ADD. Similar support had also been apparent in email and Facebook messages and in individual discussions with councillors.

The Council noted the best outcomes would be secured by the local parishes and resident groups working together under the umbrella of ADD, a non-political organisation, to protect the interests of the area and its way of life. The Council considered this would be in the direct interests of the majority, if not all, parishioners. Accordingly, the Council **Resolved** unanimously to make a grant of £1,000 under Section 137(1) LGA 1972 to ADD, subject to the Clerk making further enquiries of other parishes. The Council agreed to review on a regular basis whether it would be in parishioners best interests to make further grants to the organisation, dependent upon the Council's assessment of the progress made.

169/16 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS FOR AGENDA ITEMS AND REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATION UNDER S33(1) LOCALISM ACT 2011.

Councillor Tull had previously noted his pecuniary interest in two sites currently under consideration as rural exception sites. The Council unanimously **Resolved** to accept an application from Councillor Tull for dispensation under Section 33 of the Localism Act 2011. He noted this would enable him to update the Council fully but undertook to withdraw from the meeting if the Chairman asked him to do so. Other Councillors had previously noted their personal interests but none affected the items on the agenda.

170/16 APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Councillors noted their acceptance of the Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 10th October 2016, and the Council **Resolved** they were a true record.

171/16 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.

Apart from public comments noted in 168/16(a) above, there were no other public questions or comments.

172/16 COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS REPORTS.

There were no reports from District or County councillors.

173/16 POLICE & NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH REPORT.

There was no Police report. Councillor Bowes noted the forthcoming PACT (police and community) meeting at Colden Common.

174/16 PLANNING

a) **Planning applications.**

There were no planning applications for consideration at the meeting.

b) **Planning decisions.**

The Clerk reported the following application had been approved by SDNP:

SDNP/16/01263/FUL	Hensting Hall , Hensting Lane, Fishers Pond,
Proposal:	To convert existing storage space and garages to a two bedroom holiday let by extending it on the footprint of the adjoining bull pens. (Amended description)
Decision:	Approved

SDNP16/04203/ HOUS	23 Beech Grove
Proposal:	Construction of a dropped kerb to allow domestic vehicular access to the front garden which will become a driveway.
Decision:	Approved

SDNP16/04135/ FUL	Hazeldene, Longwood Road
Proposal:	Demolition of existing small rear porch and erect a conservatory of the rear elevation of the property.
Decision:	Approved

SDNP/16/003198/HOUS 16/03200/LIS	Hensting Hall, Hensting Lane, Fishers Pond
Proposal:	New access to garaging at the rear of Hensting Hall
Decision:	Approved

c) **Enforcement matters.**

The Council noted the recent Enforcement report on Woodland View stables and, after discussion, the Chairman agreed to review the case further and to bring the matter back to the next meeting.

Action: Woodland View stables.	By Whom:
• Chairman to review background and bring back to the next meeting.	JC

d) **Affordable housing.**

Councillor Tull updated the Council on his recent discussion with ActionHants on two possible rural exception sites. In essence, whilst he had been in contact with ActionHants (and they had inspected the sites) there appeared to be little progress; he noted his frustration at the time the process involved was taking. He also noted Footsteps Ltd had been in contact with him, although nothing of substance had yet developed.

175/16 HIGHWAYS.

a) **Traffic management.**

The Chairman noted HCC had yet to issue a revised policy allowing parishes to undertake 'self funded' traffic management measures, and the matter was deferred to a future meeting.

Action: Traffic management.	By Whom:
• HCC 'self funded' policy to be discussed at a future meeting.	Clerk

b) **Signage.**

The Council noted that two recent cycle accidents on Whites hill had been described by medical practioners as life threatening. It also noted the continuing problem of very large HGVs using the lane, most probably because of out of date satellite navigation programmes. Whilst both matters had been referred to HCC the Council felt the problem to be sufficiently serious to take action of its own on health and safety grounds. The Council **Resolved** unanimously to authorise the Clerk to incur reasonable expenditure (up to £200) to acquire signage (accidents and HGVs) to be placed on Whites hill.

Action: Cyclists and HGVs.	By Whom:
• Clerk to acquire signage re cyclists and HGVs	Clerk

c) **Red lane barrier.**

The Clerk noted the lock had been changed. Councillors agreed to make enquiries with a view to obtaining a key. If a key could not be obtained the Council would replace the lock.

Action: Red lane lock.	By Whom:
• Councillors to make enquiries re key.	Councillors

176/16 RIGHTS OF WAY.

a) **Marwell Wildlife Park.**

The Clerk and Chairman updated the Council on their recent discussions with Dr.Martin Wilkie, Marwell Wildlife Park, about the Park's plans to improve rights of way around Marwell over the next few years.

b) **FP 12 nr to Whiteflood Cottages.**

The Clerk reported that he and Councillor Tull had inspected the entrance to the right of way. The surface required improvement and the Clerk had spoken with the Countryside Department of HCC who had confirmed they had no objection to such work being carried out by the Council. Councillor Tull offered to undertake the necessary work as and when his work commitments allowed.

177/16 OPEN SPACES.

a) **Recording equipment and purchase of camera.**

The Council agreed to consider the matter at its next meeting.

b) **Benches for Recreation Ground.**

Councillor Tull noted the proposed benches were nearly ready for the Council to review for suitability. Accordingly the matter was deferred to the next meeting.

178/16 FINANCE, ADMINISTRATION AND STATUTORY.

a) **Flyer and printing costs.**

The Council **Resolved** unanimously to reimburse the Clerk for money spent on the printing of flyers (delivered to most if not all households in connection with the traffic implications of the Eastleigh local plan) (£97.72), and the printing of material required for the Council meeting (£29).

b) **Payments and receipts.**

The Council approved the following payments and authorised the Chairman and Councillor Phillips to authorise electronic payments as necessary:

Voucher	Amount (£)	Payee	Purpose	
PAYMENTS				
59	322.44	M. Cleary	Net pay October	Electronic
60	17.52	M Cleary	October expenses (0.57 postage, £4.95 travel, £12 stationery).	Electronic
61	214.40	HMRC	October PAYE.	Electronic
62	97.72	M Cleary	Printing cost of flyers for distribution to all homes	Electronic
63	30.20	OPHMC	October room hire	Electronic
64	145.00	S Comley	October grass cutting	Electronic
65	29.00	M Cleary	Printing of material for council meeting (Eastleigh option maps)	Electronic

The Council noted the following receipts:

Amount (£)	Payer	Purpose	
20.00	P Harrison	Use of play area for October	Electronic
0.04	Lloyds	Interest	Electronic
709.56	HMRC	VAT refund	Electronic

c) Estimated outcome for 2016/17 and preliminary budget for 2017/18.

The Council noted the RFO's summary of the likely outcome for 2016/17 and the preliminary budget for 2017/18, and the RFO's comments thereon. The Council agreed to consider the matter at its next meeting.

179/16 CLERK'S REPORT.

The Clerk summarised the progress made on matters determined by Council at previous meetings (Appendix 2).

180/16 ADHERENCE TO CODE OF CONDUCT.

There were no matters the Chairman wished to bring to the Council's attention.

181/16 INFORMATION EXCHANGE AND AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING.

There were no special matters not already identified which Councillors wished to discuss at a future meeting.

182/16 DATE OF NEXT COUNCIL MEETING.

It was agreed the next Council meeting would be held on 12th December 2016 commencing at 7.30pm in the Committee Room.

The meeting closed shortly after 9.30pm

Chairman ...John Chapman.....Date: 12th December 2016

APPENDIX 1: ISSUES ARISING FROM OPTIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL (EBC).

In the light of the number of people attending the Council meeting specifically in connection with the Eastleigh development issues, the Council changed the order of the agenda to allow the matter to be discussed before other Council business. The Council agreed to treat the session as part of the 'public comments' section of the meeting.

The Chairman outlined the concerns the Council, other local councils and the campaign group, Action against Destructive Development (ADD) have in relation to Option B & C currently under consideration by Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC). He stressed that whilst EBC undoubtedly needed new homes, the developments should be in the most appropriate areas. The criteria for major planning developments was set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, and this together with the public consultation already undertaken clearly indicated Option D & E would be distinctly preferable to B & C.

At the request of the Chairman, Emeritus Professor Richard Dale, summarised the main reasons for favouring Options D & E over B & C including:

1. It is a core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning decisions should make the fullest possible use of public transport, thereby reducing greenhouse gases and minimising traffic congestion. Under Options B & C there is no access whatsoever to meaningful public transport, whereas Options D & E would give direct access to the rail network. Options B & C would undoubtedly give rise to significantly more traffic on already congested roads in our area, and lead to yet more misery in Owslebury as people will inevitably use the village as a cut-through.
2. Options D & E would offer easier access to the motorway network, possibly via a new Junction 6 on the M27. Options B & C would involve the construction of a very problematical new road from Allbrook through to Mortimers Lane, just south of Upham with inevitable traffic overflow into the local lanes.
3. Options B & C takes development right up to the border of the South Downs National Park, thereby releasing commuter traffic into this key recreational area.
4. EBC's public consultation showed a strong relative preference for Options D & E as against Options B & C. There was significant opposition to Option B, based among other things on threats to the countryside (including South Downs National Park), traffic congestion and reliance on the private car. There was strong community opposition to Option C on the basis of impact on village character, nature conservation and traffic concerns. In contrast there was relatively balanced support and opposition to Options D & E.
5. EBC appears to be rushing into a preliminary decision at its December 15 meeting without the benefit of a definitive transport assessment, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. The planning decision will have generational consequences for the countryside, village life and the routing of traffic within the region. EBC appears to be over-riding national planning guidelines, local opinion and the urgent need to exploit public transport in favouring the most destructive policy options, namely B & C – options which would have serious consequences for Owslebury.

The Chairman thanked Professor Dale and asked the public for questions and comments. A large number of points were considered including the following:

- a) *Involvement of HCC*: County Councillor Humby explained that HCC was bound to undertake traffic modelling at the request of district authorities, and accordingly it had done so for EBC. It passed no opinion on the modelling – that was a matter for the district council. Once the district council has decided on the option they wished to pursue, the developers and others would put together a detailed transport assessment and plan. At that relatively late stage, HCC would examine the proposals using experts of its own choice and would conclude whether to support, modify or reject the proposals.
- b) *Involvement of SDNPA*: District Councillor Amber Thacker (and Winchester representative on the Park Authority) noted the Park's interest in the matter but that it had no direct powers – only influence. However district authorities had a statutory duty to take into account the national parks objectives and the likely impact on the park. SDNPA had already expressed its views and would do so again when the final selected option is decided upon.

- c) *Access to local MPs and to SDNPA:* the three local MPs were well aware of the concerns being expressed and had made public comments along similar lines to those expressed at the meeting. County Councillor Rob Humby confirmed he had access to the MPs, and district Councillor Amber Thacker confirmed she had direct access to SDNPA.
- d) *If D & E are obvious, why does EBC seem to favour B & C?* - It's not clear why EBC seem to favour B & C when the evidence seems to be in favour of D & E. Concerns were expressed as to the seemingly lack of transparency and to the limited planning officer support within EBC. However, it remained the case EBC may well decide in December to conclude that B & C is its preferred option and work-up a detailed proposal. In order to stop 'the ball rolling' in this direction, ADD and local councils had to be ready to put forward persuasive arguments and evidence that D & E is by far the better options.
- e) *How can EBC favour B & C when the evidence is against those options?* EBC has the right to over-rule local opinion and to some limited extent the national criteria if it can be demonstrated it has put in place sufficient mitigating measures to overcome the concerns. This means ADD and parishes have to be 'on their toes' as to what if any the likely mitigating measures might be.
- f) *Does EBC need so many new houses?* That is a matter for EBC not Owslebury or other parishes. However, it was noted EBC did not appear to be achieving its economic growth target – a question has been raised with EBC as to whether this means the number of new houses can be reduced.
- g) *Impact on house values:* a parishioner noted the likely negative impact on house prices if B & C were to be chosen. The character of the area would change for the worse.
- h) *A potential further problem:* it was noted an even worse situation could develop if EBC did not have an acceptable plan and be able to demonstrate a rolling five year supply of development land. In such a case developers could make bids for pieces of land in whatever area they chose, and the planning approval or otherwise would be determined by an Inspector. Hence the need to persuade EBC it would be sensible to adopt option D & E so as to keep control of development.
- i) *The need for funds:* the Chairman and others noted the need for ADD to have access to the best professional advice – whether consultants or barristers. This would be expensive and there would be a fund raising campaign in the parishes as well as the local councils being asked to support the campaign. Further information as to the fund raising would be provided on the OIS.

APPENDIX 2: CLERK'S REPORT

Action: Recreation Ground	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dragon's teeth to be installed on bank at Recreation Ground. 	PP/GT
<u>Temporary measures taken pending installation of teeth</u>	
Action: Staggs Gate pond	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to review boundaries; 	Clerk
<u>In hand – search arranged and maps being reviewed.</u>	
Action: Bank tree	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to acquire hosepipe – maximum price £15. 	Clerk
<u>Postponed to Spring 2017</u>	
Action: Affordable housing.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to draft memorandum of understanding in relation to current proposed sites and agree with Councillor Tull and Chairman; • Chairman to issue information note on OIS and Newsletter; 	Clerk/JC/ GT
<u>Completed</u>	
Action: SDNPA questionnaire.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to circulate questionnaire for comment; Chair and Clerk to complete on Council's behalf. 	Clerk
<u>Completed</u>	
Action: Traffic management.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Egerton to discuss with school governors and seek their support. • Chairman to write to parents and to parishioners. 	ME/JC/ Clerk
<u>In-hand</u>	
Action: Bridleway from Greenhill to Red Lane	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to inspect and assess. 	Clerk
<u>In hand</u>	
Action: Accidents.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to make further enquiries re Longwood and Hurst lane accidents. 	Clerk
<u>No information forthcoming.</u>	
Action: Cutting programme for 2017.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Tull to identify proposed routes to be included in the cutting programme. 	GT/Clerk
Action: Gate on Glebe field.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to make further enquires. 	Clerk
Action: Local Government Finance.	By Whom:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clerk to submit a response on behalf of the Council 	Clerk
<u>Completed.</u>	