

## HIGHCLERE PARISH COUNCIL

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

Tuesday 09 March 2021 at 7.30pm

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

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

**Clerk:** Amy White

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

**1. 175/20 Apologies for Absence**

No apologies received.

**2. 176/20 Declarations of Interest**

No declarations made.

**3. 177/20 To agree and sign the Minutes of the Council Meetings of 09 February 2021**

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

**4. 178/20 Matters Arising from 09 February 2021**

<b>162/20</b>	Cllr Norton to contact Patrick Hedgeland of HS to garner interest and feedback for the CFI. <b>Actioned</b> - HS newsletter directed members to web page. Clerk to write to Kevin Hyde with current questions listed above. <b>Actioned</b> - see below in CFI item 7	<b>Cllr Norton</b>  <b>Clerk</b>
<b>163/20</b>	Cllr Easton to confirm sign locations with Brian Harling. <b>Not actioned.</b>	<b>Cllr Easton</b>
<b>164/20</b>	Cllr Dierks to purchase 10 footpath markers. <b>Actioned.</b>	<b>Cllr Dierks</b>
<b>165/20</b>	Clerk to send planning objections to relevant case officers at BDBC. <b>Actioned.</b>	<b>Clerk</b>
<b>166/20</b>	Cllr York will ask Colin Wall if HPC can provide an update of the stage the NP is at on the website. <b>Actioned</b> - see item 10	<b>Cllr York</b>
<b>170/20</b>	All councillors to consider their role and to let the Clerk know if they wish to make any changes. <b>Actioned</b> , see item 13	<b>All Cllrs</b>
<b>171/20</b>	Cllrs Dierks and Leeson and the Clerk to consider shared drive options. <b>Actioned</b> , see item 12	<b>Clerk/Cllrs Leeson &amp; Dierks</b>

**5. 179/20 Public Participation**

No members of the public were present.

**6. 180/20 Reports from Borough and County Councillors**

**Cllr Thacker** reported that HCC has completed its budget setting for 21/22, Hampshire still has one of the lowest council taxes in the country.

Cllr Thacker has passed on the issue of the broken manhole cover on Foxs Lane to the HCC Highways engineer.

**Cllr Falconer** reported that the JPP planning application on the Andover Road will go to DCC Committee. BDBC has been allocated money to keep the HWRC facility on Newtown Road.

## 7. Roads and Transport

### **181/20: To decide whether to commit to first stage of Community Funded Initiative**

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

- a. Can we have two new village gateways, not one (or reusing our current one).

The drawings submitted to you (ending with 342) suggest 2 new gateways to be considered north east of Mount road – the final location will be agreed on site. I do believe that having the village gateway signing within close proximity to a speed limit change will have more affect than the speed limit and gateway being far away e.g. the hump bridge. I do not have the answers as to why they are of different size but generally all new installations will have identical gateways either side. For myself I think it is more aesthetically pleasing if village signing is attached to the gateway. For some villages this is not possible due to their name or the minimum available verge space. The 1500 mm size gateway will support this but the 960 mm version will require to be attached to posts. Although a less expensive gateway if you then consider the posts for the signing then it works out dearer than the 1500 mm one plus inevitably in time there will be a the need to replace these posts but as the gateway are plastic these are maintenance free apart from the occasional wash if under trees to returns the gateways back to the original colour (this is an exercise that happens during long term road works where road spray reduces the visibility of the cones so they are required to be washed to ensure maximum visibility is maintained).

- b. Is it possible to not have the 40mph repeater at the humpback bridge, rather a "Welcome to Highclere" and perhaps a Community Speedwatch sign.

For the 40mph speed limit at this location to be enforceable it will be necessary to have 40mph repeater signs erected along the constraints of the speed limit. This will permit the police to consider speed investigations with a view to prosecuting motorists who travel above the prescribed speed limit. By removing this repeater totally there is every possibility that enforcement would not be able to proceed. Whilst the repeater sign can be removed I would like to make you aware that to retain the enforceability of the speed limit a post would have to be erected within close proximity of the gateway. Some time ago there was a government directive requesting every authority to look at ways in reducing the amount of street furniture along its highway network. Today in conforming with this directive the gateway would be used to mount the 40mph repeater, as opposed to adding an additional post within close proximity.to this location. I am happy to add another 40mph repeater on the gateway opposite when travelling away from the village. It will be possible to remove the "Welcome to Highclere" sign at this location for the reasons previously mentioned.

- c. It is possible to get a 3,2,1 countdown signage to the 30mph?

Unfortunately our current signing regulations do not support the concept of using countdown signing for speed limits.

The two gateways proposed at locations 2 and 3 will have the desired effect as you are advising a motorist that:

- a. There is a change in speed limit
- b. The gateways with “Welcome to Highclere” act as an entry to the village

If the gateways are located too far away from the village then they could lose their desired affect (as previously mentioned).

I am happy with the locations for the gateways illustrated in plan view No 3. However the suggested location illustrated on plan view No 2 will have to be confirmed. When restrictions are lifted and site visits are resumed I will re visit site to verify that the proposed location for plan view 2 is suitable. I will be checking the available verge width and visibility when travelling towards the 30/40 speed limit terminal location (Mount Road).

With this final set of information, there were still some outstanding questions, in particular the gateway signage at the north end of the village. Cllr Jenkins agreed to lead this project through to the next stage of implementation. In addition, HPC is also satisfied that it has utilised a number of approaches to engage the public on the project (via Facebook, the website, Twitter and the Highclere Society newsletter) and the feedback received from members of the public were positive. Therefore:

**It was unanimously agreed to proceed with the project.**

It was agreed that HPC needs to be clear who was the contact for future maintenance.

**Action: Clerk to arrange a zoom call with Cllr Jenkins and Kevin Hyde to resolve remaining queries and to move project forward.**

### **182/20 Update on SID**

The SID continues to be working sporadically. Cllr Easton has created some graphs showing high speeds along Foxs Lane. **Move new SID proposals to April meeting.**

HPC has been unable to provide data requested by Highclere Society for a section of road in Highclere.

## **8. Environment**

### **183/20 Footpaths, stiles etc**

Cllr Dierks has bought some basic footpath arrows and the Clerk has placed a few on the path from Pantings Lane to Rookery Farm.

The Clerk has been contacted by a Highclere Parish resident asking about whether it would be possible to reinstall some of the old Rights of Way (RoW) which have fallen into disuse in and around Highclere and Burghclere.

Cllr Leeson is very keen to get involved and will work alongside Cllr Stoker to contact HCC and investigate the re-opening of these RoW.

**Action: Cllr Leeson to investigate feasibility of reopening of Rights of Way**

**9. 184/20 Recent Planning Applications:**

- 21/00618/OOBC 30 Spring Gardens Newbury RG20 0PR- **No comment**
- 21/00465/HSE at Hawkley Cottage Highclere Street Highclere RG20 9QB- **No comment**
- T/00040/21/TPO at 8 Penwood Heights Penwood Highclere- **No comment**
- 21/00341/FUL at Woodlea Deadmoor Lane Burghclere RG20 9DY- **No comment**
- 21/00575/HSE at Hylands Mount Road Highclere RG20 9QZ- **No comment**

**10. 185/20 Neighbourhood Plan update**

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

Cllr York has sent to Colin Wall some ideas for adding a website update for HPC’s site as it was felt there should be some more engagement and updates to the community.

**Action: Clerk to ask Colin Wall for updates on NP for website**

**11. 186/20 Broadband update**

Cllr Norton has received an outline cost from Openreach. What is unclear is whether the upcoming new voucher scheme in April (HPC is covered within this new scheme) will cover the costs per household. Cllr Norton has asked Openreach whether he can apply for all of the vouchers as a single point of contact, rather than individual households having to do it. More questions were raised regarding the feasibility of the installation and real costs.

**Action: Cllr Norton to clarify the voucher scheme with the contact at Openreach.**

**187/20 website update**

The Broadband discussion led to the Council discussing whether to upgrade the current free website. Positives include increased functionality with a paid-for website. Costs need to be considered; it was thought approx. £2k per year would provide all HPC needed for functionality.

**Action: Cllrs Dierks and Leeson to investigate website upgrade for the next meeting.**

**12. 188/20 Shared drive for councillors update**

The Clerk has moved all HPC documents over from OneDrive to Dropbox.

**13. Financial Matters**

**189/20 Accounts for Payment, March:**

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

Date incurred	Expenditure	Purpose	£ Ex VAT	£ VAT	£ Total	Payment Method
06/03/2021	Premier Grounds	SID movement from Dec 20-Mar 21	210.00	42.00	252.00	online
09/03/2021	HMRC PAYE	Clerk Tax & NI			254.88	online
23/12/2020	Cllr Expenses	Cllr Dierks footpath signs	25.10	5.02	30.12	online
27/01/2020	Litter Warden Salary	March Salary			432.64	online

11/01/2020	Litter Warden Expenses	Travel expenses for February	13.95		13.95	online
27/01/2020	Clerk's Salary	March Salary			763.60	online
11/01/2020	Clerk's Expenses	ionos mail storage (Jan) and Zoom.Pro (Feb), ICO re-registration	56.99	3.40	60.39	online
<b>Total</b>					<b>1555.58</b>	

**Bank Balance as at**

**09/03/2021:**

**Community Account: £2422.84**

**Business Account: £47242.71**

**190/20** The Clerk presented the 2021/22 budget for approval.

**The council unanimously agreed to accept the budget.** This is shown as a separate document on the [minutes page](#).

**14. 191/20 Councillor Roles and Responsibilities**

Councillors discussed their roles, and the following is the agreed responsibility list:

**Footpath projects:** Cllrs Lesson, Stoker

**Website:** Cllrs Dierks, Leeson, Smith

**Environment:** Cllr Dierks, Cllr Jenkins

**Planning:** Cllr Jenkins, Cllr Stoker, Cllr York

**Roads:** SID, speedwatch- Cllr Easton, Cllr Smith

**Finance:** Cllrs Norton, Stoker, Jenkins, York

All councillor responsibilities will be updated on the website.

**15. 192/20 Correspondence/ Clerk update**

The clerk reported no other correspondence other than the contact from a Highclere Parishioner regarding footpaths.

**16. 193/20 Items to carry forward to next meeting**

- CFI
- Openreach Broadband
- SID upgrade proposals
- Parish Assembly date

The meeting finished at 10pm.

**17. 194/20 Date of the next Council Meeting: 13 April 2021**

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Actions from March Meeting

<b>163/20</b>	Cllr Easton to confirm sign locations with Brian Harling.	<b>Cllr Easton</b>
<b>181/20</b>	Clerk to arrange a zoom call with Cllr Jenkins and Kevin Hyde to move project forward.	<b>Clerk/Cllr Jenkins</b>
<b>183/20</b>	Cllr Leeson to investigate feasibility of reopening of Rights of Way	<b>Cllr Leeson</b>
<b>185/20</b>	Clerk to ask Colin Wall for updates on NP for website	<b>Clerk</b>
<b>186/20</b>	Cllr Norton to clarify the voucher scheme with the contact at Openreach.	<b>Cllr Norton</b>
<b>187/20</b>	Cllrs Dierks and Leeson to investigate website upgrade for the next meeting.	<b>Cllrs Dierks, Leeson</b>

## Update from Colin Wall, Neighbourhood Plan, March 2021

### Highclere Neighbourhood Plan – Progress update – March 9<sup>th</sup> 2021

Since our last report in February we have received the draft of the Housing Needs Analysis from AECOM, reviewed its contents and sent our views back to AECOM along with factual corrections. As of March 4<sup>th</sup> we have also now received and agreed their revisions and expect the final version in due course, when it can be added to other documentation on the PC website.

Five issues arose from the Report and were discussed with the Wider Group on February 25<sup>th</sup> :

- Housing Requirement Quantity – it was agreed that any imposition of a requirement on Highclere was likely to be 10 or 20 (over the plan period) even if an SPB was imposed by B&D (see below). It was implicit that although there was a definite possibility of a zero requirement, the Plan should contain strong directive policies to influence location and mix.
- Affordable Housing – discussion centred on whether AH was viable in Highclere, and how it might be brought forward. This section of the HNA was less useful because it's assumptions about the demographics of affordability, the data used as the calculation basis and relevance to Highclere. A cross-Parish or cross-NP initiative could have legs but a definitive AH policy in the NP was not only untenable, but the requisite, probably lengthy negotiation with others at very different stages of NP development would have a damaging effect on our own progress.
- Type, Size and Mix – this section of the HNA came in for the most criticism from the Group who agreed that it was neither realistic nor useful. The NP needs policies encouraging a greater proportion of smaller (2-3 bed) properties regardless of development size. Policies should lean fairly heavily against any preponderance of four- and more-bedroomed properties, but we would need advice on exactly how they would best be framed.

- Housing for Older People – this section proved quite useful in taking the Group very quickly away from any thought of likely policies encouraging any sort of assisted or sheltered living. It was agreed to focus policies in this area on new/converted dwellings built to the optional building regulation standards M4(2) and M4(3) which focus on accessible and adaptable homes and wheelchair-user homes respectively.
- Settlement Policy Boundary – it was agreed that an SPB could be a good or a bad thing. A single, contiguous SPB would be impossible, and contentious to design. In that light it was agreed to continue to investigate the possibility of imposing an SPB on Highclere with the support of PlanET and in consultation with B&D.

Also discussed at that meeting were how to move forward on the overall NP Programme. It was agreed that we would begin with a number of workstreams in parallel and using our consultants, PlanET :

- Local Green Spaces – PlanET have asked for a list and map of possible green spaces and a map of and photos from valued viewpoints. All contributions welcome.
- PlanET will take our current Draft NP and work on translating the Objectives and Policies into a form which will pass inspection. This will still be at Draft level.
- PlanET will work on developing a Community Questionnaire designed to further test the validity of the Objectives and Policies and provide evidence for us to use to modify them in line with Community views.

PlanET have offered to undertake Site Assessments and this would attract further specific Grant funding. They have also suggested that they could draw up a Design Code rather than the NP have policies on the topic, which are apparently notoriously difficult to frame effectively. This would also attract specific extra Grant funding. We have agreed that these could both be attractive options taken up in due course.

In response to a request from the PC we are creating an NP Progress Page to be posted and updated on the PC website.