

***Minutes of an Extra-ordinary PUBLIC meeting of Burghclere Parish Council held on  
18th September 2019 at 7.30pm at the Portal Hall***

**Present:** Cllrs R Carrow (Chair), G Morton, R Butler, S Whiting, A Crowley, I Collins  
S Jones (Clerk), 117 members of the public.

**1. Open the meeting and introduction**

Purpose – the Parish Council will be providing a formal response to BDBC and need the views of the residents. The meeting is vital to ensure all residents know that the Parish Council will represent their combined views.

Cllrs James and Canning were unable to attend and sent their apologies.

Cllr Carrow introduced himself and advised he is also Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan committee. He introduced the Parish Council and ran through health and safety details. He advised Falcon are unable to attend the meeting.

Cllr Carrow advised the purpose of the meeting was to provide a response to BDBC that reflected the views of the public. Borough Cllr Izett was also unable to attend the meeting but would like to know the outcome and response from the public meeting.

**2. Falcon Developments Proposal**

Cllr Carrow advised in their absence, he would present the information from Falcon Developments, which he did as per the attached report.

He advised comments needs to be back to BDBC by 28<sup>th</sup> September and so far, 48 individual responses have been sent.

**3. Discussion and Questions**

Cllr Carrow opened the floor to the residents for their questions:

The first questions related to the developer and who it might be? Cllr Carrow advised Vivid have been mentioned but there is nothing definite at this stage.

In Cllr Carrow's opinion, is 35 properties a real expectation or is that likely to change? Cllr Carrow advised there are 2 documents that suggest the site is suitable for up to 60 houses, both of which are in the public domain, but they are the only documents that make reference to more than 35.

Concerns were expressed about the effect of any development on landscape and views, as well as its proximity to the Grade 2 listed Church of Ascension. Other concerns were expressed about the size of the development. It was noted that the SHELAA recorded up to 60 houses could be placed on the site and that one of the planning documents referred to 50 houses. Likewise mention of 'partial development' by Falcon inferred more could be applied for at a later date, as there seemed to be more space available than that displayed on the plans. Several parishioners expressed worries about increased traffic through Harts Lane and on the state of roads, and how much construction traffic would be involved and for how long, and the disruption this would potentially cause. The poor state of the sewage in and around the village that has been a problem in the past and would be exacerbated by any new development was also highlighted by several people. Cllr Carrow acknowledged these and said steps had

already been taken to engage with Thames Water, whose contribution to the proposed development appeared complacent.

Schooling was also raised and impact on the school with the increased numbers of pupils that could result from the proposed development.

The Chair explained the differences between what the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was trying to achieve with community support and how this development would potentially undermine its efforts; indeed even put at risk its support at referendum. He noted that at present the NP was at Regulation 14 stage and for B&DBC to take it into account (carry sufficient weight) it needed to progress to the culmination of Regulation 16 as quickly as possible. The consideration of the application by the planning officer was also considered and what options were open to the Development Control Committee.

The open Q&A session was closed by Cllr Carrow

**4. Summary of key points raised**

Cllr Carrow summarized that the meeting had addressed the processes for both Falcon Developments and the Neighbourhood Plan, the application that has gone in, the importance of the Neighbourhood Plan and also that Thames Water have provided a ‘complacent’ response to what is one of the crucial factors in the application.

**5. Vote by show of hands**

The residents were then asked to vote by show of hands for their agreement or disagreement to the proposal planning:

The results were, of the 117 people though the door:

7 left before the vote took place

0 voted in favour

1 abstained from voting

109 voted against

**6. Consideration of the outcome by Cllrs, including consultant support**

Cllr Carrow thanked Cllrs for their time at the meeting.

He advised he felt the meeting was balanced and Falcon’s view had been put across in spite of them not attended to meeting.

Cllrs all expressed surprise at the turn out and commented that it reflects the strength of feeling relating to this planning application.

Cllrs also noted that there were 0 votes in support of the application, and 109 against.

In response, Cllr Carrow proposes that a letter be written to BDBC explaining the meeting took place and the outcome, issues raised and concerns of the residents. The points to emphasize are:

- Traffic both in terms of increase through the village and disruption/damage caused by lorries and construction vehicles throughout the village.
- The proposed development is next to a Grade 2 list building
- Disruption to the landscape and views in this AONB
- School places will be impacted with the small schools possibly struggling with larger pupil numbers
- Foul water – this continues to be a problem within the village already and development will only increase the problem. History has shown with previous

developments that despite advises that the water issue would be resolved, this has not happened and the water and raw sewage leak into the road at present. A new development would only increase this issue.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.00pm.

Chairman \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_