

FOUR MARKS PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Full Council Meeting
Held on Wednesday 5th August 2020, commencing at 7.20pm
Held remotely via Zoom video conferencing**

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Cllr Janet Foster (Chairman) Cllrs Neil Bonter, John Davis, John Hammond, Shaun McCarthy, Mike Sanders, Bryan Timms, Simon Thomas and Anne Tomlinson
IN ATTENDANCE:	Sarah Goudie, Executive Officer (EO) Two members of the public
APOLOGIES:	Cllr Tim Brake Jo Tsigarides District Councillor May District Councillor Tennyson

20.101 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chairman welcomed the Councillors and members of public to the meeting, briefing all attendees on how the meeting would proceed. The Chairman then invited items for discussion under the open session.

20.102 OPEN SESSION - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The EO raised the request from a local shop proprietor to host an event at Oak Green to promote local businesses. As the event is proposed for September, there is no time to add it to a future Agenda, so asked for comments in this forum so a timely response can be given.

In principle all Councillors are supportive of any initiative that will promote local businesses, however there are several factors that need to be taken into consideration, the comments were as follows:

- Can the event be held safely and appropriate social distancing followed?
- Concern over the safety of having a barbecue in this location
- What would the impact be on other businesses adjacent to the event? Would they be involved and if not, would this affect their custom?
- There is a legal community order in place that prevents the consumption of alcohol in open spaces within the village, would a special licence need to be granted? Would alcohol be sold or handed out as 'tasters'?
- Is the seating area large enough to accommodate up to 30 people safely, could a portion of the car park be cordoned off for the event to allow the public to safely use the seating area not involved in the event?
- The event must be fully risk assessed before the event and sent to the Parish Council.
- Would the event be insured by the host?

It was agreed that there were a number of questions that needed to be asked, and the EO agreed to respond accordingly.

Cllr Thomas, following events that had unfurled on social media over the weekend, with reference to the closure of the outside seating area at the fff brewery, he wished to clarify the following:

- The licensee closed their outside area themselves, there was no order to do so by EHDC
- The situation has been misrepresented on social media
- This is an ongoing compliance issue. Since November 2018, District Councillor Thomas has been involved and working with the Licensee together with Legal Services and Licensing to try and find a way to work together to open the area without disruption to neighbouring properties.
- As this is a legal situation, all Councillors are advised not to comment on any social media posts or become involved in this ongoing and sensitive issue.

There were no further issues to raise, the Chairman closed the open session and opened the formal meeting at 7.40pm. Standing Orders were applied.

20.103 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Brake, the apology was noted and accepted. Apologies were also received from District Councillors May and Tennyson and Jo Tsigarides

20.104 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman reminded all Councillors of their obligation to declare any declarations of either pecuniary or personal interest in any Agenda items.

There were no declarations of interest.

20.105 COUNCIL MINUTES

It was RESOLVED to approve the Minutes of the remote Full Council Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 15th July 2020 following proposal by Cllr Thomas and seconded by Cllr Davis and agreed by all Councillors as a true reflection of the meeting and would be signed by the Chairman at the next meeting held in person.

It was RESOLVED to approve the Minutes of the remote Extraordinary Full Council Committee Meeting held on Monday 27th July 2020 following proposal by Cllr Timms and seconded by Cllr and agreed by all Councillors as a true reflection of the meeting and would be signed by the Chairman at the next meeting held in person.

Matters arising:

Cllr Timms asked if, when the EO sends out emails with multiple attachments, that the number of attachments is clearly identified, which was acknowledged and agreed.

The monitoring of the children's play area since opening. This had been briefly raised at the previous Open Spaces meeting and concerns had been raised over the appropriateness of Councillors patrolling the area. Cllr Foster and Tomlinson would be looking at all the patrol logs and assess them and whether any action needed to be taken, the only breaches noted currently were the taking of food and drinks into the area despite signage. It was agreed, however, that the EO should order some new FMPC hi viz tabards as soon as possible, so any Councillors on parish business would be easily identifiable.

20.106 PARISH COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO THE APPLICATION FOR THE ALTON MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY

Cllr Thomas, summarising the situation to date, confirmed that both Damian Hinds MP and Jeremy Hunt MP, and County Councillor Mark Kemp Gee have formally submitted their objections. The applicant has only, to date, issued one press release.

The Council had previously deliberated this application, and the following comments were noted, as below from all discussions, which are subsequently summarised for submission as a formal response to the planning application.

- Although acknowledging and agree with the purpose of the facility, it is in the wrong place and not near the sources of the waste. The scale is no appropriate for the rural setting
- There is already a facility at Basingstoke and the safety record is concerning
- If the rubbish is created within the vicinity then the burden and support should remain locally, however this is commercial waste and retail waste from other areas and is just shifting the problem from one area to another. The increase in vehicle movements to and from the vicinity will be unacceptable in every regard. The job creation figure is deceptive as the facility will employ less people than are employed now.
- The proposal is against HCC's own policies; the local villages cannot take the excessive vehicle movements, and detrimentally effect climate change, no protection of landscape
- Carbon emissions produced by additional lorry movements goes against the declared climate emergency
- The site is less than a mile from the SDNP, the proposal would have a detrimental affect on the landscape
- No benefit to locals from power source.
- HCC rejected the site in their own Minerals and Waste Plan
- Similar facilities of the M40/A34 sit quite comfortably in open countryside, this proposal is situated in a valley

Formal Response

Four Marks Parish Council strongly object to this application, as follows:

Landscape

The proposal is less than one mile from the South Downs National Park, this proposal will adversely affect the landscape with an unacceptable visual impact, and unsympathetic to its surroundings due to its height, scale and massing and visually intrusive. Although noting that the proposal is in a valley, the proposal will still be highly visible from all aspects.

Need

Whilst the Parish Council support the avoidance of landfill and acknowledge the purpose of the facility, with three similar facilities in Hampshire, and none in Surrey, with none over capacity, why is there a proposal for a fourth? The facility should be sited nearer the source of the waste in the South of Hampshire.

Waste

The waste is proposed to be retail and commercial from areas such Southampton and Portsmouth. It is not locally produced residential (or retail/commercial) waste, and so there is no benefit to the local residents whatsoever. There is no replacement recycling facility proposed, therefore we question how will Hampshire County Council meet their recycling targets, which they are already well short of, even after a 10% unilaterally reduced 2020 target to 50%?

Excessive Vehicle movements

The described additional vehicle movements, through local villages, on the A31 and A32 would be unacceptable, having a significant extra effect with additional pollution and particulates, against adopted HCC, EHDC and FMPC policies on the battling of the climate emergency.

Safety

Safety of the local community is of grave concern, particularly as the Basingstoke facility has a worrying safety record. The height of the masts will affect local air patterns, air traffic control will need to be consulted to ensure air traffic is re-routed safely.

Power and Heat generation

There are no proposals or infrastructure planned for the local communities to benefit from the power or heat generated to offset the inconvenience, negative impacts, and disruptions of having the facility in the near vicinity.

Conflict with Planning Policies

This proposal is against Policies 5, 10 and 13 of Hampshire County Council's own Mineral and Waste Plan (HW&MP) 2013, and against East Hampshire District Council's Local Plan Joint Core Strategy (EHDC-JCS) Policy CP29

a) HW&MP

Policy 5 : the proposed ERF plant in what is effectively open countryside is contrary to Policy 5 (Protection of the countryside) as it would not relate to countryside activities or require a countryside or isolated location, or provide a suitable reuse of previously developed land, having regard to the significant adverse impacts on the countryside as described above.

Policy 10 : the proposal does not comply with Policy 10 (Protecting public health, safety and amenity) as the development would cause unacceptable visual impact in the area, and unacceptable loss of tranquility especially in the villages of Bentley, Holybourne, Froyle, Wyck, and Binstead.

Policy 13 : the proposal will cause unacceptable negative visible impact contrary to Policy 13 (High-quality design of minerals and waste development), and would not maintain or enhance the distinctive character of the landscape; nor would it protect a Valued Landscape (as identified by CPRE Hampshire), contrary to para 170(a) of the NPPF

Policy 29 : for the same reason, the proposal does not comply with Policy 29 (Locations and sites for waste management) as the scale of the proposed plant would not be compatible with the setting of the Site, which accordingly cannot be considered "suitable".

b) EHDC-JCS

Policy CP20 - for these reasons above the proposal does not comply with Policy CP20, in any conservation of the special characteristics of the District's natural environment, notably in relation to local distinctiveness, sense of place and tranquility.

20.107 TIME FRAME FOR CHANGING FROM REMOTE TO PHYSICAL MEETINGS

Cllr Thomas had asked for the Council to consider a time frame for moving back to physical meetings.

The EO reminded Councillors that it is not lawful to have meetings that can potentially exclude the public from attending.

Current guidance indicates that up to 30 can meet indoors from different households, and whilst it is unlikely that 20 people wish to attend a meeting, the probability needs to be catered for, and the Council cannot turn people away because it is not deemed safe.

Dorset unitary looked at holding their Annual meeting in September as a hybrid and sought legal advice, which was 'to continue with virtual only meetings as the law states you can only hold face to face or hybrid meetings if it is impossible to conduct your business any other way. Provided enough members can join to be quorate that is enough'

Both HALC and SLCC are also advising to stick to remote meetings where possible.

There are only a handful of Councils who have met in person, and this was only because they were unable to use a remote system due to lack of broadband.

After a brief discussion and taking the current situation into consideration, it was unanimously RESOLVED to continue meeting remotely until such time as Government issue different guidance.

20.108 NEXT MEETING:

Wednesday 16th September 2020

20.109 The Chairman closed the meeting at 20.30