

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
SWALLOWFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
HELD ON TUESDAY 10TH MARCH 2020
IN THE ROSE ROOM, SWALLOWFIELD PARISH HALL,
SWALLOWFIELD STREET, SWALLOWFIELD AT 7.30PM

Present: Cllr. J. Anderson (Chairman) Cllr. M. Binns Cllr C. Drew
 Cllr. A. King Cllr. M. McDonald Cllr. J. Wheelwright

In attendance: Liz Halson (Clerk)

Members of the public: 4

2065 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr. Collender, Cllr. Dance

2066 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

2067 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

*NB: this is not a verbatim account of the questions and answers but information is provided to give a flavour of what was said.

2067.1 Resident – I am here to ask the Parish Council to object in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of the land west of Basingstoke Road in the Central and East Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan. I am speaking on behalf of many local residents who demonstrated their objection by attending the public meeting we held on 19th of February. 200 people attended the meeting and more watched the live stream on Facebook. Many people have offered assistance to deliver leaflets and help residents complete their objections on line. There have been a significant number of responses already submitted to Hampshire County Council. Why should you object? We have detailed the reasons in the leaflet which has now been delivered to over 3,000 houses. In summary; a) air pollution, the site is 370m from Lambs Lane School, particles can travel up to 400m and with prevailing wind will carry further, the pre-school at Swallowfield Parish Hall is only 750m away, b) noise pollution, c) access is on a dangerous bend by the Mill House, it will be impossible for large vehicles to join the B3349 without crossing the central white lines, d) flooding, the site is prone to flooding and the inevitable hardstanding will push water elsewhere, e) ecology, the site is home to a range of flora and fauna and the River Loddon Site of Special Scientific Interest runs along the southern edge of the site, f) archaeology, the site is an Area of High Archaeological Potential with a WW2 pillbox and nearby Sheepbridge Court which is a Scheduled Monument.

Cllr. Munro – a survey undertaken in 1980 indicates that there is no gravel or sand on the site.

Resident – two recent public enquiries in to land at Lambs Lane and Beech Hill referred to the importance of the landscape in this area. The visual impact of this proposal will be extremely detrimental to the landscape.

2067.2 Local Plan Update

Cllr. Munro – there was a very well attended consultation meeting in Grazeley, over 200 people attended and the overwhelming opinion is that they don't want the Grazeley Development.

Cllr. McDonald – should the Grazeley proposal not go ahead are there other options which will stop development on smaller inappropriate sites in the borough?

Cllr. Munro – yes, WBC are considering other options.

2068 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

2068.1 Councillor Vacancy – it was **NOTED** that there is a vacancy for a Parish Councillor, this vacancy may now be filled in accordance with Rule 8 of the Local Elections (Parishes and Communities) Rules 1986 and eligible persons may now be co-opted. Anyone interested should contact the Clerk or any member of the Parish Council.

Anyone interested in becoming a councillor should contact the Clerk or any member of the council.

The council expects to be in a position to co-opt a new councillor at the April meeting.

2069 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

2069.1 It was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 11th February 2020 be approved. All in favour. ¹

2070 CLERKS REPORT

2070.1 Update on items from previous meetings

2070.1.1 2048.2.3 Green Food Waste Bags – it was **NOTED** that Cllrs Anderson and Dance and Clerk met with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC). WBC explained that food caddy bags were not delivered with the blue bags as not all residents partake in the scheme. WBC recognised that it was not feasible for the parish office to supply residents and agreed to find other outlets. It is understood that The Parish Stores and Riseley Village Tea Room would now stock bags and that a resident in Riseley would assist with delivery to those people who cannot collect bags.

2070.1.2 2053.1 Rural Crime Action Group – it was **NOTED** that we have not received any formal notifications regarding meetings of this group.

2070.1.3 2055.2 Emergency Lighting – it was **NOTED** that remedial work on the emergency lighting at Riseley Memorial Hall would be carried out at a cost of £196 plus VAT. ²

2070.1.4 2056.1.1 Replacement for the children's bench – it was **NOTED** that installation of this

¹ JA

² Clerk

piece of equipment had been delayed due to the Coronavirus pandemic.

2070.1.5 2057.2 Loddon Reach Contribution – it was **NOTED** that Graham Stanley composed a piece for the April edition. No decision was made on an author for the May edition. ³

2070.2 Other Items

2070.2.1 Swallowfield Parish Hall Toilets in Pre-school area – it was **NOTED** that there are issues with the toilets in the Pre-school area, neither cistern is refilling at an acceptable rate and the ballcock needs to be replaced in one of them. ⁴

2070.2.2 Foul Water Drainage – it was **NOTED** that there are issues with the foul water drainage from the hall which is affecting toilets in the pre-school area, atrium and those next to the office. The drains had been cleaned with a high-pressure jet washer 16m into the road, but this had not relieved the problem. Thames Water attended in the early hours of Monday morning and reported that there is no blockage and left a message saying that the pumping station was overloaded due to heavy rain. The Clerk had escalated with Thames Water as this is recurring problem exacerbated by new houses not just the heavy rainfall.

2071 PLANNING

Chairman of Planning Committee: Cllr. J. Wheelwright

2071.1 Consultations

2071.1.1 The Central and East Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan – Cllr. Wheelwright presented his paper outlining the reasons on which he felt the council should object to the inclusion of the land west of Basingstoke Road in the Central and East Joint Minerals and Waste Plan. Councillors discussed each point and agreed that the points made were excellent, the following suggestions were made; reference should be made to the Arborfield proposal, it was more suitable yet it was withdrawn so why was this site now being considered, it is a poor substitute, it can't be economically viable and certainly not worth the pain it will cause local residents and the environment, Great Crested Newts should be added to the item on wildlife, reference should be made to the survey carried out in 1980 which indicated that the site did not contain sufficient sand and gravel. ⁵

It was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the council would respond as detailed in Cllr. Wheelwright's proposal with the addition of the comments above. All in favour. ⁶ See page 2020/681 for details.

Cllr. McDonald thank Cllr. Wheelwright for the work required to prepare this proposal and for his address at the public meeting which she felt showed residents that the council was taking its response the consultation seriously.

2071.1.2 Local Plan Update – Cllr. Wheelwright explained that WBC should be commended for producing such a thoughtful, responsible and diligent draft document. However, he expressed concern that some of the wording was vague and could lead to potential

³ JA to identify someone

⁴ Clerk

⁵ JW would reference the report which would be forwarded by a resident

⁶ JW to forward updated proposal/Clerk to submit

disputes. Developers would be able to find ways around caveats and it would be difficult to enforce. It would be hard to call out policies when looking to justify objections to planning applications. He also felt that as it will cover a period up to 2036 it might need to be updated to reflect forthcoming central government legislation and policies.

Cllr. Wheelwright explained that the report highlighted “valued green spaces”, none of which were in our parish, this is because we do not have a Neighbourhood Plan. He recommended that the council look at the possibility of producing such a plan.

It was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the council responded as detailed in the document circulated by Cllr. Wheelwright including the comments submitted by Cllr Anderson. All in favour. ⁷ See page 2020/682 for details.

2071.2 Current applications – for details see page 2020/685

2071.2.1 200371 - Glasspool Farm, Part Lane, Riseley RG7 1RU No comment
2071.2.2 200469 - Fairlands, Church Road, Farley Hill RG7 1TU No comment

2071.3 Results – for details see page 2020/686

2071.3.1 200243 - Glasspool Farm Part Lane Riseley RG7 1RU Approved
2071.3.2 200254 – Twitchen, Odiham Road, Riseley RG7 1SD Approved

2072 FINANCE

(Budgets/investments/sinking fund/grants/risk assessments/insurance)

Lead Councillor: Cllr. J. Anderson

2072.1 Accounts

2072.1.1 Month End Accounts – it was **NOTED** that the Month End Accounts had been circulated. It was **PROPOSED** and seconded that these are accepted. All in favour.

2072.1.2 Bank Reconciliation Statements – it was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the Bank Reconciliation Statements be signed. All in favour. ⁸

2073 BILLS FOR PAYMENT

2073.1 Bills List – it was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the bills as listed below be **APPROVED** for payment. It was **NOTED** that items 7 & 8 should be rejected as the supplier had notified the council of a change to their bank account details (last item on the Unity Trust list). ⁹ The two invoices would be re-entered by the Clerk and should be approved. ¹⁰ On line payments would be authorised by Cllrs. Anderson and Wheelwright. All in favour. ¹¹

1	NH Electrical	660.00
2	Deposit Refund	100.00
3	Loddon Reach	213.00

⁷ JW/Clerk

⁸ JA

⁹ JA

¹⁰ Clerk

¹¹ JA/JW

4	TV Licencing	154.50
5	Mrs K U Luke	78.00
6	Moorepay	52.08
7	Patrick Parsons	900.00
8	Patrick Parsons	1200.00
9	Calico Trust	250.00
10	Grundon	110.87
11	Grundon	135.50
12	Wokingham BC	270.00
13	GLS	57.59
14	GLS	53.27
15	Arborfield Tree Care	240.00
16	Lucas Plumbing and Heating	463.97
17	Lucas Plumbing and Heating	360.90
18	Crown Gas & Power	607.39
19	Southern Electric	11.36
20	Direct Debit (HMRC PAYMENTS)	596.49
21	Direct Debit (CASTLE WATER) - TW9215892362	51.49
22	Direct Debit (CASTLE WATER) - TW2836480081	54.05
23	BACS Charge	17.12
24	Payroll - January	5069.79
25	Lloyds Bank (Alto Card)	503.25
26	PWLB-Loan Repayment	9824.18
27	Maintenance	21.75
28	Mileage	18.00

2074 PROPERTY

(Fieldfare, Halls, Land)

Lead Councillor: Cllr. J. Anderson

2074.1 Parish Stores – it was **NOTED** that the solicitor had updated the side letters with the information agreed at the last meeting ready for issue.

It was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the solicitor be instructed to proceed to completion and the Clerk would sign the letters and seal the lease when required by the solicitor. All in favour. ¹²

2074.2 Car Park Update – it was **NOTED** that the consultant had been asked to prepare costings for installation of security barriers at the front of the car park prior to the rest of the work starting.

2074.3 Swallowfield Parish Hall Upgrade Update – it was **NOTED** that the architect would be sending revised drawings to the council by the end of the week. Meetings would then take place with key groups of users. ¹³

¹² Clerk

¹³ Property/Halls Working Group

2074.4 Riseley Sports Pavilion – it was **NOTED** that, following the report of roof leaks in several parts of the building, emergency work was required to repair the roof. This would be carried out by S. A. Taylor & Sons at a cost of £1,250 plus VAT.

2074.5 Swallowfield Recreation Ground – it was **NOTED** that for health and safety broken branches had to be removed from one of the tall pine trees in the Natural Play area at a cost of £200 plus VAT.

2075 ENVIRONMENT

(The Marshes/Van Demans/Swallowfield Meadow/Community/Orchard/
Biodiversity/Footpaths/Waste/NAG/RCAG)

Lead Councillor: Cllr. A. King

2075.1 Riseley Green – Cllr. King explained that residents were raising money to purchase and install a bench in memory of Mr. P. Oram. They would like to place it on Riseley Green where the bus stops. It was agreed that in principle the council had no objection, however, given that there is s106 money set aside for bus shelters in Riseley the site of any bench would have to be agreed once the site of the bus stop had been determined and Riseley Green may not be the most appropriate place.

It was **PROPOSED** and seconded that the council allow a bench to be installed somewhere in Riseley, the site to be **AGREED** with the council and that residents would be asked to take responsibility for its maintenance. All in favour.

2076 RESILIENCE

(Flooding/ditches/rivers/Flood Resilience Group (FRG))

Lead Councillor: Cllr. A. King

2076.1 Spillway Project Update – it was **NOTED** that in spite of the recent poor weather, the spillway contractor had progressed the work on site. Topsoil had been stripped and the base of the channel had been excavated and graded along its whole length. Excavation of the side slopes had progressed where possible, but the ground remains saturated and it was not sensible to continue further with this work. The contractor had therefore advised that, following completion of the inlet pipework and edge beam, they would not be able to complete further work until the ground dried out. It was hoped that work would restart on Monday 16th March.

2076.2 FRG – it was **NOTED** that Cllr. King had met with members of the FRG to discuss what had led to the flooding in the parish at the end of February, particularly Part Lane, Basingstoke Road outside Lambs Farm House and Church Road which were all still experiencing problems. Cllr. King would be contacting WBC to discuss what could be done. ¹⁴

2077 HALLS

(Maintenance/website/involvement with users/Marketing and Entertainment Groups)

Lead Councillor: Cllr. M. McDonald

¹⁴ AK

2077.1 Swallowfield Parish Hall – it was **NOTED** that hall users had been sent a letter reminding them not to touch the thermostats on the radiators as the heating system will not work properly if these are removed.

2078 RECREATION

(Play areas/skateboard park/recreation grounds/football pitches/mpg court)

Lead Councillor: Cllr. W. Dance

2078.1 Playground Inspections

2078.1.1 January 2020 Quarterly Report – it was **NOTED** that this report had been reviewed and work on items identified had started.

Surfacing in the Natural Play area – it was **PROPOSED** and seconded that bark chippings are purchased at a cost of £645 plus VAT. All in favour. ¹⁵

2078.1.2 Renewal of Contractor – it was **PROPOSED** and seconded that Reading Borough Council be engaged to carry out quarterly playground inspections on the play equipment owned by Swallowfield Parish Council at Swallowfield, Riseley and Farley Hill a cost of £348.92 plus VAT. All in favour. ¹⁶

2078.1.3 Annual Playground Inspection – it was **PROPOSED** and seconded that The Play Inspection Company be engaged to carry out an Annual Playground Inspection on all play equipment owned by Swallowfield Parish Council at Swallowfield, Riseley and Farley Hill at a cost of £258.50 plus VAT. All in favour. ¹⁷

2079 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Swallowfield Parish Council will be held on Tuesday 14th April 2020 at 7.30 p.m. in the Rose Room, Swallowfield

[The meeting closed at 9:23pm]

¹⁵ Clerk

¹⁶ Clerk

¹⁷ Clerk

DETAILS

2071.1.1 Central and East Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan

Swallowfield Parish Council strongly OBJECTS to the inclusion of the land west of Lambs Lane, Swallowfield in this proposal for the following reasons:

- The site is highly visible from the road and footpath and this development would cause a loss of visual amenity
- The site is a landscape of distinctive character which would be lost
- The site is part of the Green Gap between Spencers Wood and Swallowfield which would be lost, removing the important separate identities of these settlements
- There is a huge risk this will become a brownfield development after the site has finished operating
- The site is close to the school, a nursery, housing and a restaurant and hotel all of which will be impacted by the noise and dust generated during operation
- HGV movements. The site is small at 25ha but it would operate at the same rate as the proposal for Bridge Farm, Arborfield, as that had a single extractor which generated 100s HGV movements a day. This represents a huge increase in the percentage of HGVs on this stretch of road.
- There is no access point to the site that is safe with good visibility spays and the roads are not suitable to carry this traffic
- The site borders the highly sensitive Loddon SSSI. Even working the site with a buffer zone to the river, flash storms could easily wash site material into the river harming wildlife. There is real concern of pollution of the river and leeching from the “inert” materials used in backfill once the site working life has completed
- The site is part of a sensitive ecosystem. The University of Reading identified how rivers act as corridors for wildlife. This development would have extensive and far reaching impacts on wildlife along the river – not just at this location. Strategies to try and work around this are not practical as the site is directly beside the river.
- Loddon Pondweed grows in the river downstream and the site is a haven for birdlife. It is an important local bird habitat for linnets and redwings and a foraging area for barn owls and bats. There is badger activity on the site and traces of otters and great crested newts
- The site is close to ancient woodland which is sensitive to air quality and will be impacted by the development
- Site is too small and uneconomic versus the environmental impact extraction on site would have
- Loss of the amenity of the footpath during development
- The mineral survey from 1980 showed that there was site was not viable for mineral extraction. This hasn't changed.
- The same arguments that caused the application on the Farley estate apply to this site

2071.1.2 Local Plan Update

Overall

Swallowfield Parish Council (SPC) really appreciates the quality of the recommendation in the Local Plan Update. The breadth and depth of the topics covered is excellent and covers all aspects of our life as part of the wider Wokingham borough community. The proposals are ambitious and challenging and our concern is that this has sometimes led to there being depth and lack of clarity on how objectives can be met, how they can be measured and how the policies balance against each other. There is often reference to a policy being implemented being mindful of other policies. The challenge will be which policy takes precedence where there is dispute particularly in planning applications. As an example, in DH10 on Low carbon and renewable energy will be implemented where it "does not give rise to unacceptable impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage assets, character of the area, and amenity". What is unacceptable? How will these policies be balanced? The danger here is that everything becomes open to challenge leading to more planning appeals and lost time on developments. This tension existed in the Core Strategy but as there were fewer, more macro policies it made it easier to assess and weigh the respective arguments.

We believe the LPU must be dynamic and will need to be change in response to the Government introducing the new environment bills which will have a broad set of consequences for this Plan. Please consider whether there should be an annual or policy point review of the Plan. We understand the challenges this provides with the need to consult on updates.

Throughout the document there is reference to the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) of Nov 2019. This has become an important underpinning document for this Plan identifying critical characteristics and environments that should be protected. The LCA speaks in detail about the challenges of current Government policy and the trade-offs that this will cause with the Local Plan's objectives. These should be considered in detail by the LPU. This is particularly important in Swallowfield parish as there are 5 areas identified that are in in part in our parish: Loddon River Valley, Blackwater River Valley, Riseley Farmed Clay Lowland, Farley Hill Wooded Sands and Gravel Hills and very importantly Stanford East Wooded Sands and Gravel Hills.

Policy by Policy

Spatial

We are concerned about the emphasis and strategic importance of A33/A327 transport links. Their development risks urbanising their surrounds and closing the physical gap and hence identity of our parish settlements with other towns and villages. It is very important that Swallowfield in particular is separated from Spencers Wood. Likewise, the proximity of Farley Hill to Arborfield Garrison risks it becoming a cross route between the two arterial roads with traffic passing from the A327 across to the A33 via Farley Hill and Swallowfield.

There is no mention of cooperation with adjacent planning authorities to ensure that development proposals on the borders of Wokingham's planning area are impact assessed and approved by WBC. We've been dismayed by the development on the land west of Odiham Road Riseley which is in Hart's district and it is very important to ensure that Riseley in particular is not subject to development in which we have little influence and no cover through planning policy.

SS3 Grazeley Green E2, Transport for foot and cycleways. Although we support the proposal linking the new developments with our parish, we are concerned that these could lead to urbanisation or erosion of the identity of the parish villages. This also is true of policy SS4 which makes reference to Appendix 2 which contains a reference on foot and cycle

paths: “minimal intervention to ensure its existing character is retained. However, improvements to rights of way and public footpaths may be carried out to improve pedestrian access.” These policies need to explicitly say that these paths need to be mindful of their unique context and be implemented in a way that is sympathetic to their environment.

Missing from Spatial or Communities policies is the requirement that new developments located in existing settlements must integrate with those settlements. The growth of “balloon” cul-de-sacs with a single vehicle entrance leads to isolated communities and should be discouraged and limited in scale.

SS13: Development in the Countryside does not address the stewardship of the countryside. Swallowfield parish is suffering from the free application of farming diversity with limited policy cover to ensure that the quality of the countryside is maintained. Today, local farms and farmland have increased their footprint of buildings, access roads, spoil heaps from previous developments and installed businesses that are unsuitable to the rural setting. The policy needs to be extended to ensure there is more rigour in the way these developments are assessed for appropriateness and controlled if approved. It should also carefully consider acceptable access policies for vehicles entering and leaving the farms.

Connections

Should Wokingham follow the lead of central London and Bristol in introducing a policy of 20mph speed limits to improve safety of all road users and improve air quality? Should it also create a new policy on limiting street signage, street furniture which have been shown to improve road safety?

C1 Active and Sustainable Transport and Accessibility should include a policy to mandate that all new build housing has an electric vehicle charging point installed.

C2 Mitigation of Transport Impacts and Highways Safety and Design – Swallowfield parish has a large number of single-track roads. The amount of traffic on these roads is growing with the development in Wokingham, leading to cars having to use the verges to pass each other – damaging the edges of roads and destroying verges and their flora. There must be a policy in place to ensure that where possible traffic is channelled onto more suitable roads and, where this is not possible, that investment is made on local road infrastructure where traffic growth is likely, providing passing places and measures to protect verges.

C2 f) proposes to locate utility services in off carriageway settings. This is a great proposal, utility roadworks are the bane to our local roads adding to congestion and pollution and causing traffic to seek alternative and unsuitable routes. However, having provided foot and cycle routes, these mustn't be lost or impacted whilst utility maintenance work is ongoing. There should be a complete moratorium on new utility installations being installed under road verges in the countryside where these have a good selection of wild flora. Much of the flora diversity in the Wokingham borough is on the verges and this was lost in the recent installation of fibre broadband.

We are supportive of the proposal in C8 to join the Loddon Long Distance Path with the Blackwater Valley Way. However, it should be qualified by other policies to ensure that the environment and tranquillity of countryside is not lost.

C3 cycling and walking should be extended to consider whether the types of vehicles that use of byways should be changed. Byways are expensive to maintain and their use by powered vehicles other than for agricultural purposes is contrary to the environmental policies proposed. Byways are used by few vehicles, but they cause damage to tracks, the local environment and cause issues for other byways users on foot, cycle or on horseback.

C6 Digital infrastructure and communications technology needs to be extended to ensure that all major developments have extensible digital communications incorporated into their design – and not added piecemeal as demand grows.

Economy

No Comment

Housing

Emphasis is given to optimising housing density, but in any development, the need for open landscaped spaces should be given equal weight. Where a development is appended to an existing settlement and borders open countryside, there must be a soft boundary between built form and the countryside. We have seen glaringly bad examples where this has not happened e.g. Bellway development on the Beech Hill Road. A good example is the Bellway development at The Pippins.

Design and Heritage

No Comment

Health and Safe Communities

HC1 points 1 and 2 shows great ambition – but does it equate to a policy? The lack of public transport between Riseley and Swallowfield undermines this policy in Swallowfield parish. SPC is pleased to see that HC7 and HC8 recognises the impacts of light and noise pollution.

Natural Environment and Flooding

NE1: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation highlights that wildlife corridors can be in the form of open spaces, residential gardens, grass verges, retained hedgerows, ditches, rivers, or streams. There must be policy to stop rough maintenance of these resources which leaves them barren of flora and fauna.

NE1 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation - requires a 10% net gain in biodiversity is difficult to calculate and difficult to track whether it has been achieved despite the commentary. We are concerned that off-site compensation doesn't meet the overall strategic goals. Please can you ensure that insects are explicitly referred to in biodiversity measures?

Policy NE2: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The policy on how SANGs are delivered needs to be re-considered. Today, SANGs are often accidentally sanitised of wildlife during development whilst installing paths and clearing scrub vegetation. Grass is often used to create a clean green space. These semi-rural parks do not encourage wildlife; they do not meet the intention of this policy and must be subject to a more considered policy.

Policy NE3: Trees, woodland and hedgerows, not enough is done to protect trees within existing developments. More effort should be made to identify and put in place tree preservation orders as appropriate as sites are developed. Please consider whether this should be a mandatory part of the normal planning application process.

Policy NE9: This policy should take more account of the ERA's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Specifically, on Sustainable Drainage, the policy on non-adoption of new roads which have incorporated SuDS must be revisited. It is leading to a closed mind culture from the residents where the private road is seen as an enclave from the surrounding mature settlement and causing friction and separation between the communities. The wider point is that roads should be adopted – we shouldn't have private roads.

2071.2 Current Applications

Agenda Ref	App No	Type	Address	Application
2071.2.1	200371	PN Class R Agri to Flex COU	Glasspool Farm Part Lane Riseley Wokingham RG7 1RU	Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey. It was PROPOSED and seconded that the council would not comment on this application. All in favour.
2071.2.2	200469	Existing Lawful Certificate	Fairlands, Church Road, Farley Hill RG7 1TU	Application for a certificate of existing lawful development for use of cabin as independent dwelling. It was PROPOSED and seconded that the council would not comment on this application. All in favour.

2071.3 Results

Agenda Ref	App No	Address	Application	Result
2071.3.1	200243	Glasspool Farm Part Lane Riseley RG7 1RU	<p>Prior approval submission for the conversion of 2 no agricultural buildings to provide 5 no. dwelling houses.</p> <p>This Prior Approval Notice does NOT constitute approval under Habitats Regulations. It is also necessary for the owners of the land to enter into s106/s111 agreement with the council. The applicant is also advised to investigate whether consents or permissions under any other regulatory regimes including building control are required.</p> <p>The council objected to this application but felt that the applicant was trying to find a way forward for this dilapidated site.</p>	Prior approval is required & given.
2071.3.2	200254	Twitchen, Odiham Road, Riseley, RG7 1SD	<p>Householder application for proposed erection of single storey rear extension to form a conservatory.</p> <p>The council did not comment on this application.</p>	Approved