

East Hagbourne Parish Council

Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting duly convened and held on Thursday 11th April 2019 at East Hagbourne Pavilion.

Present were Cllrs Iain Duff (Chairman), Derek Button (Vice Chairman), David Rickeard, Cordelia Gover, Carolyn Shaikh, Paul Dixon and Jean Elliott; Laura Lloyd (Parish Clerk); County Councillor Simon Clarke, and 18 members of the public.

Apologies were received from District Councillor Jane Murphy.

1. Welcome and Introductions – Iain Duff, Chairman

Welcome to the 2019 Annual Parish Meeting. Although this meeting is convened by East Hagbourne Parish Council it is not a Parish Council meeting, but a meeting of and for East Hagbourne Parish residents. Although one purpose of this meeting is to inform you what the Parish Council has been doing over the past year, the major aspect of the meeting is for your discussion and suggestions of what we should do in the future.

We welcome our County Councillor Simon Clarke. Unfortunately our District Councillor Jane Murphy is unable to join us because of a District Council meeting tonight. Both of them have been very active in supporting our Parish and we are very grateful for their help and advice.

2. Formal approval of the minutes from the Annual Parish Meeting on 26th April 2018

The minutes of the meeting of 26th April 2018 were agreed and signed. It was noted that the draft version has been available on the website and will now be amended to the final version.

3. SODC and OCC activities

I. Duff handed out a document from Jane Murphy reporting on South Oxfordshire District Council's year (Attachment 1)

Cllr Simon Clarke reported the following:

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) accounts for approximately 75% of the council tax bill, and its responsibilities include schools, social services and road maintenance. Around half of OCC funds are spent on social care for around 2% of the population. OCC oversee the health authorities and can put pressure on them but are not decision makers.

If there was more money available then the road quality would be significantly improved however they are constantly lobbying for improvements at county council level.

S. Clarke then asked members of the public for questions.

It was queried why money for preschool funding was being reduced because, if this was maintained, then perhaps there would be less requirement for spending on the children as they get older.

Council Tax bands were briefly discussed as it was queried why there was no higher band above H in place for very expensive properties as this could generate more income from those that can afford it. S. Clarke confirmed that OCC do not set the bands but agreed that this would be beneficial.

It was queried whether Oxfordshire may become a unitary authority – this is being tested in Dorset and Buckinghamshire but is not being considered for Oxfordshire at this stage, however it could save large amounts of money.

It was queried whether Didcot Garden Town (DGT) funds could be used to mend the roads, and S. Clarke confirmed that there will be money for new infrastructure including the Jubilee Road roundabout but he was not sure on timeframe for this at present. There will also be money available for replacing existing infrastructure.

I. Duff reported on the CPRE hosted meeting of 9th April where it was confirmed that there will be a sounding board for Parish Councils which East Hagbourne intends to be involved with, and also one for the general public.

The proposals for the Science Bridge and bridge over the Thames were queried as the timeframe of 5 years seems ambitious. S Clarke agreed that this timeframe is optimistic.

The Oxford to Cambridge expressway is still pending a decision in terms of location, this may happen in summer. However, there is still some speculation as to whether it will happen at all.

4. Parish Council activities:

Chairman's report: Iain Duff, Chairman

This is my first Annual Parish Meeting as chairman and I would like to start by thanking my predecessor, David Rickeard, who was a tireless servant for the village over his nine years in the chair. In fact, since I realized that I would have trouble finding the time to equal his work effort, one of my first actions on taking over the chairmanship was to seek additional councillors to share the workload. I am very pleased to say that we were successful in co-opting two excellent councillors to bring our numbers back to seven. I am delighted to say that all seven have agreed to stand for election this coming year.

We have held ten regular Parish Council meetings this year but much of the actual work is done in working groups, by circulation of planning applications of which we had more than twenty this year, and with regular correspondence with officers and councillors from SODC and OCC. The Cemetery Committee, which is a joint committee with West Hagbourne, had three meetings this year.

In addition to recognizing the hard work of our councillors over the last year, I would like to recognize the crucially important role of the Parish Clerk. We had excellent service from Allison Leigh who left us at the end of the year after two years excellent service. She passed the reins to Laura Lloyd who started as Clerk at the beginning of January and who has already shown great ability in climbing the steep learning curve. A big additional bonus is that Laura lives in our village, the first clerk to be resident since Robin Parsley retired over four years ago.

Hopefully this past year may be the last for some time when we have to battle on an almost daily basis to literally save our village. In this respect, we have benefited greatly from the assistance of a large number of people. This includes the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group who were helped in the housing allocations by a Community Group of 14 villagers, Mind the Green Gap who have continued to be active even after the victory in the Grainger Judicial Review hearings. They have worked with resident groups to fight unplanned development and are thanks are also due to all those local residents in East Hagbourne and Didcot who have raised their voices and taken part in the campaigns. Together we managed to defend the village by defeating four major unsolicited planning applications during this last year, viz

Orchestra Land	Blewbury Road	18 May
Catesby Appeal	Park Road	27 June
Persimmon	St Hugh's Rise	14 September

Discussions with Mactaggart and Mickel who will be developing the site on the field by the Village Car Park have been ongoing for most of this last year and I will say more words on this in a separate agenda item.

The Neighbourhood Plan Referendum was held on March 14th and 93.5% of the 41.3% of the electorate who voted supported the East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan. It is worth noting that the average turn out for these plans is only 32.4%. In fact, we have just heard that the Plan has been made (that is full adopted) at a special meeting of the District Council this evening. The Plan does not, however, finish at this point and the chairman of the Steering Group, Crispin Topping, will say a few words later in this meeting about what comes next.

In fact, now that we hopefully have time to concentrate on the welfare of the village, I hope that this meeting will provide plenty of ideas towards the now standing item on Parish Council meeting agendas of village tidiness.

Communications between the Parish Council and the village has always been a concern of mine and on becoming chairman, I have tried two new initiatives. One has been regular column in the Parish Magazine with comments on items of current importance and the other has been to hold regular surgeries when I sit in the Meeting Room of Hagbourne Village Hall and talk to anyone who wants to come and talk to me. I held nine since last July and happily only had two sessions without company.

I still feel that communication could be stronger and was quite sad to talk to people this week who were unaware of the meeting tonight. I should of course mention the excellent web site, managed by Councillor Cordelia Gover, and the use of the Village Facebook Group by our Clerk and some councillors. As this meeting is largely to do with communication, I welcome help from all of you on this.

I hope we can all agree that our community is very special with very many diverse activities from sport to culture to environmental concern. It would be remiss of me to try to list them all but what I would like to do is mention the focal points of the village: this building and the recreation ground, the village hall, the community shop, the school, the pub and the church, the latter two much used for many activities other than praying or drinking, respectively. Strong though our community is can I make an appeal for volunteers to help run this pavilion, for which a report follows shortly, and I note that we will still have one vacancy on the Parish Council.

I conclude by mentioning upcoming events: – The annual litter blitz, led again by Sara James, on Saturday 27th April, meeting at 10am in the Village Car Park. – The Fun Run and walk on Monday 6th May. Finally, I remind you that all Parish Council meetings are open to the public, and you are always welcome to attend and contribute - you can find the agendas on notice boards or the web site where you will also find minutes of previous meetings.

The Chairman asked for comments following his report, and two suggestions regarding communication were made. One was the use of posters throughout the village to promote meetings or events. The other was to establish a Parish Council email list. It was agreed that this would be looked into.

Financial Statement: Derek Button, Vice Chairman

The activities that have been allocated to Parish Councils to administer through the pyramid of the Local Government organisation are financed through the Precept along with any other income generated by the Parish Council.

The Precept is the sum of money that your Parish Council has requested from the District Council to enable it to manage the affairs of the Parish. This sum is paid out of the Council Tax collected by S.O.D.C. and currently is in the order of £31,000pa.

To establish this financial requirement EHPC produces a Budget each December setting out the anticipated expenditure under various heads for the following year together with a note of any income streams (Hop Field rent, SSE wayleave, Allotment rents).

Once agreed the Precept request is lodged with SODC in January and is used by them in calculating the Council Tax demands for individual households in the Parish. The Precept is paid over to the Parish Council in two equal instalments in April and October each year.

The money is spent on

1. The employment costs of the P/T Parish Clerk and associated office expenses.
2. The general village grass cutting contract (the Cemetery & Recreation Ground grass cutting costs are paid from separate funds)
3. The Lease rent for Butts Piece.
4. The costs of lighting the Village Car Park.
5. Subscriptions and Donations to local organisations
6. Running the Village Website.
7. Insurances
8. Dog Bin emptying
9. Loan repayments for the Pavilion and Car Park construction.

Other monies have been set aside in special Reserve Funds to help even out expenditure on fighting local planning matters, running the Cemetery and Construction Infrastructure Levy Funds.

There followed some public questions regarding spending. One was whether lighting was required to be on all night however it was noted that this may help to reduce crime/antisocial behaviour.

D. Button confirmed that the Parish Council is awaiting a quote from SSE to upgrade the village car park lighting to lower ongoing running costs.

The reserve funds were queried and it was confirmed that they are as follows:

CIL Money – c. £2,000

Planned Development Support Fund – c. £5,000

Cemetery Fund – c. £7,000

Neighbourhood Plan – c. £3,500 although this may have to be paid back following the official 'making' of the plan.

Separate general reserves stand at approximately 50% of the annual precept and are at the recommended level.

5. Pavilion Report – David Rickeard, EHS & RC Chairman

East Hagbourne Sport and Recreation Committee manage the Pavilion and recreation ground for the general benefit of the community. The committee pays for the grass cutting, a share of the Parish Council insurance and playground repairs.

The Pavilion was paying business rates to SODC for the first 3 years but was granted a rebate, and has been given the same terms for 2019/20 which will ensure the finances remain stable for the near future. The Pavilion income is generated from regular users such as weekly club bookings (users have their own key and tidy after use so this reduces the management burden), and ad hoc bookings including parties. It was noted that booking admin, maintenance, safety inspections etc are currently covered by a team of 3 and really, 6-7 people are required for the team to effectively spread the responsibilities. A plea for more volunteers was made.

6. Mactaggart and Mickel development by Village Hall

I. Duff distributed the Parish Council comments that were submitted for the P19/S0357/RM development next to the village hall (Attachment 2).

C. Topping asked when the development may start. I. Duff confirmed that he has asked this question but has no clear answer. The groundworks cannot commence until all planning conditions are met, and one of the requests from the Parish Council is that a full safety report is conducted. Also the Archaeological report is not due for submission until October. It was queried how the developer can decide on the housing and site layout without the archaeological report. This is unclear but may form one of the conditions of planning approval.

The large sign was also discussed. The initial signage did not have planning approval and was removed on request. Although planning permission has now been granted, the sign has not been reinstated, for reasons unknown.

A suggestion for green roofs to help with the drainage concern was made. I. Duff confirmed this had been raised in one of the meetings with the developer, who intends to adhere to all legalities for the buildings but did not pursue the green roof route.

7. Neighbourhood Plan – Crispin Topping, Chairman of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group reported the following:

The turnout for the referendum was 41.3%, considerably higher than the average turnout of 33%. 360 of 385 voters were in favour of the plan. This means that SODC and developers will have to take the East Hagbourne plan seriously. The Neighbourhood Plan was made earlier today (11th April 2019) and therefore any planning applications received going forward will have to refer to the Neighbourhood Plan as part of the planning consultation.

Didcot Garden Town indicates that Didcot will be doubling in size over the next 20 years and there will be a big impact on surrounding villages. The Neighbourhood Plan has a list of Community Needs (Section 5 of the plan) and will be working on these to improve the village.

Traffic Management, Pavements and Road Safety are all included in the plan, with the Lower Cross turning, parking on roads and road quality for cyclists noted. The CIL monies due from the Mactaggart and Mickel development may make some speculative propositions achievable.

Existing local gaps that are protected by the Neighbourhood Plan include Coscote Fields (west of the railway line to the Parish Boundary) and all land north of the village which is referred to as the green corridor. This includes the Grainger land and some of the Nurton land, but these are subject to review in the SODC Local Plan. Manor Farm Fields are not currently included but alternative protection is being considered.

The Neighbourhood Plan will undergo a review in 12 months to ensure the plan is meeting objectives. A 5 year review will also take place, which is a full revisit and update to the plan to reflect any changes in local planning.

D. Rickeard also noted that the Conservation area was included in the Neighbourhood Plan strategies and an up to date Conservation Report (the existing one dates from 2000) would be beneficial with the suggestion that the Conservation area could potentially be extended.

The Grainger fence was discussed. SODC have not supported its removal and as it stands it was clearly indicated that there is nothing that can be done. However, if the Local Plan is adopted as it currently stands, this would add further weight to the removal request. Should this happen Grainger may choose not to maintain the fence with little prospect of building on the land, and may accept that it can be removed.

8. Open Discussion

Matters discussed:

The No Motorcycles sign by the railway bridge is overgrown. C. Gover confirmed that she reported this on Fix My Street but was told that Oxfordshire County Council don't own the sign. It was then noted that the sign itself says SODC. Land ownership is unknown but likely to be SODC or SOHA.

Defibrillators – it was agreed that an additional defibrillator at the village hall would be a benefit to the village as the range is only 300m and the west side of the village including the village hall and school are not currently covered. S. Clarke commented that he would fully support another defibrillator and those present were in favour of this moving forward.

CIL spending limitations were queried and it was confirmed that we intend to ask for clarification on this as to whether it can only be used for capital expenditure or whether maintenance and operation costs allow for ongoing payments to be made. D. Button noted that if CIL money is for capital expenditure only, a new facility would then have ongoing costs which would be the responsibility of the Parish Council and affect the Precept moving forward.

Fibre Broadband is being installed with the help of 3 grants that C. Gover has managed to secure. The cables are being installed and will provide 94 houses to the west of the village with access to high speed broadband, but the announcement is pending until this has been confirmed as fully available.

A car carrier using the village as a diversion route was slowed before the railway bridge in mid-March, and concerns over the signage in the village were raised. Unfortunately, drivers ignoring the signs is not controllable.

A 20mph speed limit was suggested. This has been discussed at previous Parish Council meetings and Aston Tirrold are enforcing this. S. Clarke confirmed he would support a proposal to drop the speed limit and will lobby for this. However, it was noted that to approve a 20mph speed limit an average speed of less than 25mph needed to be recorded during the survey period.

Blewbury Road was also noted as an area of concern for accidents and speeding. C. Shakh confirmed she has a report with the accidents on Blewbury Road and has spoken with OCC about this – recommendations for a mobile speed sign and possibly a white gateway to the village have been made by OCC – the cost of which would be the responsibility of the Parish Council. The gateway location would likely be to the south of Fieldside if this goes ahead.

Grange Farmhouse was discussed as the hedge leans well over the boundary wall and impedes vision, which is a concern for pedestrians and drivers alike and affects the Lower Cross turning. C. Shaikh confirmed that this also formed part of the meeting with OCC and further discussion with the owner will hopefully result in the hedge being cut back further. The meeting with OCC also noted improvements required to the road surface at the Lower Cross bend.

The state of the pavements was discussed, with concern for wheelchair users who have to use the road in some areas. I. Duff confirmed that we are awaiting some information from OCC on potential repair costs following a meeting with Sean Rooney. However it was indicated that their opinion was that the pavements are not that bad(!)

I. Duff noted that there is an option for pavement repairs which involves a pour into the existing hole rather than digging out and relaying the pavement. This could be tested to see if it is a durable method as it is cheaper. D. Button confirmed that in terms of pavement improvements there would likely be some restrictions due to a large part of the village being in the Conservation area.

A plea was made to residents to use the bus service, even if it is for a couple of journeys a month, otherwise this may not be able to continue running.

The meeting concluded at 9.35pm.

Signed..... Date.....

Attachment 1:

Points for Annual Parish Meetings

Use of leisure facilities continues to increase with over 750,000 visits to SODC leisure provision April – end of January

On target to deliver at least 300 affordable housing units in the current financial year

Where we receive a new claim for benefit, we are currently averaging its completion in less than two weeks (12.7days), with changes actioned in under 12 days on average

Cornerstone total audience numbers for the 18/19 financial year will be around 25,000

Planning - We have a 5year land supply and we have consulted on the Local Plan and will be submitting at the end of March.

South Oxfordshire are likely to be reinstated as Chairman of the Growth Board

Only a £5 CT increase, however we are aware with the settlement from Government now Zero and Business rates and New Homes Bonus (the amount we get for houses that have been completed from the Government) still to be agreed there will still be a need for us to look at finances and ways of creating investment and Income streams in the coming years.

I have gone into more depth below on Recycling, Homelessness and Economic Development.

RECYCLING

Recycling League Table 2017-18

County Rank	National Rank	Council	Recycling Rate
1	2 (Joint)	South Oxfordshire District Council	63.0%
2	4	Vale of White Horse District Council	62.4%
3	10	West Oxfordshire District Council	59.6%
4	25	Cherwell District Council	55.6%
5	50	Oxford City Council	50.8%

A misclassification error has been identified with Vale of White Horse quarter four returns for garden waste. The correct reuse, recycling and composting rate for 2017/18 was 62.36% not 60.4% as reported. This would have resulted in Vale of White Horse being fourth in the WCA league table. This error has been reported to Defra and while they have a policy of not correcting data at this stage they have stated they will make the revision in time for the next release of data in November 2019. This will also raise the county recycling rate to 57.6%

The above shows that not only is our recycling rate nationally high, it is very high in an Oxfordshire context as well.

To add to the above, our level of complaints around bins and waste collections (it will always appear high as we do circa 1m collections per LA per year) is by far the lowest in the top 50 performers, **running at less than half the average rate per 100,000 collections.**

We can always do better, and the service will always create complaints and due to its nature they can tend to be repetitive as they are often link to new routes/new crews.

The other thing to mention, is that the service, as your link members will know, has significantly improved over the last 18 months around both performance, attitude and their understanding that whilst they may be a separate employer and a separate organisation, they have to align to our outcomes and our desired approach. That has been vital in driving some of the improvements seen (it is such an obvious thing, that it's easy to miss, but the fact is that the majority of my 'staff' are not direct employees, but contractors.

HOMELESSNESS

On 1st April 2018 the Government changed the way that local authorities recorded homeless stats, the following are official definitions:

Prevention duties include any activities aimed at preventing a household threatened with homelessness from becoming homeless. This would involve activities to enable an applicant to remain in their current home or find alternative accommodation in order to prevent them from becoming homeless. The duty lasts for 56 days, but may be extended if the local authority is continuing with efforts to prevent homelessness.

Relief duties are owed to households that are already homeless and require help to secure settled accommodation. The duty lasts 56 days, and can only be extended by a local authority if the households would not be owed the main homelessness duty.

Both SODC and VOWH also work with households through an online portal called Enhanced Housing Options (EHO) where households are able to self-help round housing concerns. Should a household identify that they are at risk of homelessness then they will be passed to a Housing Needs Officer to make contact. The officer will then make contact and either talk through the housing options with the household or open as homeless prevention or relief case.

EHO figures are from 01/04/2018 to 05/03/2019

South

Total EHO's completed 1539

Cases allocated to an officer 548

The Government has only published Q1 data for homelessness so far which shows that:

SODC opened 95 cases of which 77 progressed to homelessness of which 69 were prevention and 8 were relief

We have submitted Q3 data which shows:

SODC opened 128 cases of which 60 progressed to homelessness of which 38 were prevention and 22 were relief

To put the new monitoring into perspective for Q1 and Q2 in 2017/18, the figures that we returned were:

SODC 243 prevention and 0 relief cases

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (ED)

Since 1.4.18 the ED team has contacted and supported at least 1000 businesses in South Oxfordshire. This support, contact and advice is delivered via the newsletter, twitter, LinkedIn, email, face-to-face meetings and introductions, and businesses attending events including the annual business breakfast, the Popup Business School (next one delivered in Berinsfield 29 April - 3 May 2019), and the South and Vale Business Awards.

During this time the ED team has consisted of four officers who are responsible for engaging and supporting the more than 13,000 businesses across both districts.

Attachment 2:

Comments from East Hagbourne Parish Council to the planning applications:

P19/S0357/RM

and

P19/S0334/DIS

Dear Joan,

East Hagbourne Parish Council would first like to say that we have had a good dialogue with Mactaggart and Mickel and their agents and are very hopeful that our good relationship with them will continue and we can all work together to make this development an asset to the village.

We do, however, want to use this response to record what we feel are important issues that should be answered either in a modified version of the plan or in conditions to the current plan.

Safety, access, traffic

One of the main reasons for the strong objection by the PC and the village in general to the outline planning application by Greenlight was on the grounds of safety, largely because of the proximity of the development to the school and to the village pre-school that uses the Hagbourne Village Hall.

We were particularly upset that the outline plan made access a reserved matter and that a woefully inadequate so-called safety plan was submitted at the last moment. We are even more concerned that the response of OCC continues to give credence to this flawed report, for example we believe that a proposal for a raised table on Main Road and the removal of the current speed cushion should be studied more carefully. We are very concerned about the safety issues and feel that these must be addressed before the current planning application is granted.

We are also very concerned both for safety issues during construction and for safety, access, and traffic when the site is developed and occupied. We note that the response posted by OCC suggests this is not appropriate for the Reserved Matters plan so we are posting our comments also to the Discharge Plan (P19/S0334/DIS), noting that OCC have not yet posted any comments to this plan.

Some of the issues that should be addressed in this safety plan include:

1. The positioning of the access to the development with respect to the school entrance and Manor Farm Lane on the opposite side of Main Road and entry to the village car park on the same side of the road.
2. Repositioning of speed limit signs and reduction to 20mph past site and along Main Road. Other traffic control measures to consider: a gateway feature, painted roundels, vehicle activated sign, upgraded pedestrian crossing.

3. Raised section within estate to slow traffic crossing access to playing fields.
4. Temporary lower speed limits during construction.

Construction

We would like OCC to comment on the Construction Management Plan before the planning application can be accepted.

We feel it should be amended to include:

1. A clear statement that all site traffic will not be routed through either the village or through West Hagbourne but will use the other routes given in the CMP.
2. A clear statement that deliveries will not be made at the beginning (8.20-9.00) or end (2.30-4.00pm) of the school and pre-school day.
3. A clear statement that loads will be managed so that they can negotiate the bends at Coscote and the railway bridge on Main Road, if necessary by splitting large items like roof trusses and reassembling them on site.
4. Wheel washing facilities will be provided on site.

Car Park

While we are grateful for the offer of more spaces than in the outline plan, we are very concerned that there should be no easy access directly into the estate and there should be a high fence separating the car park from the estate. This is to ensure that the extension is for village use and not as added parking for the estate.

Sizes of open market houses

The PC noted that the proposed Open Market housing was quite different from that in the outline plan (drawing 16-71-IN-127) that was quoted in Section 1.8 of the Planning Statement. There were far fewer 2 bed units in the current plan and some 5 bed units that were not in the outline plan. While we appreciate that the plan offers a range of house sizes we feel that something closer to that in the outline plan would more closely meet the needs of the village as expressed in the East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan.

Site plan and location of houses

The neighbouring properties to the estate are losing their open views of the countryside. Although this is not accepted as a planning objection, we trust that the development can be sympathetic to the neighbours, with good separation and good and secure boundary fencing.

The current profile of the development as viewed from Main Road could be improved by not having all very high houses in the first line of vision. If the ratio of large houses were reduced this might be used to achieve a better profile.

Future management of development

While we realize that the choice of Housing Association is not controlled by the planning officers, it is important that the association is able to provide a good service to residents and be a good neighbour to the wider village. We hope that a local company with a proven track record in the village is chosen to manage the affordable housing.

We feel it is important that more details are presented at this stage on the ongoing management of the estate by a combination of a Management Company and a Residents Association, how this is to be

organized, what aspects of life are to be covered, an estimate of the annual costs to residents of this and what legal mechanisms are required to make future changes to such a scheme.

The management and ongoing costs for the unadopted roads and for the maintenance of the LEAP area should be provided in more detail.

Drainage

The Parish Council have expressed concerns about discharge into the adjacent stream and have provided information to the drainage engineer about the local geography and past problems.

There is, however, a major problem here inasmuch as the solution proposed by BWB at the outline stage seems to be directly contradicted by the Ground Investigation Report submitted with the current application.

We understand from the ground investigation analysis and the standing water in the ditches dug by the archaeologists that the ground is not very permeable, however it is crucially important to the village that run off does not exceed current levels so that there is no added flow to downstream areas already prone to flooding.

We strongly feel that planning permission should not be granted until this matter is properly resolved.

Trees

The inclusion of trees in the plan was welcomed by the PC who wanted reassurance that the few existing trees on the edge of the development would be safeguarded given that the nature of the ground requires shallow and wide foundations.

Archaeological Report

We note that this report is not scheduled to be delivered until October 2019 and are thus perplexed about how the reserved matters plan can be accepted before this.