



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

**Present:** Cllr A Hibberd (Chairman)

Cllr S Butler (Vice Chairman)

Cllr A Butler

Cllr S Greenland

Cllr G Logan

Cllr M Smethers

Cllr D Tooke

Ms L Ellis, Parish Clerk

No members of the public

*Due to the Covid-19 restrictions the meeting was held remotely via conference link. The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, which came into force on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2020, gives Parish & Town Councils the power to do this until May 2021.*

Min No	Title	Owner
126/20	<b>WELCOME FROM THE CHAIRMAN &amp; APOLOGIES</b> The Chairman, Cllr Hibberd, welcomed all in attendance to the remote meeting of Alderholt Parish Council.  There were no apologies for absence.	
127/20	<b>TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND/OR CONSIDER THE GRANTING OF DISPENSATIONS</b> There were no declarations of interest or dispensations.	
128/20	<b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 14<sup>th</sup> September 2020 ARE A CORRECT RECORD.</b> It was proposed by Cllr S Butler and seconded by Cllr Tooke that the minutes of the meeting held on the <b>14<sup>th</sup> September 2020</b> were a correct record. ALL IN FAVOUR.	
129/20	<b>CLERKS REPORT AND NOTICES</b>  <u>Tree Surveys</u> The tree surveys had been undertaken and quotes were being obtained for the works to be carried out. A report to choose a preferred contractor would be included on the agenda for the November 2020 meeting.  <u>Website Accessibility</u> As of 23 <sup>rd</sup> September 2020, the Alderholt Parish Council website did not comply with the WCAG 2.1AA (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines). As a result an Accessibility Statement has been added to the Council website, setting out the Alderholt Parish Council's current position. A report would be presented to the Council at its November, 2020 meeting	



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

	<p>with recommendations on how the Alderholt Parish Council can comply with the WCAG 2.1AA requirements.</p> <p><u>Email Addresses</u> At the time of writing the report Assist Business IT Ltd were setting up the Officer email addresses. There is an initial issue with the forwarding from the old email address, but it is hoped to be sorted shortly. Following this, the official Councillor email addresses would be distributed.</p> <p><u>Co - option for Council</u> At the time of publication of the October agenda one person had requested an application form for one of the co-option vacancies at Alderholt Parish Council. As of, 12<sup>th</sup> October, 2020 the form had not been returned. The deadline for applications was 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020.</p> <p><u>Telephone Upgrade</u> Confirmed by BT that the upgrade from copper wire to Fibre-optic (BT Halo) would be completed by 14<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The new telephone would provide the facility to forward calls via the broadband, if the Council need to go into lockdown, bad weather, etc.</p> <p><u>Budget Setting Preparation</u> Work was about to start on the 2021/2022 Alderholt Parish Council budget/precept. The Parish Clerk would be undertaking a DAPTC course on this on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2020. It was also agreed that the date of the next meeting of the Finance Committee would be moved from 26<sup>th</sup> October 2020 to 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2020. The agenda would contain the budget reports, alongside grant applications. The budget reports would then be added to the Agenda for the Alderholt Parish Council meeting to be held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020. This would allow for any additional work to be undertaken and for then agreeing by Council at its January 2021, meeting if necessary.</p> <p><u>Scribe</u> The Clerk and Assistant Clerk now had access to Scribe and were in the process of being trained. An online training session, with Scribe, was undertaken on Thursday 8 October and a further training session would be held on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2020. It was envisaged that for the next meeting of Alderholt Parish Council that Scribe would be used to produce the financial reports for the agenda.</p>	
<p><b>130/20</b></p>	<p><b>TO RECEIVE A WRITTEN REPORT FROM DORSET COUNCILLOR DAVID TOOKE.</b></p> <p><b>Dorset Council Finances</b> The Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan approved in February 2020 identified a budget gap – including planned savings - of £31m from 21/22 through to 25/26 – of which £7.4m arose in 21/22.</p>	



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Covid had had a huge impact on this and the details are shown below.

	£k
Budget gap from 2020/21 MTFP	7,434
Reduction in tax base growth	1,924
Reduction in business rates	1,000
Change in inflation assumptions on pay, non-pay and income	1,324
Adults Services & Housing 20/21 continuing budget pressures	6,584
Children's Services 20/21 continuing budget pressures	625
Place Services 20/21 continuing budget pressures	2,208
Corporate Services 20/21 continuing budget pressures	294
Corporate Savings not achieved in 20/21	6,392
Adults Services & Housing new budget pressures	1,955
Children's Services new budget pressures	7,142
Place Services new budget pressures	2,730
Corporate Services new budget pressures	2,288
	<b>41,899</b>

The Council had identified £11.9m of Tactical Savings and a potential £8.2m of Transformational Savings, which would reduce the Budget Gap over the period

<b>Initial Budget Gap</b>	<b>£41.9m</b>
Less: tactical savings	-£11.9m
Less: transformation savings	-£8.2m
<b>Revised Budget Gap</b>	<b>£21.8m</b>

Tactical Savings derived from savings through convergence of IT systems, deleting vacant posts, reduction on staff travel, reduction on leasing office space, savings on contracts by renegotiating.

Transformation Savings derived from a large number of projects which would produce longer term savings, such as:

- Review ways of working for Office based staff
- Review the Asset Management Plan including office space
- Rationalising and integrating IT systems
- Develop BI to support further reviews

A review of the Capital Program would take place during the Autumn.

This budget gap could not be achieved through efficiency alone, service delivery would be impacted and priorities were going to important. Dorset Council needed to ensure that the protection of residents was covered.

Dorset Council continued to lobby Government but it must also grow its income and reduce ongoing costs.

### Response to "Planning for the Future" White Paper from Dorset Council

1. That delays in house building nationally are not all due to the planning system – local planning authorities do not build houses - but to other



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

	<p>factors including market absorption, the homogenous nature of large developments, and reliance on the private sector for infrastructure provision, as identified in the Letwin review. In the last decade, 2.5 million homes were granted planning permission but only 1.5 million were delivered; similarly in 2019, 371,000 homes were given permission but only 241,000 were delivered;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. That binding national housing targets and removal of the opportunity for people to comment at outline planning application stage on sites allocated for growth in plans will reduce the ability of communities to have input into proposals affecting their local areas, and reduce local democracy;</li><li>3. That greater detail is required on how the national housing targets would be derived, including how environmental constraints will be taken into account, and that this must include an element of national planning strategy setting out the aims for how places will grow and the infrastructure needed to support them;</li><li>4. That the proposed timescale for the adoption of new style plans is very ambitious bearing in mind the need for the introduction of new primary legislation, the proposed 'front loading' of community engagement and the greater level of technical work necessary if growth areas will receive automatic outline planning permission;</li><li>5. That there is significant risk to the progress of currently emerging local plans due to the uncertainty around, and scale of, these changes;</li><li>6. That if national policies are not to be repeated in local plans, they need to carry the same weight in decision making as development plan policies. Some local 'development management policies' will still be necessary to set out local mechanisms and approaches to addressing national policy issues – for example local solutions to addressing indirect effects of development on protected habitats;</li><li>7. That there is no reference to what if any effect these changes are intended to have on minerals and waste local plans, how policies and site allocations for minerals and waste would be applied under the zoning system and how minerals safeguarding can be achieved;</li><li>8. That while the support for good design and the publication of a national design code are welcomed, it is important that these focus not only on what places look like, but how they work for those living and working in them. Master planning also needs to consider infrastructure provision and mitigation of impacts on habitats, flood risk, heritage and landscape;</li><li>9. That the replacement of the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning agreements with a single levy is not likely to generate sufficient funding for the infrastructure and affordable housing that is needed, particularly bearing in mind the exemptions</li></ol>	
--	--	--



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

	<p>proposed. We would support the ring fencing of funding for affordable housing to ensure that this is not reduced;</p> <p>10. That while an increased reliance on digital methods of engagement and involvement may well attract a wider audience to comment on planning proposals, it will potentially disadvantage older people and those in more deprived areas who may have less access to digital means of communication.</p>																																											
<b>131/20</b>	<p><b>PUBLIC FORUM EMAILS</b></p> <p><i>[As this a remote meeting the Public Forum consists of Councillors responding to emails sent to the Clerk before 10 am on the day of the meeting. The Public can only observe this meeting and cannot speak or take part].</i></p> <p>There were no emails received from the public.</p>																																											
<b>132/20</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FINANCE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALDERHOLT PARISH COUNCIL ITEMS FOR SANCTION</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">12<sup>th</sup> October 2020</th> <th style="text-align: right;">£ inc VAT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b><u>PAYMENTS FOR SANCTION</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>ARA – Insurance Reimbursement 290-21</td> <td style="text-align: right;">616.91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assist IT Support 160920 and Microsoft Subscriptions</td> <td style="text-align: right;">715.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL PAYMENTS FOR SANCTION</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>1332.11</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b><u>Credits</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Precept 2<sup>nd</sup> Installment 2020-21</td> <td style="text-align: right;">47136.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/21 Allotments – Payment 1 (Plots 1, 4, 15, 20)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">125.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/21 Allotments – Payment 2 (Plot 23)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">25.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/21 Allotments – Payments 3 (Plot 17)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">25.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20/21 Allotments – BACS 080920-300920 (see payment sheet)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">465.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total of credits received to Co Op current account</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>47776.05</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other account credits received</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL CREDIT RECEIVED</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>47776.05</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>5</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b><u>DDR's</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dorset Council – Tree Inspections</td> <td style="text-align: right;">462.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>TOTAL DDR's</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>462.00</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b><u>PAYMENTS MADE IN BETWEEN MEETINGS</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Viking – Office Ink/Paper</td> <td style="text-align: right;">98.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Came &amp; Co – PC Insurance 011020-300921</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2364.30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020	£ inc VAT	<b><u>PAYMENTS FOR SANCTION</u></b>		ARA – Insurance Reimbursement 290-21	616.91	Assist IT Support 160920 and Microsoft Subscriptions	715.20	<b>TOTAL PAYMENTS FOR SANCTION</b>	<b>1332.11</b>	<b><u>Credits</u></b>		Precept 2 <sup>nd</sup> Installment 2020-21	47136.05	20/21 Allotments – Payment 1 (Plots 1, 4, 15, 20)	125.00	20/21 Allotments – Payment 2 (Plot 23)	25.00	20/21 Allotments – Payments 3 (Plot 17)	25.00	20/21 Allotments – BACS 080920-300920 (see payment sheet)	465.00	<b>Total of credits received to Co Op current account</b>	<b>47776.05</b>	Other account credits received	0.00	<b>TOTAL CREDIT RECEIVED</b>	<b>47776.05</b>		<b>5</b>	<b><u>DDR's</u></b>		Dorset Council – Tree Inspections	462.00	<b>TOTAL DDR's</b>	<b>462.00</b>	<b><u>PAYMENTS MADE IN BETWEEN MEETINGS</u></b>		Viking – Office Ink/Paper	98.87	Came & Co – PC Insurance 011020-300921	2364.30	
12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020	£ inc VAT																																											
<b><u>PAYMENTS FOR SANCTION</u></b>																																												
ARA – Insurance Reimbursement 290-21	616.91																																											
Assist IT Support 160920 and Microsoft Subscriptions	715.20																																											
<b>TOTAL PAYMENTS FOR SANCTION</b>	<b>1332.11</b>																																											
<b><u>Credits</u></b>																																												
Precept 2 <sup>nd</sup> Installment 2020-21	47136.05																																											
20/21 Allotments – Payment 1 (Plots 1, 4, 15, 20)	125.00																																											
20/21 Allotments – Payment 2 (Plot 23)	25.00																																											
20/21 Allotments – Payments 3 (Plot 17)	25.00																																											
20/21 Allotments – BACS 080920-300920 (see payment sheet)	465.00																																											
<b>Total of credits received to Co Op current account</b>	<b>47776.05</b>																																											
Other account credits received	0.00																																											
<b>TOTAL CREDIT RECEIVED</b>	<b>47776.05</b>																																											
	<b>5</b>																																											
<b><u>DDR's</u></b>																																												
Dorset Council – Tree Inspections	462.00																																											
<b>TOTAL DDR's</b>	<b>462.00</b>																																											
<b><u>PAYMENTS MADE IN BETWEEN MEETINGS</u></b>																																												
Viking – Office Ink/Paper	98.87																																											
Came & Co – PC Insurance 011020-300921	2364.30																																											



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;"><b>Total of Payments made between meetings</b></td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: right;"><b>2463.17</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><b><u>PETTY CASH</u></b></td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Balance</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>19.29</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Monies In</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>0.00</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Miscellaneous receipted expenditure</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>0.00</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Balance</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>19.29</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><b><u>Controls and checks</u></b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b><u>Cllr initials</u></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Invoices and payroll</b></td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>Total of Payments made between meetings</b>	<b>2463.17</b>			<b><u>PETTY CASH</u></b>		<b>Balance</b>	<b>19.29</b>	<b>Monies In</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>Miscellaneous receipted expenditure</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>Balance</b>	<b>19.29</b>			<b><u>Controls and checks</u></b>	<b><u>Cllr initials</u></b>	<b>Invoices and payroll</b>				
<b>Total of Payments made between meetings</b>	<b>2463.17</b>																							
<b><u>PETTY CASH</u></b>																								
<b>Balance</b>	<b>19.29</b>																							
<b>Monies In</b>	<b>0.00</b>																							
<b>Miscellaneous receipted expenditure</b>	<b>0.00</b>																							
<b>Balance</b>	<b>19.29</b>																							
<b><u>Controls and checks</u></b>	<b><u>Cllr initials</u></b>																							
<b>Invoices and payroll</b>																								
	<p>Attached to these Minutes at Appendix 'A' are the Allotment Payment Sheet.</p> <p>Councillors noted the payments and credits.</p> <p>Cllr Smethers would be the authorised Councillor for online banking and cheques during October.</p>																							
<b>133/20</b>	<p><b>REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES/EXTERNAL BODIES</b></p> <p>The following Minutes were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Committee held on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2020 - noted</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Plan Committee held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2020 – noted. Circulated separately and attached at Appendix 'B' to these Minutes was an updated report on the election of a Vice-Chairman and the future Forward Plan for the Neighbourhood Plan Committee. It was proposed by Cllr Tooke and seconded by Cllr Logan that:-             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cllr A. Butler was elected Vice-Chairman of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee; and</li> <li>b) the revised Forward Plan was agreed.</li> </ol> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>ALL IN FAVOUR</i></p> </li> <li>• Village Hall Committee. Attached at Appendix 'C' to these Minutes is Village Hall Committee Update. Members were informed of the potential rent increase for the Parish Office. The Clerk informed the Council that they were still waiting for confirmation of the increase. Members stated that there was already an agreement to alternate the provision of planting in the raised beds outside the Parish Office. It was proposed by Cllr Logan and seconded by Cllr S. Butler to:-             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) discontinue the planting of winter flowers at the Alderholt signs and that budget would be transferred to planting for the Office flower beds; and</li> <li>b) Cllr A. Butler and Cllr Hibberd contact Wolvercroft Garden Centre to discuss if they could either sponsor or provide discounted plants for the Office flowerbeds.</li> </ol> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>ALL IN FAVOUR</i></p> </li> </ul>	CllrsAB/ AH																						



**Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council  
held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020**

<p><b>134/20</b></p>	<p><b>PLANNING WHITE PAPER – PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE</b></p> <p>A report was submitted and attached as Appendix ‘D’ to these Minutes.</p> <p>Cllr Logan had drawn together a response to the consultation document for Planning For The Future. Cllr Tooke had also submitted a proposed response to the document.</p> <p>Members discussed the proposals and it was proposed by Cllr Logan and seconded by Cllr Tooke that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cllr Logan and Cllr Tooke draft a response from Alderholt Parish Council;</li> <li>b) the response then be circulated to Members for comment; and</li> <li>c) when the response was completed that the Clerk submit the consultation response to the Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government.</li> </ol> <p><i>ALL IN FAVOUR</i></p>	<p>CllrsGL/ DT</p> <p>LE</p>
<p><b>135/20</b></p>	<p><b>AMENDMENT TO THE ALLOTMENT TERMS AND CONDITIONS</b></p> <p>A report was submitted, a copy of which appears as Appendix ‘E’ to these Minutes.</p> <p>Members were requested to consider amending the terms and conditions to allow bees to be kept on the allotments.</p> <p>Following discussion and consideration, it was felt that the keeping of bees would be likely to mean that the allotment plot itself could not be worked, as per its intended purpose. Whilst the Council fully recognised the need for bees as pollinators, the keeping of bees on the allotment gardens was not permitted as it would not allow the allotment to be worked as per its intended purpose. Tenants were however, encouraged to plant bee friendly plants.</p> <p>It was proposed by Cllr S. Butler and seconded by Cllr Hibberd not to amend the terms and conditions to allow bees to be kept at the Alderholt allotments. <i>ALL IN FAVOUR</i></p>	
<p><b>136/20</b></p>	<p><b>CORRESPONDENCE</b></p> <p><b>Items for Action</b></p> <p>Dorset Council Leisure Development Small Grants – Members supported the application from the Village Hall to install audio visual equipment. The Clerk would contact Dorset Council to confirm the support of Alderholt Parish Council. <i>ALL IN FAVOUR</i></p> <p>Reforming Local Government Exit Pay Consultation - Noted</p> <p>Draft East Dorset Forest Plan Consultation – Cllr Hillard reported that he had recently received updated information and requested that this item</p>	<p>LE</p> <p>Cllr AH</p>



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

by delegated to the Chairman and that they would circulate updated information to the rest of the Council.

### Resident Emails

Drone Flying. A request was submitted, a copy of which appears at Appendix 'F' to these Minutes.

Members discussed the request and were concerned that if the flying of drones was allowed then this could lead to an influx of drone flyers at the Recreation Ground and associated issues with this. It was agreed not to allow permission to fly a drone at the Recreation Ground.

Cycle Access at Rifle Range. A request was submitted, a copy of which appears at Appendix 'F' to these Minutes.

Members confirmed that Alderholt Parish Council only owned a third of the land through to Whitfield Bottom Drove. The remaining two thirds was owned privately. Therefore, the Parish Council wasn't able to provide public access through to Whitfield Bottom Drove. It was agreed that the Parish Council could not support the request.

Parking at Ringwood Road/Charing Cross. A request was submitted, a copy of which appears at Appendix 'F' to these Minutes.

Discussion was undertaken on the issue and it was confirmed that Alderholt Parish Council could not fine drivers for parking on the pavement. Previously the possibility of double yellow lines had been discussed but following investigation this had not been possible. Members requested that an item be placed in the Parish News reminding the drivers not to park on the pavements and that the Clerk contact Synergy Housing to remind tenants to use the parking allocated to them at the back of the properties and not to park on the pavement at the front.

LE

Hedges, Pavements and Speeding. A request was submitted, a copy of which appears at Appendix 'F' to these Minutes.

Hedges and Pavements. Due the sensitivity of one of the parties involved in the request, it was delegated to the Clerk to try to find a solution to the issue raised.

LE

Speeding. It was agreed that an article be placed in the Parish News for volunteers to come forward to operate the Speed Watch Scheme.

LE

### **Meetings**

Noted - Pensions Liaison Officer Group virtual meeting 9th October 2020

### **Items circulated for information**

Noted - News Release: Climate and Ecological Emergency Action Plan  
<https://news.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/2020/09/28/dorset-council-publishes->



**Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council  
held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020**

	<a href="#"><u>climate-and-ecological-emergency-action-plan-ahead-of-cabinet-meeting/</u></a>	
--	---	--



# Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

## Appendix 'A'

ALDERHOLT ALLOTMENT PAYMENTS FOR THE PERIOD 2020/21							
ALLOTMENT PAYMENT SHEET							
PLOT No.	NAME	HOW MUCH DUE	HOW MUCH PAID	BACS/CASH/CHQ	DATE REC'D	PAID IN	REMINDER SENT
1		£25.00	£25.00	cheque	14/09/2020	Payment 1 - 24/09/20	
2		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	25/09/2020	25/09/2020	
3		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	28/09/2020	28/09/2020	
4		£25.00	£25.00	cheque	14/09/2020	Payment 1 - 24/09/20	
5		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	09/09/2020	09/09/2020	
6		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	29/09/2020	29/09/2020	
7		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	30/09/2020	30/09/2020	
8		£20.00	£20.00	BACS	08/09/2020	08/09/2020	
8a		£20.00	£20.00	BACS	14/09/2020	14/09/2020	
9		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	10/09/2020	10/09/2020	
10		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	28/09/2020	28/09/2020	
11		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	24/09/2020	24/09/2020	21/9/20 Email received to advise giving up p
12	Vacancy from 5th October						
13		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	14/09/2020	14/09/2020	
14		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	25/09/2020	25/09/2020	
15		£25.00	£25.00	cheque	21/09/2020	Payment 1 - 24/09/20	
16		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	21/09/2020	21/09/2020	
17		£25.00	£25.00	cash	05/10/2020	Payment 3 - 06/10/20	
18		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	24/09/2020	24/09/2020	Paid over 2 days £ 1+£24
19		£25.00	£25.00	cheque	14/09/2020	Payment 1 - 24/09/20	
20		£25.00	£25.00	cheque	17/09/2020	Payment 1 - 24/09/20	
21		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	24/09/2020	24/09/2020	awaiting 20 21 Form (end Oct)
22		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	09/09/2020	09/09/2020	
23		£25.00	£25.00	cheque	28/09/2020	Payment 2 - 06/10/20	
24		£25.00					
25 and 26		FOC					
27		£25.00					
28		£25.00	£25.00	BACS	30/09/2020	30/09/2020	
29 and 30		£50.00	£50.00	BACS	14/09/2020	14/09/2020	
31		£25.00					
		<b>£715.00</b>	<b>£640.00</b>				

Expected income 28 full plots @ £ 25.00 = £ 700.00 2 half plots @ £ 20.00 = £ 40.00 Plots 25& 26 FOC = Total expected income £ 740.00

New Tenancy Form and Tenancy Agreement received	Payment 1 - £ 125.00 cheque	Payment 2 - £ 25.00 cheque	Payment 3 - £ 25.00 cash	
	24/09/2020	06/10/2020	06/10/2020	



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Appendix 'B'

<http://www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk/Alderholt-PC/UserFiles/Files/Minutes/2020/200924%20NPC%20Minutes%20APC.pdf>

Appendix 'C'

Cllr T Butler and myself met with the Village Hall Committee on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020. We had a constructive meeting with the Committee and received an overview on how Covid had impacted on the Village Hall and their ideas for the future. The two financial items which were raised by the Committee were:-

- a) the increase in rent for the Village Office / Committee Room. There has been no increase for two years. I'm currently awaiting the proposed rent increase from the Village Hall.
- b) a request to pay for the flowers in the raised flower bed, outside the front door to the Parish Office. The request is to share the cost with the Village Hall, on alternate years. At present the Parish Council makes no contribution to the flowers. It is estimated that annually around £250.00 is spent on flowers for the raised bed. A volunteer currently plants the flowerbed and maintains it. Therefore, the cost would be for flowers/plants only.



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

### Appendix 'D'

At the meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2020 the following was agreed:-

*Cllr Logan thanked Cllr Tooke for their response to the consultation and stated that Alderholt Parish Council needed to provide a strong response to central Government. Therefore, if any other Members had comments to add please could they forward them to Cllr Logan by the end of September 2020. Those comments would then be agreed at the October meeting of the Alderholt Parish Council and forwarded as the Council's response.*

Below is the suggested response from Cllr Logan. Also attached is the response submitted by Cllr Tooke.

Members are requested to consider the response from Cllr Gina Logan, Chairman of the Planning Committee to the Planning For The Future which would then be forwarded to Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

### Questions

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England? **Local Complex, Sustainable**
2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No] **YES**  
2(a). If no, why not? [Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]
3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify] **All the options listed plus notices posted physically at the site.**
4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? **[Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]**
5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **This is a very simplistic approach which doesn't recognise the conflicts between Growth and Renewal particularly in rural areas on the periphery of large urban settlements. There will inevitably be disputes about the zoning of areas. Development shouldn't just be based on a zoned approach, environmental, transport and infrastructure elements make up the "whole planning process". This approach results in the LPAs being unable to react to changing circumstances, as it would appear that once a zone is set it cannot be changed. This blunt approach removes local accountability.**



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

6 Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] This standardised approach on a national level removes the adaptability flexibility of LPAs – planning has essentially been locally determined and this will be lost.

7(a). Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Sustainability appears to be missing from Pillar 2. Clear-cut policies/statements need to be seen and these again being National will never reflect the local area’s specificity regarding the environment, level of infrastructure, closeness to employment etc .

7(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate? Without a duty to co-operate it will be very difficult to get any agreement as one LPA cannot be allowed to offset its housing requirement onto a neighbouring LPA.

8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Any nationally based formula used for establishing housing requirements must be driven by the local need. A national formula may result in many more dwellings being allocated to a rural area where they are unsustainable ie no local infrastructure no employment available and thus no commercial demand for the housing.

8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] This approach is far too simplistic. The availability of good transport links, places of employment and facilities such as schools, doctors, shops etc should be the key drivers for the location of development. Often more rural locations are expensive and desirable due to their location and development here over time would damage these locations. Redevelopment of areas considered “cheap” due to a lack of infrastructure and poor housing but good transport links and access to employment opportunities would be far more useful.

9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Outline Permission can only be granted after a number of criteria have been approved namely affordable housing provision, provision (where appropriate) of a SANG, access, children’s play areas and open space. These matters cannot be left to the Reserved Matters stage of the planning process.

9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Once the area is zoned for growth or renewal it would be very difficult to change the outcome.

9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Need to see much more detail on this. However, if such large schemes are of national significance, they will undoubtedly require significant sums of Govt. funding to ensure the provision of appropriate infrastructure

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Some of the statements are of



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

potential benefit, but planning is a local issue, and the knowledge of local Cllrs is sometimes key to decision making. Local accountability must be retained, with input not only from Officers but members as well eg design.

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] In order to make the process faster and more transparent digital access to the documents and supporting data together with the tools to enable analysis is essential. But as some people will be unable to access such data paper copies must be available upon request.

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] As the Local Plan in any format is to remain the key planning tool for any area it must remain a robust document and in order to achieve this local input and consultation is absolutely necessary which takes time, so a 30month timescale is not appropriate.

13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Neighbourhood Plans by their very name relate to small local areas ie villages/hamlets. They currently have to reflect the housing numbers etc of Local Plans, but should not be constrained by other Local Plan policies eg design as such locations are very diverse. The production of Development Briefs can cover single sites/streets.

13(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Delays in completing planned developments creates a significant problem for the LPAs with regard to the Deliverability tests. We suggest that in addition to the statutory 3 year starting period there is a statutory completion period banded according to size and complexity of the development. If developers aren't able to meet the completion deadline then they should be subjected to a fine or the permission withdrawn. A significant land bank of already determined planning permissions exists. The existing system of allowing the digging of a single foundation trench within the initial 3 year period that effectively secures the planning permission in perpetuity, can not be retained.

15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify] Developments over the last 5 decades has been of the standard type reflecting general design trends eg brown window and door frames of the 1970s to the grey treatments of the 2000s. Good attractive design enhances any development.

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify] As a result of climate change and in a rural area, we would have a least two priorities – less reliance on cars and energy efficiency of new buildings.

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] National guidance eg Manual for Streets has been welcomed, but LPAs must be able to promote design that reflects each local character area. This ability should not be dependent solely upon "effective inputs from the local community" as such engagement cannot necessarily be guaranteed. A



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Aldersholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

“one size fits all” approach to design isn’t acceptable.

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / **Not sure**. Please provide supporting statement.] **Design is a local issue – each area having its own character and with each LPA there is undoubtedly a wealth of evidence of past good design that can be utilised without the necessity of yet another over-arching Govt body.**

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes / No / **Not sure**. Please provide supporting statement.] **Although the “Manual for Streets” approach has been worthwhile, design is very much a local issue and beauty subjective. Thus, much more detail is required, and also how would local input be included in the design of any development.**

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / **No** / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Where there are already agreed design codes and policies in place and these are complied with then planning can be achieved more swiftly, but legislation must not be used to determine design through a tick-box form exercise as stated in para 3.20. this is pre-determination of what is good.**

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [**More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space / Don’t know / Other – please specify**] **In a rural setting, the provision of more affordable housing and infrastructure are of equal importance, as any increase in population requires the commensurate provision of facilities to reduce the car usage in the climate emergency.**

22(a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / **Not sure**. Please provide supporting statement.] **This will be dependent upon the proportion and of course the threshold both of which need to be determined locally, which of itself precludes a national system.**

22(b). Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / **Locally**]

22(c). Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / **More value** / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **If S106 agreements are to be abolished, but included in the CIL then it is essential that the CIL makes up any shortfall from the loss of the S106.**

22(d). Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / **Not sure**. Please provide supporting statement.] **The theory sounds good, but for LPA’s to take on this burden when they are already facing severe financial pressures only becomes feasible if there can be complete certainty as to when any development is completed and successfully sold.**

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [**Yes** / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **This will allow LPAs to benefit financially through PDR thus helping to ensure appropriate infrastructure can be put in place to serve the changed environment.** 24(a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [**Yes** / No in the / Not sure. Please provide



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

supporting statement.] If this doesn't occur then contributions from the developers will fall resulting in the LPAs being unable to meet the obligations of providing the levels of both affordable housing and infrastructure.

24(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] The theory in para 4.22 is acceptable but the risks to the LPAs outlined in paras 4.23 and 4.24 are of grave concern, as the LPAs must not be out of pocket to the developers. Right to purchase would allow the LPAs to consider the level of affordable housing required in their areas, and they would also then become the social landlords.

24(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

24(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] Both build quality and design must be properly regulated and there must be no differentiation between any facilities provided for market housing and affordable housing.

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] With fewer restrictions the LPAs are able to use funds were needed in their areas, this contributes to local democracy and accountability.

25(a). If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] In favour of the greater freedoms, but essentially the provision of affordable housing is key and therefore some element of the monies must be secured to ensure this provision.

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

None

### Response from Cllr Tooke

### Proposed Response to Government Planning White Paper: "Planning for the Future"

#### Background

- A. The Government is consulting on several plans to overhaul the planning system.
- B. There are plans outside the White Paper for reforms to existing planning rules which would allow fast track permissions for offices and retail centres to be converted to houses; and extra storeys to be added to existing housing and flats.
- C. There are also separate plans to change the assessment of local housing need and the threshold below which developers are required to contribute to affordable housing.
- D. The Government has already laid new regulations allowing Permitted Developments that do not provide adequate environmental standards to counter Climate Change dangers
- E. In the future reforms proposed in the "Planning for the Future" consultation published on the 6 August 2020, land will be categorised into Growth, Renewal or Protected zones;



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

- i. 'Growth' areas will allow outline planning permission with no democratic oversight within any areas so designated in the local plan. Although mitigation measures may be required for areas of Flood Risk, or other important constraints.
- ii. 'Renewal' areas, existing built areas, or rural areas not designated Growth or Protected, will be subject to a statutory 'presumption in favour of development', although LPAs can consider the case for resisting "inappropriate development of residential gardens".
- iii. 'Protection' areas will be where development will be discouraged. Such as Green Belt, AONB, Conservation Areas, Local Wildlife sites,, flood risk, and important green space.

### **Alderholt Parish Council recognises:**

- i. The need to build more housing to prevent homelessness and provide adequate, affordable and suitable accommodation for everyone, and the failure of successive governments to address the issue.
- ii. That councils currently approve nine in ten applications.
- iii. That the Local Government Association findings show that over a million homes have planning permission but remain unbuilt.

### **Alderholt Parish Council believes that:**

- a. The planning system is not the cause of low build-out numbers.
- b. These proposals reduce democratic accountability and public scrutiny undermining the ability of councils to determine planning applications.
- c. These proposals significantly reduce the scope for public participation and influence on planning applications within local communities.
- d. The proposed changes would favour development interests over those of local communities.
- e. Delegation of detailed planning decisions to planning officers, rather than a democratically elected planning committee fails to recognise the role that public democratic scrutiny has in ensuring decisions are fair, transparent, with any impacts fully considered.
- f. The reforms restrict a planning authorities' ability to set local planning policies in line with the needs of their area and community aspirations, undermining the plan-led system, disempowering councils and communities.
- g. Replacing the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 payments with centrally imposed housing targets and a national levy, will likely result in less money for affordable housing, sustainable transport and other critical infrastructure.

The effort to speed up applications risk watering down or removing the requirement altogether for Strategic Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Assessments and similar assessments

### **Alderholt Parish Council recognises:**

- i. The need to build more housing to prevent homelessness and provide adequate, affordable and suitable accommodation for everyone, and the failure of successive governments to address the issue.



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

- ii. That councils currently approve nine in ten applications.
- iii. That the Local Government Association findings show that over a million homes have planning permission but remain unbuilt.

### **Alderholt Parish Council believes that:**

- a. The planning system is not the cause of low build-out numbers.
- b. These proposals reduce democratic accountability and public scrutiny undermining the ability of councils to determine planning applications.
- c. These proposals significantly reduce the scope for public participation and influence on planning applications within local communities.
- d. The proposed changes would favour development interests over those of local communities.
- e. Delegation of detailed planning decisions to planning officers, rather than a democratically elected planning committee fails to recognise the role that public democratic scrutiny has in ensuring decisions are fair, transparent, with any impacts fully considered.
- f. The reforms restrict a planning authorities' ability to set local planning policies in line with the needs of their area and community aspirations, undermining the plan-led system, disempowering councils and communities.
- g. Replacing the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 payments with centrally imposed housing targets and a national levy, will likely result in less money for affordable housing, sustainable transport and other critical infrastructure.
- h. The effort to speed up applications risk watering down or removing the requirement altogether for Strategic Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Assessments and similar assessments.

### Appendix 'E'

#### **Bee Keeping**

As the next person on the waiting list has enquired regarding our policy on beekeeping, we need to consider our policy. The prospective tenant would be happy to explain the methods used to keep disturbance to a minimum for the other tenants to avoid inconvenience to them.

However, upon consideration/discussion with Cllrs Hibberd and S Butler, it was felt that the keeping of bees would be likely to mean that the allotment plot itself would not/could not be worked as per its intended purpose so the recommendation from officers and allotment representatives would be to insert the following text into the allotment information.

#### **Bee Keeping**

Whilst the Council fully recognise the need for bees as pollinators, the keeping of bees on the allotment gardens is not permitted as it would not allow the allotment to be worked as per its intended purpose. Tenants are however encouraged to plant bee friendly plants.

**Cllrs are requested to agree the above amendment to the Tenancy agreement.**

#### **For Information**

- Currently all plots are allocated.
- There are currently 11 applicants on waiting list.



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Appendix 'F'

### **Drone Flying**

I live at Broomfield drive in Alderholt and I am a CAA approved commercial drone operator. I recently acquired my Permission for Commercial Operations (or PFCO) this year through 3IC as I film weddings in my spare time and have often been asked if I can use a drone for them.

Under the CAA rules Alderholt is in Class D airspace (which means I am permitted to fly, although I have to be mindful of other air traffic in the area.) If I were to go a little further down the road towards Ringwood, then that becomes a restricted airspace due to the proximity of Bournemouth airport. If I travel towards the new forest area past the Fighting Cox then that becomes private land due to the New Forest, so I am limited where I live to where I'm able to legally fly my drone.

As part of having a PFCO I have to submit my operations manual to the CAA to get it renewed each year. As part of my submission process I also have to submit my flight logs to show that I have completed at least 2 hours flying time over the year. If I'm unable to do at least 2 hours flying time then I can't have my permission renewed.

2 hours doesn't seem much over the course of the year, but typically I'll only fly for between 10 and 20 minutes on each wedding job I do. This year, due to Covid, all my wedding work has now been postponed until 2021, so I have no opportunity to fly as part of my commercial work.

So, to get my flight times up, I have visited the field on the rec every month or so, in order to get around 10 to 15 minutes of flight time to add to my logs. When I do these flights I wait until the field is relatively empty (there maybe a few people walking dogs etc, but I certainly wouldn't do it when the grounds were being used for cricket or football) normally on a Sunday evening. I would then go to the far end of the field and wait until any passer-by's have gone, then take off and fly it round and round in a circle, normally over the adjacent empty fields. I avoid flying it over any residential houses (even though I legally can, if I keep it above 250ft) as I know that may cause annoyance to certain residents.

It was only last Sunday that when packing my stuff away in the car that I noticed a sign on the club which stated that flying of model aircraft was not permitted on the grounds. So this is why I'm emailing you, to ask if you may be so kind as to grant me permission that so that I'm able to continue to fly every once in a while on the rec grounds in order to get my flying logs up to date for the CAA. If you wanted to only allow me certain times or dates when I would be able to do this, then I'd be happy to adhere to these.

I have attached copies of my operations manual, my permission from the CAA for commercial work, my recreational insurance from coverdrone (my current policy expires at the start of next month, so I have included both this years and my renewal for next year), my cover note from flockcover (this is my commercial insurance policy which I take out policies on a job by job basis as certain jobs require different levels of cover) and a copy of one my flight logs from last Sunday, so you can see whereabouts on the field I've been flying from and how I've been flying my drone each time.)

Please let me know if it's possible for me to continue flying my drone and if there's anything else you need from me.

As I said, I only live in Broomfield drive so it would be ideal for me to continue using the area. I've never had any resident complain to me whilst I've been out flying and I am very limited to where I can fly in the local area.



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Kind regards

### **Cycle Access at Rifle Range**

Re: 22/18 New Planning Applications for Consultation: "Alderholt Parish Council support this application so that the land is put to community use, as was the intention when the land was transferred to Alderholt Parish Council by East Dorset District Council."

Reference: <http://www.alderholtparishcouncil.gov.uk/Alderholt-PC/UserFiles/Files/Minutes/2018/180319%20Planning%20Committee%20Minutes.pdf>

I am a resident in Alderholt and cycle for fitness. May I respectfully request that the community use of this land includes public access through to Whitefield Bottom Drove, where many residents walk their dogs and exercise please?

I ask because currently my only access on bike or foot to the drove is off Hillbury Road / Harbridge Drove, crossing a 60mph road, with no provision for cyclists or pedestrians at all - no footpath or verge - it is extremely dangerous to cross over here from this fast road into Whitefield Bottom Drove. Public access to Whitefield Bottom from the 30-40mph Ringwood Road, by way of the former rifle range, would be far safer I feel.

Please advise.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

### **Parking at Ringwood Rd/Charing Cross Junction**

I am sure I am not the only resident of the village who finds the parking of vehicles on the junction of Ringwood Road and Station Road opposite the children's shop very dangerous. Not only do they block vision of the junction when turning right when coming down Ringwood Road but they also park on the pavement so anyone with a pram or wheelchair would struggle to get pass, also the school buses struggle to get pass as well. It is I am sure the residents of the sovereign housing flats on the corner, although they do have parking to the rear. Is it possible to have yellow lines put outside on the junction or write to the Housing Association and ask them to remind their clients not to park near the junction or on the pavement. It is an accident waiting to happen.

Would you please bring this to the attention of the council when next they meet.

Kind regards

### **Hedges, pavements and speeding**

Good morning. I'm writing to request that the parish council consider these items for discussion at the next meeting.

1. Please could a reminder be sent out to householders about keeping the pavement outside their houses free for pedestrians? As a grandparent I am often out and about with my grandchildren in pushchairs and it is very difficult to pass on the pavement without stepping into the road, which clearly is very dangerous. My main issue is with the hedge outside



## Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of Alderholt Parish Council held remotely at 7.00pm on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020

[REDACTED] where the pavement is restricted due to the hedge growing out across the pavement, but in other places careless parking where a car or van blocks the pavement is also a problem. This is, in my view an accident waiting to happen and I would urge the council to take action as soon as possible.

2. The problem of speeding in the village is also an issue I think needing to be raised. A few years ago a request was sent out for volunteers to man the speed watch station and at the time I volunteered. Unfortunately nothing happened as it seems I was the only volunteer at the time. Please could a further request go out, as I feel this problem is getting worse as time goes on.

I would be most grateful if these items could be discussed and action taken on them.

Thank you in advance