

FAWLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of Fawley Parish Council held on Wednesday 03 June 2019 at 7pm in the Jubilee Hall, Fawley.

Members	Present	Apologies	Absent
Cllr A Alvey Chairman	√		
Cllr A Carcas	√		
Cllr B Coyston	√		
Cllr A Glass	√		
Cllr B Hall	√		
Cllr McElhenny		√	
Cllr S Milgate	√		
Cllr J Poole	√		
Cllr S Read			√
Cllr C Reece	√		
Cllr A Sanders		√	
Cllr K Smith	√		
Cllr T Terrill	√		
Cllr B Thorne Vice-Chairman	√		
Vacancy			

In attendance:

Steve Postlethwaite, Clerk/RFO to the Council
Sue Markides, Deputy Clerk

Also present: District Councillor Mark Clark, New Forest District Council Planning Officers Ian Rayner & Claire-Upton Brown, New Forest National Park Planning Officers Steve Avery & Natalie Walters.

Approximately 100 members of the public

19/23 Apologies: Apologies were sent by Cllrs D McElhenny and A Sanders and by County Councillor A McEvoy for personal reasons. These were accepted.

19/24 Declarations of Interest and dispensations:

24.1 To receive declarations of interest from councillors on items on the agenda Cllrs Glass and Thorne declared a non-prejudicial interest in the 3 planning applications on the agenda, as they are members of the New Forest District Council Planning Committee. They stated that they would remain in the meeting but would not take part in the vote.

Cllr Alvey as Chairman advised under the Localism Act 2011 individual councillors are required to declare any interests/dispensations on agenda items.

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

For planning application 19/10476 at the Fawley Refinery, the Parish Council as a whole is not required to declare an interest but in the interests of transparency Fawley Parish Council discloses that an annual sum (in the region of £4000) is received from ExxonMobil to support community work within the parish. However this donation/any sponsorship does not mean that any prejudgement in the decision making process has taken place.

24.2 To receive written requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests None

24.3 To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate None

19/25 Chairman's Announcements: The Chairman advised of the following:

I wish to clarify the role of the Parish Council in reviewing these applications.

The local planning authorities (New Forest District Council and New Forest National Park Authority) must take into account the representations of the Parish Council who are consultees in the planning process. However, this does not mean that the local planning authority will necessarily decide an application completely in accordance with the Parish views. It is not the role of a Parish to duplicate or replicate the role of the local planning authority. There are several reasons for this:

The local planning authority is only entitled to take into account planning matters. If the comments of Parish Councils do not relate to legitimate planning issues, they must be set aside.

The local planning authority must determine applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As consultation responses are material considerations, the local planning authority takes into account the representations of others, as well as the Parish, especially those from statutory consultees (e.g. the County or national highway authority or the Environment Agency), other officers of the Council, neighbours, and the applicant.

The comments of a Parish, when weighed in the balance, may have insufficient weight to enable the application to be determined with the wishes of the Parish, whether to approve or to refuse. In addition, there are restrictions on the way in which a local planning authority is entitled by law to deal with applications.

We will have 2 Public sessions.

The first will be before Application 19/10476

A total of 15 minutes will be allowed with each person allowed 3 minutes. Please do not be repetitive in your comments.

The council will then debate the application.

The second public session will be before applications 19/10581 and 19/00365, which will be considered together.

Again a total of 15 minutes will be allowed with each person allowed 3 minutes.

We have invited Officers of NFDC and the NFNPA to attend and offer advice to the Council in reaching their conclusions.

Standing orders were suspended

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

PUBLIC SESSION relating to planning application 19/10476

Member of the public 1 – member of environmental group, Save Our Shores.

We believe the Esso/ExxonMobil's application 19/10476 to build new hydrogen and diesel plants at their Fawley refinery should be rejected on the basis Employment, Policy, and in the face of the Environmental effects. We appreciate the very long-standing good relationship the applicant has had with the community, but the fact that fossil fuels are a major contributor to global warming must be addressed.

Jobs: Although ExxonMobil's press release indicated there could be 1000 new jobs, their Planning Statement [paragraph 2.83-2.84] states otherwise:

2.83: "only a negligible increase in existing staff numbers" will be needed for long-term operation and;

"on average there will be 196 *temporary* jobs. A "proportion" of which will be sourced from outside the area because of the expertise needed

Policy: NFDC Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2009:

The principles of 'Sustainable Development' - social and economic sustainability as well as environmental - are central to this Core Strategy. 'Sustainable development seeks to meet the needs and aspirations of the present without compromising the ability to meet those of the future'

From the UK National Planning Policy Framework Feb 2019

The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate... It should help ... in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Pollution. Operation of the new plants will increase Sulphur Dioxide, Nitrous Oxides and Particulate Matter.

The applicant claims that "Whilst there are exceedances of the [pollutants per] annual Air Quality Standard (AQS) and daily mean Environmental Assessment Level (EAL) at Solent and Southampton Water SPA (Special Protection Area as designated by EU law) this is due to the background concentration which already exceeds the Air Quality Standards before any emissions from the new sources (or existing refinery emission sources) are considered.

The fact that the air quality already exceeds healthy standards is not a convincing argument for ignoring further increases of these same pollutants. For example, Sulphur Dioxide in this area is currently at 7 micrograms per cubic metre of air...

The allocated speaking time for the member of the public finished.

Member of the public 2 - member of environmental group, Save Our Shores.

I object to the Fawley Refinery expansion plans as I believe that the diesel demand that underpins the justification within the planning application, does not take into account the likely significant decline in diesel demand resulting from new environmental legislation, regulations and targets that will be required to meet commitments under the Paris Climate Agreement, as well as the government's own targets.

The emphasis on the fact that UK diesel consumption will not change, disregards the possibility that global consumption might change as a result of the new diesel refinery. While the UK will supposedly cease to import diesel fuel from overseas, reducing the UK's consumption of overseas diesel from its diverse pool of markets, this assumes that the diesel produced in these refineries will as a result, reduce also. However, the diesel may just be exported to different markets to supply growing demand elsewhere.

The application does not specify if the greater capacity for ADO production might require an increase to crude oil coming into the refinery. Would crude oil used in residual diesel intermediates decrease by the same amount that the crude oil used in the new diesel production would increase, or would more crude oil be required to meet additional demand by the refinery? If crude oil used for residual diesel intermediates or petrol production is not expected/intended to decrease, then due consideration should be paid to the increase in demand for crude by the refinery. Therefore, it is also critical to ask if GHG emissions from the increased crude oil imports will offset the save in emissions from the reduction in diesel fuel imports and thus cancel out this projected GHG reduction. There is also no mention of where the crude oil will be imported from.

In the UK, diesel saw a 29.6% drop in new vehicle registrations in 2018, as compared to 2017, while petrol climbed 8.62%, Hybrid Electric Vehicles (HEVs) and Plug in HEVs rose by a marked 22.3% and Battery Electric Vehicles (zero-carbon) increased by 14% on 2017's sales. BEVs sales grew in the first quarter of 2019 by 35% from the same period in 2018, HEVs (Including PHEVs) increased by 9.9%, petrol by 5.9% and diesel decreased by -20.3%. Government's 'Road to Zero Strategy' sets out a target for half of new vehicles to be Ultra Low Emissions (so BEVs) by 2030, but up to 70% possible, with 40% of new vans (LGVs?) also Ultra Low Emissions.

As older diesel vehicles come to the end of their use, these will be increasingly replaced with the Ultra-Low Emissions vehicles, so the UK diesel fleet will see significant reductions at least from 2030 onwards, if not sooner in the lead up to this government target.

The allocated speaking time for the member of the public finished.

Member of the public 3 (from Bournemouth University) wished to ask a question – How are councillors addressing the addition of air pollution caused by the refinery in line with the Southampton Clean Air Policy?

Cllr Glass as Chairman of the New Forest Environmental Liaison Committee advised that air quality around the Fawley site has been monitored for a very long time; pollution is so low that there is currently no legal requirement to monitor the air. He considered the air is cleaner in Fawley than it is in Bournemouth and there will be monitoring documents to prove this.

A further question was asked regarding the measures in place to monitor the ambient air quality PM2.5. This was considered to be a query that should be made to ExxonMobil.

Member of the public 4 – as a Fawley resident living very close to the boundary of the refinery he wished to support the application on environmental grounds. He considered that electric vehicles were not currently a sustainable option and that the super low diesel and Hydrogen being produced on site is the future. He also considered that the air quality in Fawley is so clean it is not even a legal requirement to measure it.

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

Simon Downing, Fawley Refinery Manager advised of the following:

Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Councillors, ladies and gentleman. Thank you for giving me the chance to outline ExxonMobil's planning proposal to install two new units at our Fawley site: a hydrotreater to enable us to produce more ultra-low sulphur diesel, and a plant to produce hydrogen, in support of the hydrotreater process.

The latest standards for diesel in the UK require such fuel to produce ultra-low sulphur emissions. Fawley currently exports some higher sulphur diesel that we are unable to treat to meet UK specifications, and imports ultra-low sulphur diesel to meet the UK demand. This project significantly reduces this two way traffic across our Jetty by enabling us to treat the higher sulphur diesel at Fawley, to make more of our own ultra-low sulphur diesel and reduce imports.

To put the project in context, we already have six similar hydrotreater units on site, which have operated successfully for many years. While the hydrogen plant is new to Fawley, we operate such units elsewhere and they use well-known and well-understood refining technology.

So why do we want to spend £800 million on this project? There are two clear reasons: Firstly, it will help secure the future employment for our 2,000 employees and contractors on site (most of whom live locally) – and provide excellent career opportunities for youngsters as they enter the workforce. Secondly, it will enable us to help meet high demand for quality fuels in the UK market, where approximately 50% of all UK diesel is currently imported.

Transport fuels are a critical component of our society enabling us to travel to work and school and access key services such as health care. Fuels keep the economy moving and without them we would literally grind to a halt. While the use of carbon intensive fuels will reduce over time in line with Government policy and in order for the UK to meet the 2050 Paris treaty climate commitments, this is a transition over a period of 30 years. In the meanwhile we need to use best available technology (including ultra-low sulphur fuels) to reduce emissions from private vehicles. Although electric vehicles are gaining popularity, they currently account for a very small portion of the overall vehicle population. We anticipate that diesel vehicles, including hybrids, are likely to continue to play a prominent role for many years to come during the transition period. Heavy vehicles, such as trucks and coaches will also continue to need fuel.

The two new production units have been designed to the latest ExxonMobil, UK and EU standards and we have successfully completed initial reviews on the design with the Health and Safety Executive, demonstrating that it is fully consistent with their most recent guidance on safety in plant design and operation.

Both units will be powered by cleaner burning natural gas, and the latest low-emission technology is fitted to the heaters. The new units will also feature extensive heat integration as part of their design in order to minimise energy consumption. We have also been awarded an Environmental Permit for the new plants from the Environment Agency after demonstrating that we have met the stringent requirements of

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) and have applied the concept of Best Available Techniques (BAT) to minimise emissions.

Though there will be some additional local traffic during construction, we do not anticipate that it will have a major impact on local roads, and we will plan any unusual traffic movements to minimise any disruption.

The new units will not have any impact on road transport movements once they are commissioned – all the crude used at Fawley is imported via our Fawley Marine Terminal, and all the fuel produced at Fawley for the UK market is transported by pipeline to fuel terminals.

In summary, if approved, this project will help secure future employment for 2,000 people on site and many more in the local community who serve the site. It is also of strategic importance to the country having a positive impact on UK energy security and the country's Balance of Payments. In environmental terms, the refinery operates well within its regulations, and the performance of the new units will be equal to, or better than, our existing units – and almost certainly better performing than many of those overseas refineries that currently supply a significant proportion of the diesel used in the UK. Producing the UK demand on site also helps cut transport emissions by reducing the number of ship movements.

In other words, this project is good news for all those living locally who work at the refinery, for the local community and for the UK as a whole.

Cllr Alvey advised that this was the end of the public session –no one else wished to speak or had any other questions; three objectors live outside of the area and one local resident in favour.

Standing orders were reinstated

19/26 Planning: RESOLVED: To submit the following observations:

a) Parish List

Full Planning Permission

19/10476

Fawley Refinery, Block 36B, Marsh Lane, Fawley SO45 1TX

Proposal: Two re-fuelling units consisting of Hydrogen Unit and Hydrotreater (Block 36B);
Automotive diesel oil storage tank (Block 13)

Suspension of standing orders

Members debated planning application 19/10476.

The comments of on line representees were noted.

Questions raised to members of the ExxonMobil team present included why does more diesel need to be produced?

Answer: There is a demand which is currently not being met and this will be low sulphur diesel which will reduce the need to import from outside the UK.

Q. How much diesel is imported by the UK currently?

A. 50% of the diesel used by the UK is imported.

Q. Will more crude oil need to be imported?

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

A. The figures go up and down on a day to day, week to week basis but fundamentally the amount of crude oil imported will remain the same.

Q. Will CO2 emissions be increased?

A. Fawley diesel will have a much lower co2 emission; we could take advantage of this being produced in Fawley and reduce the current carbon footprint.

Concern was raised regarding traffic movements. It was noted that a study has been undertaken and during the construction period there will be a predicted increase of 25% of local traffic movements however it was considered that this would not result in any significant queuing at roundabouts and the figures are less than experienced during a larger "turnaround " at the site. Once constructed the increase will be minimal, as it will create in the range of 10-30 new permanent jobs.

The figure of a 25% increase in traffic movements was queried. It was noted that during peak construction 1000 extra people will be working on site, every effort will be made to bus these staff in (as Exxon normally do at times of turnaround). These workers will be staying in the local area, using local accommodation and travelling counter to the normal commuting traffic.

The impact of the project on the environment was discussed. An officer of NFDC confirmed that a comprehensive submission has been made by the applicant which they continue to work through; if there are any queries the district council will immediately contact the applicant.

It was noted that an agreement has been reached with Fawley Waterside to accept large deliveries through the Calshot Wharf; these will then proceed by road to the refinery. The effect on the public footpath close by and the necessary bridge movements was queried.

It was further noted that a total of 20 shipments will take place, predominantly in 2021. Road closures may be required but these will be as usual under traffic management – co-ordinated similarly to large deliveries already received at Fawley.

Cllrs considered that diesel is still required to be produced and a proposal was made that this planning application goes ahead with the condition that it meets environmental standards. Whilst Cllrs Glass and Thorne did not take part in the vote, all other members present were in favour.

RESOLVED: To submit the comment as follows: **(No 3)** We recommend permission with the condition that all environmental standards are met.

6 members of the public left the meeting.

Standing orders were suspended

PUBLIC SESSION relating to planning applications 19/10581 & 19/00365

Member of the public 1

The local resident (and others that he was representing) consider; the infrastructure is just not there for this development; it is out of scale with the surrounding area and the section 106 monies due will not provide the council with sufficient funds to provide a safe highway. There is no provision made for the double amount of traffic he expects to see use the B3053, no change in speed limit, no school crossing and as he lives very close to the road he considers the lorries using the route from 02.45am onwards to be a danger. He provided details of crashes that have occurred at the bottom of Ashdown Hill and considered the road there to be lethal whilst suggesting long term plans could perhaps include a route from Calshot via Langley to join the Hardley Roundabout with the A326 being widened. However he considered that as it stands, the development is a no go.

Member of the public 2

A resident of Holbury considered this application to be the wrong development on the wrong site and continued that it is not sustainable, being at the end of a 9 mile cul de sac. The development will be served just by a single carriageway road with no feasible travel alternative to the motor car. There is large car parking provision on site, 3,800 spaces, which proves big projected car use. There is an acute flooding risk.

This is an isolated site in a beautiful rural area, it is in the middle of nowhere entirely within a National Park. This new town is remote from any existing settlement and against National, and current, Local Planning policies. It will harm sites of nature conservation importance There are 5, landmark buildings (98m (322') – 42m (138')), the designs of which I consider to be inappropriate; an almost sub-urban layout housing scheme.

Traffic will be a nightmare with grid-lock on the A326

The houses are not for locals – the New Forest is one of the most expensive areas to buy a house in England. There will be no stat controls on occupancy and so perhaps sold to wealthy incomers – second /retirement /executive homes.

Is it a done deal? The Council's Chief Planning Officer is reported as calling the scheme "exciting" and this is just the start with press reports which say "It's going to happen".

There appears to be no chance of fair hearing.

Personally I support the idea of local jobs but NOT as part of a new town here. When the site is cleared it should be left open and returned to forest /wetlands which would benefit the National Park.

Member of the public 3

A local resident felt this development would be too large in this location (will be the size of Lyndhurst). She noted the numbers of housing required in the NFDC area outside the National Park was 10,500 homes.

She queried what would happen in the future if Dibden Bay also went ahead? There would be a major impact on local traffic and she considered the suggested widening of roundabouts would not work. Traffic locally has already been predicted to increase by 14%

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

between 2017 – 2036 and this is, without including this development; there will be a huge impact on forest roads.

She queried why the project is only financially viable if it develops outside of the boundary of the power station into the National Park Authority – 120 houses, drinking establishments, a school? It has already cost millions to take the power station down. Development within the site of the power station is bad enough without it spilling out.

This site is a SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest) and also has the Solent & Southampton Water Special Protection Area, and Ramsar site; what will happen to these, to the birds? The habitats should remain undisturbed. In the southern quarter of these plans is Tom Tiddlers Field, the development will result in a loss of habitats here, they say it will be replaced but in my view it will be replaced with a recreational park and this is not what we need.

Member of the public 4

The member of the public who had requested to speak advised that his points had already been made and as per the request of the Chairman he did not wish to repeat these – the lack of infrastructure and the affordability of the housing.

Member of the public 5 advised I've lived in Holbury for 38yrs, almost as long as some of the developers have lived.

I would like to quote from the Times newspaper dated 26/03/2017, "This is your working day in the mid 2020's. Take a stroll through colonnaded streets to the office before joining your daughter to watch wild ponies graze at lunch. Then go kite surfing after work – all with no need to own a car".

Fantasy?

In my view – YES, we are told there will be 4000 people living here, but people use cars, there is no public transport to support.

This is the wrong development in the wrong place; this development is more akin to Gun Wharf.

The developers are planning a Poundland at the end of one of the longest Cul-de-Sacs in the UK – the A326.

This development is the urbanization of the New Forest.

This development will affect everyone from the M27 at Totton all the way down the Waterside, we will be gridlocked – and that's without Dibden Bay being developed – which if the Power Station is developed – will almost certainly happen.

Why are the planning applications being submitted piecemeal, not as a total package? Last week it was the Habitats regulations prior to notification of demolition – then outline planning permission submitted last week for 120 new homes etc. why? No developer is going to spend millions demolishing the power station if he is not going to achieve his development goal!

Primary school provision is planned, but we already have four such schools in our area, if children move away from these existing schools to the proposed new one – then their funding could be affected.

The first speaker spoke about a potential relief round around the back of Holbury to join the Hardley roundabout – this is just more land to support a development we don't need – why should the taxpayer fund the landowner to make money – this not what we should be doing.

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

The member of the public who had requested to speak advised that her points had already been made; however she corrected the previous speaker in that he meant Poundbury not Poundland!

Member of the public 6

Aldred Drummond of Fawley Waterside advised he would try to answer some of the questions raised. The road seems to be the main issue; he has lived in the area for 40 years and now uses the road every day. It does need improving, has done since the 60/70's; it could still be done and he agreed that it should be.

He outlined the suggested improvements which will significantly increase capacity up to the Dibden Roundabout.

There are no concerns of overlapping with the Exxon development as the first houses will not be being built until 2023. As the developer he is pushing the reopening of the railway line, promoting that and the fast ferry so the road is not the only transport option.

In explaining why the area could be developed he informed of the demographic change seen. This is an opportunity to do something on the land – there will be affordable housing as this is a statutory responsibility, local occupancy restrictions could be imposed although the NFNPA had decided against these.

Member of the public 7 echoed the concerns raised so far and asked regarding the energy strategy for the new development, in particular with regard to older carbon factors, which have in London now been dropped, has this been taken on and thought about?

The Chairman advised this was a matter for the planning authorities.

The public session was closed.

Standing orders were re-instated.

Outline Planning Permission

19/10581

Site of Fawley Power Station, Fawley Road, Fawley SO45 1TW

Proposal: Land within the New Forest District Council comprising the demolition of the existing power station buildings and provision of 1,380 new homes, 102,600 square metres of new commercial, civic and employment space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, B2, B8, C1, C3, D1 and D2), enlargement of the dock and creation of a canal within part of the turbine hall basement, refurbishment of the remainder of the turbine hall basement to create a 2,100 space car park, a boat stack, public open space, SANG, primary access road through the site, flood defences/sea wall, raising site level, hard and soft landscaping, associated infrastructure and engineering works (Outline Application with details only of Access)

b) New Forest National Park Authority:

Outline Planning Permission

19/00365

Land adjacent to Fawley Power Station

Proposal: Outline application for development of 120 homes, 300 square metres of new civic space (Use Class D1), 200 square metres of drinking establishments (Use Class A4), a

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

two form entry primary school, early years provision, public open space and habitat enhancement of existing land, hard and soft landscaping, Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, a saline lagoon, tidal creek, reconfiguration of the existing access and creation of a new access from the B3053 and access road through the site, associated infrastructure and engineering works (access to be considered)

Councillors debated the planning applications.

Cllr Glass as Chairman of NFDC wished the meeting to note that the statement that the council has already reached a decision regarding this application is inaccurate: the decision has not been made; it is not officers that reach the decision but planning committee members who come to their own decision. As a member of the NFDC planning committee he considered it was inappropriate to comment further.

Cllr Alvey noted that the briefing notes from the officer of NFNPA referred to a third planning application; however it was noted that this application for 30 new houses by the new cemetery at Calshot is not included. The application is for 120 houses in the National Park to address the need identified in the emerging local plan.

Cllr Alvey considered transport to be a real issue and concern to all living in the area and suggestion the parish council could condition any approval. He noted representee comments on the website of the planning authorities. In particular he queried a representation from Go South, the local bus company who say the transport proposals are nonsensical.

Mr Drummond responded that the comment had been made on an out of date document which they are intending to put right. Fawley Waterside has had productive discussions with the transport firm.

Cllr Alvey did not believe that the reopening of the railway line (which is not referenced to in the application) could go ahead due in his own view to security issues relating to the refinery) and topographical issues on other parts of the line. He did not consider the Park and Ride north of the refinery to be viable.

Cllr Alvey wished to raise as a minor issue, that page 14 of the travel plan stated Holbury was separate from Fawley parish, Holbury is of course included.

Cllr Alvey asked whether the use of geotextile membrane was a reasonable and safe proposal for the land contamination at the power station site – NFDC Officers would not confirm at this point that this was the case as they are looking at this but did confirm that this is a technique widely used to contain contaminants. Plans for the area would take these into account e.g. an allotment site would not be put in that particular area.

Mr Drummond confirmed that some asbestos remained on site although some had been removed by RWE with some being imbedded in the structure which is being dealt with as an ongoing process.

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

Regarding the footpaths and bridge (opening and closing) it was noted that the footpaths will remain and the bridge height raised slightly so that a ferry could enter without the need to open it.

The definition of affordable homes was queried – within NFDC to be policy compliant it is 35% whilst the requirement in the emerging NFNPA local plan is for 50% of affordable housing in new builds.

Affordable housing can be several different tenures – rental/social rental/ shared ownership and it is possible to reach a legal agreement to secure affordable housing, both local planning authorities if the applications are approved are able to do this and these need to be looked at as legal agreements to ensure what is said to be delivered is delivered .

Cllr Coyston advised he is against the railway line as it is not suitable being for goods only and would have to be upgraded for passengers. He raised his concern regarding the buildup of traffic along the A326 and Long Lane, Holbury and the proposed minor changes and road marking were not sufficient.

Cllr Carcas asked if Fawley Infants School will remain open as a new school is proposed for the new people in the area.

Mr Drummond advised that there is currently capacity at Fawley Infants School although this could change; there is also capacity at the local senior school with limited capacity at Blackfield Primary. The probability is the school would not be built for 5-6 years after the start of the development.

Cllr Hall considered that the traffic on local roads was a general concern for most and there was no concrete plan in place to alleviate this. He did not believe either the train or ferry would have a great impact on reducing traffic or that the suggested road improvements would work. He queried who would pay for these improvements when Hampshire County Council is unable to fill the pot holes in the road in the village let alone build a new road. As per the Councillor Handbook for Fawley Parish Councillors he considered it was the duty of the Council to represent the people of this parish, we know where we stand.

Cllr Milgate asked regarding the purpose of a SSSI.

The meeting was advised that it is a conservation designation denoting a protected area with clear guidance on the natural habitats of threatened species/ other species.

It was suggested by a member of the public that there are other ways to more tightly control conservation of sites.

Cllr Alvey considered that the planning applications will go in front of the planning committees and hoped that the meeting had provided a flavour of what people felt so that items could be addressed.

The 5 comment options for the council were noted. Cllrs Glass and Thorne did not take part in the vote.

Draft awaiting confirmation at the next Parish Council meeting

Cllr Coyston proposed No 2 – we recommend refusal on the grounds of traffic concerns but would accept the decision reached by officers which Cllr Hall seconded.
A vote was taken and the proposal rejected.

Cllr Alvey proposed No 3 we recommend permission subject to major improvements to the A326, Long Lane to Calshot site which Cllr Smith seconded.

Cllr Milgate stated the roads need a major rethink.

Cllr Alvey repeated his proposal No 3 we recommend permission subject to major improvements to the A326, Long Lane to Calshot site (BO3053) although he recognised the improvements were not the responsibility of the parish or district councils but that of Hampshire County Council.

A vote was taken.

The proposal was agreed 6 votes to 3.

RESOLVED: To submit the comment as follows: **(No 3)** we recommend permission subject to major improvements to the A326, and Long Lane to Calshot site (BO3053).

19/27 Date of next meeting: 12 June 2019

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.27pm.

.....
Chairman