

**CHILBOLTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON**

**FRIDAY 22 AUGUST 2025, 18:00, CHILBOLTON VILLAGE HALL**

Present: Cllrs Tony Ewer (Vice Chairman) (TE), David Griffith (DG), Emma Noble (EN), Sue Larcombe (SL), Debbie Collis (DC), David Hall (DH)

Members of the public: 22

1. **Apologies for Absence:** George Marits (GM) and Julian Hudson (Chairman) (JH)

2. **Chairmans Welcome**

In JH absence, TE (as vice chair) chaired this special meeting. The meeting was requested by Cllrs DH, DC and EN in order to discuss the way forward on the community housing project following receipt of the pre application advice (25/00258/PREAPN, dated 30 June 2025) from TVBC.

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

TE has an interest due to being on the list for an affordable or downsize home.

DH queried whether TE had taken advice from the TVBC Monitoring Officer about whether TE should recuse himself from this meeting due to his interest in the housing development. TE confirmed that he had not spoken with the Monitoring Officer that day, but had spoken to her in the past and she was happy.

No other declarations of interest were made.

4. **Resolution for Exclusion of Public for Confidential Planning Matters**

As there was nothing confidential to discuss, this resolution was not debated.

TE stated that he had received permission on the previous Wednesday (19 August) to make public a letter that the landowner of the site to the NE of Drove Road “the Painter site”, James Painter had sent to the CPC Chair. (attach letter to minutes) TE confirmed that this letter will be placed on the CPC website as soon as we can.

5. **Discussion of the Housing Project, to include the way ahead and scope of development.**

*James Painter Letter 16 August*

TE provided a brief summary of the contents of James Painter’s letter. The Painters will apply for outline planning permission now they have the pre-app advice. They are going to apply for the first 25 houses. They would like to continue working closely with PC and to establish community needs. In 1998 they gifted land for the village hall and community houses at Eastman’s Field.

Copies of the letter were handed out to the public present and time allowed for them to read.

TE noted that he had heard indirectly that the Painter family might be considering doing this, but until the letter arrived he couldn’t confirm.

Agreed and Signed ..... (Chairman)

DH stated that it is a good, clear, courteous letter from James setting out what they want to do. We've wanted clarity on what the Painters want to do and now we have it. We are no longer talking about a CPC led development on this site, it's a landowner development. This may be a good thing, depending on which route we decide to go down. No matter how good our committees are, we are not developers. The shift in emphasis is not necessarily a negative one and we should give the plans due consideration. He mooted that CPC should add this to the options being reviewed by CDC and run the ruler over it as we are doing with the other sites. I think it's a positive move.

TE noted that he has always been worried by the cost of putting in a planning application. If CPC did it ourselves it would cost c. £50,000+ which we don't have.

SL suggested that CPC could now wait and see what the landowner comes back with. It's a sea change in the CPC approach to Housing Development. An alternative approach suggested by DG is to be proactive and engage with the Painter family to provide CPC input to the housing scheme. This aligns with James stated desire to work with CPC on this project.

In the first instance CPC should respond to the letter, initiating dialogue between the two parties. The meeting was unable to confirm whether JH, as chair, had already sent a letter to James Painter acknowledging his letter. DG suggested that a letter from CPC should go further than just acknowledging the letter and say we would want to work with him and how CPC propose to proceed.

**ACTION JH to send a letter to James Painter once letter agreed by CPC**

#### *Site options*

DH proposed that the work of the CDC in assessing the site options for the community housing development would continue, with all 4 sites still under consideration. SL questioned why would CPC refuse the Painter site for the housing development and go with one of the others, but it was agreed that all still needed to be evaluated before a final decision is made. TE commented that for whichever landowner we deal with, the landowner will be driving the development and CPC will be involved through consultation. So in that way the Painter site is not different to any of the others.

SL noted that all of the sites under consideration by the CDC fell outside the settlement boundary. She proposed that CDC should contact TVBC to confirm whether these sites would be accepted as a Rural Exception Site in accordance with TVBC Policy COM9. If TVBC reply "no" then the site should be discounted so no nugatory work undertaken.

**Action DH/SL (for CDC) advise CDC to contact TVBC to discuss COM9 applicability to sites.**

DC noted that there are currently four sites under consideration; TE opined that if other sites were to crop up these should be considered by CDC in a similar manner.

#### *Community Development Committee Terms of Reference*

It was noted that the current CDC Terms of Reference version 3.2 which were agreed at the CPC meeting on 7 July 2025 restricted the work of the CDC to the Painter site only. At the CDC meeting on 23 July 2025, CDC proposed a compromise TOR (version 4.2) that would allow CDC to explore the

Agreed and Signed ..... (Chairman)  
Page 2 of 5

other site options, and consider sites from a commercial, legal and strategic perspective as well as the other parameters.

DH proposed and DC seconded approval of the TOR version 4.2. The CDC vice chair, who was present at the meeting as a member of the public, provided supporting detail and recommended that CPC approved CDC ToR version 4.2.

TE questioned whether it may be better to hold off until site analysis complete. DH noted that CDC are currently conducting site analysis and there is a whole work stream that is about the commercial business case involving Mark Husson, Fiona Barrie, JH and DH. It is impossible for CDC to make any recommendations without taking these into account.

DH further proposed that the reference to a referendum be removed from the CDC ToR version 4.2, as this is a matter for CPC and is also not required to progress the current CDC activities.

CPC voted to accept the CDC ToR version 4.2, once amended to remove the referendum clause. 4 councillors voted in favour and the chairman noted the vote was carried.

**ACTION DH/SL (for CDC) Advise CDC Secretary to amend the ToR Version 4.2 to remove the referendum clause and provide to the Clerk for dissemination**

#### *Recommendations to the Community Development Committee*

The meeting then discussed items that CDC may wish to consider with regards to the interaction with site landowners.

DC noted that CPC should consider what it is that the village want from the site development. TE agreed and noted that this is something CDC, on behalf of CPC, should look at. He referenced the two surveys of parish needs and aspirations that CDC should use as their starting points for discussion about community benefits. In response to a question from a member of the public, it was agreed that the Painters should be made aware of the CPC objection to the provision of 65 houses on the site, and any other “red lines” that the village may have with regards to the development. SL shared her gut feeling that the Painters will put in outline application for 65 houses because it adds a bigger degree of protection for the village.

The meeting also clarified that CDC may speak with landowners on CPC behalf. TE suggested that discussion with landowners should not occur until confirmation had been sought from TVBC regarding the sites suitability as a COM9 Rural Exception Site. The meeting noted that CDC had already laid out a framework of questions for discussion with landowners. The CDC working group tasked with landowner interaction includes the chair of CPC, JH, as well as DH, Fiona Barrie and Mark Husson. DG noted, and it was agreed, that a written record must be kept of all discussions between landowners and CDC/CPC.

**ACTION DH/SL (for CDC) Advise CDC of the above discussion and agreements**

DC asked how the Painter proposal to put in an outline planning permission will affect the work of the CCLT. TE noted that CPC are going to get 10 affordable houses from either the Painters or from another developer. With regards to the Painter site specifically, TE understands that the 25 homes proposed by James Painter reflect the 10+10+5 homes identified in the pre application advice request. Any homes built outside the settlement boundary have to meet the Rural Exception Housing rules which include that 40% of the development have to be affordable homes.

TE stated that the Painters have always said they'll gift the land to the village, so he was sure that can be easily confirmed and they won't get the development without it. DC noted though that until a commercial agreement was reached it was premature to discuss land gifting and suggested that land for affordable housing would be made available at affordable housing land rates instead.

### **Questions from the Public**

MOP (Neil Connor): I'd like to add three points. 1) It's good that this is out in the open 2) re the second paragraph, it refers to the 'First 25 houses' 3) other landowners may be doing things and we need to get talking to them and getting information to allow recommendations to be made.

TE noted that as discussed above, CDC could now speak to landowners, but they should confirm the COM9 piece with TVBC before doing so.

MOP (Colin Ruffalls): As I understand it, the CPC have accepted CDC terms of reference version 4.2, with the exception of the referendum or public vote? What have CPC actually agreed to do?

DH: The point about removing the reference to a referendum in the CDC ToR was not because I have a view on referendums one way or another, that's a CPC consideration. This is about allowing CDC to get going. Where a referendum comes in is when CPC have options that we can put to the community. For example, and this is just an example, there could be a vote between whether we support the Painter development or prefer development on another site we have considered. CPC make a recommendation and we go to the village for a decision. TE concurred that when there is a proper question it is appropriate to hold a referendum.

MOP (Tony Parr): The letter refers to 25 homes, Sue has made reference to 65 houses, I've seen reference to lots more. Where are we with that?

TE: The original SHELAA said 300 homes on the site to the NE of Drove Road, reaching down towards Village St and Cart Lane. Clearly if they used our recommended houses sizes that wouldn't work, it would mean a whole load of houses close together. In Jan / Feb 2025 we asked James Painter to ask his planning team and they revised the SHELAA to 150 homes which is over the whole site and there has been no discussion of doing that except over a 50 - 75 year period. We don't know what James is going to put in other than he has stated that he is putting in an outline planning application for the first 25 houses. He could technically put in more than 65. I cannot speak for him but I would be surprised if he did that.

MOP (Tony Parr): I think DHs recommendation (about referendums) must be offered to the village because I think you'll find that the viewpoint of the village has changed markedly over the last few months.

TE: I would agree with you on that. David and I agree on that, if we have a clear proposal or choice to put to the village.

MOP (Peter Collis): There seems to be broad community acceptance of 20+5, rough acceptance, but not really for 65, without proven need. Clearly James is thinking over 25, do you think we should discuss this with him?

TE: My view is we can discuss this with him, but he can still do it.

MOP (Peter Collis): We should start advising him that the village support does not extend beyond 20-25 houses if he wants to go for more than 25. That is the village response to the Local Plan and that is the current village view.

MOP (Martin Gossling): I'd be a little bit careful. 65 homes are earmarked for Chilbolton. We just have to make sure we don't leave back doors open for other land owners with plans.

TE: I really want to keep the discussion to James's letter.

MOP (Andy Revell): Is this project still community led?

TE: The legal position at the moment is that it doesn't have to be. Any landowner can put in an application and there is an assumption that it will be approved. The application would have to follow the rules for a rural exception site which is that 40% will have to be affordable houses.

SL: That's what's worrying about the Church Commissioners site. I can almost guarantee that they won't be interested in working with us.

DH: "Community led" is something TVBC mentioned in the pre-app. If we're changing the emphasis and the project is now developer led or landowner led, our terms would be the red lines we negotiate with the Painters. If the application has PC and village support we could agree that it would be community led. If the Painters want to put that seal of approval on the application, they would need to consider our terms.

MOP (Martin Watson): Who's leading the discussions with the Painters?

TE: At the moment no decision has been made on this. James Painter says quite clearly I 'I also want to work with the PC'. I imagine it will be Julian in his role as CPC chair. As was noted earlier in the meeting, the CDC Commercial and Business Case working group comprising JH, DH, Fiona Barrie and Mark Huston will progress these discussions.

DG: If there are discussions between CPC and the Painters, there should be a written record of what was discussed.

TE: I think that's absolutely right.

This was the final question, TE thanked everyone for coming and wished them goodnight.

**6. Next Meeting** Full Council Meeting Date 01/09/2025

Agreed and Signed ..... (Chairman)  
Page 5 of 5