

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

**Members of the Parish Council are summoned to attend a meeting to be held at the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke on Tuesday 25 September 2018 at 7.30pm  
This Meeting is Open to the Public (7.30pm – Question Time)**

*An invitation to attend all meetings of Bishopstoke Parish Council is extended to relevant: Hampshire County councillors; Eastleigh Borough councillors; and, the Eastleigh East Safer Neighbourhood Team*

## AGENDA

### Public Session

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Councillors' Questions
3. To adopt and sign Minutes of the Parish Council meetings held on 24 July and 31 July 2018
4. To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes
5. Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations
6. Report on Planning Committee Meeting of 24 July, 14 August, 28 August and 11 September 2018 – to note Resolutions and to determine Recommendations
7. Report on Finance and General Purposes Committee Meeting of 11 September 2018 – to note Resolutions and to determine Recommendations
8. To receive the RFO's Report and approve the July and August 2018 Statements of Accounts
9. To discuss the Parish Council position regarding the Bishopstoke Community Centre
10. To receive reports from County, Borough and Parish Councillors on matters of interest
11. To receive the Clerk's Monthly Report
12. To consider content for the September 2018 Press Release
13. Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting – Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 7.30pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke



***D L Hillier-Wheal***  
***Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council***  
***20<sup>th</sup> September 2018***

*Members: Cllrs Toher (Chair), Dean (Vice-Chair), Brown, Daly, Francis, Greenwood, Harris, Mignot, Moore, Parker-Jones, Roling, Thornton, Tidridge and Winstanley*

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Bishopstoke Parish Council held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.30pm on 24 July 2018

**Present:** Councillor Sue Toher (Chair)  
Councillor Anne Dean (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Peter Brown  
Councillor Andrew Daly  
Councillor Chris Greenwood  
Councillor Trevor Mignot  
Councillor Andy Moore  
Councillor Louise Parker-Jones  
Councillor Gin Tidridge

**In Attendance:** Mr David Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)  
Councillor Ray Dean of Eastleigh Borough Council

**Public Session** 4 members of the public were present

**FULL\_1819\_M04/**

**Public Session**

The public session began with Cllr Tidridge introducing Drew Mellor, a young resident of Bishopstoke, and his mother Julie. Also joining them was Mel Phillips, one of 100 ambassadors for Litter Heroes. Cllr Tidridge expressed her admiration for Drew who has been spending most of his weekends over the past several months litter picking along the banks of the River Itchen. He has also persuaded others to join him litter picking on the way to and from school. Cllr Tidridge also informed the Council that Drew had recently been honoured at an event in Manchester as one of only 16 eco-influencers under the age of 16.

Drew was invited to speak to the Council and spoke of his efforts to not only pick up litter but also recycle more. One example of his efforts is to send back to the manufacturers every crisp packet he finds, with a request that they change their packaging to be more eco-friendly. Drew has also been writing to supermarkets on a similar theme. Drew explained that it does not take a huge amount of time to make a difference – in fact his idea for everyone to do just 5 minutes of litter picking every week has been taken on and sent to over 18,000 eco-schools across the country.

For Bishopstoke, Drew hoped there could be more bins, and in particular more options for recycling throughout the Parish. Drew would also like to see more awareness of both the problem and the options that are available to help solve it.

Drew received a round of applause from the Council.

Cllr Toher thanked Drew and stated he was a credit to both Bishopstoke and his age group.

Cllr Tidridge then proposed that Item 10 on the agenda be moved to the start of the meeting. The Council agreed to this proposal.

Cllr Toher then took a moment to inform the Council of the sad news of the passing of Steven Lugg, former Chief Executive of the Hampshire Association of Local Councils. Steven was widely admired

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

and respected for his work and had personally trained a number of Bishopstoke Parish Council members and officers. A minute's silence was held as a mark of respect.

#### **48 Apologies for Absence**

48.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllrs Francis, Harris, Roling, Thornton and Winstanley.

#### **49 To make decisions on Bishopstoke Parish Council involvement in local litter picking**

49.1 Cllr Tidridge had asked for this item to be on the agenda. Cllr Tidridge would like to see the Parish Council have a number of litter picking kits available for members of the community to borrow. Each kit would consist of a litter-picker, gloves, bin bags, a hi-viz jacket and a hoop to keep the bag open. Cllr Tidridge was initially hoping to have 8 kits, 2 of which would specifically be child sized, with the possibility of buying more if the scheme proved popular.

49.2 Cllr Tidridge had two suggestions for the potential running of the scheme. The first option would be for the kits to be stored in the office and distributed by the Clerk or other officers. The second option would be for the Parish to purchase a storage box and secure it with a combination padlock. Those interested in using the equipment could then simply be given the code. Cllr Tidridge noted that it was important to understand that Bishopstoke Parish Council would take no responsibility for anything that happened whilst using the equipment, and that any children using the equipment should be supervised by a responsible adult.

49.3 Following discussion, a number of other things were agreed to: There should be information on Litter Heroes available to all; users should be made aware that they can register their event with Keep Britain Tidy to be included on their Public Liability Insurance, but this would only be available if a full risk assessment had been completed; information relating to the scheme should be available on the website and Facebook; the Parish website should record its thanks to each group that uses the equipment; it would be useful to have two bags when litter picking and that it would be useful to have more bins around Bishopstoke.

49.4 Drew was invited to come up with ideas regarding the reuse of plastic and took the opportunity to tell the Council about his school uniform – his blazer is made from 18 plastic bottles and his shirt from 2.

49.5 A vote was taken between the original options 1 and 2, with option 1 gaining 2 votes and option 2 gaining 4 votes. Cllr Brown then proposed an amendment limiting the maximum amount of time people could keep the equipment to a week, and this was agreed unanimously.

49.6 Proposed Cllr Tidridge, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Parish Council provide 8 litter picking kits, to be stored in a box secured by combination padlock, which can be borrowed by residents and groups for a maximum of one week.

*4 members of the public left at this point*

#### **50 Councillors' Questions**

50.1 Cllr Greenwood asked if, in light of the gas leak in Fair Oak which is due to rotten mains, Bishopstoke should be more aware of similar potential problems in this Parish.

50.2 Cllr Daly reported that number plates for houses in Portal Road are missing. Cllr Toher recommended that Cllr Daly get in touch with the housing management company

**Action: Cllr Daly**

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

50.3 Cllr Parker-Jones informed the Council that she had been contacted again by residents over the weekend complaining about the bells in Sayers Road park. Cllr Toher asked Cllr Parker-Jones to refer or forward them to the Clerk. Cllr Parker-Jones indicated she would forward them to Cllr Toher. The Clerk requested that if possible, future complaints include the time of the disturbance.

**Action: Cllr Parker-Jones**

50.4 Cllr Tidridge noted that she had observed amounts of broken glass around the Brookfield estate and wished to know if there is anything more the Council can do. The Clerk advised that it would be possible to ask Green Smile to increase how often and how far they litter pick, but that would carry increased costs. Cllr Brown suggested the Street Pastors be asked to visit more often, and Cllr Dean suggested that litter pick activities could be publicised at the YZone.

50.5 Cllr Toher asked whether there was an update on repairs to the clock at Riverside. The Clerk informed the Council that Jason Bruno is thought to have spare fixings for the clocks and should be able to repair them.

**51 To adopt as a true record, and sign, Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 19 June 2018**

51.1 The minutes of the above meeting had been circulated prior to this meeting.

51.2 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Parker-Jones, **RESOLVED** unanimously to adopt as a true record the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 19 June 2018.

**52 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes**

52.1 Item 35.1 The Clerk reported that he had been unable to find any useful method of contacting Hampshire County Council from their website and so had been unable to progress this. Cllr Greenwood advised contacting Tim Lawton.

**Action: Clerk**

52.2 Item 35.2 The Clerk reported that he had sent out the privacy policy. Cllr Parker-Jones also reported that she had sent round the slides from the Borough presentation on GDPR.

52.3 Item 35.3 The Clerk reported that bins had again been discussed at the Borough / Parish Liaison meeting, but progress has again stalled. Other companies are now being considered for the installation of bins, although it is unclear whether the Borough could then be engaged to empty them.

52.4 Item 35.5 The Clerk reported that he had asked Andy Thompson at the Borough regarding the ownership of any new trees that the Borough plants and is awaiting a reply.

52.5 Item 35.6 Cllr Toher reported that she had contacted Cllr Thornton at Hampshire County Council and that some of the tree growth had been removed, but not all.

52.6 Item 42.2 The Clerk confirmed that the Parish Council would be responsible for general maintenance of the British Legion silhouettes. Royal British Legion have been contacted to determine what happens in the event of serious vandalism.

52.7 Item 43.3 The Clerk reported that the Assistant Clerk, Mrs Taylor, was still waiting for a reply from the Institute of Cemeteries and Crematoria Management regarding the length of time certain documents need to be kept.

52.8 Item 43.4 The Clerk reported that the water testing logs have been added to the Document Retention Policy.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

52.9 The Clerk reported that as yet there has been no PCSO invoice received, and so the PCSO contract has not yet been added to an agenda.

**53 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations**

53.1 None declared or requested.

**54 Report on Planning Committee Meetings of 19 June and 10 July 2018 – to note resolutions and determine recommendations**

54.1 The Planning Committee Minutes from 19 June and 10 July 2018 had been circulated prior to this meeting.

54.2 Cllr Greenwood noted that he had declared an interest in the Planning meeting of 10 July as he is resident in one of the houses being discussed.

54.3 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the resolutions of the Planning Committee meeting held on 19 June and 10 July 2018 be noted.

**55 Report on Finance and General Purposes Committee Meeting of 10 July 2018 – to note resolutions and to determine recommendations.**

55.1 The Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting minutes from 10 July 2018 had been circulated prior to the meeting.

55.2 Proposed Cllr Tidridge, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the resolutions from the Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting of 10 July be noted.

55.3 Proposed Cllr Tidridge, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Parish Council respond to the consultation on Hampshire County Council's Permit Scheme by supporting it, and adding the comment that anyone applying to dig up the road should be asked to submit plans that account for completion in the shortest time possible.

**56 To receive the RFO's report and approve the June 2018 Statement of Account**

56.1 The June 2018 Statement of Account had been circulated prior to the meeting and is attached to these minutes.

56.2 Proposed Cllr Moore, Seconded Cllr Tidridge, **RESOLVED** unanimously to receive the RFO's report and approve the June 2018 Statements of Account.

**57 To discuss options for keeping the area around Bishopstoke shops clean**

57.1 Cllr Daly introduced this item as he had asked for it to be on the agenda. Cllr Daly has become concerned that the area around the Spring Lane shops has become litter-strewn, with grass growing in between the pavement slabs, and dog mess lying there too. Cllr Daly would like to see the area cleaned, cleared and swept, from Tasty House to the Working Men's Club. Cllr Daly also wanted to include the shops on the corner of Scotter Road and Hamilton Road.

57.2 Cllr Moore raised the issue of needing a risk assessment for health and hygiene. Cllr Daly reported that he had contacted the Borough Council who had stated that they were happy to supply equipment if necessary.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

57.3 Following discussion, the Council agreed to ask the Clerk to contact the Borough to determine how often they clean the area, and whether they would be able to increase that frequency.

**Action: Clerk**

57.4 Cllr Parker-Jones informed the Council that there is a litter pick taking place on Sunday 29<sup>th</sup> July at 4pm. The area covered will include Bishopstoke Beach and, potentially, in front of the Spring Lane shops.

**58 To adopt the Delegation Policy**

58.1 The delegation policy had been circulated prior to the meeting and is included in the document pack for this meeting.

58.2 The Clerk explained that this was a collection of the various delegations contained within Standing Orders, Financial Regulations and the various other Council documents.

58.3 Cllr Parker-Jones asked for section 1.3 to be reworded and for the section referring to government legislation to be updated to include more recent statutory instruments. Cllr Toher asked Cllr Parker-Jones to send her amendments through to the Clerk, possibly via the Chair.

**Action: Cllr Parker-Jones**

58.4 Cllrs thanked the Clerk for the work done and approved the idea. The Clerk was asked to bring the amended policy to September's meeting.

**Action: Clerk**

**59 To review delegations to Committees, Sub-Committees, Working Others and Officers**

59.1 The various delegations had been circulated prior to the meeting and are included in the document pack for this meeting.

59.2 The Clerk informed the Council that there had been no changes to any delegations since the last time the Standing Orders had been approved.

59.3 The Council agreed they were happy to approve the delegations.

**60 To review Terms of Reference to Committees, Sub-Committees and Working Groups**

60.1 The Terms of Reference had been circulated prior to the meeting and are included in the document pack for this meeting

60.2 The Clerk informed the Council that there had been no changes to any Terms of Reference since the last time the Standing Orders had been approved.

60.3 The Council agreed they were happy to approve the Terms of Reference.

**61 To make decisions on proposed screening for Bishopstoke Cemetery**

61.1 Cllr Parker-Jones informed the Council that it has been recommended that the proposed screening will not be suitable and therefore the matter will be referred back to the Cemetery Working Group for further consideration.

61.2 Cllr Parker-Jones also informed the Council that the public art funding for the Cemetery gates is likely to be passed over to the Parish Council to use.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **62 To receive reports from County, Borough and Parish Councillors on matters of interest**

62.1 Cllr Brown reported that Carnival progress is good, but if any Cllrs knew anyone who might like to take part in the parade, the river floats or run a stall, then please could they get in touch.

62.2 Cllr Tidridge reported that she had attended a meeting of the Borough Council Admin Committee, at which the ward boundary changes for Bishopstoke had been approved.

62.3 Cllr Parker-Jones reported that she had attended the Eastleigh Unwrapped event, the Mela and the Armed Forces Day. The Borough Council Policy and Performance Committee are looking at the new rules for Houses of Multiple Occupancy, whereby more dwellings will now need to be registered. Cllr Parker-Jones had also attended the YZone management meeting, at which funding for improvements had been discussed. The BIFOHH LAC had also met to discuss Traffic Regulation Orders and Cllr Parker-Jones requested that if anyone had an area they felt could benefit from a TRO please could they contact either herself or Cllr Tidridge by August 6<sup>th</sup>.

62.4 Cllr Dean reported that she had attended Eastleigh Unwrapped, and a recent meeting of the Memorial Hall Committee, whose major concern now is progress on transferring ownership to the Parish Council. The Cemetery Working Group had looked at the improvements made to the Cemetery so far and have been impressed. Cllr Dean also reminded Cllrs that comments on the Local Plan need to be in by August 6<sup>th</sup>.

62.5 Cllr Toher reported that she and the Clerk had met with Steve Postle of Green Smile to discuss issues with Open Spaces, including walking around the Brookfield estate. Cllr Toher had also attended the Armed Forces Day, a recent Liaison meeting between the Parish and the Borough, a Local Plan exhibition, the YZone management meeting and a Neighbourhood Plan meeting. The YZone meeting had agreed that Stella would provide some words for both Bishopstoke and Fair Oak to use to promote the YZone on their Facebook pages. The Parish Council contribution for the next budget is £25,000. The Neighbourhood Plan meeting had discussed the Vision of Bishopstoke in 20 years time. A draft of this has been prepared and is being circulated amongst the Steering Group. The end date for the Neighbourhood Plan will be 2031, and it is hope that it will be adopted by the end of 2019. The next meeting will take place on September 6<sup>th</sup>.

## **63 To receive the Clerk's monthly report**

63.1 The Clerk reported that the Office would be closed during the following week due to holiday. The voicemail message will direct anyone with an urgent problem to contact the Assistant Clerk, Mrs Taylor.

63.2 Memorial inspections are taking place this week and, if not completed, will continue in the week beginning 6<sup>th</sup> August.

63.3 In order for the Parish Council to respond to the Local Plan consultation there is a Community event being held at the Bishopstoke Community Centre on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> July at 7:30pm. Local residents have been invited to come along and share their thoughts with the Council so that their views can be taken into account when the Council agrees its response. This will be followed by a special Full Council meeting on Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> July in the Parish Office at 7:00pm. This will be for the Parish Council to agree its response.

63.4 The Clerk also reported that he had attended Stoke Common Cemetery to watch test holes being dug. The ground to the left of the footpath appears to be acceptable for burials, but the ground to the right has more problems.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

63.5 The Carnival Court attended the Mela, and also a recent evening where they had been invited to hand out awards.

63.6 The recent Liaison meeting had included discussion of bins. The bin at Old St Mary's has finally been agreed to be Eastleigh's, but the bin survey carried out by the Borough raised questions as well as providing answers.

**64 To consider content for the July 2018 press release**

64.1 It was agreed that the press release would mention Drew Mellor, the Community event, the Carnival Court activity, Litter Picking, Stalls and the Parade for the Carnival, the Cemetery improvements and memorial inspections. It will also include a link to the page giving details of major roadworks, which will also be included on Facebook and the website.

**Action: Clerk**

**65 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

65.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 31 July 2018, at 7:00pm in the Parish Office.

65.2 Agenda items for September's Full Council meeting to the Clerk by Monday 17 September 2018 please.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 8:45pm*

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Bishopstoke Parish Council held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 31 July 2018

**Present:** Councillor Sue Toher (Chair)  
Councillor Anne Dean (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Andrew Daly  
Councillor Chris Greenwood  
Councillor Geoff Harris  
Councillor Trevor Mignot (from 68.5 to 73.2)  
Councillor Louise Parker-Jones  
Councillor Mike Thornton  
Councillor Gin Tidridge  
Councillor Anne Winstanley

**In Attendance:** Mrs Cheryl Taylor (Assistant Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

**Public Session** 2 members of the public were present.

**FULL\_1819\_M05/**

**Public Session**

### **66 Apologies for Absence**

66.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllrs Brown, Francis, Roling. Cllr Moore not present.

### **67 To decide the Parish Council response to the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan consultation**

67.1 Cllr Toher stated that the decisions by the Parish Council for the response to the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan consultation would be decided by majority response from councillors present, but that individual councillors can put in their own individual response to the plan should they wish to do so, which may differ from the response of the Council. The intention was for content of the minutes to be uploaded electronically to the consultation on the Eastleigh Borough Council website.

67.2 Cllr Toher agreed with councillors that the proposed format of the meeting would be to review the list of proposed policies for the Local Plan in order to give the opportunity to take a vote and comment on each individual policy. Each policy was then considered in order.

67.3 Strategic policy S1, Delivering sustainable development  
All councillors voted to support the principle of policy S1.

67.4 Strategic policy S2, Approach to new development  
All councillors voted to support policy S2.

67.5 Strategic policy S3, Location of new housing  
Votes were taken as Support 4, Oppose 5

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Comment to be included: The proposed locations that Eastleigh Borough Council have chosen are unsustainable and other options have not been fully appraised.

67.6 Strategic policy S4, Employment provision

Councillors discussed the need for the plan to have sufficient employment provision and for the ratio of additional employment to additional housing to be improved. There is also the need for consideration of the quality and variety of the additional jobs created.

All councillors voted to support policy S4.

Comment to be included: There needs to be a full variety of different types of employment, and the level of additional employment needs to be related to the level of additional housing and be more proportionate.

67.7 Strategic policy S5, New Communities, land north of Bishopstoke and land north and east of Fair Oak

Councillors discussed the following issues on this policy, including comments received before the meeting from members of the public and the robustness of the plan, and a vote was then taken. Cllr Mignot arrived partway through the discussion and before the vote.

67.8 It was agreed that all comments which were intended to be uploaded to the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan consultation, would be included in the minutes. Minutes to be drafted by the Assistant Clerk and Cllr Toher and to be sent to all councillors prior to submission, and to show a variety of views. Councillors noted the tight timescale to review the draft.

Discussion of the issues relating to the plan included the following:

67.9 An example of where the plan is unsound due to lack of supporting evidence is the Habitat Regulations Assessment June 2018 page 52 5.3.1, where the term “any other measures required” is too vague and implies lack of sufficient exploration of the issue.

68.0 For the air quality data, page 59, 6.2.2, concerning the impact of the dwellings on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation - this implies that because the air quality is assumed to be at an acceptable level by 2036 that this is sufficient, however, the impact of the air quality needs to be modelled all the way through the plan period, as poor air quality during the plan period will cause environmental damage to occur. The issue of air quality should also require a baseline to be taken now and before work starts.

68.1 A view was expressed that air quality on Bishopstoke Road was thought to be acceptable at present, but could worsen if the relief road does not go ahead.

68.2 A view was expressed that there was too much high density housing near the district and local centres and that there was sufficient high-density housing already. A further view was expressed that the same number of houses at a lower density could cover a greater amount of countryside.

68.3 Views were expressed that the projected housing total increase is too high compared to the level of houses actually required, and that this may affect whether the preferred option was the correct choice, leading to a need for review. It was noted that the previous Local Plan was rejected by the inspector for insufficient housing.

68.4 The plan states only 3350 of the 5200 houses will be built by the end of the plan period to 2036, so is it realistic to assume developers contributions from only 3350 houses will be sufficient to fund all of the deliverable infrastructure.

(Cllr Mignot arrived at this point)

68.5 The possibility was discussed of Eastleigh Borough Council, ensuring that infrastructure was put in place before any housing is built. It was felt that the road infrastructure should be put in place

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

before any housing is built, particularly concerning any roads necessary for construction traffic. Comment to be included under strategic policy S6.

68.6 Concerns were expressed that the plan mentions in various sections that solving issues is “up to the developers”, and this was felt to be too vague and needed to be clearer. Concern was expressed that the plan has a lack of clarity and vagueness which should be highlighted to the inspector, and which could be highlighted with examples from the above issues raised for the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

68.7 Concern was expressed that the general vagueness associated with the Strategic Growth Option meant that there was a fundamental problem with assessing its impact. It is unclear from the transport assessment which roads would be open, and which would be closed, and whether there will be a link from Bishopstoke via The Chase development. This is fundamental to assessment of the option, as it could have a beneficial effect in terms of existing residents being able to access the new facilities, all new residents being able to access existing facilities such as the Parish Office. If a link is planned from Bishopstoke via the Chase development, the transport assessment would need to assess the impact of the additional traffic passing through existing roads, including construction traffic.

68.8 Concern was expressed that it is unclear what route lorries will take where they are currently too large to pass under the railway bridge at Allbrook. If the new link is not completed this could result in excess travel through the village of Bishopstoke, and the transport assessment has not looked sufficiently at this, and the reasons behind people travelling different routes. Comment to be included: Transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively. It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke. Comment was made that the map of the highway infrastructure does not show any new roads linking to Bishopstoke.

68.9 Concern was expressed that the two new communities are referred to as distinct and separate to existing communities, however, at least part of the land falls within the current parish boundary, which may mean that the boundary has to be redrawn. One of the strategic policies is to integrate communities, which should mean that the new communities should be integrated with the existing Bishopstoke community, such that new facilities and existing businesses can be used by all, and the current plan shows the new communities as distinct and separate, thus keeping them isolated. As a separate community it may not be sustainable. However, any integration would need to avoid excessive traffic on Bishopstoke roads and might need road improvements to achieve this. However, it was felt that the new school could relieve pressure on existing schools, which would require access between Bishopstoke and the new development.

69.0 The view was expressed that the concerns expressed by current residents in the recent Neighbourhood Plan Survey should be considered. Residents are particularly concerned by congestion and parking, and concerned about the rivers, green spaces and environmental issues. There is concern that the plan may cause damage to sites of ancient woodland because the development is too close, or through the planned road infrastructure.

69.1 Concern was expressed over the risk of flooding from these developments to houses, woodland and countryside, and the effect on the River Itchen. The Council would like reassurance that the risk of flooding has been properly assessed with the latest hydrological methodology, taking into account recent experiences at the developments The Chase and Crowdhill Green, and consideration of advice on future climate changes, such as an increase in extreme weather events.

69.2 Concern was expressed as to whether the new ruling on the wholly exceptional protection of ancient woodland and ancient trees had been taken into account and complied with. If plan is based on previous National Planning Policy Framework guidance, then when planning applications, as proposed by the plan, are submitted, they may be undeliverable if they are judged against new NPPF

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

guidance, thus making the plan unsound. If the plan does not allow for the most recent NPPF guidance, then it may be unsound.

69.3 Votes were taken as Support 4, Oppose 5, Neutral 1.  
Comments to go into the online consultation on the Local Plan will be summarised by the Assistant Clerk and Cllr Toher, and passed to councillors for review.

69.4 Strategic policy S6, New Allbrook Hill, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak link road  
Repeat comment made in S5 concerning the lack of granularity of the transport assessment, which means that it is difficult to assess if link road will be beneficial.

69.5 Concern was expressed if it has been properly assessed whether the motorway can take all of the extra traffic which would arise from Allbrook Way, which is currently very congested.

69.6 The view was expressed that without the new link road, the 1000 houses north of Bishopstoke cannot be delivered. Concern was also expressed that new residents would not use the link road and would instead go along existing roads to reach Eastleigh.

69.7 Concern was expressed over the impact of the new road on the Itchen SAC because of the angle of the cut and runoff into the Itchen, and whether this issue had been looked into sufficiently concerning possibility of contamination. Road cannot currently take large HGV's because of the railway bridge, where it also currently experiences flooding. If the solution to this problem is that the road is dug down at the railway bridge, this might increase the run off to the River Itchen. If proposed road cannot take large HGVs it cannot properly service the new communities. It is also unclear if any road runoff will be treated before going into the Itchen, and there may be issues caused by the location of the weir. More definitive answers are required for the runoff into the Itchen SAC at the location of the cutting for the new road. If the proposed solution is to lower the road and dig down under the railway bridge, the runoff should then be treated as dirty water, however, digging down is not a recommended solution.

69.8 Concern was expressed that the road should not have led the plan, but that there should have been more consideration given to sustainable alternatives to the car, and the lack of these alternatives mean that the plan is unsound.

69.9 Concern was expressed that the new road has the potential for bottlenecks at the railway bridge and any new traffic lights. If the motorway cannot take the additional traffic from the new road, existing roads will become even more congested.

70.0 There is a potential problem from the realignment of the road being on the flood zone and there are no supporting documents to point 4.3.8 that it will actually provide relief to current traffic congestion in Bishopstoke Road.

70.1 There is also a potential problem from point 4.3.9 concerning the uncertainty of the release of land to create this new road at Allbrook. There is also risk of whether the new road can be delivered as some land is not within the area covered by Eastleigh Borough Council. If the road is not able to be delivered it brings into question the sustainability of the plan.

70.2 Votes were taken as Support 1, Oppose 5, Neutral 4.

70.3 Strategic policy S7, New development in the countryside  
Concern was expressed that the plan will have a negative impact due to the fragmentation of ancient woodland and the impact on the Itchen SAC, and also due to the scale of the proposed development. This refers to the SGO, and there is concern that the plan itself contradicts strategic policy S7.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

70.3 Votes were taken as Support 9, Neutral 1.

Comment to be included: The Council support strategic policy S7 but consider the rest of the Local Plan is not congruent with this policy.

70.4 Strategic policy S8, Protection of countryside gaps

Concern was expressed that although there is a mention of a countryside gap between the new communities, there is no mention of a countryside gap between Bishopstoke and option B, and this makes it unclear what the relationship should be between Bishopstoke and the new communities. There is a lack of consistency and clarity on the definition and application of strategic gaps, and distances to services.

Votes were taken as Support 6, Neutral 4.

70.5 Strategic policy S9, The coast

Two members of the public left at this point. No comment requested by councillors.

70.6 Strategic policy S10, Green infrastructure

A view was expressed that this policy should be supported, due to the importance of close accessibility of green spaces.

All councillors supported this policy. No comment requested.

70.7 Strategic policy S11, Community facilities

Comment to be included: the plan needs to factor in access from Bishopstoke to the facilities in the new communities, with the relevant infrastructure in place to allow this.

Comment to be included: reference to “churches” should be replaced by reference to “faith groups”.

All councillors supported this policy, with comments.

70.8 Strategic policy S12, Transport infrastructure

Repeat comments on link road (S6).

Concern expressed that the strategic policy does not go far enough to consider sustainable transport, eg public transport, although it does consider route 2. Houses should include electric charging points in their specifications. High specification facilities should be included from the outset to avoid having to retrofit.

70.9 Concern was expressed that the proposed new traffic lights could worsen the road situation as traffic lights can impede movement of traffic. The use of smart lights should be considered to turn off traffic lights at non peak periods.

71.0 Votes were taken as Support 6, Oppose 3, Neutral 1.

71.1 Strategic policy S13, Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links

Item 9 pathway - not realistic to use it daily and if this means any improvement works in the woodland it needs to be carried out very sensitively, and consideration given to the impact of runoff. Concern was expressed that the path leading through the Planny (woodland north of Edward Avenue) is too small a path to be part of the bridleway route. Those on the route will also have to go through an area with 3 road junctions at the same point (Jockey Lane, Sewall Drive, a new 9 house development).

71.2 Existing routes have been highlighted which are not fit for purpose instead of a complete re-evaluation of new routes.

71.3 Concern was expressed over the Number 5 footpath running parallel to railway line, which is either going to be very dark, or there will need to be lights in the fields.

(Cllr Parker-Jones left at this point. No further comments needing minuting were made before Cllr Parker-Jones returned).

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

71.4 Comment – Support the principle of the policy, but very concerned about pathway no. 9 concerning the environmental impact on woodland habitat as it runs through Stoke Park Woods, and that this route is not currently in a sufficient state for a strategic route, and the concern that it also involves a dangerous junction at the Planny (Jockey Lane, Sewall Drive, a new 9 house development), with an impact on the strip of woodland north of Edward Avenue.

71.5 Concern expressed that some of footpaths have now become pavements.

71.6 All councillors supported this policy.

(Cllr Dean left at this point)

71.7 Policies DM1 to DM32  
No comments requested by councillors.

71.8 Policy DM33, Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople  
Concern was expressed that the policy is limited to known travellers and is not catering for all other types of travellers who may need temporary accommodation eg mobile vehicles.

(Cllr Dean returned)

71.9 All councillors supported this policy, with comment.

72.0 Policy DM34, Protection of recreation and open space facilities  
Comment to be included: there is too much focus on sports making use of sports grounds. There should be more emphasis on activities in the countryside ie activities that do not require recreation grounds.  
All councillors supported this policy, with comment.

72.1 Policies DM35 to DM40  
No comments requested by councillors.

72.2 Policy Bi1, South of Stokewood Surgery, Bishopstoke  
Comment to be included: the Council strongly support the extension of health facilities.  
All councillors supported this policy.

72.3 Policies, F01 to F09, BU1 to BU9, HA1 to HA3, H01, CF1 to CF3, E1 to E12, AL1 to AL2, HE1 to HE7, WE1 to WE4, B01 to B07  
No comments requested by councillors.

72.4 Cllr Toher read out the wording on the section ‘overall assessment of the local plan’ and requested councillors to vote on legal compliance and soundness.

72.5 For the question ‘with regards to the above information, do you consider the local plan to be legally compliant?’ All councillors voted to complete as ‘Unsure’.

72.6 For the question ‘with regards to the above information do you consider the local plan to be sound?’ Votes were taken as No 5, Yes 4, Unsure 1.

72.7 Councillors requested that the comments from previous sections be included to support the ‘No’ vote concerning the soundness of the local plan.

72.8 It was agreed that draft minutes to include responses and comments to go into the local plan, would be produced as soon as possible and distributed to councillors for review, following which the

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

formal response would be made to the Local Plan consultation on Eastleigh Borough Council's website.

**Action: Assistant Clerk and Cllr Toher**

**73 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

73.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 25 September 2018, at 7:30pm in the Parish Office.

73.2 Agenda items for September's Full Council meeting to the Clerk by Monday 17 September 2018 please.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 9.23pm*

Clerk's Note

The issue of taking part in the oral examination was part of the consultation but not included in the meeting. This was subsequently discussed by email, with the majority email vote to be taken as the Parish Council's response. Votes received by the deadline of Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> August 12pm No 2 Yes 1, and so the Parish Council decision is to not take part in the oral examination.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix A

### Summary of comments under each policy uploaded to the Eastleigh Borough Council website:

#### Strategic policy S3, Location of new housing

The proposed locations that Eastleigh Borough Council have chosen are unsustainable and other options have not been fully appraised.

#### Strategic policy S4, Employment provision

There needs to be a full variety of different types of employment, and the level of additional employment needs to be related to the level of additional housing and be more proportionate.

#### Strategic policy S5, New Communities, land north of Bishopstoke and land north and east of Fair Oak

The plan has a lack of clarity and vagueness causing the plan to be unsound. An example of where the plan is unsound due to lack of supporting evidence is the Habitat Regulations Assessment June 2018 page 52 5.3.1, where the term “any other measures required” is too vague and implies lack of sufficient exploration of the issue. A further example is for the air quality data, page 59, 6.2.2, concerning the impact of the dwellings on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation - this implies that because the air quality is assumed to be at an acceptable level by 2036 that this is sufficient, however, the impact of the air quality needs to be modelled all the way through the plan period, as poor air quality during the plan period will cause environmental damage to occur. The issue of air quality should also require a baseline to be taken now and before work starts.

There is concern over there being too much high density housing near the district and local centres and that there is sufficient high-density housing already.

The projected housing total increase is too high compared to the level of houses actually required, and this may affect whether the preferred option was the correct choice, leading to a need for review. The plan states only 3350 of the 5200 houses will be built by the end of the plan period to 2036, so is it realistic to assume that developers contributions from only 3350 houses will be sufficient to fund all of the deliverable infrastructure.

It is unclear from the transport assessment which roads would be open, and which would be closed, and whether there will be a link from Bishopstoke via The Chase development. This is fundamental to assessment of the option, as it could have a beneficial effect in terms of existing residents being able to access the new facilities, all new residents being able to access existing facilities such as the Parish Office. If a link is planned from Bishopstoke via the Chase development, the transport assessment would need to assess the impact of the additional traffic passing through existing roads, including construction traffic. There is concern that it is unclear what route lorries will take where they are currently too large to pass under the railway bridge at Allbrook. If the new link is not completed this could result in excess travel through the village of Bishopstoke, and the transport assessment has not looked sufficiently at this, and the reasons behind people travelling different routes.

The transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively. It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke.

There is concern that the two new communities are referred to as distinct and separate to existing communities, however, at least part of the land falls within the current parish boundary, which may mean that the boundary has to be redrawn.

One of the strategic policies is to integrate communities, which should mean that the new communities should be integrated with the existing Bishopstoke community, such that new facilities and existing businesses can be used by all, and the current plan shows the new communities as distinct and separate, thus keeping them isolated. Any integration would need to avoid excessive traffic on Bishopstoke roads and might need road improvements to achieve this. However, it was felt that the new school could relieve pressure on existing schools, which would require access between Bishopstoke and the new development. There is concern that the plan may cause damage to sites of ancient woodland because the development is too close, or through the planned road infrastructure.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



The Council would like reassurance that the risk of flooding has been properly assessed with the latest hydrological methodology, taking into account recent experiences at the developments The Chase and Crowdhill Green, and consideration of advice on future climate changes, such as an increase in extreme weather events.

If the plan does not allow for the most recent NPPF guidance, then it may be unsound.

#### Strategic policy S6, New Allbrook Hill, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak link road

The road infrastructure should be put in place before any housing is built, particularly concerning any roads necessary for construction traffic.

The transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively.

It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke.

There is concern whether it has been properly assessed if the motorway can take all of the extra traffic which would arise from Allbrook Way, which is currently very congested. The new road has the potential for bottlenecks at the railway bridge and any new traffic lights - if the motorway cannot take the additional traffic from the new road, existing roads will become even more congested.

More definitive answers are required for the runoff into the Itchen SAC at the location of the cutting for the new road. If the proposed solution is to lower the road and dig down under the railway bridge, the runoff should then be treated as dirty water, however, digging down is not a recommended solution.

There is concern that there should have been more consideration given to sustainable alternatives to the car, and the lack of these alternatives mean that the plan is unsound.

There is a potential problem from the realignment of the road being on the flood zone and there are no supporting documents to point 4.3.8 that it will actually provide relief to current traffic congestion in Bishopstoke Road.

There is also a potential problem from point 4.3.9 concerning the uncertainty of the release of land to create the new road at Allbrook. There is also risk of whether the new road can be delivered as some land is not within the area covered by Eastleigh Borough Council. If the road is not able to be delivered it brings into question the sustainability of the plan.

#### Strategic policy S7, New development in the countryside

The Council support strategic policy S7 but consider the rest of the Local Plan is not congruent with this policy. There are concerns that the plan will have a negative impact due to the fragmentation of ancient woodland and the impact on the Itchen SAC, and also due to the scale of the proposed development.

#### Strategic policy S8, Protection of countryside gaps

There is concern that although there is a mention of a countryside gap between the new communities, there is no mention of a countryside gap between Bishopstoke and option B, and this makes it unclear what the relationship should be between Bishopstoke and the new communities. There is a lack of consistency and clarity on the definition and application of strategic gaps, and distances to services.

#### Strategic policy S11, Community facilities

The plan needs to factor in access from Bishopstoke to the facilities in the new communities, with the relevant infrastructure in place to allow this. Reference to "churches" should be replaced by reference to "faith groups".

#### Strategic policy S12, Transport infrastructure

The road infrastructure should be put in place before any housing is built, particularly concerning any roads necessary for construction traffic.

The transport assessment is insufficiently granular to be able to determine the impact of this major development on Bishopstoke positively or negatively.

It is essential that construction traffic does not go through the existing roads in Bishopstoke.

There is concern whether it has been properly assessed if the motorway can take all of the extra traffic which would arise from Allbrook Way, which is currently very congested. The new road has the potential for

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

bottlenecks at the railway bridge and any new traffic lights - if the motorway cannot take the additional traffic from the new road, existing roads will become even more congested.

More definitive answers are required for the runoff into the Itchen SAC at the location of the cutting for the new road. If the proposed solution is to lower the road and dig down under the railway bridge, the runoff should then be treated as dirty water, however, digging down is not a recommended solution.

There is concern that there should have been more consideration given to sustainable alternatives to the car, and the lack of these alternatives mean that the plan is unsound.

There is a potential problem from the realignment of the road being on the flood zone and there are no supporting documents to point 4.3.8 that it will actually provide relief to current traffic congestion in Bishopstoke Road.

There is also a potential problem from point 4.3.9 concerning the uncertainty of the release of land to create the new road at Allbrook. There is also risk of whether the new road can be delivered as some land is not within the area covered by Eastleigh Borough Council. If the road is not able to be delivered it brings into question the sustainability of the plan.

The specification for new houses should include electric charging points.

The use of smart lights should be considered to turn off traffic lights at non peak periods.

#### Strategic policy S13, Strategic footpath, cycleway and bridleway links

There is concern over the Number 5 footpath running parallel to railway line, which is either going to be very dark, or there will need to be lights in the fields.

The Council support the principle of the policy, but very concerned about pathway no. 9 concerning the environmental impact on woodland habitat as it runs through Stoke Park Woods, that this route is not currently in a sufficient state for a strategic route, and that it also involves a dangerous junction at the Planny (Jockey Lane, Sewall Drive, a new 9 house development), with an environmental impact also on the strip of woodland north of Edward Avenue.

#### Policy DM33, Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople

The policy is limited to known travellers and is not catering for all other types of travellers who may need temporary accommodation eg mobile vehicles.

#### Policy DM34, Protection of recreation and open space facilities

There is too much focus on sports making use of sports grounds. There should be more emphasis on activities in the countryside ie activities that do not require recreation grounds.

#### Policy Bi1, South of Stokewood Surgery, Bishopstoke

The Council strongly support the extension of health facilities.

#### Overall Summary:

Councillors requested that the comments from previous sections be included to support the 'No' vote concerning the soundness of the local plan.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 24 July 2018

**Present:** Cllrs Brown (Chair), Dean, Greenwood, Mignot and Toher

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

**Public Attendance:** 0 members of the public were present

**PLAN\_1819\_M07/**

### Public Session

#### 67 Apologies for Absence

67.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs Harris and Francis.

#### 68 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 July 2018

68.1 The Minutes of the above meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting.

68.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 July 2018 be accepted as a true record.

#### 69 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

69.1 Item 59.1 – The Clerk reported that he had written as requested to the resident regarding house numbering on Church Road.

#### 70 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

70.1 None declared or requested.

#### 71 Consideration of Planning Applications

71.1 F/18/83553 – Land to the rear of 70/72 Stoke Common Road – Construction of 2 bed bungalow (variation to approved planning application F/18/82515) – The Committee noted that this plan was a minor variation in the layout of the path from the road to the door and therefore raised no objection to the planning application.

71.2 F/18/83555 – Land to the rear of 70/72 Stoke Common Road – Construction of 2 bed bungalow (variation to approved planning application F/18/82515 for amended house type) – The Committee noted that this was for the same property as the previous application. However, this is a completely different layout of the house. As such this raised many concerns for the Committee. The Committee wished to object to this plan on the grounds that it now overlooks neighbouring property in an inappropriate way; it is not in keeping with the surrounding dwellings; it is misleading as an application in that it is described as simply a variation in house type, whereas it is clearly much more than that and that there is a reduction in the number of trees on the property.

71.3 H/18/83464 – 29 Sedgwick Road – Retention of detached garage (retrospective) – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the planning application.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

71.4 H/18/83473 – 45 Church Road – Single storey rear extension following removal of existing conservatory – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

71.5 T/18/83361 – 27 Sydney Road – 2 x Ash, pollard to approx. 5-6 metres – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application.

**72 Report on recent planning decisions**

72.1 The Clerk reported that there were no recent planning applications to report back on.

**73 Clerk's Report**

73.1 The Clerk advised the Committee that the Parish Council application for tree maintenance work in the Cemetery has been approved.

**74 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

74.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 14 August 2018, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

74.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 6<sup>th</sup> August.

**75 Motion for Confidential Business**

75.1 This was not proposed as no one present indicated they had any confidential business to discuss.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.27pm*

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 14 August 2018

**Present:** Cllrs Brown (Chair), Dean, Greenwood, Francis and Toher

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

**Public Attendance:** 0 members of the public were present

**PLAN\_1819\_M08/**

### Public Session

#### 76 Apologies for Absence

76.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Mignot.

#### 77 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 July 2018

77.1 The Minutes of the above meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting.

77.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 July 2018 be accepted as a true record.

#### 78 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

78.1 There were no matters arising.

#### 79 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

79.1 Cllr Francis declared an interest in planning application H/18/83678 as she is a neighbour.

#### 80 Consideration of Planning Applications

80.1 T/18/83090 – 51 East Drive – Various tree works – The Committee noted that the consultation had apparently ended on 26 June, despite the application not being received for consideration until this meeting. There was some question over whether Holly and Leylandii require planning permission to have tree works and the Clerk was requested to determine this. The Committee also noted that in all cases, excessive shading is given as the reason for the works, and as this is not a valid planning consideration, the Committee agreed to object. Additionally, the Committee wished to comment that all trees involved in any prospective works should have their species correctly identified.

80.2 H/18/83640 – Itchen House – Erection of detached triple garage – Despite the alterations to the plans, the Committee still felt that application was not in keeping with the area. There should also be a flood risk assessment as it is situated in a flood risk area. Additionally, following the previous application for this garage a full tree report was requested – this does not appear to have been provided. The Committee agreed to object on all these grounds. The Committee also wished to comment that the application is for part of the Conservation area, and as such should be subject to extra care. Finally, the Committee wished to request that, should the application be permitted, a condition be attached that there not be permitted any future request to convert to residential.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

80.3 H/18/83678 – 34 Drake Road – Single storey side and rear extension – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the planning application.

80.4 H/18/83692 – 3 Beaver Drive – Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension – The Committee agreed to object to this application on the grounds of overdevelopment and loss of parking, as the number of bedrooms is being increased but the parking is not.

## **81 Report on recent planning decisions**

81.1 H/18/83023 – 12 Haig Road – Single storey rear extension. Box bay window at first floor level at rear. Replace existing flat roof at rear with hipped roof – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the planning application – The Borough Council permitted this planning application.

81.2 H/18/83320 – 32 The Ridings – Two storey side extension – The Committee agreed to raise no objection but wished to comment that a previous refusal in 2004 had been based on policies held by both the Borough Council and County Council, and these policies should be borne in mind this time too – The Borough Council permitted this planning application.

81.3 H/18/83358 – 30 Longmead Avenue – Conversion of garage to living accommodation and fenestration alterations – The Committee agreed to RNO to the planning application – The Borough Council permitted this planning application.

81.4 H/18/83381 – 2 Dartington Road – Two storey rear extension, conversion of existing garage – The Committee agreed to RNO to the planning application – The Borough Council permitted this planning application.

81.5 H/18/83404 – 3 Burrow Hill Place – Loft conversion with roof lights to front and rear elevations – The Committee agreed to RNO to the planning application – The Borough Council permitted this planning application.

81.6 T/18/83293 – Orchard Gardens Care Home, 1 Garnier Drive – 1 x Ash (T387) crown reduction by 4m; 1 x Ash (T388) crown reduction by 6m -The Committee agreed to RNO to the planning application – The Borough Council consented to this planning application.

81.7 T/18/83299 – River Inn, 2 Fair Oak Road – 1 x Lime (T1) reduce lateral branches by 1m and remove epicormic growth on main stem up to 3m; 1 x Lime (T2) reduce height and lateral branches to the S and SW by 4m – The Committee agreed to RNO to the application – The Borough Council consented to this planning application.

## **82 Clerk's Report**

82.1 The Clerk advised the Committee that there was nothing further to report.

## **83 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

83.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 28 August 2018, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

83.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 20<sup>th</sup> August.

## **84 Motion for Confidential Business**

84.1 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RESOLVED** unanimously that in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be discussed relating to possible breaches of planning regulation it is advisable in the public interest that the public be excluded and for the record the business be regarded as confidential.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**85 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)**

85.1 The Clerk reported two new alleged breaches of Development Control.

85.2 The Clerk reported no concluded breaches of Development Control.

85.3 Cllrs reported one additional item of confidential business

**Action: Clerk**

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.40pm*

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 28 August 2018

**Present:** Cllrs Brown (Chair), Greenwood, Dean (from para 93), Francis, Harris and Toher

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)

**Public Attendance:** 0 members of the public were present

**PLAN\_1819\_M09/**

### Public Session

#### 86 Apologies for Absence

86.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Mignot.

#### 87 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14 August 2018

87.1 The Minutes of the above meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting.

87.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Harris, **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14 August 2018 be accepted as a true record.

#### 88 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

88.1 The Clerk reported that the matter raised in confidential business at the previous meeting had been progressed, but that no response had yet been received.

#### 89 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

89.1 None declared or requested.

#### 90 Consideration of Planning Applications

90.1 H/18/83770 – 12 Rosehip Close – Single storey rear extension – The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection to the planning application, but requested that the Clerk enquire of the Borough whether they hold records on any covenants or clauses on houses or sites in the area that may apply when considering a planning application.

**Action: Clerk**

#### 91 Report on recent planning decisions

91.1 H/18/83464 – 29 Sedgwick Road – Retention of detached garage (retrospective) – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the planning application – The Borough Council permitted the application.

#### 92 Clerk's Report

92.1 The Clerk advised the Committee that two wasp nests have recently been treated in Glebe Meadow and requested that Councillors pass on any reports of nests on Parish land so that they may be dealt with. Nests on Borough land should be reported to the Borough.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



92.2 The Clerk informed Councillors that the car park at Eastleigh railway station had recently and briefly been occupied by members of the travelling community. Another group were observed at St Cross cricket club a few days later. As yet there has been no attempt to use Parish land.

*Cllr Dean arrived at this point*

**93 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

93.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 11 September 2018, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

93.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> September.

**94 Motion for Confidential Business**

94.1 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RESOLVED** unanimously that in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be discussed relating to possible breaches of planning regulation it is advisable in the public interest that the public be excluded and for the record the business be regarded as confidential.

**95 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)**

95.1 The Clerk reported no new alleged breaches of Development Control.

95.2 The Clerk reported one concluded breach of Development Control.

95.3 Cllrs reported one additional item of confidential business

**Action: Clerk and Cllr Toher**

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.20pm*

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.00pm on 11 September 2018

**Present:** Cllrs Brown (Chair), Dean, Francis, Harris and Toher

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)  
Cllr Tidridge (from para 101)

**Public Attendance:** 0 members of the public were present

**PLAN\_1819\_M10/**

### Public Session

#### 96 Apologies for Absence

96.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs Greenwood and Mignot.

#### 97 To adopt as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 August 2018

97.1 The Minutes of the above meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting.

97.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Francis, **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 August 2018 be accepted as a true record.

#### 98 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

98.1 Item 90.1 The Clerk reported that there had been no response regarding covenants and was asked to pose the question again.

#### Action: Clerk

#### 99 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

99.1 None declared or requested.

#### 100 Consideration of Planning Applications

100.1 H/18/83814 – 1A Sedgwick Road – Erection of a 1.8m fence and gate around the garden of 1A Sedgwick Road – The Committee agreed to object on the grounds that the line of sight for vehicles at the Sedgwick Road / Hamilton Road junction would be severely impaired and as such this was a health and safety risk. Additionally, the Committee believe there is a limit on height of fences at road junctions of 1 metre which this obviously breaches, and the posts for the fence appear to have been laid within the public footpath rather than within the boundary of the property.

*Cllr Tidridge arrived at this point*

#### 101 Report on recent planning decisions

101.1 H/18/82980 – 12 Rosehip Close – Conversion of garage to provide annexe accommodation – The Committee agreed to object on the grounds of the loss of parking spaces – withdrawn by the applicant.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

101.2 F/18/83447 – 282 Fair Oak Road – Construction of detached three bedroom dwelling following demolition of existing side extension accommodation – Cllr Greenwood updated the Committee on the changes made since the previous application. The size of the proposed dwelling has been reduced to give more green space, windows have been added to the side that was deemed to be “plain”, and the problem of tandem parking does not apply as both spaces are for one dwelling. The Committee agreed to Raise No Objection (RNO) to the application – The Borough Council refused the application as the proposed house, due to the insufficient plot size would result in a cramped form of development with parking for the new dwelling in front of the window of the main habitable room for the neighbouring property. In addition users of the garage block to the rear of the new dwelling would pass and re-pass in vehicles and as pedestrians past two ground floor windows to all the habitable ground floor rooms of the new dwelling and the proposal is therefore considered to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity of occupiers of the existing and new dwellings by virtue of a lack of privacy contrary to saved policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan and advice contained within the Quality Spaces SPD

101.3 T/18/83276 – 27 Sydney Road – 1 x Ash, pollard back to primary unions; 1 x Ash, pollard back to primary unions – The Committee agreed to RNO to the planning application – withdrawn by the applicant.

101.4 H/18/83473 – 45 Church Road – Single storey rear extension following removal of existing conservatory – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application – The Borough Council permitted the application.

101.5 T/18/83361 – 27 Sydney Road – 2 x Ash, pollard to approx. 5-6 metres – The Committee agreed to raise no objection to the application – the Borough Council refused the application as “The proposed 2 x Ash - pollard to approx 6 metres, is considered unjustified and will be of detriment to the health and appearance of the tree. The works would thus result in an adverse impact upon the visual amenity, ecology and wildlife and screening of the surrounding area”.

101.6 H/18/83640 – Itchen House – Erection of detached triple garage – Despite the alterations to the plans, the Committee still felt that application was not in keeping with the area. There should also be a flood risk assessment as it is situated in a flood risk area. Additionally, following the previous application for this garage a full tree report was requested – this does not appear to have been provided. The Committee agreed to object on all these grounds. The Committee also wished to comment that the application is for part of the Conservation area, and as such should be subject to extra care. Finally, the Committee wished to request that, should the application be permitted, a condition be attached that there not be permitted any future request to convert to residential – The Borough Council permitted the application with conditions which are detailed on Appendix A, attached to these minutes.

## **102 Clerk’s Report**

102.1 The Clerk advised the Committee that there was nothing further to report.

## **103 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting**

103.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 25 September 2018, at 7:00pm. The doors will be open at 6:45pm for viewing of applications.

103.2 Any agenda items should be submitted in writing to the Clerk by Monday 17<sup>th</sup> September.

## **104 Motion for Confidential Business**

104.1 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RESOLVED** unanimously that in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be discussed relating to possible breaches of planning regulation it is advisable in the public interest that the public be excluded and for the record the business be regarded as confidential.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**105 Reported Breaches of Development Control (Confidential Business)**

105.1 The Clerk reported no new alleged breaches of Development Control.

105.2 The Clerk reported four concluded breaches of Development Control.

105.3 Cllrs reported no additional items of confidential business

105.4 The Clerk informed the committee of his findings regarding an item of confidential business from a previous meeting.

**Action: Clerk**

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 7.35pm*

DRAFT

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

## **Minutes of a Meeting of the Finance and General Purposes Committee held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.30pm on 11 September 2018**

**Present:** Cllrs Harris (Chair), Brown, Dean, Tidridge and Tidridge

**In Attendance:** Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council)  
Cllr Daly

**Public Session** 0 members of the public were present

**FGP\_1819\_M05/**

**Public Session**

### **51 Apologies for Absence**

51.1 Apologies had been received and were accepted from Cllrs Winstanley and Thornton.

### **52 To accept as a true record, and sign, the Minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Meeting held on 10 July 2018**

52.1 The draft minutes had been circulated with the supporting papers for this meeting.

52.2 Proposed Cllr Dean, Seconded Cllr Tidridge, **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Meeting held on 10 July 2018 be accepted as a true record.

### **53 To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes**

53.1 Minute 44.1 – The Borough have indicated that if the land is not fit for purpose then the developer would be required to fix the problems.

53.2 Minute 44.3 – The Clerk indicated that the Street Pastors have been informed.

53.3 Minute 49.4 – The Clerk reported that he had spoken with PC Helen Rees and she had indicated a willingness to come to a future meeting. As the Beat Surgeries have now finished their current run, PC Rees stated that she would be continuing the practice, but probably alternating between here and Fair Oak. The dates will be published when known.

### **54 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensation**

54.1 Cllrs Toher, Brown and Harris all declared an interest in parts of Item 9, Carnival Grant Requests.

54.2 Cllr Harris declared a personal interest in Item 10, the Open Sight Grant Request.

### **55 To receive reports from Working Groups**

55.1 Cllr Brown reported that the Cemetery Working Group had recently had a productive meeting discussing the items contained in the report to be discussed later. Additionally, discussions were held regarding the possibility of raising the age beneath which no charge is made for interment from 12 to 16. Cllr Tidridge informed the Committee that there has been more fly-tipping at the new Cemetery car park, and let the Committee know that Assistant Clerk Taylor is keeping a log of all incidents.

Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

55.2 Cllr Toher reported that the Neighbourhood Plan group had recently met and agreed the Vision for the Plan. They had then gone on to agree a draft version of the Aims and Objectives that will form the basis for writing policies. The Objectives are attached to these minutes. The next meeting is set for 4<sup>th</sup> October.

55.3 Cllr Harris reminded the Council that it is Carnival this weekend. There have been no major surprises or disappointments so far and the weather looks good. Cllr Brown added his thanks to all the programme deliverers and put out a request for Parade Marshalls. Cllr Tidridge reported some confusion regarding the stall holder form and insurance, and the Clerk committed to looking at that for the next Carnival

**Action: Clerk**

**56 To receive the RFO's Report, and approve Budget Monitoring and Payments Reports for July and August 2018**

56.1 The budget monitoring and payments reports had been circulated with the supporting papers for this meeting and are attached to the minutes.

56.2 The Clerk reported that all vired sums have now been appropriately recorded in the budget monitoring and the tree costs relating to the previous year have been removed. The next report will have the Open Space Budget properly split out across the various sites. The budgeting process is now beginning, so any Cllrs that have items they wish included in next year's budget should forward them to the Clerk by mid-October.

**Action: Cllrs**

56.3 Cllr Harris requested clarification on what constitutes a Community Project and the Clerk offered to regroup and retitle items as necessary.

**Action: Clerk**

56.4 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Committee approve the RFO, Payment and Budget Monitoring reports for July and August 2018.

**57 To determine whether to recommend employing a cleaner for allotment toilets and how to cover the cost**

57.1 A report from Assistant Clerk Thorogood had been circulated with the supporting papers for this meeting.

57.2 Cllr Toher thanked Assistant Clerk Thorogood for her report. After discussion, the Committee agreed that the site reps should remain responsible for the cleaning of the toilets in addition to their other responsibilities.

57.3 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Harris, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Parish Council not provide a cleaner, but instead remind the site reps of their responsibilities.

**58 To recommend virement of £2,000 from reserves to pay for essential remedial work at the Underwood Road allotment site**

58.1 A report from Assistant Clerk Thorogood had been circulated with the supporting papers for this meeting.

58.2 Proposed Cllr Tidridge, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RECOMMENDED** unanimously that £2,000 be vired from reserves to pay for essential remedial work at the Underwood Road allotment site.

## **59 To make recommendations regarding the Carnival street collection grant requests**

59.1 The Grant requests had been circulated with the supporting papers for this meeting. There was an additional request that had come in after the papers had been sent which the Clerk provided to the Committee.

*Cllr Toher left the room at this point*

59.2 Cllr Dean noted that four of the applications were for £200 each and the fifth for “a share”. Cllr Tidridge asked what happens if the Street Collection does not cover the grants and the Clerk informed the Committee that the Parish Council grant fund would cover any shortfall.

59.3 Proposed Cllr Tidridge, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RECOMMENDED** that £200 be awarded to each of ARK Eastleigh, Age Concern Bishopstoke, MHA Live At Home, Wessmaps Housing Trust and the Bishopstoke Community Association.

*Cllr Toher returned to the room*

## **60 To make recommendations on the grant application from Open Sight**

60.1 The documentation for the Open Sight grant had been circulated with the supporting papers for this meeting.

*Cllr Harris stepped down from Chairing at this point. Cllr Toher, as Chair of the Council, took over the duties of Chairing the meeting.*

60.2 It was noted that currently Open Sight helps 16 people in Bishopstoke, as well as others from around the area. After discussion it was agreed that £500 should be granted, rather than the requested £1,000, and that Open Sight should be encouraged to apply to other parishes for the remaining funds.

60.3 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Tidridge, **RECOMMENDED** that Open Sight be awarded a grant of £500.

60.4 The Clerk was requested to contact Open Sight to encourage them to apply for grants from other parishes.

**Action: Clerk**

*Cllr Harris resumed the Chair*

## **61 To agree the Bishopstoke Parish Council response to the consultation on Local Government – 2019/20 Council Tax Referendum Principles**

61.1 Proposed Cllr Harris, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RECOMMENDED** unanimously that the Parish Council support the council tax referendum principles proposed by the Government for 2019-20.

## **62 To approve payment for the bicycle and buggy park in Sayers Road play area**

62.1 Proposed Cllr Harris, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RESOLVED** unanimously that payment for the bicycle and buggy park in Sayers Road be made.

62.2 The Clerk was requested to extend the current use of purchase orders to cover non-contracted payments of over £1,000 and bring forward draft amendments to the Financial Regulations accordingly.

**Action: Clerk**

### 63 To decide upon the actions contained in the report from the Cemetery Working Group

63.1 Cllr Toher thanked Assistant Clerk Taylor for her comprehensive report, which had been included with the papers for this meeting.

63.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Harris, **RECOMMENDED** unanimously that signage for the new car parking area outside Bishopstoke Cemetery be installed, with funding being vired from reserves.

63.3 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Tidridge, **RESOLVED** unanimously that an area for memorials without interment be set aside in Bishopstoke Cemetery, with the fees matching burial grant requests (which grants the right to have a memorial) and memorial applications.

63.4 Proposed Cllr Brown, Seconded Cllr Dean, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the suggested new wording for the third recommendation contained in the report be amended such that the second sentence in the first paragraph would now read "Should this not be the case then after 14 days . . .", and the last sentence of the second paragraph would now read "If any items are placed elsewhere then the grass will not . . .".

63.5 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Harris, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the Cemetery Regulations be altered as suggested in the report, as amended in Minute 63.4.

63.6 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RECOMMENDED** unanimously that the next phase of improvement works for Bishopstoke Cemetery be approved, with up to £5,000 being vired from reserves as necessary.

### 64 To receive the Clerk's Report, including an update on Parish Council assets

64.1 August saw 1 new burial and 1 re-opening, with 1 new ashes interment and 3 re-openings. The total for the year so far is 15, and there are two booked for September so far.

64.2 Since the last F&GP meeting work has been completed on the bank shoring, the knee rail fencing and the bin palisade, all of which we are very happy with. Work has also been ongoing on the badly needed repairs to the boundary wall of St Mary's Church. The Parish Council has a legal obligation regarding health and safety on the church grounds and after many years of no work being done is faced with a number of jobs in relatively quick succession. It is anticipated that once they are complete that should be it for a few years in terms of major work.

64.3 Two wasp nests have been treated at Glebe Meadow play area, and mole control has taken place at the Cemetery, and is about to take place at the play area on Church Road. The Clerk also reported that he had been informed that the Ant Nest in Stoke Park Woods is being removed due to health and safety reasons on 24<sup>th</sup> September.

64.4 As no one has come forward to be a site rep at the Jockey Lane site the toilets will now remain locked. Underwood Road received three nominations and as there are three vacancies no elections were necessary. Work continues on the various issues that have come to light as a result of the inspection scheme that was put in place last year.

64.5 The Clerk reported that Assistant Clerk Taylor would be on holiday from Friday 14<sup>th</sup> to Friday 21<sup>st</sup> September, and that the Clerk would be on holiday from October 15<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup>. Any queries over that period should be directed to Assistant Clerk Taylor or Thorogood.



64.6 Twynams will be using the office on Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> September. There will be the next EBC / BPC Liaison meeting here on Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October, and on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> October the office will be closing at 11am as the Clerk is attending the Community Safety Group meeting in Fair Oak. The next Neighbourhood Plan meeting is in the Parish Office that evening. Finally, the Clerk reminded those present that it is Carnival weekend and invited everyone to come and join the fun. The Clerk was asked to see whether Twynams could in future use a day other than Thursday for their meeting so it does not interfere with residents wishing to come in to the Parish Office.

**Action: Clerk**

## **65 Date, time, place and agenda items for the next meeting**

65.1 The next meeting is scheduled to be on Tuesday 9 October 2018 at 7:30pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke.

65.2 Agenda items for this meeting should be received by the Clerk at least 7 days prior to the meeting.

*There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 9:10pm*

DRAFT

### **Resolutions to be noted by the Full Parish Council**

52.2 that the Minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Meeting held on 10 July 2018 be accepted as a true record.

56.4 that the Committee approve the RFO, Payment and Budget Monitoring reports for July and August 2018.

57.3 that the Parish Council not provide a cleaner, but instead remind the site reps of their responsibilities.

62.1 that payment for the bicycle and buggy park in Sayers Road be made.

63.3 that an area for memorials without interment be set aside in Bishopstoke Cemetery, with the fees matching burial grant requests (which grants the right to have a memorial) and memorial applications.

63.4 that the suggested new wording for the third recommendation contained in the report be amended such that the second sentence in the first paragraph would now read "Should this not be the case then after 14 days . . .", and the last sentence of the second paragraph would now read "If any items are placed elsewhere then the grass will not . . .".

63.5 that the Cemetery Regulations be altered as suggested in the report, as amended in Minute 63.4.

### **Recommendations for consideration by the Full Parish Council**

58.2 that £2,000 be vired from reserves to pay for essential remedial work at the Underwood Road allotment site.

59.3 that £200 be awarded to each of ARK Eastleigh, Age Concern Bishopstoke, MHA Live At Home, Wessmaps Housing Trust and the Bishopstoke Community Association.

60.3 that Open Sight be awarded a grant of £500.

61.1 that the Parish Council support the council tax referendum principles proposed by the Government for 2019-20.

63.2 that signage for the new car parking area outside Bishopstoke Cemetery be installed, with funding being vired from reserves.

63.6 that the next phase of improvement works for Bishopstoke Cemetery be approved, with up to £5,000 being vired from reserves as necessary.

**Actions arising from this meeting**

55.3 The **Clerk** committed to examining the language used regarding insurance on the Carnival Stall Holder form.

56.2 **Cllrs** that have items they wish included in next year's budget should forward them to the Clerk by mid-October.

56.3 The **Clerk** offered to regroup and rename the "Community Project" budget heads more appropriately.

60.4 The **Clerk** was requested to contact Open Sight to encourage them to apply for grants from other parishes.

62.2 The **Clerk** was requested to extend the current use of purchase orders to cover non-contracted payments of over £1,000 and bring forward draft amendments to the Financial Regulations accordingly.

64.6 The **Clerk** was asked to see whether Twynams could in future use a day other than Thursday for their meeting so it does not interfere with residents wishing to come in to the Parish Office.

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Clerk's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**PARISH COUNCIL MEETING ON 25 September 2018  
MONTHLY STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT (July 2018)**

**ITEM 8**

<b>Fund Movements</b>						
Bank Accounts		Money In		Money Out		
	Starting Balance	Receipts	Transfer In	Payments	Transfer Out	Closing Balance
Co-op	£ 96,071.47	£ 620.00		£ 16,554.65		£ 80,136.82
EBC	£ 93,540.87					£ 93,540.87
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 189,612.34</b>	<b>£ 620.00</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>£ 16,554.65</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>£ 173,677.69</b>

<b>Receipts in detail</b>	
Burial Board	£ 450.00
Allotments	£ 170.00
Carnival	
VAT refund	
Misc.	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 620.00</b>

<b>VAT</b>	
Previously Claimed	
Claimed in April	
Unclaimed	

<b>EBC Loan Account Summary</b>						
		Money In			Money Out	
	1 April 2017 Balance	Precept	Support Grant	Interest	Transfer to BPC	Current Balance
Prior to July	£ 127,591.03	£ 92,231.51	£ 13,336.38	£ 381.95	£ 140,000.00	£ 93,540.87
July						£ 93,540.87

<b>Notes</b>	

**PARISH COUNCIL MEETING ON 25 September 2018  
MONTHLY STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT (August 2018)**

**ITEM 8**

<b>Fund Movements</b>						
Bank Accounts		Money In		Money Out		
	Starting Balance	Receipts	Transfer In	Payments	Transfer Out	Closing Balance
Co-op	£ 80,136.82	£ 2,704.21		£ 16,337.82		£ 66,503.21
EBC	£ 93,540.87					£ 93,540.87
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 173,677.69</b>	<b>£ 2,704.21</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>£ 16,337.82</b>	<b>£ -</b>	<b>£ 160,044.08</b>

<b>Receipts in detail</b>	
Burial Board	£ 2,704.21
Allotments	
Carnival	
VAT refund	
Misc.	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 2,704.21</b>

<b>VAT</b>	
Previously Claimed	
Claimed in April	
Unclaimed	

<b>EBC Loan Account Summary</b>						
		Money In			Money Out	
	1 April 2017 Balance	Precept	Support Grant	Interest	Transfer to BPC	Current Balance
Prior to August	£ 127,591.03	£ 92,231.51	£ 13,336.38	£ 381.95	£ 140,000.00	£ 93,540.87
August						£ 93,540.87

<b>Notes</b>	

## Full Council – September 25<sup>th</sup> Information regarding Bishopstoke Community Centre

Hampshire County Council and the Bishopstoke Community Association have been working over the past year to determine all the necessary work for bringing the Community Centre back into a state of proper repair. Work has already been done to repair flood damage, and to replace some of the heating and air conditioning units with more efficient systems. Painting and decorating work, as well as clearance work, has also been undertaken, and the majority of the ancient heating system has now been removed.

Having discovered major drainage problems, Hampshire contractors have undertaken work to determine the full extent and repairs are expected in the near future.

Hampshire have indicated that they would like to hand the building over, preferably to the Bishopstoke Community Association OR the Bishopstoke Parish Council by March 31<sup>st</sup> 2019.

There has already been other work that has been identified as necessary.

The tower is in need of either repair or replacement. The current suggestion is that the repair work could just be a matter of replacing the internal support structure, and so may be cheaper than originally envisaged.

Dealing with the flat roof section so as to avoid future flooding is necessary, as is repairing the damp proof course once the drainage system has been repaired.

The tower, flat roof and damp proof area all seen by Hampshire as works that they would not undertake themselves, but they have stated that they would provide grants to cover the costs of the works. Those grants would be available to whoever takes charge of the building.

It is possible that further work will be identified. If they are classed as needing Hampshire to react to a situation (eg flooding) then they will be undertaken by HCC. If they are not “reactive” works then they would be undertaken by whoever controls the building, but with the expectation that HCC grants would cover the cost.

Once the building ownership is transferred, then it is my expectation that further grants would only be available for a limited time, if at all.

Options for the Parish Council are as follows:

- 1) Decide that the Parish Council wishes to take no part in the future of the Community Centre. This incurs no costs to the Council, but also risks the Community Centre eventually shutting down or being sold on.
- 2) Decide that the Parish Council does not wish to own the Community Centre, but it will act as a last resort source of funding should anything major need repairing / replacing. The Parish Council insurance policy may be able to be updated to mitigate some of the risk. There would be occasional costs in future years, some potentially substantial, but minimal regular work as the building would be left in the hands of the Bishopstoke Community Association, always assuming that they wish to take over. If neither the Parish Council nor the BCA wish to actually run the building, then new owners would presumably be sought by HCC.
- 3) Decide that the Parish Council is happy to own the Community Centre, to ensure its continued use as a Community Centre, but that it does not wish to be involved in the day-to-day running of the building. In that case, a similar situation to what occurs currently could take place, with the BCA continuing to run the building and being responsible for the internal upkeep of the building, with the Parish Council responsible for the shell of the building and anything external to it. Again, this is dependant on either the BCA or another body being prepared to run the building. This has similar costs to option 2, but also has the potential of bringing in rent from the BCA or other organisation.
- 4) Decide that the Parish Council not only wishes to take over the building, but that it also wants to be involved directly in the running of it. Members of the current BCA committee could be invited to join the BCC Management Group as they obviously have relevant recent experience of the building and its hirers. The Parish Council would be responsible for all costs related to the building, but would receive all the hire fees resulting from use of the building.

It is worth noting that there is substantial parking at the Community Centre, and there is ample space there for a Parish Office, whether permanent or temporary. There are also rooms that can be used for Council meetings. If the Council owns and

runs the building then these rooms could be used for free (whilst recognising that potential income from them may be lost as a result), whereas if the building is run by another body then rooms would need to be rented for the Council to use them.

HCC wishes to know the Parish Council position as soon as possible. The Council benefits from having several Councillors that are already on the Committee in various guises, and so it should be possible for any questions regarding the current state of the building and grounds to be answered at least in part.