

CHANDLER'S FORD PARISH COUNCIL

7.00 PM 15 June 2015 CORNWALL ROOM, VELMORE CENTRE, CHANDLER'S FORD

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillor Atkinson (Chairman), Councillors, Aubry, Boyes, Broadhurst, Bull, Cox, Foulds, Hughes, Jolly, Johnson, Leslie, Luffman, Pragnell and Scott.

In Attendance: Duncan Murray (Parish Clerk)

Public Participation

There were no members of the public present.

566 APOLOGIES

These were received from Councillors Bicknell, Duguid, Grajewski and Simmonds

567 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cllr Bull declared that he was friends with the owner of Stoneham Park.

568 COMMUNITY SAFETY – UPDATE

569 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman had no report.

570 TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE BOROUGH COUNCIL'S REVISED LOCAL PLAN.

The Chairman introduced Tony Guymer of Eastleigh Borough Council's Planning Policy Team, he hoped that his manager Toby Ailing would be able to join the meeting. Mr Guymer gave a presentation on the revision of the Draft Local Plan stating that the currently adopted one was over 9 years old, and that revisions had needed to be made to the previous draft since it was rejected by the Planning Inspector at the shortened Examination in Public in November 2014. The Inspector had considered that not enough housing was being planned. The Borough Council's view had been that to take a need of 10,140 over the plan period was reasonable. The Inspector also felt that there was a shortfall in the 5 year land supply available and that 560 dwellings a year were needed to be planned for.

The decision was therefore taken by EBC to abandon the previous draft and do a new 15 year plan to 2036, which was in line with PUSH (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire). The invitation for sites had begun along with establishing the evidence base. EBC were currently looking to the end of 2015 to publish an indicative version of the plan to the community and then identify the preferred approach and option. He commented that there were no current preferred sites and that the first consultation would be between Christmas and February and after a formal consultation in June 2016 to submit to the Inspector later that summer.

It was also said that there was a report going to Cabinet that week on General Needs, Travelling Communities and Employment. Consultation was needed with partners especially New Forest and Southampton Councils due to environmental effects and that there was a warning to the potential to need to absorb some other districts' needs. It was commented that the Planning Policy Team wanted to engage in dialogue with parishes, seek their views and see if their aspirations could be accommodated before decisions were made.

The Chairman asked Members if they had any questions. It was asked if there was to be a matrix of differences so that it was easy to understand how the Local Plan had changed, the issue of Draper's land being withdrawn for housing was also raised along with flood risk, strategic gaps, Test Valley's plans and whether they included affordable housing at Stoneham Lane, the proposals for the Ford site and actual figures for social housing requirements.

With regards to Stoneham proposals it was reported, in answer to Members' questions that the target for affordable housing in Stoneham as 35% of which 66% would be social rented and 33% shared ownership. In terms of sports fields some King George V fields were being brought back into use. It was acknowledged that if the scheme was not viable at 35% affordable dwellings then the Borough Council would look into renegotiating s106 agreements as the developers had a right to be able to challenge.

It was also commented that there was a new Spatial Strategy out for consultation in the new year from PUSH, which had elements of cross-bordering. It was agreed to email the PowerPoint presentation to the Clerk for dissemination.

571 TO DISCUSS AND CONSIDER IF THE COUNCIL SHOULD MAKE A RESPONSE TO THE AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT TO THE LAND SOUTH OF CHESTNUT AVENUE, NORTH STONEHAM PARK.

Although Members did not appear to have received the letter of variations to the application it was decided to use the briefing note from the previous consultation comments. Members agreed after debate that it was necessary to concentrate only on the aspects that directly affected the Parish. It was UNANIMOUSLY AGREED to comment that:

- i. the proposals would have an impact on any remaining Strategic Gap; and
- ii. that there would be a significant increase in traffic movements on the local highways that were already significantly congested at peak times.

572 TO APPROVE/ACCEPT MINUTES OF MEETINGS:

- a) to approve the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council (AGM)

held on 20 May 2015.

On a show of hands the minutes were AGREED.

- b) to approve the minutes of the Policy and Finance Committee meeting held on 1 June 2015 and to note the financial reports.

On a show of hands the minutes were AGREED and the financial reports were NOTED.

- c) to approve the minutes of the Asset Management Committee meeting of 8 June 2015.

On a show of hands the minutes were AGREED.

573 TO AGREE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

- i) To AGREE the UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATION from the Policy and Finance Committee that supports the provision of youth facilities at Hiltingbury and will contribute up to £5,000 towards costs in the first year. This would be subject to continuing financial support of a minimum of £6,000 per annum being committed/received from the LAC for this project.

It was noted that on the 10 June the Local Area Committee had agreed the funding of £6,000. On a show of hands Members UNANIMOUSLY AGREED the recommendation.

- ii) To AGREE the UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATION from the Policy and Finance Committee that a three year long-term agreement be entered into with Zurich Insurance.

On a show of hands Members UNANIMOUSLY AGREED the recommendation.

- iii) To NOTE the DECISION of the Policy and Finance Committee to provide grant funding under the General Power of Competence to Velmore Youth Café/Groundworks South of £2733 and to the AWCA of £100 towards the Eastleigh Mela.

This was noted

574 TO CONSIDER AND AGREE, FOLLOWING THE INTERNAL AUDITOR'S VISIT, TO THE CHAIRMAN AND THE PROPER OFFICER/ RESPONSIBLE FINANCE OFFICER SIGNING OF THE ANNUAL ACCOUNTING STATEMENT AND THE ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31 MARCH 2015 AS REQUIRED BY THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTING REGULATIONS IN PLACE.

- i. Accounting Statement:

The Motion was proposed by Cllr Bull and seconded by Cllr Boyes. Members reviewed the Accounting Statement and on a show of hands AGREED that the

Accounting Statement could be signed by the Responsible Finance Officer and the Chairman.

ii. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

Members reviewed the Annual Governance Statement point by point AGREEING to each statement separately by a show of hands and it was AGREED that the Accounting Statement could be signed by the Responsible Finance Officer and the Chairman.

It was NOTED that the Minute Reference would be 574 for both items.

575 TO AGREE TO THE CHAIRMAN AND THE RESPONSIBLE FINANCE OFFICER SIGNING THE FORMAL ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR AS PREPARED BY HUMPHRYS ASSOCIATES.

It was proposed by Cllr Boyes and seconded by Cllr Luffman and ALL AGREED that the Annual Accounts be signed by the Officer and the Chairman.

576 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE ANY ACTION REQUIRED TO THE MOTION FROM CLLR PRAGNELL.

Cllr Pragnell had previously requested that the motion to go before the Parish Council be amended slightly the motion before the Members was therefore as follows: **'This council wishes to protest in the strongest terms about the road repairs that were recently made to Oakmount Rd, Chandler's Ford. The standard of repair is considered unacceptable by this council with the pre-work to date that has not been completed.**

The work has left the surface in an uneven state that is causing significant problems and potential hazards for road users particularly cyclists.

This parish wishes to make the strongest representations to HCC to request that the road repairs are revisited and the road brought up to a satisfactory standard. This council does not consider that a surface dressing is likely to achieve this.

Furthermore that this council has serious concerns about a number of roads in the parish that are in a substandard state and requests that an action plan be developed to address them.'

The amended motion was seconded by Cllr Hughes.

Cllr Pragnell expanded on his motion stressing the dangers of the road surface, the shortcomings of the repairs so far undertaken and the need for it to be resurfaced rather than have further repairs and then surface dressing only to fail in a short time span as happened with Common Road. He also commented that the Council had to be heard as one voice.

Members contributed to the debate agreeing with the dangers for bikes and mopeds, speaking about similar issues that had occurred in the New Forest which later had to be resurfaced despite surface dressing. Issues with Oakmount Road generally were made and particularly the delay from repairs to proposed surface dressing. The consensus amongst Members was that resurfacing should be undertaken due to the dilapidated state of the road.

It was noted that the proposed surface dressing was scheduled for 27 June and that the Clerk was on leave from the end of the meeting. It was unanimously agreed therefore that the Chairman could follow it up with HCC Highways to seek resolution of works that would be acceptable due to the very restricted time limits.

577 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE THE RULES WITHIN WHICH MEMBERS' QUESTIONS MAY BE REINTRODUCED TO FULL COUNCIL MEETINGS.

The Chairman commented that she asked for this to be on the Agenda especially if Members do not sit on the relevant committees. Debate was based on the appropriateness of questions being submitted in writing in advance and getting a written reply; also on supplementary questions for the sake of clarity. It was commented that the questions could ask why, but not open up a debate on recommendations that were within committees powers. The Clerk explained that the minutes were a matter of accuracy for those that were present, not debate, and that the committees had agreed delegated powers from Full Council which meant certain items were concluded at the committee stage. Members also debated where the questions would be on the agenda, some expressing a desire for them to be before minutes being agreed and others before the recommendations.

It was agreed that Members' Questions would be added to the Agenda before Committees' recommendations.

That being all the business the meeting closed at 9.15 p.m.

Date and place of next meeting: 27 July Council Meeting Room, Fryern Pavilion, Greenways, Chandler's Ford at 7.00pm.

Chairman.....