

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

In Attendance: Duncan Murray (Parish Clerk) and Andrew Thompson (EBC Officer).

Public Participation:

There were 4 members of the public 3 of whom spoke. The first speaker said that he had concerns over the level of demand, whether the Business Case was robust, how the proposed facility would be maintained. He commented that if these were covered satisfactorily the along with making the parking and access for the scouts safe then he would support the proposals. A second speaker was concerned over the level of responses to the survey and that residents weren't asked if they would use it. She commented that the elderly wouldn't use it neither would the young. She also queried the issue of Agenda item 3(b) that previously had stated any loan would be paid for by hirers. A third speaker commented on the strength of the Business Case and that a much bigger consultation was needed. She also requested confirmation that the temporary car park would in fact be temporary.

765 APOLOGIES

These were received from Cllrs Bicknell, Bull and Simmonds, an emailed apology from Cllr Jolly was picked up later.

766 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Grajewski declared a non-pecuniary interest in the items for the meeting being a Borough Councillor who had been on the Local Area Committee at which the planning application for the scheme had been considered. But as this was a separate issue from planning she was coming with an open mind. Cllrs Atkinson, Broadhurst and Hughes declared the same.

A councillor enquired about the comment made in the Briefing Note about expanding on the advice from Eastleigh Borough Council's (EBC) Legal Officer and the Clerk commented on the additional advice he had been given by the Legal Officer:

"As a cautionary note, and as a matter of statutory limitations to councillors, if any Members feel minded to frustrate the gaining of this essential information/authorisations for the final decision next year, I would expect there to be challenges (from other Members) as to them being predetermined (i.e. the mind is made up and nothing will change it) in their decision making, which, if successful, would exclude them from taking part in any decisions or debate. Such a challenge can be made at any point in a meeting and nullify a vote. The reason I would expect there to be a challenge is because any person who does not want to know whether we can have authorisation to borrow, or any person who does not want to know the final tendered costs (thus the actual build costs) would probably be considered NOT to be "coming to the matter with an open, rational mind, [to] take part in any debate and vote" (to quote EBC Legal Team).

Therefore, if Members feel predisposed (i.e. feeling strongly against [or for] a proposal but they are still open to persuasion either way) to not thinking the

proposed development should go ahead the safest way of expressing those thoughts would be by abstaining on these procedural items.

Please note figures have been left off the published agenda as, at this point in time, they are commercially sensitive and to publish them could have a detrimental effect on prices gained during the tender process – obviously all figures will be made public after the tender documents are returned and form part of the open debate for a Final Investment Decision.”

It was asked that the advice be minuted verbatim.

Cllr Duguid said that he had gained advice to the contrary, but accepted what the Clerk had said and that at a point in the meeting he would like to move for a confidential session to discuss the figures in detail.

Cllr Pragnell stated that he was a Borough Councillor and that circumstances had kept him away from the LAC meeting, but that he came with an open mind but was concerned about the finances. Both the Chairman and the Clerk agreed that the finances were very important to get right.

767 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE WHETHER THE COUNCIL, THROUGH ITS RESPONSIBLE FINANCE OFFICER/PROPER OFFICER, CAN APPROACH THE SECRETARY OF STATE (DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT) TO SEEK APPROVAL TO BORROW MONIES FOR THE PROJECT AT AN INDICATED LEVEL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUSINESS CASE/ASSOCIATED PAPERS. IN SO DECIDING TO CONSIDER WHETHER: -

- a. IT WILL BE OF BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY THE PARISH COUNCIL IS HERE TO SERVE,**
- b. THE PROPOSALS ARE AFFORDABLE (I.E. LOAN AND INTEREST REPAYMENTS) WITHIN OUR CURRENT PRECEPT OF £50.27 FOR A BAND D PROPERTY, AND**
- c. THE PARISH COUNCIL HAVE THE WHEREWITHAL (CASHFLOW) TO FUND THE BUILD PROCESS IF IT WERE TO BORROW IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUSINESS CASE/ASSOCIATED PAPERS FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD AND RECEIVES THE £400K NHBS GRANT FROM EBC?**

Following proposal and seconding the clerk clarified some of the salient points from the Briefing Note and Members were able to ask questions before debate took place. Members enquired about the financial forecasts, whether VAT was included or not (it was excluded) and whether there were more benefits or ‘dis-benefits’ to the community. The Clerk answered the questions and commented about additional benefits such as a fitness track with outdoor gym equipment that the proposals could help attract funding for.

Mr Thompson was invited to make comment and he spoke about the research showing no capacity at peak times even with Places Leisure Eastleigh opening the following day. That sports clubs were desperate for facilities, the ‘5-0 Club’ that was needing additional places to meet for short and long mat bowls, a need for an indoor tennis court.

A Cllr commented that what she was hearing at ward and county level was that many people were looking forwards to the provision of the new facility, and that one of the 'dis-benefits' would be the current building falling down. She also commented that it was not unusual for councils to run buildings at a loss, but reminded those present that the Fryern Pavilion was exceeding all expectations. She finished by saying that this was about finding out what they had to be able to afford and the Clerk being enabled to get the financial information so that the Council could make those decisions.

It was mentioned that whilst agreeing with about 80% there remained questions of occupancy at Thornden and the white elephant of the 'Basement' at Hiltingbury. Another commented that whilst assured on items 3(b) and (c) he had a reserved yes on 3(a).

That being the end of debate on this item it was moved to a vote and on a show of hands of 9 for, 3 abstentions, and 1 against (Cllr Leslie) the item was AGREED

- 768 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE WHETHER THE PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP A SPORTS HALL EXTENSION TO HILTINGBURY PAVILION SHOULD BE PUT OUT TO TENDER, FOLLOWING THE PLANNING CONSENT OF 15 NOVEMBER 2017, AND AT AN INDICATIVE PRICE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BUSINESS CASE/ASSOCIATED PAPERS.**

A Member moved that this part of the meeting be confidential.

- 769 TO AGREE TO EXEMPT THE MEETING FROM PUBLIC ATTENDANCE UNDER THE PUBLIC ACCESS TO MEETINGS ACT 1960 /C2 DUE TO THE CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF THE ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED.**

Following proposal, seconding and on a show of hands this was AGREED and at 8.00pm the public were excluded due to the commercial sensitivity of the financial information to be discussed.

At 8.20 the meeting returned to being a public meeting.

It was UNANIMOUSLY AGREED that the tender document should be drawn up and finalised by the Design Team in consultation with the Quantity Surveyor and architect for issue by the Parish Clerk.

- 770 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE THAT THE PARISH CLERK CAN OBTAIN FORMAL APPROVALS FROM PREVIOUS GRANT FUNDERS AND OTHER RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS TO FULFIL PLANNING CONDITIONS THAT MIGHT BE NECESSARY TO PROGRESS THE PROJECT TO A FINAL INVESTMENT DECISION.**

Following proposal, seconding and on a show of hands it was UNANIMOUSLY AGREED that the Clerk was authorised to gain the necessary consents to progress the project to final decisions.

- 771 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE THE PROVISION OF SITE INVESTIGATIONS AND EXISTING FOUNDATION TRIAL HOLES FOR THE PROPOSED HILTINGBURY PAVILION**

CHANDLER'S FORD PARISH COUNCIL – EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL 27 NOVEMBER 2017 (Continued)

EXTENSION AT A COST OF £6,470 (EX VAT), DEFERRED FROM 30 OCTOBER, BUT NEW TRIAL PITS/SOIL TESTING REQUIRED AS A PLANNING CONDITION.

The Clerk briefed Members that there was a necessity as a planning condition for fresh soil sampling. A Member asked if the existing services were adequate for the proposals which was commented that the M&E consultant had confirmed this. Following proposal, seconding and on a show of hands site investigations were UNANIMOUSLY AGREED.

Date and place of next meeting was moved to 7.00pm 18 December 2017 at Fryern Pavilion, Chandler's Ford, due to a clash with EBC's Council meeting on the 11th December.

That being all the business the meeting was closed at 8.30pm.

Chairman.....