****

**NOTES OF THE MEETING OF SOUTH WONSTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**Held on Monday 10th June 2019**

**In the Pavilion, Lower Road at 7.30pm**

**Present:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.**  | **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**Apologies were received from  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **2.** | **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS** No interests to be declared. **The Chairman suspended Standing Orders.****The Chairman will request that the meeting be held in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance and respect by both attendees and the Parish Councillors. Consideration should be made regards to the voluntary role of the Parish Council** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **3.** | **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** **Meeting Rules:**The Chairman will inform Members of the public that any representation must relate to an agenda item for the meeting - also three minutes is permitted per presentation. The Chairman will then **suspend** Standing Orders (the rules of the meeting for Members) whilst public participation takes place being 3 minutes for each person. |  |
| **4.**  | **Reports from Local Councillors** To receive an update from local councillors |  |
|  | **Resume Standing Orders** |  |
| **5.** | **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 13th MAY 2019** **It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes as a true record of the meeting following minor amendments.** |  |
| **6.** | **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 13th MAY 2019** **To be noted** |  |
|  **7.**  | **FINANCE** **- Recent Transactions**A spreadsheet of recent transactions was provided for all Members. **It was RESOLVED to approve the transactions. A copy is appended to these minutes.****- Account Reconciliations**  The relevant figures for each account as at 31st May 2019 were:Co-op Deposit Account 7 £91,393.62Lloyds Account 10 £71,131.57Total = £162,525.19May’s overall balance of £162K, is £4K less than March £166K due to VAT income and hires income netted with higher than normal transaction expenditure.The balances were noted and each reconciliation sheet will be signed by the Chairman once all cash books have been brought up to date, to confirm the Council’s monitoring role.**To be noted****- Year End Annual Return 2018/19**Clerk emailed the Management Accounts to the Parish Council to review the income and expenditure for 2018/19 and requested that questions to be emailed prior to the PC meeting on Monday evening.The reserves for 2018/19 = £36,600Remaining Reserves = £43,000**Total Reserves = £79,600**Items that make the balance Balance @ 31/3/19 =£119,000VAT to 31/3/19 reclaim = £4,500Net Debtors & Creditors = (£5,000)Reserves & CIL spent during the year = (£39,000)Total Reserves to be allocated against the project plan = £79,600 (to go to the July PC meeting)The internal auditor has reviewed all the documents for the year end 2018/19 and is satisfied with the internal controls. There were no recommendation. 1. Section1 – Annual Governance Statement 2018/19 to be agreed at meeting
2. Section2 – Accounting Statements 2018/19 to be signed at the meeting.

**A formal RESOLUTION will be required to approve the annual return.** |  |
|  |  |  |
|  **8.** | **PLANNING****- Applications**Due to the deadlines, responses have been submitted for the applications below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 19/01070/PNHOU  |
| Alternative Reference  | Not Available  |
| Application Received  | Tue 14 May 2019  |
| Application Validated  | Tue 14 May 2019  |
| Address  | 12 Waverley Drive South Wonston Winchester Hampshire SO21 3EF  |
| Proposal  | Single storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory.Existing conservatory is 6m wide and 4.5m deep ie extending 4.5m beyond the rear wall of the dwelling at the longest point. The replacement extension would be 8.3m wide (to allow extension of the existing kitchen) and 4.5m deep ie extending 4.5m beyond the rear wall of the dwelling. The replacement extension would be constructed of brick and tile with materials matching or very similar to the materials used on the existing house. The roof will be pitched. The windows and doors would be white upvc to match existing. There would be a door and window at each end - the west and east elevations, to serve the existing patio and decking areas located there, and the garden beyond. There would be one large or two smaller windows in the southern elevation, and three Velux windows in the roof.  |
| Status  | Current  |
| Inspected By | Cllr Dodson |
| Response | Looking At |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 19/01005/TPO  |
| Alternative Reference  | PP-07836013  |
| Application Received  | Tue 07 May 2019  |
| Application Validated  | Wed 08 May 2019  |
| Address  | Orchard Croft Orchard Road South Wonston SO21 3EX  |
| Proposal  | Beech (T1&T2) - Reduce lateral tips of branches that cover light gap between the two trees up to the height of 6m as per previous application for crown raising.  |
| Status  | Current  |
| Inspected By | Cllr Dodson |
| Response | No Comment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 18/02432/FUL  |
| Alternative Reference  | PP-07348438  |
| Application Received  | Thu 18 Oct 2018  |
| Application Validated  | Mon 25 Feb 2019  |
| Address  | Land Adjacent To 2 Alresford Drove South Wonston Winchester Hampshire SO21 3HW  |
| Proposal  | Application for hardcore entrance onto the land so there is access from Alresford Drove.  |
| Status  | Current  |
| Inspected By | Cllr Peal |
| Response | See Below |

18/02432/FUL Land Adjacent to 2 Alresford Drove, South Wonston.The application is for a hardcore entrance onto the land so there is access from Alresford Drove. The work has already started; an access has been made through the original hedge, which was removed, and a close boarded fence erected. Clearance has taken place on the land, which has been laid down to grass. The land is classified as agricultural and has no permitted development rights as it covers less than 0.4 hectares. The new access to and from the public highway requires planning permission. Two parking spaces are being sought. The applicant states that no drainage is necessary as only a small area of hardcore is proposed. The entrance area measures 7.2 x 9 metres and will be gated, and the parking/turning area measures 13 x 7 metres. The fence at the front of the property is one metre high.The applicant maintains there are no trees or hedges on the proposed development site. He has removed the trees which formerly covered the land and removed the hedge which was part of a longer section bordering the agricultural land and a public right of way apparently without permission, which may have contravened the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations, particularly as the applicant has never, to the best of my knowledge, demonstrated that access from elsewhere would have been impossibly expensive – or even that access couldn’t be achieved in any other way, as was noted by an inspector making his final report after the applicant lodged an appeal following refusal of his original planning application.The applicant also states that there are no trees or hedges adjacent to the development site that could influence it or be important as part of the local landscape character. This neighbourhood is characterised by groups of trees and hedges, examples of which border the property to the west and oppose it from the north.Pre-application advice has been received from the Principal Planning Officer – Enforcement. The site has a planning history, beginning with 16/02926/FUL, originally an application for the creation of a hardcore entrance onto the land, to which the Planning Department added the parking area and the close boarded fence of 1.8 – 2 metres high, so the application became part retrospective with regard to works already begun. This application was refused in 2017 on the grounds of inadequate visibility splays and a fence detrimental to the street scene. The applicant appealed; this was dismissed later in 2017 in similar terms.The fence was lowered to 1 metre at the roadside, making it permitted development. The land had become subject to enforcement over alleged hedge removal in 2016 (16/00138/HEDGE). A new application was sought from the owner, who provided details of a speed survey, possibly because in 2017 a Highway Engineer had commented that it might be possible to relax the visibility requirements depending on the results of a speed survey to establish the 85th percentile speed in wet weather. This section of Alresford Drove is within the 30mph limit. The results of this speed survey can’t currently be obtained due to format problems, if the Excel spreadsheet included in the current application documents contains these results.The present application was eventually received and validated. According to correspondence to the Parish Council from Enforcement, if the application had remained invalid, it wouldn’t have been possible, according to advice from Hampshire County Council’s Principal Engineer cited below, in its opinion, to justify taking enforcement action so long as the existing access is for occasional use to maintain the field. After validation, will action now be taken?In 2018, Hampshire County Council’s Principal Engineer (Highways, Unit South and East), commented that vehicular access onto an unclassified road would ordinarily not require planning per mission but would be applied for under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. Despite the inadequacy of the visibility splays, if access was only for occasional maintenance the County Council might have allowed the access under the Act cited above, but if an application is submitted to carry out building or engineering operations on the land or to change its use, he would have expected County to raise an objection on visibility grounds. We have no evidence that an application under the Highways Act has been made. We do have the current application which proposes surfacing works for a new access, which constitutes development, which includes engineering operations e.g. groundworks, therefore we might reasonably conclude that the original objection could be raised.The current application is essentially the same as the 2016 original before the Planning Department’s additional parking area and close boarded fence. The planning statement is the same, as well as the notations on the site plan. The conditions which resulted in the refusal of 16/02926/FUL and the dismissal of the applicant’s appeal are still the same; the visibility splays are well below the required minimum standards of 2 x 43 metres on a road limited to 30mph.RECOMMENDATIONThe applicant’s proposal for a hardcore entrance to his land on Alresford Drove has been turned down twice on the same grounds and remains contrary to LPP2 DM 18 iii in that it doesn’t make provision for access to the site in accordance with any highway requirements on the grounds of safety, including the provision of … visibility splays. With regard to the access from Alresford Drove, the applicant hasn’t, as far as we can tell, demonstrated that access from elsewhere would have been impossibly expensive, thereby avoiding potential problems with the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, or indeed unachievable in any other way, or applied for access under the Highways Act 1980. We would require very watertight assurances that the land was only to be visited occasionally for maintenance. Faced with an application involving groundworks, and given the Principal Engineer’s expectation of a County highways objection on visibility grounds on top of the original reasons for rejection, the Parish Council believes that refusal is the only option.**- Decisions by WCC**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 19/00876/TPO  |
| Alternative Reference  | PP-07793127  |
| Application Received  | Wed 17 Apr 2019  |
| Application Validated  | Wed 17 Apr 2019  |
| Address  | Belle Vue West Hill Road North South Wonston SO21 3HN  |
| Proposal  | T1 Ash to fell due to no amenity value and no significant impact on the surrounding environment. This will also help improve the natural light to the family home.  |
| Status  | Decided  |
| Decision  | **Application Permitted**  |
| Decision Issued Date  | Tue 04 Jun 2019  |
| Inspected By | Cllr Dodson |
| Response | T1 Ash to fell due to no amenity value and no significant impact on the surrounding environment. This will also help improve the natural light to the family home.My Response - This tree has TPO number 1654T2 and therefore needs to be maintained and kept in good order |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 19/00157/FUL  |
| Alternative Reference  | Not Available  |
| Application Received  | Mon 21 Jan 2019  |
| Application Validated  | Mon 04 Mar 2019  |
| Address  | Post Office 95 - 97 Downs Road South Wonston Winchester Hampshire SO21 3EH  |
| Proposal  | Single storey side extension to provide new cafe to existing shop with commercial kitchen and toilet, internal change of use from residential to commercial, single storey side and rear extension to existing single dwelling  |
| Status  | **Application Permitted** |
| Inspected By | Cllr Peal |
| Response | See below |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 19/00672/HOU  |
| Alternative Reference  | PP-07734168  |
| Application Received  | Tue 26 Mar 2019  |
| Application Validated  | Tue 26 Mar 2019  |
| Address  | 28 Stavedown Road South Wonston SO21 3HA  |
| Proposal  | Front ground floor lounge extension.  |
| Status  | **Application Permitted** |
| Inspected By | Cllr Peal & Cllr Perrins |
| Response | See Below |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 18/02875/FUL  |
| Alternative Reference  | PP-07457248  |
| Application Received  | Mon 17 Dec 2018  |
| Application Validated  | Mon 17 Dec 2018  |
| Address  | 131 Downs Road South Wonston SO21 3EH  |
| Proposal  | (AMENDED PLANS 18.04.19) - Erection of new 1.5 storey dwelling to the rear of No.131 Downs Road. New single storey garage to front garden of existing dwelling.  |
| Status  | **Application Permitted** |
| Inspected By | Cllr Peal |
| Response | See below |

**STILL UNDECIDED**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference  | 19/00630/FUL  |
| Alternative Reference  | PP-07718379  |
| Application Received  | Wed 20 Mar 2019  |
| Application Validated  | Mon 15 Apr 2019  |
| Address  | Street Record Stainers Lane South Wonston Hampshire  |
| Proposal  | Proposed Construction of 20m x 40m Outdoor Equestrian Arena for Private Use  |
| Inspected By | Cllr Peal & Cllr Dodson |
| Response | Cllr Peal - The planning officer has been out to see the site and pronounced it satisfactory, subject to the access issue being settled (because of the works vehicles as much as the owners). The access question is, I believe, a box ticking one, but of course you're not allowed to drive a car on a bridleway without lawful authority, this being the permission of the landowner if it is not yourself. The field boundary is shown as running along the edge of the roadway (under tarmac since about 1968, courtesy of the late Lord Rank), but it is possible the Jerrams own the subsoil to the middle of the road. The owner of the adjacent fields definitely owns to the middle. This is called a "moiety" and gives them the right to access their property. The Jerrams are currently talking to their solicitors about the access situation, since they may have the appropriate papers which the family can't trace at home. If they haven't, the solicitors will have to sort something out. We have had another case of this at the east end of Soutrh Wonston. If you just concentrate on the outdoor arena and say the access is being investigated, all will be well. I gather the site of the arena is very favourable in terms of impact. If you prefer, send Rachael your recommendation to post online before 10th May, Cllr Dodson - I have looked at the proposed plans and everything looks well thought out for the Outdoor Equestrian Arena.I therefor recommend No Comment on the Arena with a note the access is being investigated |

**That the decisions be noted.****- Enforcements** An update on the open cases has been received from Enforcements and is an appendix at the end. **To be noted** **- Appeals – None at present****- Affordable Housing**A meeting took place on the 15th May with the Parish Council, Winchester City Council, Action Hampshire and HASTOE. **Present: Cllrs Peal, Perrins, Street, Dodson, Selby, Mags Wylie (Action Hampshire), Nigel Baldwin (Winchester City Council), Javed Ditta (Hastoe)** Opened the meeting and began the discussion by asking why the Verification of Housing Need Report was so difficult to interpret, so apparently ambiguous? It evidently showed there was a need, but for how many? Why couldn’t it have said that there are X people with a local connection, wanting South Wonston, in actual need and able to pay?Nigel clarified the information sent to the Parish Council in April. 16 households were contacted of which 12 responded and 2 have since been accommodated. He agreed therefore that the housing numbers are 7 rental plus 3 shared ownership, in all 10 households which qualify from the housing register for affordable housing in South Wonston. The report goes into more detail and has been said to be ambiguous information. It was explained that the numbers in the report were the same people broken down into sub sections. Frank brought up the difference between want and need.Nigel confirmed that rented was a need and that shared ownership was a want. David mentioned that at the previous Parish Council meeting a resident raised about the Old Hunstanton versus Hastoe case, which was won by the village. Is this scheme lawful?Ann asked about the numbers in the village survey. David said that 246 of 640 households said they were in favour of affordable housing, but it wasn’t pinpointed to rent only. A resident said at the last Parish Council meeting that, as private rental can be similar in cost to affordable housing rent, could people in need not rent the house for up for let in the village? Cllr Neville said that some private rentals could not been let to people in receipt of housing benefit as their buy to let mortgage stipulates that they can’t be rented to them. David also commented that as there is affordable housing in Kings Barton couldn’t the families be redirected there?Mags pointed out that this would be a small rural exception scheme for people with local connections to the village that would help keep the village alive. They are people who want to live in South Wonston, qualify under the rules and are currently on the housing register. Kings Barton will be allocated to those with the greatest need on the housing register which is a different allocation.David asked how long people live in affordable housing. This question couldn’t be answered.June said that a need had now been demonstrated and the Parish Council have voted to support the need. People with a local connection with a desire to live in the South Wonston in rented accommodation demonstrated a need. Frank agreed that the need was supported but not a site. Based on this the project has now moved to the next stage.Nigel said that Winchester City Council Housing Needs Teams write to everyone on the register every 2 years to confirm their history and find out if they still wish to be on the register. His list is as up to date as possible i.e. 2019-20. Nigel has visited all the sites made available for development. Frank commented that should the Persimmon field be developed would other land adjoining be developed?Nigel spoke about SHELAA which has identified 4 plots of land around South Wonston. One of the key problems is access and Hampshire highways have already confirmed that they will not give any access onto Alresford Drove. June explained that the Goldfinch development couldn’t go any further as it was outside of the boundary, but was left with a walking path behind 3 houses and road access from Goldfinch into the Persimmon field. Mags contacted owners and visited all the sites in South Wonston and asked owners of land at the top of West Hill Road North could they sell their land for £10K per house built. They were unwilling to sell as it was too cheap than if sold for private development.June asked if there was now a willingness to go forward or not?Frank suggested that, based on the new housing numbers, should the scheme be modified?Javed replied that they would take a cautious approach on how many units to build and agreed that 10 houses would still be viable. He then went on to talk about some local schemes that have been successful. The examples are Harding Close, Wonston, where the Parish Council is now looking at doing a second scheme, and Micheldever.Ann agreed that one of the next steps would be to contact and visit Wonston and Micheldever and is also keen to ensure that community support is demonstrated.June asked whether it is wrong to do the scheme because residents adjacent to it are not happy, when you compare the scheme that is nearing completion on Downs Road that seems to have gone up with little objection.Javed said that so far they have built in 300 villages around the country and once built the objections disappear. The smaller scheme would still be viable due to the cost of houses in the area.David spoke about the La-Frenaye shared ownership scheme which has shown to have been problematic for some of the owners.Javed confirmed that HASTOE would look to buy the whole field.**Way Forward / Next Steps**1. Javed to check that the land is still available and that the ransom strip has been dealt with.
2. Nigel to produce a briefing paper (to be approved by Julie Pinnock) looking at all available sites and demonstrating which proves most favourable and to answer the email from Cllr Godfrey.
3. Clerk to type up minutes of the meeting to go with the above which are to be checked by attendees before being circulated to the Parish Council and interested parties.
4. It was agreed that at the next Parish Council meeting in June the suitability of the Persimmon Field should be put to the councillors’ vote.

UPDATE: After the meeting recorded above, Nigel Baldwin proposed a consultation reviewing all the original sites, any changes in assessment and any new locations now forward. The Parish Council will consider whether it approves this course of action rather than an immediate vote.The Chairman requested a vote from the Parish Council whether a Consultation should take place.HASTOE have since notified the PC that the Persimmon land is still available to purchase.Email From Nigel Baldwin Following the MeetingBelow is a note from a law firm about the Hunstanton case.  It does not appear to be relevant to the South Wonston situation, especially as all the households that were contacted for the Housing Needs Verification had the South Wonston connection not the wider housing need.  Below the paragraph is the assessment from the Briefing note that was sent out.  Perhaps the information could be circulated to other members of the Parish Council for completeness as I am aware that the case was being raised.Old Hunstanton Parish Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 1958 (Admin)The Planning Court has handed down judgment in *Old Hunstanton Parish Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*[2015] EWHC 1958 (Admin), in which it quashed a planning inspector’s decision to grant permission for 15 affordable homes on a rural exception site adjoining the village of Old Hunstanton in West Norfolk.Old Hunstanton Parish Council contended that the inspector had misinterpreted the relevant provisions of the West Norfolk Core Strategy. The housing needs register for the area identified 33 households, of which two were located in Old Hunstanton, and 22 were located in a nearby town. It was not lawful, the Parish Council argued, for the inspector to have treated housing need located in the town as justifying development in the village.The Parish Council also argued that the inspector had failed to give adequate reasons for her interpretation of the relevant local policies.Lang J upheld the Parish Council’s challenge on both grounds. Properly understood, the relevant policies of the West Norfolk Core Strategy provided policy support for rural exceptions housing only where there was a need for that housing in the immediate rural settlement, or in other small rural communities as defined by the old PPS3, where those rural communities were local to the development site. The judge described the rural exception site policy as “*exceptionally, relaxing planning constraints on development in rural areas so as to meet the needs of small rural communities, not to meet the housing needs of neighbouring towns and larger conurbations.”*On the reasons challenge, the judge held that the decision letter was inadequate: it was not possible for the Parish Council to know or understand the basis on which the inspector had interpreted the development plan as she did, and this caused substantial prejudice. The judge added that: “*more generally, it seems to me that an Inspector ought to give reasons for his or her conclusions on any fundamental question raised about the proper interpretation of a development plan policy, as this is central to his or her statutory duty, under section 38(6) PCPA 2004, to determine an application for planning permission in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”*From the response to the Goldfinch Way action Group comments on the Briefing Note to Ann and Ward Councillors here is an extract which explains how the case relates to South Wonston* “In the High Court case it was considered that the Rural Exception Site policy was being misapplied, because it was meeting the housing needs of the town of Hunstanton, not the local needs of Old Hunstanton.
* In the case of South Wonston, there is specific reference to the housing need for South Wonston rather than the district and so the outcome of this High Court case would not be relevant”

Email from Helen Farnham – WCC New Homes Delivery Team – Confirming Available for PC meetingMy colleague Nigel has informed me that the majority of Parish Councillors would like to proceed as suggested to look at all possible sites with community involvement.  The District Councillors have asked if a WCC officer can attend the next Parish Council meeting so that we can outline this proposed process which will give parishioners the opportunity to comment on sites and put forward new sites, which will then be assessed by planning officers for suitability.  I am happy to attend your meeting on Monday evening.  Please let me know if you are agreeable to this and any information which would be helpful prior to my attendance. **To be noted**  |  |
| **9.** | **RECREATION GROUND** **- To consider general repairs & annual maintenance.**Is there anything the Parish Council would like looked at?**To be noted**1. **– Playground Repairs**

The swings have been painted and new seats are on order. Clerk has contacted Caloo about doing the maintenance work to the adult gym equipment. What will the cost be?**NB** from the previous meeting- Cllr Peal - essential work is mending the gate and replacing the fence and cleaning off the moss and algae, and greasing the rotating net. The medium risk items would need thinking about, especially where bearings are wearing - the cross rider, the body twist, the horse, the Spica - or where there is movement, like the rower. The slide will need replacing because it isn't slippery and the mound is losing its timber and we can think about some new toys. **To be noted****– Playground Inspection**The Playground Inspection from ROSPA has been received as 3 reports. They have been shared with the Parish Council for review and comment. Council need to decide what playground items need action. Clerks suggestions is anything scoring 6 or over. **To be noted****- Grassed areas of the recreation ground**I will speak to Pete and my supplier tomorrow, I am getting mixed massages about the success at this time of year and the product label is suggesting a lot later in the year, which is a contradiction to what I was told last year.I do have one idea , I  believe it may be to concider treating visible areas now and then treat again the whole area in September?My thinking behind this:  the manufacture suggest aug - Oct is the best time, and if treated in April / May / June then it will only kill what's currently active with no lasting effect and all the eggs will still hatch, still cause damage over summer and need further treatment in September.Depending what you think?  I would be happy to identify key areas, and treat now by hand and then treat again September whole area.  which I am sure could do for the same cost  or we try treat whole area now and review later in year?Also thinking I will do in the evening to help stop product drying out**To be RESOLVED to approve ….** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **10.** | **PAVILION**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PAVILION COMMITTEE 4th JUNE 2019APOLOGIES were received from Mr T. Gardner (Swifts).PRESENT: Cllrs Perrins (Chairman), Peal and Dodson and Mrs Jones, Clerk.PAVILION MANAGEMENT: INSPECTION.Clerk suggested that the scrape marks on the paint below the dado rail could have been made by the edge of a table and demonstrated this convincingly. Table bumpers were suggested. Mr Ray Watts will be asked if he can repaint the lower walls during the school holidays. All the toilets were satisfactory, as was the office. In the Plant Room it was noted that the floor was dry behind the heat pump. The garage was also satisfactory. The floor in the Away changing room was grubby, as was the floor in the Home changing room, where there was also a dirty basin. Members were aware that there were more items than usual in the Home changing room because of the Youth Awards to be held on 8th June and observed that the wooden benches used for the fete were still there. Mrs Knock will be contacted about these. The amount of storage had clearly made cleaning difficult. The Referee’s changing room was in good shape. Scrape marks were seen on Away and Home doorsills and all the doors were very stiff to open. Mr Watts will be asked if he could remedy this. By the main entrance, it looked as if the plant troughs could do with some attention.CLEANING SCHEDULEIt was thought the handyman/caretaker might benefit from an appropriate floor cleaner for the changing rooms. He already has one for the public side. The cost will be investigated The state of the changing rooms was very disappointing to the committee and it was agreed that Cllr Peal would write to Tim Gardner asking him to pass on a request to Swifts for the Home changing room to be cleared and that club standards of tidiness, cleanliness and respect for the building be raised. The Pavilion committee will consider charging for damage and raising the annual hire charges.ACTIONS ARISINGClerk to engage Mr Watts for remedial works and investigate purchase of table bumpers and changing room cleaner and forward Cllr Peal’s email to Mrs Knock. Cllr Peal to contact Tim Gardner.PAVILION MAINTENANCEClerk had received an email recommending the application of finger guards to the pavilion’s interior doors to prevent injury to young children. It was agreed to try these out on the Parish Room doors first after researching how they are fitted and what impact they might have on door closure. Safety plugs for sockets were also considered by members.Plumber Mr S. Tilley of Pipeworks had made another recent visit to unblock drains connected to the ladies’ toilets. Members thought that, given the evident complexity of the system, the original plan should be consulted. None of the previous building’s drains were used in the rebuild. The problem is a very flat run flow. Stuart Payne from Tildan might also be brought in. Cllr Perrins will contact him. Clerk holds drawings from architect Michael Weakley. Cllr Dodson noted that the drains had been built and passed to modern specifications and wondered if rubble was the cause of blockages. Clerk had received a second invoice of £100.00 from Mr Tilley which Cllr Perrins advised her to pay and contact Corrigenda to recommend a plumber with a camera. If the system proves clear, hirers should be asked not to flush unsuitable items. Cllr Dodson suggested checking the toilets regularly. Clerk asked if this should be an annual maintenance item or whether problems should be dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Members agreed to Cllr Perrins’ proposal that the drainage plan should be found, along with a plumber who will visit annually in early autumn. Mr Tilley might apply for the job, but he would need the plan, specific instructions and to provide a quote. Clerk would see to any contract and locate the plan, unless Cllr Perrins can find it.ACTIONS ARISINGClerk or committee members to investigate finger guards, clerk and Cllr Perrins to locate drainage plan, clerk to research suitable plumber and set up annual maintenance contract.FINANCEIt was agreed that Mr Jon Wright, who has booked the Pavilion from 6 – 7 pm on Monday 17th June, should be charged the business rate of £25.00. Cllr Peal will open the building for him. Leads for a power point presentation will be needed.FOOTBALLIt was reported that the new pitch had been marked out, and Swifts had filled in the previous goalpost holes and marked the new ones in red. The large bare patch had been covered in topsoil, to be rolled by Grass and Grounds. Topsoil had been dumped on the hard-standing strip, but there was no sign of any seeding. Cllr Perrins expressed her disappointment at the slow pace of work. Cllr Peal will email the committee’s dissatisfaction. The pitch may not be ready for the friendly match on 27th July and permission may have to be refused and the area cordoned off. The adult first team games begin on 3rd August but the pitch may not be playable, so they might not be able to begin till mid or late August.Grass and Grounds don’t advise dealing with the chafer grubs now. This isn’t their sort of work as they don’t believe nematodes are effective; they will carry it out if required, but the life span of the nematode is limited and rain and watering will be required. Excavations for the hard-standing revealed grubs underground. Clerk wondered if we should treat the patches, get the bank tidied and do the next treatment in October. Original advice from Complete Weed Control, which applied the autumn fertilizer for Grass and Grounds, was to treat in May. Cllr Perrins suggested doing the football pitch and the bad patch and the approach to the bank and leaving it there. Originally the whole field was done. The cricket strip tap could be opened up or a bowser employed, which might be expensive. Clerk supposed there might be more general moisture in September. It was decided to go for a September treatment to include the main pitch and mound. Clerk will ask Grass and Grounds to undertake this, and will work out when is the best time. Grass and Grounds will also be asked to reseed a patchy area by the hard-standing.ACTIONS ARISINGCllr Peal to contact Swifts about the ground issues and Clerk to contact Grass and Grounds about chafer grub and seed treatment.DATE OF NEXT MEETINGTuesday, 2nd July, 2019**To be noted.** |  |
| **11.** | **HIGHWAYS****- To receive an update on highways** Cllr Dodson to give council an update.**To be noted****- Speed Detector Control System – Speed Display Sign**Cllr Perrins to give an update on the new sockets for Village Hall and Alresford Drove.All the ground work is now complete.The unit now needs to be moved.My suggestion would be to relocate onto the new site in Downs Road and see how easy it is to lock onto the new pole if Bob is agreeable, we need to put tape on the pole where the clips need to go.Then we would need to recharge the battery and move the pole to Alresford Road. Obviously, we would need to find out how we would need to manage the movement of the pole, basically if this looks problematic then I suggest we purchase a pole for Alresford Drove.**To be noted****- Lengthsmen Schedule of Work for July**Clerk has suggested:-* Cut and clean signs;
* Strim and cut back fire pit
* Clean Church Lane
* Strim gaps into the field from Christmas Hill to the Recreation Ground

Anything else?**To be noted** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **12.****13.** | **GENERAL AMENITIES** **- Cycle Path**Clerk has sent an email to Cllr Warwick but no update has been received.**To be noted****Annual Review of Standing Orders**Item placed on agenda in error. Standing Orders were reviewed in March 2019.**To be noted** |  |
|  |  |  |
| **14.** | **CORRESPONDENCE** Correspondences were received from:-14/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston – Residents invited to meeting with Nigel Baldwin?15/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Questions from PC April meeting15/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Regulations on Hedgerow Removal25/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Removal of Hedge Row26/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston - FOI on Open Space monies from Worthy Down25/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Community Presentation30/5/19 - A resident of South Wonston -Jazzmyn Fields (x2 emails)30/5/19 – A resident of South Wonston – FOI New Cycle Path3/6/19 - A resident of South Wonston – 18/02432/FUL Land Adj to Alresford Drove3/6/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Weed Killer4/6/19 - A resident of South Wonston – HCC Balancing the Budget4/6/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Traffic Data (x2 emails)4/6/19 – A resident of South Wonston – Facebook re: Jon Wright5/6/19 – A resident of South Wonston - Speed Detector8/6/19 – A resident of South Wonston – Smell of GasAll emails and responses were forwarded onto Council |  |
| **15.** | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** The next meeting will be held on Monday 8th July 2019 at 7.30pm. |  |