

DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting Held at Dogmersfield Primary School 24th March 2014


Councillors present:

Cllr Geoff Beaven (GB)
 Cllr Alastair Clark (AJC)
 Cllr Graham Leach (GL)
 Cllr Mike Ricketts (MR)
 Cllr Martin Hannah (MH)
 CLERK Claire Inglis (CI)

Members of Public present:


Tom Scott (TS) Chris Ward (CW) Cllr Stephen Gorys (SG)
 Valery Duggleby (VD) Elizabeth Waller (EW) Cllr Ken Crookes (KC)
 Mary Morrison (MM) Chris Waller (CWa) Christine Smith (CS)
 Sophie Harmer (SH) Jo Thomas (JT) Christine Lowe (CLO)
 Max Fullbrook (MF) Sally Selfe (SS)
 Carol Leversha (CL) Steph Thomas (ST)

29/14	Agenda item 1	<p><u>Welcome & Apologies</u></p> <p>The meeting was opened at 7.30pm by Chairman who welcomed everyone. Apologies were received from Mrs I Harding and Mr & Mrs Robson and Cllr Crookes who then arrived.</p>	
30/14	Agenda item 2	<p><u>Declaration of interests – current agenda</u></p> <p>GB declared an interest under agenda item 9 Planning Report due to an application submitted by him for works to trees reference 14/00343/CA.</p> <p>AJC declared an interest under Finance as expense claim had been submitted.</p> <p>MR declared an interest under agenda item 9 Planning Report due to an application submitted by him for works to trees reference 14/00167/CA.</p>	
31/14	Agenda item 3	<p><u>Public Participation</u></p> <p>GB invited those present to raise any issues not appearing on the agenda later at this time.</p> <p>CL asked for clarification in relation to three items on the minutes of the February meeting. Agenda item 2 referring to GL regularising his land deeds as they are not in accordance with the actual boundary fencing. GL clarified which boundary this referred to and stated that there was no change to the existing garden fencing which had been in place for at least the last 5 years. CL was satisfied.</p> <p>The second item related to Agenda item 8 Flooding - it was reported that water is issuing from the road surface adjacent to one of the pumping main access chambers on the bend in Church Lane about 50 metres south of the Dower House entrance. AJC confirmed that he would investigate further.</p> <p>The third item related to Agenda 9 reference the choice of sign for the Pilcot Road footpath scheme. The DPC logo was referred to and suggested it be included on the sign providing the letters DPC are removed. GB confirmed that it had been decided not to include this logo as it related to the parish council and was not an adopted village logo and it was now too late to change.</p> <p>CWa queried who was responsible for the wonderful job that had been done on</p>	AJC




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

31/14	Agenda item 3 cont'd	<p>clearing the canal bank opposite to the towpath near the Barley Mow. AJC reported that this was a voluntary working party of the Canal Society. Further it was reported that a truck was observed hitting a low branch of a tree along Chatter Alley. The branch has not fallen and it was requested whether the council would consider some work to the trees lining the road before they come into full leaf. GB confirmed this would be discussed under agenda item 10.</p> <p>GB requested update on correspondence with Fiona Shipp of the Basingstoke Canal Authority. AJC reported that a proposal had been made to repair the damage caused to the verge on the corner of Chatter Alley outside Bridge House by installing a hard standing parking area. DPC had responded by saying this would not be welcomed as this area is common land and that reparation of the verge back to the original state would be required. The canal authority would approach the resident who has offered their driveway as a parking area for the canal authority vehicles. CI to request Canal Authority repair verge.</p> <p>MF asked whether due diligence had been performed on the developer Vortal Properties Ltd. GB responded that they are working on behalf of the landowners and there would be no reason for the council to perform due diligence on them. A formal response was requested and GB stated that the parish council has not performed any due diligence on Vortal.</p>	CI
32/14	Agenda item 4	<p><u>To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10th February 2014</u></p> <p>GB asked Councillors present at the February meeting if the minutes were a true representation of the meeting.</p> <p>It was resolved that the minutes (16/14 to 28/14) be accepted as a true record and they were signed by GB. (AJC proposed, GL seconded, MH abstained as he was not present at the last meeting and all others were in favour).</p> <p>It was noted that the minutes from the Vortal meeting held 18th February 2014 have been circulated amongst Councillors and the final version agreed. It was agreed to uplift these minutes to the website.</p>	CI
33/14	Agenda item 5	<p><u>Matters arising from the minutes of 10th February 2014</u></p> <p>The outstanding action list was considered at this time starting with old actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Repair required to noticeboard outside school – AJC confirmed he now had the equipment to carry this out. This would be scheduled. . Potential Lengthsman scheme projects would now be considered as receipt of funding is anticipated shortly. . Risk Register will be on AGM agenda for consideration. . Training courses are now being recorded as members embark on training courses. . GL was asked to expedite quotes for tree work along Chatter Alley to reduce overhanging/dead/dying branches and to bring forward a proposal in time for the APA. . Information on method of eradication of invasive species such as Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed to be re-circulated. . To book training as required now on-going business. . Website updates and review now on-going business. . Ditch clearance to be considered under agenda item 10. . Lengthsman scheme update due under agenda item 10. . AJC to bring request for Dragon's teeth to next Traffic partnership meeting. 	<p>GB/AJC</p> <p>CI</p> <p>GL</p> <p>AJC</p> <p>AJC</p>




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

33/14	Agenda item 5 cont'd	<p>. Farnborough Flight Path Consultation – GB thanked the member of public who drew the attention of the council to the consultation on proposals to change the flight paths in and out of Farnborough Airport. This opened on the 4th Feb with any responses to be made by 2nd May.</p> <p>It has been assessed that currently the arrivals and departure routes are only loosely bounded within reasonably wide areas and vary on a day to day basis. GB however is aware of regular patterns within these areas as for example a very noisy BAE Systems shuttle flight regularly passes over his property at fixed times.</p> <p>With the proposals arrivals and departures will be restricted to quite narrowly defined routes. It seems that all departures which are the noisiest and most disruptive will take place away from Dogmersfield to the South and as such should be an improvement. Arrivals to runway 06 will be closer than departures and to the East of Dogmersfield. Arrivals to runway 24 will be more concentrated and directly over Dogmersfield. However, arrivals are relatively quiet when compared to departures.</p> <p>The most significant issue is that the number of movements is likely to double compared to current rates by 2019 and this increase is not being considered under this consultation.</p> <p>Despite the increased traffic, when taken overall these proposals appear to be an improvement on current noise disruption due principally to the rerouting of departures. Although the increased concentration of arrivals is not welcome GB concluded that DPC should not oppose them through the consultation process.</p> <p>MH was asked for any comment on this matter. He considered that noise abatement comes across as the top priority whereas safety should be the main concern. CS added that it had been reported in the Farnham Herald that Crondall/ Fleet and Church Crookham may be affected more significantly. Cllr Gorys commented that there was allowance for departures to be made at a much steeper get away to reduce their impact.</p> <p>. CI confirmed budget virements had been made and February payments made. . Auditor appointment to be discussed under agenda item 8. . Thames Water action plan and follow ups to be discussed under agenda item 10. . Re-siting of Church Lane sign – AJC to take a photo and bring to Traffic Partnership meeting. . CI confirmed that the choice of road sign and request for removal of the word 'village' from the sign has been made and confirmed by Highways department. . CI confirmed that school premises have been booked for meeting dates as set for the coming year.</p>	AJC
34/14	Agenda item 6	<p><u>Annual Parish Assembly (APA)</u></p> <p>The APA is scheduled for Monday 14th April 2014 in lieu of the next parish council meeting with the AGM to follow on May 12th. The evening will commence at 7.15pm aiming to get the formal part of the evening under way by 7.45pm. It was noted that the meeting got under way a bit earlier at 7.35pm last year.</p> <p>A strategy meeting is due to be held on Thursday 27th March to enable Councillors to prepare for the APA. CLO requested that the date be notified via the residents email list as the date is fast approaching. GB confirmed that an invitation will also be delivered by early next week to each household.</p>	ALL
35/14	Agenda item 7	<p><u>Residents Association</u></p> <p>GB reported that as many residents will know following the Planning Briefing Rus Slater</p>	




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

35/14	Agenda item 7 cont'd	<p>took the initiative to establish whether there was sufficient support to form a Residents Group in Dogmersfield. He approached the school to establish whether he could host a residents meeting in the school hall but the policy for use of the hall was limited to the school, the church and the Parish Council. He then approached the Council to see if we could help. Although the Council believe that the Residents group should be quite separate from the Council the possibility of the council sponsoring a residents meeting was explored as a good relationship with the residents group is important (which was not yet formed at this stage). However, to go ahead on this basis a formal decision was needed by the Council at this meeting. In the meantime however Rus has held the initial residents meeting at the Four seasons Hotel last week.</p> <p>The parish council is additionally aware that the school governors have amended their lettings policy which should now allow a residents group to use the school hall in the future should they wish to do so although the group will need to provide their own insurance cover.</p>	
36/14	Agenda item 8	<p><u>Finance</u></p> <p><u>Statement of account and payments in month</u></p> <p>CI drew attention to the RFO report circulated prior to the meeting with the position as at 28th February confirmed by the bank statement (Agreed by GB and signed). Bank balance at end of February stands at £7,468.51 with payments to clear of £612 and payments to be raised in March of £604.76. The year-end cash book balance will therefore be £6,251.37.</p> <p>Payments raised in the month were listed as per the report and include the payment raised in March for 1st Call Trees Limited (as approved prior to receipt of invoice at February meeting). A breakdown has been provided of the variance to budget to date £1,206.20.</p> <p>It was resolved that the statement of accounts be accepted as a true record and payments listed therein be confirmed (GL proposed, MH seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>Payments requested for authorisation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 2014 Clerk Salary payment £387.00 due March 20th. • Clerk expense claim £6.00. • AJC expense claim £101.26. • School Hall Hire £63.00 (2 January meetings and February). • School Hall Hire £21.00 (March meeting) • Key Centre Room Hire 18th February 2014 £26.50. <p>It was resolved to authorise payments as listed (GL proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p><u>HDAPTC meeting venue</u></p> <p>AJC requested that DPC sponsor the next quarterly HDAPTC meeting to be held at Dogmersfield Primary School explaining that he had volunteered to find a meeting place this quarter and had approached Miss Wall of the school about it some weeks ago. The understanding that he obtained from Miss Wall was that if it is a Parish council organised meeting then it will fall within the "School Hall Letting Conditions" and thus be allowable. DPC has never hosted this meeting before partly because in the past, the two winter meetings were held at Hart DC offices thus making it a theoretical ten year</p>	CI




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>36/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 8 Cont'd</p>	<p>cycle. On the basis that there are four meetings per year and twenty one Parish Councils it could be another four or so years before we are asked to do it again. GB commented that this was a worthwhile organisation that DPC supported and DPC should fund its fair share of the organisations activities and agreed that it should be resolved.</p> <p>It was agreed to sponsor the next HDAPTC meeting due to be held on April 8th and authorise the expenditure of £21 for hall hire (GB Proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p><u>To consider appointment of Internal Auditor</u></p> <p>CI confirmed that the paperwork has now been received from BDO who will perform the Annual Audit of DPC for the year ending 31st March 2014 from 30th June 2014. They have provided the timetable and CI will soon be working on preparing the figures for approval at council and collating all the relevant paperwork for the audits to be performed post year-end.</p> <p>CI reported that she had sought three quotes to perform the internal audit of the accounts for year ending 31st March 2014.</p> <p>Quote 1 – Treetops Chartered Accountants who realistically do not cater for small parish audits as their price exceeded £1000.</p> <p>Quote 2 – Eric Shimmin who performed the internal audit of accounts last year. Eric will be available to perform an internal audit again this year and the fee chargeable would be the same as in prior year £175. This was a verbal quote.</p> <p>Quote 3 – Eleanor Greene of Do The Numbers Ltd audits Hartley Wintney and Fleet Town Council. Eleanor will be available to perform an internal audit the first week of May and the fee chargeable will be £155. This was a verbal quote subsequently followed up by email confirmation.</p> <p>CI would be happy to recommend Eleanor Greene to perform the audit for DPC year ending March 2014. Her fee is the lowest and she has experience of auditing different size parishes and would be able to complete the audit in 2-3 hours with prompt follow up of any issues if required. Her availability fits in well with the BDO audit due to take place from 30th June. AJC was also able to confirm her position as HALC company secretary and was also happy to recommend her.</p> <p>It was resolved to appoint Eleanor Greene of Do The Numbers Ltd as internal auditor for the financial year ending 31st March 2014 at a fee of £155.00 (GB Proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</p>	<p>CI</p>
<p>37/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 9</p>	<p><u>Planning</u></p> <p>GB firstly reported on meetings that had taken place since the last council meeting in February that were planning related:</p> <p><u>Meeting with Vortal 18th February 2014</u></p> <p>GB confirmed that following the residents briefing DPC had written to Vortal to set out the Council's position on a number of key issues and to provide feedback of the residents' views of the then Fisk Field scheme. At the meeting of the 18th DPC (GB, GL,</p>	




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

37/14	Agenda item 9 Cont'd	<p>AJC and CI attended) gave Vortal the chance to respond to this letter but they declined preferring to discuss new outline schematics.</p> <p>Vortal presented outline schematics for Chatter Alley, Church Lane and a wider scheme. It was stressed that the schematics were for illustrative purposes and had not been discussed with all of the owners of the land involved.</p> <p>The schematic for Church Lane showed one house each on two of the four sites illustrated on the SHLAA. Vortal explained that strict adherence with HDC planning policy for land parcels >0.2 hectares would require 5 houses including affordable housing to be built to prevent under-utilisation of land. However the character of Dogmersfield is large houses situated on large plots and this was reflected in the schematic.</p> <p>The Chatter Alley schematic incorporated changes made in response to concerns about privacy of the existing houses and the adequacy of the car parking provision. The foot print for the new schematic requires more land than the Fisk Field but this concept had not been discussed with the land owner concerned.</p> <p>A further schematic was produced representing a much larger scheme incorporating much of the SHLAA land and including provision for community facilities such as a Village Green, a Village Hall and sports facilities including a football pitch. This was provided to make DPC aware of the potential for using the land available and that if such benefits are to be realised in the longer term this would need to be taken into account in all development proposals. Vortal confirmed that the schematic was at this stage 'stylised' and not a true representation of any immediate plan.</p> <p>DPC commented that there would be very little if any desire by residents for a sports field and village hall types of facilities that would realistically bring more traffic into the village. There would not be enough demand from within the village for such facilities to be financially viable.</p> <p>DPC summarised the schematics put forward at the meeting. The Fisk Field schematic showed some improvements but there are still elements of the layout that do not work. In relation to the generic layout of the larger schematic, there is no demand in Dogmersfield for the sports facilities and village hall, and residents would not view these as worthwhile compensatory benefits for a development scheme on this scale. The Church Lane schematic was consistent with the linear settlement character.</p> <p>DPC said that as the larger schematic had not even been seen by all the landowners it would be wrong to consider it any further and give it any wider publicity. Vortal agreed and all copies were returned to them.</p> <p>With the Chatter Alley schematic Vortal agreed that there is a need to look again at the parking situation and keep within the Fisk Field footprint.</p> <p>Vortal would be looking to move to Pre-application stage with the Church Lane proposal.</p> <p>We asked what information could be shared with residents. Vortal would need check back with the landowners but they expected to be able to provide updated schematics for both the Fisk Field and Church Lane within the next few days that could be shared with residents. Nothing has been provided to date. The minutes to the meeting will be available via the website.</p> <p>MF voiced concerns that such meetings were not being communicated to the recently created residents group known as DRAGON and that it could be construed as DPC helping the developer. Cllr Gorys commented that consultations of this nature are now encouraged as part of the planning process and all are welcome to submit their objections. GB confirmed that at all stages DPC are being open about the meetings held; where no decisions are made and the meeting is minuted by the Clerk with the notes then made available for the public.</p> <p>CLO confirmed that DPC's approach has been consistent with the way they set out at</p>	
-------	----------------------	--	--




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

37/14	Agenda item 9 Cont'd	<p>the Development Briefing held in public in January.</p> <p>GB stated that it is the intention of the council to represent the views of the residents but reiterated that it is also the intention of the council to maintain open communication with the residents group and discussions will take place as to how this will be best achieved. CI voiced that communication is to be channelled via the clerk.</p> <p>MH stepped out of meeting for five minutes.</p> <p><u>Meeting at Hook</u></p> <p>Many of you may have seen from the local press that a public meeting took place in Hook on Friday 14 March to allow residents to question MPs about planning matters. Some from DPC attended. Numbers attending far exceeded the 200 anticipated with the car park and the A30 gridlocked for a time. The top table included Stephen Parker, Planning Cabinet member for Hart; James Arbuthnot MP, Ranil Jayawardena Prospective Parliamentary Candidate and Maria Miller MP for Basingstoke and Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport hence a Cabinet Minister. All three local Hart members for Hook were also present.</p> <p>After the short opening speeches, the public session was vigorous and critical. Many of the points made were hostile to government policy and of the NPPF, and particularly the planning free-for- all in the absence of a Hart local plan. The newly set up local action group were very vocal. JA offered to invite Nick Boles (the planning Minister responsible for the NPPF) to visit Hart, and meet the people. It is considered that this next meeting should cover all of Hart as it was obvious that our concerns are shared throughout the District.</p> <p><u>Hart Planning Seminar</u></p> <p>Hart held a planning seminar for Local councils on 11th March which was attended by AJC and GB. Topics covered included detail on the work being done to generate what is called the SHMAA (Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment – which is the demand for housing in the HMA encompassing the three districts – Hart, Rushmoor, and Surrey Heath). The results are still emerging and have recently been embargoed. The seminar also examined the effectiveness of SANGS in mitigation to the SPA and options for drawing up the next version of the local plan which will include a new settlement. The new Local plan still looks set for delivery in 2015 although there will be consultations on parts as it is developed.</p> <p><u>Report on current planning applications and confirmation of Parish Council responses</u></p> <p>Edenbrook – decision still pending. No submission by council as DPC views were input during original consultation.</p> <p>Crandall Bee Farm – permission granted. No objection from council.</p> <p>Rose Court, Rye Common Lane – this is a residential development on the NATTA building yard with a small corner of the development being in Dogmersfield (majority in Crandall). This was a pre-application advice application with some concerns/issues raised by residents. On attempting to submit comments via the HDC planning system this was not possible as Hart had already answered and closed the application consultation before the published deadline. This matter was discussed further see below.</p> <p>Pond House – Conversion of outbuilding to dwelling pending consideration by HDC.</p> <p>A pre application advice application has been submitted by owners of Acorns but this has not been looked at yet and will be circulated ex-committee for comment in due course.</p>	
-------	----------------------	---	--




DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

37/14	Agenda item 9 Cont'd	<p>In relation to Pre-application advice requests through the planning system at HDC, GB commented that these are now more visible to the public being posted to the website where previously this activity went on behind the scenes. MR asked for comment from Cllr Gorys and Crookes as it has felt for a long time that the concerns voiced by parish councils on planning applications is falling on deaf ears and permissions seem so often to go against concerns raised. It is hoped that the residents' voice will also have a stronger influence in the future.</p> <p>Cllr Gorys disagreed with this viewpoint as he is always willing to listen to the views of the public and public bodies bearing in mind that not many applications are made for the Dogmersfield parish. He summarised by saying that whilst his position is constrained by his membership of the planning committee it is never too late to raise concerns with him and he is always at the end of the telephone if anyone seeks advice on converting their objections into meaningful planning related issues as opposed to comments that have no planning basis for objecting to an application.</p> <p>Both Cllrs Gorys and Crookes confirmed that they were always willing to discuss applications with concerned parties and are available for that.</p>	
38/14	Agenda item 10	<p><u>Environment</u></p> <p><u>Sewage – to review the measures being taken following the flooding over the Christmas period and agree further actions if necessary</u></p> <p>At the last meeting a comprehensive review of the various strands of activity that the Council and affected residents were pursuing was provided from the issues that arose during the adverse weather in January and February.</p> <p>There was quite a lot of emphasis on letters and formal complaints to Thames Water. In summary these were all dealt with by the companies 'complaints factory' which admitted no liability for any of the consequences and promised nothing in the form of rectification of shortcomings to the sewage system. DPC understand that they refused point blank to fit protection (non-return valves to Red Cottages) despite a letter stating that these were already fitted according to their records.</p> <p>The only real progress has resulted from an initiative taken by Cllr Crookes in the form of a Parish Flood Forum and the council extend their gratitude for this. Cllr Crookes organised a walk about in Dogmersfield with a TW Operations Manager which took place on 25th Feb this inspected the pumping stations in Chatter Alley and Pilcot Green and other key locations including Red Cottages.</p> <p>This revealed two issues – firstly TW as an organisation is very fragmented as the operations manager only dealt with Chatter Alley, had no responsibility for Pilcot Green pumping station and the rest of Dogmersfield and had no knowledge of the connection to Four Seasons. Secondly parts of Crookham Village are connected to the Pilcot Green pumping station and hence we need to be concerned about the impact of new developments there such as Tudgeys Nursery.</p> <p>The Parish Flood Forum which under Cllr Crookes initial leadership (to establish the group) will provide a regular meeting between Dogmersfield, Crondall and Odiham parish councils and Thames Water, Environment Agency and Hampshire Highways. The first meeting of the forum is due to take place on April 1st and the councils have submitted their priority list of issues to be addressed. This is seen as our best chance of securing an action plan from the various organisations for Dogmersfield.</p> <p>SH commented that her 3 year old child had fallen into the ditch near the Chatter Alley pumping station and was told by TW that there was no run off of sewage into that ditch but this appears not to be the case from the inspections carried out by councillors. GB further commented that the area where sampling occurs is actually upstream of where</p>	GB



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>38/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 10 Cont'd</p>	<p>the discharge from the sewer system is often seen to flow into the ditch.</p> <p>Another resident also expressed gratitude for the work that had been done by the council in clearing the culvert that runs under her driveway which is now seen to flow much better. DPC expressed thanks to those residents who assisted in the work to clear culverts which is on-going.</p> <p><u>Gas supplies – to review problems experienced on 15th February and agree further actions if necessary</u></p> <p>As explained at the last meeting DPC have written to British Gas complaining about the state of the Gas pipework network which is allowing water ingress and asking for action before a safety incident occurs. The reply from BG was that they take no responsibility indicating that the issue should be raised with the Network company Scotia in the form of Southern Gas Networks. In the meantime problems on 15th Feb disabled numerous boilers in the village. However there has been a surprisingly positive response from SGN – GB read the letter out which in summary advised the council that work is due to start in April in the area to include Dogmersfield. This will involve investigations to establish where the pipe network is susceptible to external water contamination and determine the solution to provide a safe supply.</p> <p><u>Ownership and management of Common land in the village</u></p> <p>MR spoke to this subject and highlighted that there were parcels of land in the village where land ownership is vague and listed as unknown owner. MR suggested collating a list of where common land exists to create a record for future use if required. AJC has some data/records relating to this and would forward this to MR, who has also suggested a walk-about to correctly identify these areas.</p> <p><u>Lengthsman Scheme</u></p> <p>CI confirmed that the Lengthsman scheme contract for 2013/14 was hand delivered on 10th March to M3 Compound. This was followed up by DPC issuing an invoice for the funding. The receipt of which was acknowledged by Dean Cronk who administers the scheme on behalf of Hampshire Highways department. As of 19th March Dean Cronk had passed the invoice to his admin team to process payment and the only delay of payment may be the return of the legal agreement back from the legal department. Dean was chased again on 24th March for an update on progress.</p> <p>AJC and CI agreed to discuss allocating expenditure from this financial year against the project for submission to highways department upon request.</p>	<p>MR/AJC</p> <p>AJC/CI</p>
<p>39/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 11</p>	<p><u>Highways</u></p> <p><u>20mph Speed limit</u></p> <p>AJC reported that he would raise the request for Dogmersfield to be included in the current 20mph pilot at the next Traffic partnership meeting. Dogmersfield would like to be considered as a special case because following the installation of the footpath on Pilcot Hill pedestrians are subjected to walking on the roadway as they enter Dogmersfield and a reduction in the speed limit here would be much safer. GB and AJC will consider whether a written case should be submitted</p> <p>Working parties have been involved in gully clearing and litter picking in the village collecting up to 8 sacks of rubbish. AJC would like to invite residents to create a working party to clean non-illuminated road signs. MR confirmed he would be happy to get</p>	<p>GB/AJC</p> <p>AJC/MR</p>



DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

39/14	Agenda item 11 Cont'd	<p>involved in this task. Other volunteers are welcome.</p> <p>AJC asked Cllr Crookes if HDC were providing funding for speed indicator devices. Cllr Crookes was not aware of this. MR commented that he had spoken to Bob Wyatt who was involved in the self-enforcement initiative of speed watch along Hitches Lane and that it is proving very successful. Such an initiative would be worthwhile in Dogmersfield.</p>													
40/14	Agenda item 12	<p><u>Other matters to report</u></p> <p>Community Liaison – None in addition to matters on agenda.</p> <p>Training CI requests authorisation to attend ‘Local Council Finance’ course at Winchester on 3rd April costing £50. This will assist the year end process and ensure that all areas are covered going forward in her role as RFO.</p> <p>It was resolved that CI attend HALC course Local Council Finance on 3rd April and authorises expenditure of £50 for the course (MR proposed, AJC seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>Website – Nothing to report.</p> <p>Newsletter - None due.</p>	CI												
41/14	Agenda item 13	<p><u>Crime and Disorder Act, section 17</u></p> <p>No matters to discuss.</p>													
42/14	Agenda item 14	<p><u>Dates of future meetings</u></p> <p><u>2014/15</u> Meetings are scheduled as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>APA April 14th</td> <td>AGM May 12th</td> <td>June 9th</td> <td>July 14th</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>No August meeting</i></td> <td>September 8th</td> <td>October 13th</td> <td>November 10th</td> </tr> <tr> <td>December 8th</td> <td>January 12th</td> <td>February 9th</td> <td>March 9th</td> </tr> </table>	APA April 14 th	AGM May 12 th	June 9 th	July 14 th	<i>No August meeting</i>	September 8 th	October 13 th	November 10 th	December 8 th	January 12 th	February 9 th	March 9 th	
APA April 14 th	AGM May 12 th	June 9 th	July 14 th												
<i>No August meeting</i>	September 8 th	October 13 th	November 10 th												
December 8 th	January 12 th	February 9 th	March 9 th												
43/14	Agenda item 15	<p><u>Information Sharing</u></p> <p>Nothing to report and meeting closed at 9.33pm.</p>													

Signed.....
Chairman

Date.....