



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Meeting Held at Dogmersfield Primary School 12<sup>th</sup> September 2016


### Councillors present:

CLlr Geoff Beaven (GB)  
CLlr Alastair Clark (AJC)  
CLlr Graham Leach (GL)  
CLlr Joanna Thomas (JT)  
CLlr Mike Ricketts (MR)  
CLERK Claire Inglis (CI)

### Members of Public present:

T Davies  
E Waller  
C Ward  
J Thomas  
C Waller  
CLlr Ken Crookes  
M Morrison  
C Smith

93/16	Agenda item 1	<p><b><u>Welcome &amp; Apologies</u></b></p> <p><b>All DPC councillors were present.</b></p> <p>GB welcomed those present and commented that the Parish Council did not meet in August but this did not mean that the Council had not been active over this period. Tonight's meeting will be an opportunity to catch up on a number of important activities.</p> <p>As in July the meeting of the Parish Council will be followed by a formal meeting of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. This will start after the Council meeting has closed but not before 9.00 pm. The Steering Group will be considering whether to launch a local consultation on a vision and objectives statement.</p> <p>Apologies were received from C Leversha, District Councillors S Gorys and J Kennett.</p>	
94/16	Agenda item 2	<p><b><u>Declaration of interests – current agenda</u></b></p> <p>None received</p>	
95/16	Agenda item 3	<p><b><u>Public Participation</u></b></p> <p>The following opening statement made by GB updates the status on a few items of local interest that are normally raised during this session.</p> <p><i>Flooding</i></p> <p>GB was pleased to report that on August 25<sup>th</sup> the road opposite the Queens Head was closed and contractors spent several hours attempting to clear the underground pipework between the kerb drain opposite the Queens Head to the open gully across Pilcot Green North.</p> <p>A report from Hampshire Highways followed which confirmed that they had proved that the drain opposite the Queens Head is connected to the open ditch across Pilcot Green North and then to the river Hart. However they have also identified that there are breakages in the connecting pipework. Repair work will require the road to be closed again but they cannot provide a date for when this work will be carried out at this time.</p> <p><i>Chatter Alley Sewerage System</i></p> <p>GB was also pleased to report that a number of Councillors have had a site meeting with representatives from Thames Water on the 25<sup>th</sup> July. One of the residents most affected</p>	




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

95/16	<b>Agenda item 3</b>	<p>also attended. Although nothing new was revealed Thames Water confirmed their commitment to overcome the current problem which they believe to be due to surface or ground water entering the system. Regular tankering has not been necessary during the recent dry weather but the amount of contractor activity on the site has noticeably increased.</p> <p>EW raised issue of reduced sight lines over Pilcot Bridge due to the Willow tree branches. GB confirmed this was an agenda item and work to improve this has been quoted for. EW also requested any update to the proposed Chatter Alley development. GB confirmed that a meeting is to be held with the potential developer on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> where DPC will provide their views on the latest proposal of 8 units [2 detached and 3 pairs of semi-detached]. It is anticipated that Earls Gate are looking to submit a Pre-application. EW voiced concerns over the property line sitting too far back in the site and potentially shadowing their garden. GB commented that this is not a strong planning issue and HDC may consider the loss of the open gap more of an overriding reason to refuse permission. The requirement for at least 1.3 cars per property may also cause overspill onto the road which would further exacerbate the parking issues along this road.</p> <p>KC confirmed that HDC would enforce as part of the planning application that all parking for new houses must be off road. GB confirmed that it would be the intention for DPC to attend any pre-application advice meeting and would encourage residents to issue a response to the pre-app when it was submitted.</p> <p>KC provided a Local Plan update. East Hants CC has been working on behalf of HDC and has issued some informal briefings. The current matter of importance is the SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) and EHCC have come up with a number with the outstanding issue of the potential threat of a requirement to build the Rushmoor shortfall. Informally however Rushmoor have indicated they can build their requirement. Therefore with what has been built in Hart; what is in the pipeline and with Pyestock the balance to locate is around 1,400-1,500 further dwellings in the plan period. KC therefore expects villages to take only a small amount of houses.</p> <p>MR asked about the timeline for delivery of the SHMA numbers and the impact on the Local Plan being delivered. KC responded by saying that within the next month the SHMA numbers are expected to be completed making a draft plan available in Autumn aiming for completion in Spring 2017. AJC asked about Surrey Heath's numbers and KC confirmed that these were ok.</p> <p>GL asked if the delays reported in the Fleet news were therefore journalistic and that developers will have a field day in the interim period prior to the Local plan delivery. KC agreed that the Plan would shore up the defences.</p> <p>KC also commented on the Council Tax reduction scheme which some residents in the district will be invited to comment on proposed changes. Residents will be selected at random. The criteria for the scheme are subject to change. This has provided council tax relief to those of working age. The outcome of this consultation will be reflected in the 2017/18 budget.</p>	
96/16	<b>Agenda item 4</b>	<p><b><u>To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016</u></b></p> <p><b>It was resolved that the minutes (78/16 to 92/16) be accepted as a true record and they were signed by GB (AJC proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</b></p>	




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

97/16	Agenda item 5	<p><b><u>Matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016</u></b></p> <p>The outstanding action list was considered at this time with many items due for consideration as an agenda item below.</p> <p>Other actions outstanding or completed are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AJC investigated hole in road by PGS not considered serious at this time but it will be monitored.</li> <li>• As reported above meeting took place with Thames Water re Chatter Alley sewage system.</li> <li>• ROW officer has confirmed that cutting schedule was met and reports from residents with thanks for the work that has taken place.</li> <li>• Correspondence between Winchfield PC, DPC and Anesco regarding the Community Benefit Fund are in progress.</li> <li>• Community Benefit Fund to be confirmed prior to issue of draft proposal for footpath/ project works.</li> <li>• NCCZ data was sent to Hampshire Trading Standards end of July. They have been chased for a status update.</li> <li>• HDC were emailed to register interest in further Pre-App meeting re Schoolfield Corner.</li> <li>• GB forwarded East Hampshire County Council emails to Cllr Crookes.</li> <li>• Purchase order has been issued to Goslings and expecting second verge clearance visit w/c 12<sup>th</sup> September.</li> <li>• Newsletter and delivery were completed by deadline.</li> </ul>	CI/JT CI
98/16	Agenda item 6	<p><b><u>Update on Employee Appraisal Process</u></b></p> <p><u>To confirm completion of Performance Review interview of employee and for report to be signed</u></p> <p>The Performance review interview of the Clerk was performed on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> July by GB and AJC. The report has been finalised and circulated to all councillors for approval. All were content with the report and its finding and setting of objectives for 2016/17. The report was signed by GB.</p>	
99/16	Agenda item 7	<p><b><u>Finance and Regulatory Matters</u></b></p> <p><u>To receive and approve financial statement of account from 1st July – 31st August, confirm payments made in July &amp; August and authorise any payments now due; and to confirm budget virement of £20 from Admin Consumables to Subscription for Basingstoke Canal Contribution £240.</u></p> <p>CI reported the bank balance at end of August stands at £17,263.22 and this has been agreed with the bank statement by a councillor and signed.</p> <p>Of this balance £5,715 exactly is an earmarked reserve for the funding of the NHP. No payments to date have been made from the grant money although consultancy work has been committed but not yet invoiced.</p> <p>Therefore Parish Council precept funds balance at end of August was £11,548.22. The following payments were made during July and August and are confirmed below:</p> <p>Chq no: 982 £409 Claire Inglis Clerk July 16 salary          Chq no: 983 £150 HIOW CRC Ltd May and June CPT visits          Chq no: 984 £120 Hart District Council Enforcement training</p>	




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

99/16	Agenda item 7	<p>Chq no: 985 £409 Claire Inglis Clerk August 16 salary Authorised &amp; committed expenditure to date totals £1,016 and relates to: £791 Chicane work and fence repair (please note Purchase order has not yet been issued) £225 CPT visits not invoiced at time of report April, July &amp; August</p> <p>Further commitments of £1,117 have been entered into by purchase order since which include: £625 Goslings 2<sup>nd</sup> verge clearance works £492 Fallen tree works on PGN carried out today</p> <p>If the chicane project is to be completed this year this leaves a combined Village maintenance and Lengthsman budget of £287.70 which informs further financial decision to be made later in the agenda.</p> <p><b>It was resolved that the statement of accounts be accepted as a true record and payments listed therein be confirmed</b> (GB proposed, AJC seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>CI confirmed that in paying the Basingstoke Canal Contribution of £240 the budget amount remaining in Subscriptions is £220 and therefore a virement of £20 is required and suggested from Admin Consumables budget line to the Subscriptions budget line.</p> <p><b>It was resolved to approve the budget virement of £20 from Admin Consumables to Subscriptions</b> (GB proposed, JT seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>CI requested authorisation of the following payments which will fall due before the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• £409.00 September 2016 Clerk Salary payment due 20<sup>th</sup> of the month</li><li>• £49.51 Clerk Expenses</li><li>• £75 Community Payback Team for additional August visit</li><li>• £240 Basingstoke Canal Contribution</li><li>• £590.40 Lotus Landscapes for fallen tree works</li><li>• £750 Goslings for 2<sup>nd</sup> verge clearance visit</li><li>• £56.10 Hart District Council for Election admin costs</li></ul> <p><b>It was resolved to authorise the payments to be settled as listed upon receipt of relevant paperwork (invoice or expense claim)</b> (GB proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>GB confirmed that no payments from the NHP Grant money were required to be authorised at this time.</p> <p><u>To confirm completion of Annual audit</u> CI confirmed receipt of the Completion of Audit notice from the external auditors BDO with no issues to report. The notice was displayed on the noticeboards for the required period. The details will now also be made via the DPC website.</p> <p><u>To report on Lengthsman scheme progress</u> CI updated councillors on the position of the Lengthsman for 2016/17 via email on 6<sup>th</sup> September. The invoice has been issued for this year. Steve Pellatt was contacted following the</p>	CI
-------	---------------	--	----




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>99/16</p>	<p>Agenda item 7</p>	<p>departure of Peter Eade requesting Steve’s assistance in getting the invoice processed. Firstly he expressed his disappointment at DPC not joining a cluster even though CI had made it clear that DPC had attempted to investigate joining but with no timely reply from the designated cluster lead parish.</p> <p>To process the invoice Steve has requested the following:          “I will authorise payment but I cannot do this before I see a copy of the Lengthsman’s £10million public liability insurance and traffic management qualification. I don’t recall seeing these before and they are a requirement of the scheme for the safety of the public. Once I receive those I will ask that your invoice be processed as quickly as possible.”</p> <p>The contractor has issued a copy of his £10m public liability insurance certificate. However they do not have the traffic management qualification referred to here. The Lengthsman funding barely covers the annual contract for verge clearance which in Dogmersfield does not require traffic management. Therefore the certificate can be forwarded but CI is seeking some input from councillors on how to proceed regarding the traffic management qualification. CI also commented that it is evident that there is no consistency between parishes as CVPC are allowed to remain un-clustered and the onerous admin burden that parishes are required to complete for this funding stream. AJC would liaise with CI to formulate a response to SP.</p> <p><u>To confirm and adopt New model finance regulations as amended by NALC</u>          CI circulated an updated version of the Financial regulations following updates from NALC summarised in the Financial Briefing note issued by them. These relate to adjustments to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MFR 1.6 which has been amended to provide for the possibility of disciplinary action in the event of breach of the Regulations, rather than a definitive statement as to gross misconduct</li> <li>2. MFR 6.4 which has been re-written to apply more generally than merely in respect of disclosable interests.</li> </ol> <p>and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Incorporation of the specific requirements of The Public Contracts Regulations 2015 in MFR 11 (as explained in detail in LTN 87 and Legal Briefing L05-15 of January 2016).</li> </ol> <p>CI sought acceptance of the changes made and agreement from councillors to readopt the updated Fin Regulations. All councillors were content with the updates and it was agreed to re-adopt the updated version. CI would circulate once complete.</p> <p><u>To consider payment of Councillor allowances</u>          GB reported that as part of the work to review the allowances it pays to District Councillors, HDC have also reviewed and published guidance on the allowances that parish councils may choose to pay their members.          Like most local parish councils DPC has not paid allowances in the past. However, the guidance commissioned by HDC has focussed attention on this possibility and it seems likely that several local parish councils are now considering whether they should introduce some form of payment. It is therefore timely to consider whether any form of allowances should be paid by DPC.</p> <p>The government’s justification for allowances recognises that whilst parish councillors did not stand for office for any financial reward, an allowance could actively support someone in the councillor role in circumstances where it was essential to be able to</p>	<p>AJC/CI</p> <p>CI</p>
--------------	----------------------	---	-------------------------




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

99/16	Agenda item 7	<p>attract parish councillors from a wider range of backgrounds.</p> <p>This statement reflects the situation in Dogmersfield as Councillors do not seek reward for their time and efforts in support of the local community. However, recruitment of new Councillors has proved problematic in the past and there could be circumstances where offering an allowance to help with the additional financial burden of becoming a Councillor such as for child care could make a difference.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that DPC should not normally pay allowances. However, allowances could be considered in order to offset a financial disincentive to becoming a parish councillor. This option would be considered as part of the recruitment procedure for a future vacancy.</p> <p>It was agreed to address this relative to recruitment of councillors. The levels suggested allow up to £470 per annum.</p>	
100/16	Agenda item 8	<p><b><u>Consultations</u></b></p> <p><u>To Discuss / Confirm responses to:</u></p> <p><u>Winchfield NHP</u></p> <p>DPC has already responded to the HDC consultation on the Winchfield Neighbourhood plan. The DPC's submission supported the plan and confirmed that it would do its best to help preserve the important strategic gaps around the Winchfield settlements highlighted by the plan some of which are within the Dogmersfield parish.</p> <p><u>Odiham &amp; North Warnborough NHP</u></p> <p>HDC have launched a similar consultation on an amended version of the Odiham and South Warnborough Neighbourhood Plan. GB will be making a recommendation for a Parish Council response in good time for the closing date of 14<sup>th</sup> October.</p> <p>GL commented on the difference in style, layout etc. and asked if HDC had a preference. KC commented that styles will vary because of the different communities they represent and there is no preference.</p> <p><u>Devolution Hampshire</u></p> <p>Devolution Hampshire is a complex matter resulting from the government's desire to simplify local government and devolve more authority and finance to unitary Authorities headed by a locally elected mayor. This consultation is about HCC's proposal to create one or more unitary authorities for a large part of Hampshire which for DPC would mean the centralisation of many functions currently carried out by HDC which itself would disappear with some functions being made the responsibility of the parish council. It is not entirely clear what this would mean in practice although planning would be centralised in Winchester. A complicating factor is that HDC delivered a leaflet to all households which indicated that in their view the consultation was premature but said it was important that all residents responded. Hart appear to be backing an alternative proposal which also has potential disadvantages for the parish.</p> <p>The consultation ends at lunchtime on the 22<sup>nd</sup> September and time is short to decide how DPC itself should respond and also whether we should provide advice to our residents. The HCC website appears to only allow responses using their proforma which does not accommodate a simple narrative style of response.</p> <p>GB asked for KC to comment. KC admitted this is a confusing and complicated issue. The idea is to combine authorities who would still retain their own identity but set their own</p>	GB



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL


100/16	Agenda item 8	<p>precepts whilst providing additional services such as highways. The Hampshire consensus was to go ahead and put a bid together but the government insist on a directly elected mayor which Hampshire do not want. Existing Unitary authorities Southampton, Portsmouth and IOW have put their own bid together which has been met positively by government. The risk to HCC is that if this comes into existence then neighbouring districts could then join them and this would have a huge impact on HCC. HCC want to reorganise the remaining area into one or two Unitary Authorities which would dissolve all of the District Councils which would mean that a single county councillor could be responsible for a huge area. The overriding factor is that it could save money. KC anticipated a low response to the consultation and GB commented that the paperwork does not provide for providing a meaningful answer.</p> <p>GL relating to the leaflet issued by HDC said it does nothing to clear up the confusion. AJC also confirmed that there have been plenty of seminars on the subject for parish councils. AJC read from the HALC commentary by Steven Lugg.</p> <p>GL asked that if HDC no longer existed and DPC was to deal with a larger unitary how will DPC and other small councils' function. It sounds as if extra staff and most of the newly devolved activities will have to be funded through large increases to the parish precept. KC added that the County and District Councils are under severe financial pressure and presenting a balanced budget without going into reserves will be very difficult.</p> <p>Devolution could save money but the issue will be lack of representation for the public. GB concluded that DPC were no further forward to determining how to respond. A nil return could be construed as apathetic or change averse. KC suggested writing to the Chief Executive of HCC to provide DPC's view on the process. GB concluded that he would draft a letter for circulation and approval. All were in agreement.</p>	GB
101/16	Agenda item 9	<p><b><u>Document Adoption</u></b></p> <p><u>To agree Data Protection Protocol</u></p> <p>Following discussions about how to proceed with a DPP it was agreed to confirm that DPC is compliant with the law but will consider any potential risk to this as requirements for data sharing arise in the future. This will form part of the annual risk management review or at a time when is appropriate.</p> <p>All councillors were in agreement with this way forward.</p>	
102/16	Agenda item 10	<p><b><u>Planning</u></b></p> <p><u>Report on current planning applications and confirmation of Parish Council responses</u></p> <p>The current situation on the following applications were discussed and decisions noted where applicable:</p> <p><b>16/01317/FUL Ormersfield Lodge new stabling</b> – Permission has been granted for a new stabling block to the side and just beyond the existing garage block. There were no objections.</p> <p><b>16/01509/PREAPP North Lodge</b> – This application seeks advice on a proposal to erect railing and a gate across the roadway that runs between the North and South Lodges to the old entrance Dogmersfield House from the A287. HDC's opinion was very negative towards the proposal.</p> <p><b>15/02401/CON 15/02401/SANGS, 16/01857/CON, 16/01858/CON, 16/01859/CON, 16/01860/CON and 16/01861/CON Church Lane Discharge of Planning Conditions</b> – These applications seek to satisfy two of the conditions and discharge conditions on others attached to the approval to build 3 houses on this site. No response was submitted by DPC as the matters are technical in nature. Some have been decided by Hart DC but others are still being considered.</p>	



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>102/16</p>	<p>Agenda item 10</p>	<p><b>16/0633/PREAPP Schoolfield Corner</b> - This is a further pre application request for guidance on a slightly amended scheme. The two houses towards the rear of the site are of a smaller size and lower height. In their response HDC have concluded that the new design does not impact on their opposition to a second row of houses on this site and there is consequently no change to their earlier conclusion that they should recommend refusal.</p> <p><b>16/01651/OUT Netherhouse Copse</b> - This is a virtually unchanged resubmission of the earlier outline application for the major development of 423 new dwellings to the East of Hitches Lane on roughly the same site that was in the past called Grove Farm.</p> <p>DPC objected to the previous outline application because the scheme will significantly encroach on the green gap both between CV and Fleet and between Dogmersfield and Fleet. We also expressed concerns about the impact on traffic flows through Dogmersfield and congestion at the junction between Hitches Lane and Pilcot Road. In its consideration of the application the Parish Council recognised that this application refers to one of the urban extension sites that constituted Approach 2 – strategic green field expansion - within the recent Refined Options for Delivering New Homes consultation. DPC concluded that of the options put forward for consultation Approach 2 would be the least damaging to our Parish and consequently ranked it no 1.</p> <p>The Traffic Assessment for the new application demonstrated clearly that the proposed development will generate a significant increase in traffic movements at local road junctions that are already working at maximum capacity or are overwhelmed. Of most interest to Dogmersfield is the junction between Hitches Lane and Pilcot Hill where the Transport Assessment confirms that peak time traffic movements have increased by 13% since the last assessments made only in 2014.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the problems at the Hitches Lane/Pilcot Road junction there is no adequate transport route for southbound traffic between the proposed development and the A287. In attempting to address this obvious shortcoming the Transport Assessment relies on the unconvincing mitigation that reducing the speed limit to 30 mph and adding an extra junction in Hitches Lane will persuade potential motorists to use another route.</p> <p>DPC concluded that it should object to the new development due to its inadequate measures to mitigate the impact on local roads particularly those which would impact most on Dogmersfield residents. In order to inform residents of our concerns the draft submission was included in an advice letter delivered to all residents.</p> <p>There have been numerous other objections to the outline scheme. Despite the obvious concerns that remain for Dogmersfield, HCC has submitted no objections. This is qualified as being subject to certain road improvements going ahead. These include profiling the curb lines at the junction of Hitches Lane and Pilcot Hill but this is to be a retrospective action and only if it proves to be needed.</p> <p>KC confirmed that EHCC have carried out separate traffic assessments which will be analysed in relation to the urban extensions.</p> <p>AJC attended the Elvetham Chase traffic meeting and all the concerns were traffic related in particular concern for the 700 houses proposed on Pale Lane. Consultants claim to have addressed these concerns with minor alterations to the road layout outside Fleet station; the roundabout in Hartley Wintney and the Oatsheaf. But these do not go far enough.</p> <p><b>16/01688/FUL Blue Bell Lodge</b> – This is the latest in a long string of applications, enforcement notices and appeals affecting an existing mobile home. This application seeks to replace the mobile home which is now deemed to be lawful with a 4 bedroom</p>
---------------	-------------------------------	---





# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

102/16

Agenda  
item  
10

house. Although in Crondall Parish it is sited on our boundary. DPC have objected as have Crondall PC on the grounds that there is no adequate justification for building a new house in the countryside.

**16/00121/NMMA Old Parsonage** – This application proposes to increase the size of the recently approved extension to the existing garage in order to compensate for the removal of a part of the design needed in order to secure planning permission. DPC drew attention to its concerns with the original application. HDC has refused permission as the application described the proposal as a minor amendment change whereas it represented a material change.

**16/01974/CON Ormersfield Lodge** – This application discharges a condition associated with the granting of permission for the new stabling block. DPC did not respond.

**16/01997/PREAPP Floods Farm Cottage** – This pre-application seeks guidance on a very large extension that will create a substantial countryside dwelling out of the existing pair of modest cottages. DPC has not responded at this stage as the issues to be taken into account have been highlighted in a submission to HDC by one of the local residents. The website shows that HDC have issued their opinion although this has not been made available which is very unsatisfactory.

**16/02048/PREAPP and 16/02062/PREAPP Four Seasons Hotel** - These two pre-applications seek guidance on proposals to vary the recently approved Pergola and Childrens' Swimming Pool. DPC did not object to the original application and has not responded to these applications. The Hart Conservation officer does not support the revised design of Pergola and has asked for more information on the design of the swimming pool.

#### To confirm scope and date of meeting with Earlsgate


Oliver Myerson requested a further meeting with DPC to discuss an alternative proposal for the Fisk field land on Chatter Alley. DPC have agreed to meet with him on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> September. CI requested whether those available can meet for 3.30pm. GB, AJC and GL have confirmed attendance.

#### Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) update on progress

At the last meeting DPC considered the possibility that the NHPSG might wish to increase the Limit of Liability on the Consultant support purchase order following receipt of the initial tranche of government grant funding of £3,715. DPC resolved that the increase would be carried out if the NHPSG requested this to be done. DPC also resolved to pay upon receipt of an invoice from Planet the first consultancy session which had been scheduled for 14<sup>th</sup> July.

At the NHPSG meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016 the need and risks involved were considered and it did resolve to request DPC to increase the Limit of Liability of the purchase order placed to Planet from £1,500 up to £3,715 to cover the full cost of the company's quotation. However it was agreed that the chairman of the NHPSG would judge when to pass this request on as it would be dependent upon need and any continuing concerns about the risks involved. GB reported that there has been no need to pass on the request and hence the Limit of Liability of the purchase order currently remains at £1,500.

On the 14<sup>th</sup> July a number of the working group members met with the consultants from Planet to receive guidance on drawing up a Vision and Objectives statement. How best to formulate this statement and the potential content for Dogmersfield were explored in some detail. The outcome was that the working group drew up two versions for further consideration. These recognised that only objectives that could be delivered should be included but there could be a separate section in the plan called a Community




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

102/16	Agenda item 10	<p>Aspirations into which those responses from the original consultation which are not deliverable through planning (village shop) can be logged.</p> <p>These draft vision and objectives have been reviewed by Planet who provided a further reworked version. The working group will consider all of these versions at the meeting to follow this one and a final draft will be put forward which should be suitable for consultation. The NHPSG will also consider how it moves forward to the next step which is all about identifying options which will satisfy the vision and objectives.</p>	
103/16	Agenda item 11	<p><b><u>Environment &amp; Rights of Way</u></b></p> <p><u>To report on volunteer day and progress from current months visit by CPT and to confirm dates/ work and attendance for additional visits of CPT in early Autumn</u></p> <p>Only one resident attended the volunteer day on the 30<sup>th</sup> July but with two Councillors present most of the remaining Himalayan Balsam was uprooted. A further CPT visit was consequently arranged for the August 24<sup>th</sup> and this task was completed.</p> <p>CI has requested availability for dates in September and October and expects a reply from Stephen Mills on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup>. A Friday project has been planned by CPT and SM is trying to change that to accommodate a Friday slot for Dogmersfield. CI warned of the budget constraints on booking too many more CPT visits. It was agreed to forego September and October visits. CI was requested to provisionally book a Friday visit in November to allocate to the Church footpath which will be reviewed during the October meeting if the need arises.</p> <p><u>To report on Tree work on PGN and agree work to be committed and agree budget line where in budget to pay from</u></p> <p>Tree work to remove a fallen tree on PGN which fell into a resident's garden was carried out today 12<sup>th</sup> September leaving a stack of logs for a natural habitat on the green and putting woodchip on the paths. Expenditure for this emergency work was authorised ex-committee and payment authorised above under agenda item 99/16.</p> <p>Further work has been quoted to two further trees</p> <p>a) Improve sight lines to bridge with pruning to willow tree £308 This tree would be cut back more severely and shaped so that the branches do not reduce visibility in future.</p> <p>b) Investigation work to report on health and sustainability of mature willow within PGN £270</p> <p>This willow tree is a very prominent tree in the village with evidence of a rotting trunk and a 7ft high hole in the trunk. The quotation is for an assessment on the health and safety of the tree with the aim of saving the tree. If the tree was to fall it could have an impact on properties and the roadway. If the tree cannot be saved the cost to remove it would be significant potentially up to £2,000. DPC would look to seek HCC to remove the tree under this scenario because of danger to the highway. KC inquired if it had a TPO on it. This was not clear. KC suggested asking the HDC tree department Adam Maskill to investigate. CI would email KC who would look to ask for AM's assistance.</p> <p><b>It was resolved to issue a purchase order to Lotus Landscapes for £308 plus VAT for works to improve the sight lines by pruning the willow tree by Pilcot bridge (GB proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</b></p>	<p>CI</p> <p>CI</p> <p>CI</p>



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

103/16	Agenda item 11	<p><b>It was resolved subject to HDC Tree Officer providing service at nil cost to issue a purchase order to Lotus Landscapes for £270 to carry out a Health &amp; Safety assessment of the Willow tree on PGN</b> (GB proposed, AJC seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p><u>To report on the Chicane work package</u>          This project has been further blighted by delay. At the end of July CI requested certain information from Goslings to progress the chicane project which did not arrive prior to annual leave. CI then sought to clarify their insurance position not only for the chicane project but also to guarantee the Lengthsman funding. They have been slow to reply to emails and telephone messages but the confusion over the insurance has now been resolved.</p> <p>They had provided a copy of their Employers Liability which only showed “no less than £5m” cover. CI was seeking their Public Liability of at least £10m which has now been received. CI still requires a statement from Goslings on what road signage they will be providing on the day of works which she will work with them to progress. Hence the work has not been booked for a specific date at this time.</p> <p>CI has suggested to Goslings that we look at October half term when the village will be quieter due to lack of school traffic and this provides the appropriate timeline for the licence application which can take up to four weeks for approval.          CI and GL will also require Goslings to provide an example of the materials to be used in the project prior to commencement</p> <p>All councillors were content with this timeline.</p>	<p>CI</p> <p>CI/GL</p>
104/16	Agenda item 12	<p><b><u>Highways</u></b></p> <p><u>To report any updates on Highways matters</u>          AJC reported that white lines had been freshened through the village and pot holes have been marked suggesting imminent refilling.</p> <p>Speedwatch - AJC confirmed that following a visit by the Fleet Speedwatch team locations within the village have been identified as potential places to carry out speed monitoring. These locations have been submitted to the Police for approval. Some were discounted by the Police because they were in a 40mph zone. Speedwatch can only take place in a 30mph zone. AJC will meet with the police to finalise the locations that can be used and look to get volunteers from Dogmersfield authorised to carry out the speedwatch with the assistance of the Fleet team.</p>	<p>AJC</p>
105/16	Agenda item 13	<p><b><u>Other matters to report</u></b></p> <p><b>Community Liaison</b> – GB was asked by Dogmersfield Events about the Parish Council providing a Christmas tree for displaying lights. There has been a precedent set here from before the use of the Cypress tree which was removed this year. The budget has now become very tight due to the emergency tree work that has been necessary this year. GB would offer DPC to fund an affordable sized tree to Events and ask if they can contribute and also invite The Queens Head also to make a contribution in order that a more substantial tree can be provided.</p> <p><b>Training</b> – GB and AJC attended HDC Planning Enforcement training and found it very informative and useful.</p>	<p>GB</p>



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

105/16	Agenda item 13	<p><b>Website</b> – CI to include a NHPSG page. CI would look further into a new website but following the budget period just about to commence.</p> <p><b>Newsletter</b> – No further newsletter planned in 2016. Communications to residents will be as required over the coming months.</p>	CI						
106/16	Agenda item 14	<p><b><u>Crime and Disorder Act, section 17</u></b></p> <p>GL reported on a dangerous incident of fly tipping along Chalky Lane when a dismantled shed lay in the road. Many cars stopped after dark to clear the road and the police were called to cordon off the area.</p> <p>Nothing else to report</p>							
107/16	Agenda item 15	<p><b><u>Dates of future meetings</u></b></p> <p><b><u>2016/17</u></b> Meetings scheduled as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>October 10<sup>th</sup></td> <td>November 14<sup>th</sup></td> <td>December 12<sup>th</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>January 9<sup>th</sup></td> <td>February 13<sup>th</sup></td> <td>March 13<sup>th</sup></td> </tr> </table>	October 10 <sup>th</sup>	November 14 <sup>th</sup>	December 12 <sup>th</sup>	January 9 <sup>th</sup>	February 13 <sup>th</sup>	March 13 <sup>th</sup>	
October 10 <sup>th</sup>	November 14 <sup>th</sup>	December 12 <sup>th</sup>							
January 9 <sup>th</sup>	February 13 <sup>th</sup>	March 13 <sup>th</sup>							
108/16	Agenda item 16	<p><b><u>Information Sharing</u></b></p> <p>Meeting closed at 9.34pm</p>							

Signed.....  
Chairman

Date.....

Abbreviations used	In place of
DPC	Dogmersfield Parish Council
HDC	Hart District Council
HH	Hampshire Highways
HCC	Hampshire County Council
NHP	Neighbourhood Plan
CPT	Community Payback Team