

**Greatham Parish Council**  
**Minutes of Council Meeting**  
**held on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021, 8pm**

**Present** Cllr T Butler, Cllr A Cheesman, Cllr A Crick, Cllr M Rodbert (Chair), Cllr O Rook

**Also present** Jane Ives, Clerk to Parish Council  
3 members of the public

- 21.32 Chairman's Announcements:** Cllr Rodbert welcomed everyone to the first face to face meeting since the Covid-19 pandemic started in March 2020. He noted that some members of the public were observing the meeting via Zoom but there would not be an opportunity for those people to speak during the meeting. He reminded everyone that questions could be emailed to the council in advance of the meeting. Cllr Rodbert also thanked everyone in the village who has helped over the last year such as volunteers helping their neighbours and also those who are members of council working groups.
- 21.33 Apologies for absence:** Cllr Driver, Cllr Harris
- 21.34 Declarations of Interests:** Cllr Rodbert declared a pecuniary interest in planning applications SDNP/21/02707/HOUS and SDNP/21/02708/LIS as this is his property.
- 21.35 Council Meeting Minutes:** It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Annual Meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> May 2021.
- 21.36 Update on actions arising from previous meetings:**
- i) Bridleway 11 funding** – Response from Hampshire Countryside Services has been received advising that the Parish Partnership Fund could be a source of funding. This should be considered at a future meeting.
  - ii) HCC Traffic Study** – Clerk to ask HCC to wait until lockdown is over before further studies
  - iii) Telephone Box** – Clerk to liaise with neighbours and relevant organisations such as EHDC to see if planning permission is required. Services underground need to be investigated and marked up. The panes in the telephone box need to be replaced.
  - iv) Defibrillator** – Now installed at the village hall and the change registered with the ambulance service. The old cabinet is still in situ at the church and could be used if the church decide to buy a defibrillator.
  - v) Bench in churchyard** – Thanks were given to Cllr Rook for installing the bench.
- 21.37 District Councillor's Report:** No report this month
- 21.38 County Councillor's Report:** Cllr Oppenheimer had provided a report which was noted (Appendix 1).
- 21.39** The Chair **adjourned** the meeting for **Public Questions:**  
The school had emailed the Council seeking help with parking as the pub car park could no longer be used. The Traffic Working Group will contact the school to see if any assistance can be given with their park and stride scheme.  
A member of the public commented that parking spaces for the school drop off are available at Eurotec. She also commented that some parents park in Bakers Field but can cause a nuisance by parking near the junction of Petersfield Road.  
A member of the public was concerned about school parents parking on the no parking area in the village hall car park.  
A member of the public informed the council of a recent accident at the Longmoor roundabout where a car had overturned. Cllr Rook noted this was in Whitehill & Bordon parish and not Greatham. Cllr Cheesman was aware of a second accident and would forward details to the Clerk. The Council will report their concerns to Highways.  
A member of the public was concerned about the parking at Bakers Field near the bungalows. The Traffic Working Group would investigate.  
A member of the public reported that the drain opposite 10 Bakers Field was causing surface water flooding. The Clerk would report it.

A member of the public reported the bench in Bakers Field was rotten and needed work. The Clerk will investigate.

A member of the public wanted to understand what the parish council is responsible for. The Clerk will write to the resident.

***Meeting reconvened***

**21.40 Clerk's Report:** The Clerk's report on current matters was noted (Appendix 2). The Clerk reported that the external audit had not yet been completed by the auditor and that the Q1 bank reconciliation would be circulated prior to the next meeting for approval.

**21.41 Financial Report:**

The financial records as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 are as follows:

**Receipts 1<sup>st</sup> April to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

EHDC precept (tranche 1)	£ 9,768.50
--------------------------	------------

**Balances as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

Current Account	£ 8,718.58
-----------------	------------

Deposit Account	£35,044.68
-----------------	------------

<b>Total at bank</b>	<b>£43,763,26</b>
----------------------	-------------------

**Earmarked Funds held**

CIL fund	£ 8,229.00
----------	------------

Community Engagement	£ 500.00
----------------------	----------

NDP	£ 2,000.00
-----	------------

Election costs	£ 500.00
----------------	----------

Tree works	£ 500.00
------------	----------

S106 project	£ 4,802.00
--------------	------------

CFI Scheme	£ 1,000.00
------------	------------

Grants	£ 213.00
--------	----------

<b>Total Earmarked Funds</b>	<b>£17,744.00</b>
------------------------------	-------------------

<b>General Reserves Balance</b>	<b>£26,019.26</b>	<b>(total at bank less earmarked funds)</b>
---------------------------------	-------------------	---

**21.42 Delegated Decisions:** The following delegated decisions made since 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021 were noted as follows:

**Recommendations from Informal Meeting of Councillors 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

Councillors attended an informal meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> May and made the following recommendations to the Clerk under the delegation scheme. The Clerk will now carry out the following actions:

1. Write a letter of complaint to Mark Webb, EHDC Planning Relations Manager, regarding actions taken by EHDC relating to planning application SDNP/21/00667/APNB. The letter of complaint will outline the background to the events leading up to deemed consent being given and will then cover the main issues as we see them: lack of communication with parish council and residents when deemed consent was given; failure to upload any documents on the web portal showing that deemed consent has been given; and conflicting advice from EHDC planning officers as to whether permitted development rights apply.

The complaint will also be sent to Tim Slaney, SDNPA and Julia Mansi, EHDC Planning Development Manager with a series of questions as follows:

- a) Is the correspondence between EHDC and the applicant to advise that EHDC got the dates wrong and confirming they now have deemed consent going to be published?
- b) What has EHDC formally told the applicant about permitted development rights?
- c) What is EHDC's formal position on whether the applicant has permitted development rights as two planning officers have given conflicting information?
- d) Why was the correspondence confirming deemed consent not published?
- e) Where is the formal withdrawal of the decision notice for refusal?

- f) How exactly did the failure in the SDNPA system happen? Was it an input error or a system error? Who was overseeing the system and were there any checks in place?
  - g) When Danielle Hall says in her email of 11<sup>th</sup> May that the system has now been changed, what system has changed and how? And is this a control process change or a technical change?
  - h) How can we be sure that this kind of failure will not happen again?
  - i) Can you tell us all the other applications this has affected?
  - j) Why did the Planning Officer not contact Greatham Parish Council to update them on the change of status of the application to deemed consent?
2. A Freedom of Information request will be sent to both EHDC and SDNPA asking for all correspondence relating to SDNP/21/00667/APNB including, but not limited to:
- a) Correspondence between EHDC and the applicant and/or his agent;
  - b) Correspondence between officers of EHDC;
  - c) Correspondence between officers of EHDC and the SDNPA; and,
  - d) Correspondence between officers of EHDC and District Councillors from Whitehill, Hogmoor and Greatham ward

Once we have responses to the above questions and seen the information provided under FOI, the Council will meet again to decide next steps.

### **Recommendations and Delegated Decisions: Informal Meeting of Councillors 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

**Attendees: Cllr Tim Butler, Cllr Olly Rook, Cllr Mark Rodbert, Cllr Susie Harris, Cllr Andrew Crick, Jane Ives (Clerk)**

The Council have adopted a Delegation Scheme which gives the Clerk the authority to make decisions on behalf of the Council once they have given their recommendations.

The following items were discussed and the notes below outline the recommendations that were made and the decisions then made under delegated powers.

#### **Future meetings**

Councillors discussed the future of meetings and were unhappy that they are unable to hold remote meetings any longer and would like to meet face to face as soon as everyone feels safe to do so. The Clerk recommended that, in July, the Council meet face to face to make any important decisions and possibly defer some decisions from this evening's agenda until that meeting. Some councillors are concerned about the recent rise in cases and the fact that some of them are not double jabbed so would prefer to wait. A decision will be made nearer the time but an outdoor meeting could be held if that was more acceptable for all.

#### **Discuss options for consideration of planning applications including formation of a planning committee**

This was not resolved in May 2021 as not enough members put themselves forward. It was agreed that a planning committee should be formed and this would be put on the agenda for the next formal meeting. Minor applications could be taken to full council if the agenda and timing of the response allowed. Consider amending terms of reference to have 3 members rather than 4.

**Decision: Appoint members to a planning committee at a face to face meeting in July 2021 and amend the terms of reference to change the number of members required.**

#### **Consider the publication of Freedom of Information requests**

This item had been deferred from the May 2021 meeting. The Clerk advised that the current Publication Scheme is out of date and needs to be updated. A new draft had been sent to all councillors along with information relating to disclosure of freedom of information requests. Councillors recommended that a disclosure log containing information that was in the wider public interest should be published. The Clerk advised that questions that were only of interest to the individual asking them should not be published; only those questions that were of wider public interest should be published.

Councillors recommended that a working group is formed consisting of the Clerk, Cllr Crick and Cllr Harris to clarify how the disclosure log will work and to make decisions on future freedom of information responses and whether they should be published.

**Decision: Publication Scheme as drafted is adopted. Working group consisting of the Clerk, Cllr Crick & Cllr Harris will form a working group as described above.**

### **Appointment of trustees to Greatham Allotment Charity**

Two of the trustee positions had expired and need to be reappointed. The Clerk advised that during the councillor drop in session prior to the meeting a member of the public, who is a trustee, recommended that we reappoint the two trustees to the vacancies.

The Clerk recommended that this item should be deferred to a face to face meeting in July for a final decision in order to be fully transparent.

In the meantime councillors felt that they wanted to see a more diverse group of individuals coming forward to be trustees, perhaps newer residents in the village. This would not rule out individuals who are already trustees, but councillors would like a wider group to select from. Councillors also wanted to understand exactly what the role involves, ie what the key responsibilities are, so that they can make a more informed decision. They asked the Clerk to contact the charity to ask them to advertise the roles and ask for applications. The council would also promote the opportunity via our website, mailing list and Facebook page.

**Decision: Clerk to advise Allotment Charity of the above, and defer the decision until July 2021.**

#### **Appointment of trustees to Coryton Trust**

Cllrs Crick and Cheesman are currently trustees and the Clerk advised that the charity would like them to continue as they have concerns about having too many changes among their trustees.

**Decision: Clerk to advise Coryton Trust that Cllrs Crick and Cheesman will continue as trustees.**

#### **Consider Terms of Reference for Parish Tree Wardens**

This item will be deferred as the Clerk had not been able to provide the documentation prior to the meeting.

**Decision: Defer until the July 2021 meeting.**

#### **Consider amending Terms of Reference for Traffic & Transport Working Group**

Cllr Butler wanted to recommend amending the terms of reference to allow up to 3 members of the public to be appointed by the working group.

**Decision: Clerk will amend the Terms of Reference in line with the above.**

#### **Consider response to planning application SDNP/21/02415/HOUS: 3 Woolmer Cottages, Petersfield Road, GU33 6AS, Single Storey Rear Extension**

Councillors had reviewed the application and made recommendations to the Clerk that they did not object to the plans.

**Decision: No objection**

#### **Update from Old Church working group including notes from previous meeting, repair/maintenance work, service to be held in July**

The Clerk had circulated some information to councillors following a meeting of the working group. The report was noted. Decisions relating to the potential issue with the ruined nave wall would need to be brought to a future meeting. The Clerk urged councillors to adopt a plan for all the work that is required. Cllr Rodbert advised that the working group would like Josh Dale-Harris to work with Cllr Rodbert on the Old Church strategy working group.

**Decision: The May 2021 meeting agreed that the Clerk and Cllr Rodbert would work on section 1 of the framework and a working group would be appointed at the next council meeting. We have not yet agreed who will join and nor have we promoted the opportunity. This needs to be done first before the working group can be appointed.**

#### **Update on Lone Barn Farm and discuss any further actions**

The Clerk and Cllr Rodbert provided updates about the Lone Barn Farm decision. EHDC had responded to our complaint and FOI. The FOI had not currently been answered in full and the Clerk will advise when the information has been sent through. The complaint needs to be responded to and councillors are going to send their thoughts to the Clerk.

**Decision: The Clerk will respond to EHDC's complaint response once councillors have sent their recommendations to her.**

#### **Discussion regarding proposed new footpath near waterworks**

Cllr Rook outlined his thoughts regarding proposing two amendments to bridleway 11 to make it safer for pedestrians and cyclists accessing Liss station and shops whilst avoiding the Ham Barn roundabout.

The Clerk advised the Traffic & Transport Working Group speak to the SDNPA and Hampshire Countryside Services to sound them out with the ideas before consulting any landowners or residents. Proper consultation would need to be carried out before these ideas could be progressed but this would likely be done by Hampshire County Council.

**Decision: The Clerk will give details of the various officers at HCC and SDNPA for the Traffic & Transport working group to speak to for advice.**

**To note payments made and payments due to be made**

J Ives salary £809.97 (payment date 26th May)

HMRC £12.86

J Ives repayment of Zoom subscription £110.37

**To consider publishing an annual report in place of the annual parish meeting**

It was previously agreed that we may publish a report in place of holding an annual parish meeting. We did not hold an annual parish meeting due to Covid-19 restrictions. Cllr Harris will co-ordinate with councillors to get the report drafted and it could be circulated as an insert in the Village Magazine.

**Decision: Annual Report to be drafted as soon as possible and circulated widely.**

- 21.43 Payment Schedule:** It was **RESOLVED** to approve the following payments:  
**Proposed: Cllr Rodbert. Seconded: Cllr Cheesman**

Invoice Date	Payee	Description	Net Total	VAT	Total
		<b>PAYMENTS MADE</b>			
10/06/21	Defib Warehouse	Defibrillator cabinet for village hall	£465.00	£93.00	£558.00
09/06/21	Boston Seeds	Wildflower plugs	£545.07	£108.97	£654.04
30/06/21	HMRC	Tax/NI liability month 3	£101.57	£0.00	£101.57
14/06/21	Petersfield Town Council	Grass cutting playground	£25.00	£5.00	£30.00
01/06/21	Parish Council Websites	Website hosting	£180.00	£36.00	£216.00
30/06/21	Clerk	Salary month 3	£1071.08	£0.00	£1071.08
13/07/21	Hampshire ALC	Planning training A Cheesman/A Crick	£90.00	£18.00	£108.00
		<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>£2,477.72</b>	<b>£260.97</b>	<b>£2,738.69</b>

- 21.44 Grant Applications:** It was **RESOLVED** to approve the following grant payments to local organisations:

Victim Support £ 200.00

Citizens Advice Bureau £ 250.00

Petersfield Shakespeare Festival £ 238.00

St John's Church (churchyard maintenance) £1,100.00

Councillors agreed to hold back a sum of £200 should there be any further applications during the year. A separate applicant's grant application would be reconsidered later if they approach the Council with further information relating to their application.

**Proposed: Cllr Cheesman. Seconded: Cllr Crick.**

- 21.45 Planning Committee:** It was **RESOLVED** to elect the following members to form a planning committee: Cllrs. Cheesman, Crick, Rodbert and Rook. **Proposed: Cllr Cheesman. Seconded: Cllr Rook.**

- 21.46 Planning Committee Terms of Reference:** It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the current terms of reference without amendment. **Proposed: Cllr Cheesman. Seconded: Cllr Rook.**

- 21.47 Lone Barn Farm planning matters:** It was **RESOLVED** to **DEFER** any responses to EHDC or the SDNPA until the Freedom of Information request to EHDC has been answered in full. It was **RESOLVED** to delegate any response to the Planning Committee.

- 21.48 Village Gateways:** Hampshire Highways had provided sketches of gateway designs and it was **RESOLVED** to select design B. Additionally, oak posts would be sourced and costs for installation sought.  
**Proposed: Cllr Rodbert. Seconded: Cllr Rook.**
- 21.49 Old Church:** In response to a report from the Clerk regarding the condition of the Old Church (Appendix 3) it was **RESOLVED** to appoint Julian Livingstone to carry out an architectural survey of the building at a cost of £300-£500. **Proposed: Cllr Cheesman. Seconded: Cllr Butler.**
- 21.50 Cherry sapling in Old Church churchyard:** It was **RESOLVED** to give permission to the neighbour to remove the cherry sapling that had self sown in the churchyard next to his garage wall. Removal of the sapling would be at his cost and the Council would accept his offer to provide a replacement tree. The Old Church working group would be consulted for their recommendations. **Proposed: Cllr Cheesman. Seconded: Cllr Butler.**
- As the meeting had now reached 1.5 hours, it was **RESOLVED** to extend the meeting by 30 minutes*
- 21.51 Tree survey outstanding works:** It was **RESOLVED** to ask the Old Church working group to complete the agreed works in the churchyard by the end of September 2021.
- Cllr Rodbert left the meeting during consideration of the next items*
- Cllr Rook chaired the meeting in Cllr Rodbert's absence*
- 21.52 Planning Applications:** It was **RESOLVED** to submit the following responses:
- SDNP/21/02908/HOUS 1 Rose Cottages, Petersfield Road, Greatham GU33 6AZ**  
Two storey rear extension & enclosed front porch following demolition of existing single storey extension.  
**Response: NO OBJECTION. Proposed: Cllr Crick. Seconded: Cllr Cheesman.**  
**Comments:** Greatham Parish Council have considered the application and wish to raise concerns about overlooking for the neighbouring property. In principle the council have NO OBJECTION but would ask that the following conditions are applied to any permission. We would ask that the proposal complies with Policy SD48 regarding energy efficiency and carbon reduction features. Additionally, we would ask that the SDNPA SPD for Sustainable Construction is applied to this application.
- SDNP/21/02707/HOUS & SDNP/21/02708/LIS Swains Cottage, Petersfield Road, Greatham GU33 6HA**  
Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation. Replacement of timber garage doors with windows & brickwork to match existing. Replacement of rear garage window with French doors. Removal of wall between kitchen & garage and raising of garage floor. Listed building consent.  
**Response: NO OBJECTION. Proposed: Cllr Rook. Seconded: Cllr Crick.**  
**Comments:** Greatham Parish Council has no objection to this application. We would ask that the proposal complies with Policy SD48 regarding energy efficiency and carbon reduction features. Additionally, we would ask that the SDNPA SPD for Sustainable Construction is applied to this application.
- 21.53 SDNPA Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide Consultation:** It was **RESOLVED** to delegate the response to the Planning Committee to consider at their next meeting.
- 21.54 Wildflower Planting/Watering Device:** It was **RESOLVED** to purchase a watering device to assist with watering the new wildflower plugs recently planted. Funds will be taken from general reserves. The device will be sourced from Tanks Direct at a cost of £239.00 plus carriage and VAT.  
**Proposed: Cllr Cheesman. Seconded: Cllr Crick.**
- 21.55 Wildflower Plugs District Councillor Grant:** It was noted that the surplus of £213.00 from the grant provided by Cllr Carew for wildflower plugs, would be used for purchasing compost and top soil for planting.
- 21.56 Boundary Commission Review:** It was **RESOLVED** to delegate authority to the Clerk to respond to the boundary commission review with comments aligned to those set out in the County Councillor's report at appendix 1.

**21.57 Reports from representatives of Organisations, Outside Bodies, Working Parties, Leads & Groups:**  
Cllr Cheesman reported that he would carry out minor repairs to a piece of playground equipment.

**21.58 Items for next agenda:** There were no requests for future agenda items.

**21.59 Date of next meeting:** The next meeting will be Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2021.

**21.60 Exclusion of the Press and Public:** It was **RESOLVED** in accordance with the provisions of Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 that the press and public be excluded from the meeting by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

**Proposed: Cllr Rodbert. Seconded: Cllr Crick.**

**21.61** The following items were **RESOLVED:**

The Clerk's appraisal was noted and the objectives were agreed by the Council.

The Council approved a 2.75% increase to the Clerk's salary with a working from home allowance of £25 per month. Additionally, the Council agreed to increase the holiday allowance to 25 days per annum and to provide a pension in line with legislation.

The Chair closed the meeting at 10.15pm.

**Signed:** ..... **Chair**

**Date:** .....

## Appendix 1: Report from County Councillor

### 1. Serving Hampshire consultation

Hampshire County Council is currently consulting on ways to find £80m of savings from its annual budget. It is a broad consultation. If you have strong views on things like the importance of Household Waste and Recycling Centres, then I would encourage you to take 10 minutes to complete the online consultation. It is quite likely that there will only be around 4,000 responses so your opinion will carry genuine weight. You can complete the consultation at this link:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/aboutthecouncil/haveyoursay/consultations/balancing-the-budget>

The consultation closes on Sunday 18 July 2021.

### 2. Active Travel schemes

At my first “Decision Day” on 17 June 2021 I decided to remove all the emergency active travel schemes in Hampshire once Covid lockdown restrictions end on 19 July. The only exception is Winchester due to their ongoing Movement Strategy. The plastic barriers in Petersfield will be removed in late July or early August.

Lessons have been learned from the “pop-up” schemes implemented during the pandemic. Those lessons will inform the next phase of Active Travel measures. Decisions on Phase 2 Active Travel measures will be taken in late July and implemented later in the year. These schemes will be tasteful, permanent and will make no use of plastic barriers. Hampshire County Council is committed to improving walking and cycling networks and this will form a core plank of our Local Transport Plan later this year.

### 3. Parish Forum on Motorbike Noise and Nuisance

On 25 June 2021 I chaired a Parish Forum to consider actions to tackle the scourge of motorbike noise and damage to BOATs in our area. The meeting was well attended and I am grateful to all those Parish Councillors who attended from Petersfield Hangers Division.

Damian Hinds MP explained that he is working closely with Flick Drummond MP to pursue action at the national level. He is pushing for the outcome of the Department for Transport trial into acoustic cameras to be published. Damian is also following closely the acoustic camera trial at Kensington & Chelsea which uses Public Space Protection Orders to penalise noise as anti-social behaviour with £100 fines. Damian and Flick will continue to seek to build a coalition of other MPs towards the possible establishment of an All Party Parliamentary Group. Damian cautioned that legislative change may be difficult to achieve in a reasonable timescale so we should find interventions within the current regulations.

Donna Jones, Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, set out her priority actions with the Roads Police Team. They are undertaking a feasibility study into average speed cameras and she is committed to more patrols, including outside Loomies. Donna also explained that technological progress may provide solutions in the coming years. Donna Jones listened carefully to all the points raised and undertook to redouble efforts with the Hampshire Constabulary to find ways to tackle the excessive noise and speed of motorbikes. Donna and I will meet to co-ordinate our efforts.

As Executive Member for Highways I explained that I am awaiting an “options report” on possible measures which HCC could take as the Highways Authority. This may include such measures as:

- Signs, lines and coloured surfacing
- Rumble strips and over-run areas.
- Speed limit reminder signs (vehicle activated)
- Speed limit reductions.
- Low noise surfacing
- Traffic calming (e.g. chicanes and build-outs)
- Sound barriers
- Road realignment
- Education, Training and Publicity

On BOATs, it was agreed that it was incredibly unwise to spend public money repairing BOATs so that they could be degraded all over again by vehicles, as seemed to be the current situation. Cllr Robert Mocatta summarised the campaign which he is leading at the SDNPA which seeks to persuade the Authority to use its powers to make



Traffic Regulation Orders on the byways open to all traffic (BOATs). This would require the gathering of evidence and working with communities. It was also widely agreed that the National Park Authority had a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the countryside, and to safeguard access to the countryside, and to promote the health and wellbeing of communities, all of which would be well served by meaningful action in this area.

The Campaign Against Noise and Speed set out their progress in progressing their campaign. Parish Councils who are not currently affiliated with them may wish to consider whether they should become members to add to the weight of that campaigning organisation.

Tangible progress in tackling this problem may take some time but your elected representatives will continue to work together to identify effective and affordable solutions, and we will organise another Parish Forum to update you in due course.

#### 4. Recycling of glass at HWRCs

I wanted to explain why glass bottle banks at the HWRC are being removed.

The use of glass banks at the HWRCs has declined significantly across the county over the past few years, as districts have introduced kerbside services, with between 60-80% less glass being deposited at the sites. In addition, EHDC does provide glass recycling facilities in places such as car parks and supermarkets.

The glass bank provision at the HWRCs incurs significant costs. The haulage costs of the material far outweigh any income that is derived from the material. Due to the ongoing financial pressures we are unable to fund services where more effective provision is made for a material elsewhere in the system. Our focus has to be on waste prevention as the number one remedy so that we seek to avoid creating the waste in the first place, reducing the carbon impact of waste and helping to manage our resources in the most effective way. The move also maximises space at HWRCs for bulkier items for which kerbside collection is less suitable.

#### 5. Boundary Commission review

The Boundary Commission for England has proposed to chop several Parishes out of East Hampshire.

If approved by Parliament following consultation, two Bordon wards (Pinewood and Chase), Lindford, Headley, Grayshott and Bramshott and Liphook wards would join a new Parliamentary constituency with SW Surrey named "Farnham and Bordon". This move will damage the interests of residents by making it harder to coordinate local government services with national priorities. Further boundary fragmentation will inevitably make it harder to deliver joined-up approaches across welfare, economic development, climate change and transport.

Although this does not affect any Parishes within Petersfield Hangers, I would invite you all to consider how you would feel if the Boundary Commission proposed to move your Parish to a constituency with a Surrey MP. Our community will be divided and the impact on Whitehill and Bordon is especially concerning. I feel we need to show solidarity with our neighbouring Parishes and contribute to the outcry. I have made a strong objection and I would be very grateful if Parishes could debate this issue and consider making objections too (or make individual responses if you prefer).

You can respond online at this web link (enter postcode and then click on the map).

<https://www.bcereviews.org.uk/>

[Responses by 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021](https://www.bcereviews.org.uk/)

#### 6. Queen Elizabeth Country Park secures grant to boost family-friendly cycle facilities

Good news for mountain bike enthusiasts in East Hants! Please see this link for the full Press Release.

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/News/25062021cyclefacilitiesQEpark>

## **Appendix 2: Clerk's Report**

### **Update on previous meeting actions**

#### **Bridleway 11 funding**

In response to my request to Hampshire Countryside Services about funding to resurface a section of bridleway 11 (Shipwright's Way), I have now received a response with potential grant opportunities.

Full details of the Parish Partnership Fund can be found via the following link:

[Parish Partnership Fund | Hampshire County Council \(hants.gov.uk\)](https://www.hants.gov.uk/parish-partnership-fund)

The council may wish to consider this at a future meeting.

#### **HCC Traffic Study**

HCC have been asked to wait until lockdown has eased until further studies have been carried out. This action to be carried forward.

#### **Telephone Box**

With regards the telephone box we need to speak to the planning department at EHDC and also to neighbours immediately adjacent to the proposed site. We will also need to consider buried services as Virgin Media cables/water/gas and whoever we choose to install it would need to obtain plans and mark up the site for these services. The telephone box still needs to have the glass panes replaced.

#### **Defibrillator**

The cabinet has now been successfully installed at the village hall and the defibrillator has been moved to its new location and registered with the ambulance service. I understand the church is seeking funding for a new defibrillator to be installed. The cabinet that the parish council installed is still in situ and can be reused by the church.

#### **Bench in churchyard**

Thank you to Cllr Rook who has now installed the bench.

### **Other matters**

#### **Annual Audit**

The documents for external audit were submitted prior to the deadline of 30<sup>th</sup> June and have been acknowledged by the auditor. Once the audit has been completed the report will come to full council. All relevant documents relating to the audit have been published on our website.

#### **Public questions**

A member of the public contacted the council about a problem with a gate on footpath 34 which caused him an injury. This was reported to Hampshire Countryside Services and was dealt with very quickly. The landowner has been contacted and will be required to resolve the problem.

#### **Community Funded Initiative Scheme**

I have chased Highways for a response on our CFI form. The village gateways can go ahead once councillors have agreed the design of the signs (agenda item).

#### **Councillor training update**

Cllrs Cheesman and Crick recently attended a planning training course run by the Hampshire Association of Local Councils.

### **Appendix 3: Maintenance work at Old Church**

In 2018 it was identified that maintenance work should be carried out on a regular basis on the Old Church to try and manage the damp issues that have occurred over many years. The parish council appointed a contractor who was due to carry out works last year but pulled out before works commenced. We have not yet appointed a new contractor to carry out the work.

In the meantime, it has been identified that a section of one of the ruined nave walls has become unstable and could collapse. I have arranged to have the area cordoned off and notices placed on site warning members of the public not to disturb the walls in any way. The council need to act promptly now to make the area safe.

However, my advice is that we should not deal with this issue in isolation as we need to understand the full extent of the work now required on the Old Church. Whilst we have appointed a working group to carry out some of the tasks required at the church and in the churchyard, the parish council are the legal owner and are required to act accordingly. This means we have the full responsibility for all health and safety issues but must also carry out all the work required to meet with the trust deed (attached) which was agreed at the point of sale by the Church of England.

The current points of concern, as far as I understand them are:

1. North East nave window repairs
2. Ruined nave walls
3. Guttering
4. Trench around the church
5. Stability of tombstones
6. Altar rails
7. General maintenance of walls
8. Re-rendering of west chancel wall
9. Potential restoration of Foster mausoleum/tomb

Torquil McNeillage, a church conservationist, carried out works to the tomb in 2018 and provided a report to the council which contained recommendations about the building as a whole (attached).

The report gives some guidance regarding points 1 and 7 above as follows:

#### ***North east nave window repairs***

*The eastern jamb of the north east nave window was becoming vulnerable to collapse due to the failure of the lowest jamb stone. It was agreed that this stone should be repaired with both lime mortar/tile repairs and a stainless steel rod inserted with hydraulic lime.*

#### ***Maintenance***

*There are several areas of the ruined nave wall masonry that are now showing signs of instability, some of them urgent. During my recent visit, I packed and pointed one area on the internal north wall with lime mortar to stabilise it, but the nave requires a strategy of regular low-level maintenance and monitoring if it is to remain intact. It is also worth saying that such a programme will avoid the development of dangerous areas of instability that might threaten public safety.*

*In addition, some of the lime mortar repair work undertaken to the nave during the repair course of 2016 has now failed, and this may indicate that sporadic projects using volunteers have their limits, welcome though the energy and intentions are.*

*It is therefore recommended that the committee considers appointing a local, experienced and sympathetic contractor to visit the church, identify the areas most in need of repair and stabilising treatment and undertake that work as part of a maintenance brief. This work need not be very expensive and will in itself save the committee money in the longer term, by nipping developing problems in the bud. The current areas*

*of the ruined nave walls in need of urgent stabilisation would, I estimate take perhaps a weeks of mortar repair work by an experience hand to solidify, and once they have been done, two or three days per year may be sufficient. It would be best if the same person returns repeatedly to do this work."*

Having consulted with two contractors I have summarised below where we are with each of the items of concern listed above.

### **1. North East Nave Window Repairs**

Two stonemasons have been to look at the church recently and provided their advice and quotations for proposed works. However, they have suggested quite different approaches to the repair of the north east nave window and quite different costings.

The options on repairs to the nave window are:

1. Remove the top part of the window which is in danger of collapse and do not rebuild
2. Remove the top part of the window, make safe and rebuild
3. Rebuild top part of the window as per original and add a stone buttress to prevent the stone wall from moving in future

Costs for this work range from £2,900 to £37,000 for the buttress option.

Both contractors have suggested a rebuild of the top part of the window (option 2) with quotes of £6,720 and £12,000 (slightly different approaches suggested which may account in some part for difference in cost).

My main concern about these quotations is that we have contractors with a vested interest advising us of work that needs to be carried out. We have also not had an independent survey carried out of the work required.

### **2. Ruined Nave Walls**

The ruined nave walls are generally in need of some attention. It has been suggested that the soil/plants on top of the walls should be removed entirely as they are allowing water to ingress into the walls and the weight of the soil may be exacerbating any issues of stability. It may also be useful to apply a lime cement capping to the tops of the walls to stop water ingress.

It has also been suggested that the opposing nave window is also started to bow outwards at the top and will, at some future point, need similar work to the north east nave window.

### **3. Guttering**

Guttering works were carried out a couple of years ago but the downpipe drains straight into the trench that was dug around the church to help dry the walls. This seems somewhat counterproductive and additionally the trench was not supposed to be a permanent feature so the downpipe would need to be moved once the trench is filled in.

The Old Church working group have advised that it was the intention for the downpipe to lead into the drain that discharges onto Forest Road. The guttering contractor was not asked, apparently, to price for the linking drainage but said he would come back to do it free of charge. However, he has not done so which means the water continues to flow along the base of the wall potentially leading to more damp issues. The council were not aware of this issue until earlier this year.

### **4. Trench around the church**

A trench was dug around the church in order to allow the walls to dry out. However, please note the current guttering situation has not helped this to happen. The trench is now full of vegetation and it has not been maintained since it was dug. A contractor also pointed out that the shingle is now compacted and the wrong type of shingle was put in. Much larger shingle (3/4") should have been used which would stop compaction and would allow soil/debris to flow through more easily.

The Old Church working group are going to be arranging a working party to clear the vegetation shortly.

A contractor also suggested that the bottom of the walls should be coated in a waterproof render as most of the damp issues inside are coming from damp rising up the walls.

My understanding is that the trench was a short term measure and we need to establish now the use of the trench longer term and, if it is to be there for a substantial period of time, to think about more permanent safety fencing which is more attractive.

## **5. Stability of tombstones**

Many of the tombstones in the churchyard are leaning and we have a duty to protect public safety.

NALC advise that a council has a duty to keep a closed churchyard in decent order and powers to make safe memorials in its own cemetery. In addition councils have the over-riding legal obligation to maintain public safety (see paragraph 3). If these duties have any meaning a council must have the right to ensure memorials are safe and to take minimum action to render safe those which prove to be dangerous.

I will be seeking legal advice on this subject as the council are the legal owner of the churchyard but it may mean that we must carry out topple testing and laying flat of dangerous tombstones in the interest of public safety.

## **6. Altar rails**

The Old Church working group have reported some issues with the altar rails. They believe this damage has occurred recently due to infestation/damp.

I arranged a meeting with Gary Appleton from Oakworks who carried out the plinth repairs to the Old Church tomb some time ago. We met at the Old Church where he spent some time carrying out an inspection. He has now sent me his report as follows:

*Having looked closely at the items of concern, it would appear that the flight holes (where the insect departed after pupation) seen on the end newels are historical; this damage is likely to have occurred when the timbers were in contact with the damp inner walls, the ensuing rot making the timber suitable for infestation.*

*Moisture content readings taken on the day gave levels of 20-22% consistently along the Altar rail, figures also replicated in the tomb surround.*

*There are other areas of historical insect attack along the Altar rail, primarily in sap wood areas which is to be expected.*

*The wood worm will bore their way through sapwood and other timber that has previously been attacked by decay; dry oak heartwood, which the rail consists of, is naturally resistant.*

*The larvae gathers nitrogen from the timber until it has sufficient to pupate, when it makes its way to the surface, pupates and flies off, (hopefully into a spiders web).*

*As the newels are no longer in contact with the walls the moisture content will remain low enough to cause any remaining larvae to desiccate within the timber.*

*Treatment with chemicals will have little effect upon the outcome, merely serving to kill off the other insects such as spiders that would naturally predate upon any emerging beetles. No live larvae or beetles were found during the inspection.*

*Unless the aesthetic is of concern, I would suggest no action needs to be taken on what is a beautiful, untouched Altar rail, other than keeping the areas ventilated.*

*I would suggest revisiting in a year or so, just to check the moisture content levels.*

*I hope this reassures you, please ask if you have any more queries.*

## **7. General Maintenance of Walls**

We are awaiting a quotation from one contractor for general maintenance of the walls and a second contractor has suggested a regular maintenance contract.

One of the stonemasons who has looked at the building can offer a maintenance contract where we agree to them carrying out a certain amount of maintenance per year. For example, they could do a day a month at a cost of

approximately £300-350 and we would agree a programme of works. This would give us the added benefit of dealing with problems as they arise and for the contractor to get to know and understand the building and work with us in making the necessary improvements. We could start with 2 or 3 days a month for say 3 months and then drop down to one day a month, or one day every two months.

One of the contractors noted the bottom of the interior walls could be patched up and repaired and a whitewash used on the interior to make it look lighter and brighter and more inviting to visitors.

This item should be revisited once we have another quotation.

#### **8. Re-rendering of west chancel wall**

I have received two quotations for this work which are both approximately £4,000. However, one contractor has suggested that the wall is not in a poor state and little or no damp is getting into the building. Looking at the plaster on the inside of the wall it is dry with no signs of damp. It may be that a simpler job of repatching could take place rather than a complete re-render.

One contractor noted that a lime mortar will last a maximum of 15-20 years before it will need to be done again.

#### **9. Potential restoration of Foster mausoleum/tomb**

The Old Church working group have identified a project to restore this feature of the churchyard. Initially they would simply remove the vegetation surrounding it. The tomb has not been subject to any inspection so I have no costings or recommendations to offer currently.

#### **Conclusion**

There are considerable works and possibly considerable costs in carrying out all of the above works. My recommendation is that all of this work needs to be brought together so that we can form a strategic plan to meet the requirements set out in the deeds which are "to carry out such works of repair as may be required to maintain the building erected on the said property in the condition prevailing at the date hereof".

This gives us considerable responsibility and we must also remember that we must seek permission from the Diocese of Portsmouth for all works that we carry out. We need to also now retrospectively apply for permission for works carried out over recent years before we can proceed with anything else.

#### **Recommendation**

Due to the complexities of the building and the differing views of the work that is required, my recommendation is that we now appoint a church architect who can carry out a survey of the whole building and provide recommendations. I have spoken to Julian Livingstone (***the contractors name should not be used during the meeting unless he is appointed***) who is a church architect and carried out a survey in 2016 at the Old Church. He has been recommended by Garry Appleton from Oakworks. The costs of a survey would be approximately £300-500.

***Jane Ives, Clerk, 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021***

#### **To consider a request from a resident to remove a tree in the churchyard**

A resident has contacted the parish council to report that a self-seeded cherry tree has grown very quickly to about 15 feet tall (trunk diameter roughly 5cm) next to their home. They would like this to be removed. The trunk is around 60cm from the wall of our house and if this tree is left, and judging by the cherry tree in our garden which is the same type and now around 30 feet tall, if left to grow it will become very large indeed, disrupting foundations, blocking light and being a threat to the safety of the building.

The resident would be happy to fund a new tree in another location if the council thought that appropriate.



**To consider outstanding tree works and agree further actions required**

In July 2020, the parish council agreed to carry out tree works at the Old Church in accordance with the specifications provided to us.

The Old Church working group were keen to do some of the work and the council agreed that this could happen. The following is in the minutes:

*However it was agreed that the Ash tree should be left for now and the Lilac tree would be worked on by the Old Church working group. The dead tree could be removed but should be left to rot down as habitat for wildlife. The ivy removal would be carried out by the Old Church working group. The grass sward removal can be carried out by the Old Church working group before the tree works commence, but should it not be completed by then the tree surgeons the tree surgeons would do the work (included in the cost).*

Some work has been done on the lilac tree but it does require more work and the working group are proposing to do this in September. I am not aware that any ivy removal has been done. The grass sward proved to be highly contentious following this meeting and the work has never been done. Both the ivy removal and the grass sward were going to be done free of charge by the contractor and it would be a great shame now to have to pay for this work to be done at a cost to the taxpayer.

The grass sward has not been fully removed and nor has enough mulch been installed. The photo below shows the extent of the drip line of the tree and the yew tree specialist said that the grass should be removed all the way to the drip line. Mulch then needs to be added at a depth of 3-5cm to the entire area. We did not have sufficient arisings from the site to provide mulch so will need to purchase this but the grass sward needs to be removed first. I suggest that we ask the working group to carry out this work as agreed.

