



# WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

www.winchfield-pc.org.uk

- Chairman • Andrew Renshaw • Talbothays Farm, Station Road, Winchfield, Hook, Hampshire RG27 8BZ  
• e-mail: andrew.renshaw@talbothays.co.uk • Tel: 01252 843566
- Clerk • Alison Ball • 54 Lapin Lane, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG22 4XH  
• e-mail: winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com • Tel: 01256 810649

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF WINCHFIELD PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON MONDAY 23 JULY 2018 IN WINCHFIELD VILLAGE HALL STARTING AT 7.30 PM

**PRESENT:** Cllr A Renshaw (in the Chair), Cllr H Dicks, Cllr L Hodgetts, Cllr P Jackaman and Cllr M Williams  
Mr C Griffin, Footpath Warden  
5 members of the public (*see note at the end of item 14.2*)  
Mrs A Ball (Clerk), Mrs S Richardson (Acting Clerk)

### 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Simpson (HCC), Cllrs Crampton and Southern (HDC) and members of the Neighbourhood Policing Team.

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND APPLICATIONS FOR DISPENSATIONS UNDER S33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT (2011)

A dispensation was granted in May 2015 to Cllrs Renshaw, Dicks, Jackaman and Williams and in May 2017 to Cllr Hodgetts to participate in all discussions and decisions by this Council relating to the emerging Local and Neighbourhood Plans and associated matters until May 2019.

As at previous meetings, the Chairman declared his ownership (with his wife) of 45 acres of land in the parish which had been the subject of overtures from developers. He reiterated that the land is not available for development.

Cllr Williams declared his membership of Winchfield Action Group and an interest in item 10 Broadband as he would be likely to benefit from any improvement in speeds.

Cllr Jackaman declared an interest in item 10 Broadband as he would be likely to benefit from any improvement in speeds.

### 3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WITH REGARD TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

The Chairman invited members of the public to participate in any of the ensuing discussions through the Chair.

### 4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 21 May 2018 were accepted and signed as a correct record.

### 5 MATTERS ARISING

#### 5.1 Matters arising from Annual Parish Assembly (item 6)

Cllr Hodgetts reported that she had been looking into ways to provide defibrillators within the village. She had found several options with regard to grants, some of which would involve fundraising for charity. She had also reached out to neighbouring parishes that already had defibrillators to draw from their experiences. It was anticipated that due to the size of the parish

it would be beneficial to have two defibrillators. One could be placed at the Village Hall or Station but it was proving difficult to find a second location as it would need a power source. Cllr Hodgetts was still pulling together all the relevant information and would present this to the Parish Council in due course. It was agreed to include this as an agenda item at the next meeting.

### **5.2 Parish Lengthsman (item 12)**

It was confirmed that the Lengthsman had been asked to paint two coats of preservative on the inside and outside of the bus shelter, cut back any vegetation around the bus shelter and paint two coats of varnish on the noticeboard. The Clerk was waiting for a date for the work to be carried out and would chase this up. The Lengthsman had also been asked to cut back the vegetation around the fingerpost at the top of Pale Lane/ bottom of Sprats Hatch Lane as requested by a resident at the last meeting but he had advised that when he went to look at the site the work had already been done.

### **5.3 Cover During the Clerks Maternity Leave (item 16)**

Susan Richardson, Acting Clerk, was welcomed to the meeting and it was requested that she circulate her contact details to councillors. It was confirmed that on or around 1 August the Clerk would pass the laptop and the [winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com](mailto:winchfieldparishclerk@outlook.com) email account to the Acting Clerk, ensuring continuity of business.

## **6 COMMUNITY SAFETY**

Prior to the meeting the Fleet Neighbourhood Policing Team had emailed a report updating on all incidents in the area. This included one residential burglary, two thefts from vehicles, a suspicious vehicle in Sprats Hatch Lane car park and a damage only road traffic collision in Bagwell Lane.

On the proposals for the Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) the draft report for submission to Hampshire County Council (HCC) was circulated, the contents of which had been drawn up by Cllrs Hodgetts and Dicks and Cllr Hodgetts' husband. Cllr Dicks thanked Cllr Hodgetts for her work on drafting an excellent report which included representations from residents.

Cllr Hodgetts summarised the contents of the report, advising that it contained six potential locations for the placement of a SID. These sites had been identified with the aim of reducing the risk to life and property as a result of unsafe driving across the parish by reducing the speed of vehicles, improving the quality of life for people living in the parish and raising awareness of local speed limits and accident hot spots. It was noted that four of the six locations failed to meet the criteria set out in the HCC installation guidance but they had been identified as speed hot spots and where incidents had occurred, and it was felt that these sites needed to be drawn to the attention of Hampshire Highways.

Research had been done into the types of SIDs available and it was thought that the best ones were those triggering an emotional response from drivers. There was a lot of research that could be looked at in relation to how long a SID should be placed in any particular location to ensure its effectiveness.

The report set out details of the six locations identified and provided particulars of any known incidents or hazards at the location, any remedial activities needed to comply with HCC guidance or which contravened the current policy and if the location aligned with HCC guidance.

During a discussion of the report it was agreed that whilst most of the sites did not comply with the HCC guidance it was important that these be raised with HCC and it was hoped that if a SID was not appropriate, then alternatives would be suggested. Cllr Hodgetts requested that the Parish Council support submission of the report to HCC and have further discussion once a response was received.

It was agreed that the Winchfield Parish Council Community Safety Speed Indicator Device Proposal be submitted to HCC for consideration. It was agreed that the document should also be copied to Cllrs Simpson, Crampton and Southern for information.

Cllr Williams reported that he and Cllr Dicks had attended the Hart flood forum for parishes in May and raised an area of concern near the railway tunnel in Taplins Farm Lane. He was pleased to report that flood warning signs had now been installed at this location.

## **7 HART LOCAL PLAN**

Cllr Williams advised that the Examination would be likely to take place in November. Background work had been on going with JB Planning Associates to prepare for the inquiry. A recent decision by the EU Court of Justice meant that Habitat Regulation Assessments needed to be completed when thinking of carrying out development rather than once development was happening which could impact on the proposals in the Local Plan. This was being considered during the examinations of other Local Plans and the results of these would be monitored.

Cllrs Jackaman and Williams intended to look through the Regulation 19 responses and draw any important issues or responses to the attention of JB Planning Associates for comment and consideration. The Chairman advised that it was useful to look at the comments made by Inspectors on other districts' Local Plans as they often gave council's pages of modifications. Cllr Jackaman advised that the point had already been made that HDC had been using draconian policies which serve to prevent the conversion/redevelopment of redundant buildings in nineteen 'Strategic and Locally Important Employment Sites'.

The Inspector appointed to look at the Hart Local Plan, Jonathan Manning, was currently carrying out the examination of the Local Plan produced by Breckland District Council and Cllr Williams reported that his work appeared to be very thorough and detailed, which was good news.

## **8 SOLAR FARMS COMMUNITY BENEFIT**

There was nothing to report on this. It was agreed to remove this item from future agendas unless any issues arose.

## **9 FOOTPATHS REPORT**

Cllr Williams reported that work on Footpath 4 had been carried out in the previous week and a new path and gates were now in place. This work had been carried out by Ben Robinson with help from Cllrs Williams and Dicks, and footpath warden Chris Griffin. There was a temporary fence in place and consideration would be given to making this permanent. In carrying out this work it was decided not to install a 1.9 metre two-way gate which had been purchased as it would involve installing quite a lot of additional fencing. This meant an alternative location needed to be found for this gate. Chris Griffin suggested that a gate by the railway line needed replacing and he would look into this.

The next project would be to install a narrow gate on Footpath 501 at Totters Lane after the motorway bridge. It was noted that Footpath 15 was now clear of old vehicles.

The website had been updated to include details of 'Walks in Winchfield' and leaflets were available at the Village Hall, the pubs and the station. External leaflet holders would be placed near the Church and the Canal car park. Extra signs had been placed on the footpaths. Cllr Williams thanked Malcolm Billyard for his work on this. It was agreed that a brief article should be placed in the Contact Magazine drawing attention to the work that had taken place to improve the footpaths and where to find further details.

## **10 BROADBAND**

The residents of Winchfield Court were waiting for the installation of fibre optic broadband.

Cllr Williams reminded the meeting that he and other representatives had met with BT in January to discuss fibre optic broadband for the whole village. Following this meeting BT had

produced a report that had been incomplete and inaccurate. It had been requested that it be re-done but Cllr Williams had been unable to get an update on progress with this as BT were overwhelmed with requests. He would continue to follow this up.

## **11 BEAUCLERK GREEN ADOPTION**

The Chairman advised the meeting that the road and estate at Beauclerk Green had not yet been adopted. A resident had done a considerable amount of work to get this done and a representative of Bewley Homes had advised that there was currently only one outstanding issue for agreement with HCC which related to the highway drainage. It was hoped that this would soon be resolved and the roads finally adopted.

## **12 SCRAPYARD IN TOTTERS LANE, POTBRIDGE**

The Chairman advised that a multi-agency meeting had been held to discuss this issue at Hart on July 12. HCC had acted and the vehicles had been removed from Footpath 15 but unfortunately they had been dumped in the donkey field opposite which is an SSSI, in Odiham parish. It was down to Natural England to take action to remove the vehicles from the donkey field and to protect the SSSI. There had recently been a police raid and then a serious fire at the scrapyard and Hampshire Fire and Rescue and Environmental Health had attended. It was hoped that continued pressure would be put on the owner of the Scrapyard and the various bodies involved to take action.

## **13 GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION**

### **13.1 To note the Data Audit**

In order to assess the Parish Council's compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) the Clerk had carried out a Data Audit which had been circulated prior to the meeting. This had identified the need for some documents and policies to be drafted and adopted, including a privacy notice, a procedure for dealing with a data security breach should one occur and how to deal with subject access requests. These would be considered in due course.

The Clerk had previously advised that it would be prudent for all councillors to have email addresses that were retained for Parish Council business only. This was discussed and it was agreed that each councillor would make the decision for themselves.

Cllr Jackaman suggested that consideration needed to be given to the retention and disposal of council documents. The Clerk advised that the Society for Local Council Clerks had produced a template retention and disposal policy which would be circulated for information.

It was agreed to note the Data Audit.

### **13.2 To approve the Privacy Notice**

It was agreed to approve the Privacy Notice which had been circulated prior to the meeting which set out how the Parish Council dealt with personal data.

### **13.3 To approve the updates to Standing Orders**

Prior to the meeting the Clerk had circulated updates to the Standing Orders which were needed to take into account changes to legislation, particularly the coming into force of the GDPR. The updates made the following changes:

- Para 15(b)(i) – allows delivery of agendas by email
- Para 18(a)(v) & (c)- £25k – amount decreased for the need for a formal tender in line with legislation
- Para 18(f) – new section to reflect legislation changes
- Para 18(g) – new section to reflect legislation changes
- Para 20 – Data Protection Legislation – new section for GDPR
- Para 26 – new section on document management information due to GDPR.

It was agreed that the changes to the Standing Orders as set out above be adopted.

## 14 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### 14.1 Applications received since the last meeting

The following applications had been considered and responses made since the last meeting:

**18/01190/HOU Glebe House, Bagwell Lane** *Construction of a new annex building and insertion of window into garage, following the demolition of three outbuildings.* No objections.

**18/01318/HOU Barley Mow House, Sprats Hatch Lane** *Replacement fence along boundary with canal.* Application withdrawn.

### 14.2 16/03129/OUT Pale Lane Farm appeal by Wates

The developer who had proposed 700 residential dwellings, a primary school and local centre at Pale Lane Farm had recently appealed the decision by HDC to refuse the application. Cllr Jackaman had drafted comments to submit for consideration during the appeal which had been circulated prior to the meeting. He felt it was important that the comments from the Parish Council concentrate on the reasons for refusal and the grounds of appeal, and not simply regurgitate the wording of its January 2017 objection letter.

The meeting discussed the draft put forward by Cllr Jackaman. Cllr Williams suggested that a comment be included recommending that the Inspector travel west along Pale Lane and turn right to The Hurst in Winchfield at the Barley Mow public house or take the right fork before Winchfield Court and judge the dangers that additional traffic would cause. Cllr Jackaman stated that transport and environment were not included in the reasons for refusal but a short statement could be included in the response.

Cllr Williams asked that the final response should be sent to JB Planning Associates prior to submission for them to confirm that nothing in the response conflicted with the already submitted Regulation 19 response. It was agreed that this be done but that any comments be limited to a conflict with the Parish Council's Local Plan response rather than on the content of the response, and that a maximum of £200 be spent.

Following the meeting the representations below were agreed and submitted to the Planning Inspectorate:

"We are against the Appeal proposals for the same broad reasons given by Hart District Council (Hart) in their refusal letter of 29/01/2018.

We lodged our objection letter, dated January 2017, with Hart and we give below further narrative regarding each Refusal Reason given that 18 months have elapsed since then and during that period there have been changes to national and local guidance and Hart's new Local Plan has been submitted for examination. Additionally, we make two further comments regarding transport and environment.

By way of background, although the site is not within the Winchfield Parish boundary it is less than 100 metres north of it at Pale Lane and immediately abuts us in the west. Where we refer to paragraph numbers they relate to the Appellants 'Appeal Statement of Case' unless otherwise stated.

**Refusal Reason 1.** We note the conflicting opinions between Hart and the Appellants as to whether saved policies CON22 and RUR2 are out of date. We agree with Hart's Delegated Report assessment that they are not out of date.

We refer to the issue regarding settlement boundaries and note Hart reviewed them in February 2018: published as CD2 of the Examination Library – 'Proposed Changes to the Adopted Policies Map', Index B, 'Amendments to Settlement Policy Boundaries'. The Appeal Site is not in the new Local Plan and, unsurprisingly, was not incorporated into the Fleet settlement boundary in that review.

Having argued that CON22 is out of date and NPPF14 is engaged anyway, the Appellants then give CON22 limited weight and work through its policies. The Netherhouse Copse

Appeal Inspector's report concluded RUR2 was out of date but still accorded it moderate weight; however, the Appellants have not given consideration or weight to Policy NBE1 in Hart's new Local Plan (sent for examination four days after the Appeal was notified) which, inter alia, says 'Inappropriate types and scales of development will not be supported. Policy NBE1 should be given significant weight; in our opinion, it does not support their case for a new development in open countryside outside a settlement boundary.'

We note the Appellants do not refer to or mention any of the policies in the new Local Plan.

Returning to the Appellants' argument that NPPF14 should be engaged we point out that that paragraph relates to a presumption in favour of **sustainable** development (our emphasis). We draw your attention to the Paragraph 'Sustainability and Summary' in our 2017 Objection letter where we argued the site does not meet the economic dimension (it is not in the right place or at the right time) or the environmental dimension (the natural environment is neither enhanced, nor protected and the constrained nature of the site would encourage use of the motor car). The **context and contrast here** is that the Netherhouse Copse decision was for a site which has sustainable transport facilities; where daily needs are easily accessible; where access to the adjoining secondary and primary schools is on foot (and probably off road).

Further comment on the Settlement Boundary/land supply issue. We do understand the Netherhouse Copse Inspector's logic regarding the 9.74 years land supply figure being the result of granting a number of development permissions outside boundaries identified in the existing Local Plan, in breach of policies RUR2 and RUR3, in order to meet current housing needs. However, in practice, that seems to leave Hart in a bind because there doesn't appear to be any practical way they can comply.

If they allocated settlement boundaries in advance to sites of their choice or some other method of selection they would be open to a charge of pre-determining outcomes: if they continue as they do now – when approving sites outside boundaries acknowledging that is so because other policy factors had greater importance – they face having their land supply figure ruled invalid. Currently, Hart has reviewed settlement boundaries to align them with the sites in the new Local Plan (to take them to the end of the Plan period) and there is a state of equilibrium (which this Appeal seeks to disturb). In what is a largely rural District this could be an ongoing problem regarding any future planning applications outside the new settlement boundaries.

We ask the Appeal Inquiry to take our Refusal Reason 1 narrative into account and refuse this Appeal.

**Refusal Reason 2.** We agree the proposed development would degrade the setting of the listed Pale Lane Farmhouse. The Appellants mention, but do not elaborate on the importance of, the aspect from the railway embankment. Railway passengers have a clear view of The Farmhouse, as we said in our objection letter, '...travellers from London still regard Fleet as where 'urban' ends and where the countryside begins and that is valued'. Placing a 700-home development there would degrade not just The Farmhouse setting but the countryside demarcation as well. The A323 road marks the divide between town and country, the Farmhouse is the primary rural building.

See also CD11 of the 'Examination Library', Modification 50, regarding development proposals that would result in physical and/or visual coalescence.

**Refusal Reason 3.** We note the proposals for SANG/SAMM contributions and that they would be secured by an Agreement.

**Refusal Reason 4.** We note the Appellants list the various financial contributions they intend making (as would be expected in a development of this size) and that the various Sec 106 Agreements were incomplete at the time their planning application was determined.

However, we also note the contradiction between what they say about the proposed new settlement and what they intend doing regarding financial contributions for that proposal – see full explanation under ‘Refusal Reason 5’.

**Refusal Reason 5.** The proposed development was premature and speculative when our objection letter was sent in January 2017 and that remains the case in July 2018. The Appellants, in May 2018, said it would be some time before the new Local Plan would be sent for inspection, yet that was already in train and was sent only four days after Hart received notice of the Appeal.

Submission was planned for (what was a hard deadline of) March 31 this year and was only delayed because of a further change to national criteria resulting, as we recall it, from the delay in consultation on the new iteration of the NPPF. We understand Hart agreed that delay with the Planning Inspectorate.

In para. 4.71 the Appellants argue the Appeal site would provide a robust supply of housing land in the District until 2027/2028. Hart already had that. However, within CD11 of ‘Examination Library’ ‘Schedule of proposed Modifications’ sent to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the new Local Plan submission is Modification 75, a (updated June 2018) ‘Housing Trajectory Graph’ showing that cumulative completions/projections **will comfortably exceed the cumulative housing requirement for every year up to and including 2031/32**. Further confirmation that the Appellants development proposals remain premature and unnecessary.

The Appellants contend that the Appeal scheme would not undermine the Local Plan process (para.4.47; clearly, it would because their site is not in the new Local Plan.

We also note the contradiction in the following two statements:

- In para.4.5.6, ‘Approval of the Appeal Scheme would have no material impact on the decision whether or not this site\* would come forward, as the DHDLPSS notes at footnote 7 on page 29 that ‘*a new settlement within the Area of search is not needed to meet the housing needs in this Plan*’.

\* i.e. the Winchfield/Murrell Green proposal.

- In para.8.5.4 of the Transport Addendum (November 2017) they refer to Hampshire CC concerns relating to potential development to the west at and around Winchfield, the impact on the A30/A323 junction at Hartley Wintney and drivers seeking to use rural roads instead. In para 8.5.5 of that Addendum they say ‘The Elvetham Chase development has already considered and identified improvements to fully accommodate its impact (and that from all committed and planned growth). However, it has been agreed that HCC could deploy some of the agreed financial contributions on an identified number of rural roads such as those identified above’.

We regard authorising the use of financial contributions relating to the Appeal site to be used to facilitate road improvements relating to the (as yet untested and undecided)

Winchfield/Murrell Green proposals as a **material impact** on the Local Plan process. There is a further contradiction - in their Reg. 19 Consultation response (26/03/2018) they say Policy SS3 is not justified, effective or sound and that the policy should be deleted.

We agree with Hart’s detailed assessment regarding prematurity on pp37/38 of the delegated Report. The proposed development is still premature, and speculative, because the site is unnecessary (Hart’s Land supply, 9.74 Years at April 2018, will see it through until 2032); because the site is not included in the new Local Plan; because that Plan contains refreshed policies germane to the Applicant’s case which they have ignored; because the proposals do not represent sustainable development; because the Local Plan Examination hearings are

expected to take place in November this year with the Inspectors Report in early 2019 which should clear the air for everyone concerned.

We consider the Appeal Inquiry should take the above factors into account and refuse this Appeal.

**Refusal Reason 6.** We do not agree with the Appellants' reasoning in paras. 4.60 to 4.65 of their Statement of Case.

They state that '...agricultural use of the land is limited...' positioning the site as poorer quality land: yet NPPF112 says, even for poorer quality land, LPAs should only seek to use it where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary. In our opinion the Appellants have not demonstrated this development is **necessary** (our emphasis).

We agree with Refusal Reason 6 that the proposal would result in the **unnecessary** (our emphasis) loss of approximately 32 hectares of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

We ask that our argument be considered, and the Appeal refused.

**Transport.** We were surprised Hart did not cite this as a refusal reason and we refer you to our January 2017 objection letter and the detailed information appended to it. We note the Appellants' detailed Transport Addendum (November 2017), however we remain unconvinced. We would also urge the Inspector to travel south along Pale Lane and turn right at the Barley Mow public house into The Hurst in Winchfield (or take the right fork, just before Winchfield Court into Winchfield Hurst) and judge the dangers that additional traffic would cause.

We note the November 2017 Traffic Addendum. Wates have not considered relevant Rural Road Standards; traffic flows on Pale Lane have not been assessed realistically and the Rural Road Impact assessment is both incomplete and misleading. No consideration has been made for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and the lack of any parking facilities at Winchfield Station after mid-morning is simply dismissed. Wates have not considered relevant Rural Road Standards; traffic flows on Pale Lane have not been assessed realistically and the Rural Road Impact assessment is both incomplete and misleading. No consideration has been made for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, and the lack of any parking facilities at Winchfield Station after mid-morning is simply dismissed.

Shortly thereafter we wrote to Hart pointing all this out: it is recorded in the documents on 16/03129/OUT.

**Environment.** We have already commented on landscape above. In terms of Wildlife, we are disappointed our January 2017 comments were not better received. The Applicants proposals concentrate on flora but still ignore the effect of 1400 cars and 1883 residents on fauna in that area; the three copses would be sterilised as regards itinerant fauna, a quick look at an OS map shows the paucity of such wildlife refuges in that area.

**Sustainability Appraisal.** We note the Appellants' arguments regarding suggested amendments to the scoring and are content to let Hart assess their merits.

**Draft Statement of Common Ground.** We note this has been prepared by the Appellants but does not yet contain any input from Hart and we are therefore unable to comment at this stage.

We note also, in Hart's Refusal Report, the in-depth objections from Elvetham Heath Parish Council, Fleet Town Council, Hartley Wintney Parish Council and the 663 objections from individuals. As a neighbouring parish consultee, we are very surprised our own objection letter was not included in that Report.

**In Summary** we are against the Appeal proposals because:

- We disagree that saved policies CON22 and RUR2 are out of date as regards this proposal.



- We think that new policy NBE1 should be given significant weight.
  - Settlement boundaries were reviewed in February 2018, crystallised in the new Local Plan in June 2018, and the Appeal site is not included in them.
  - The proposals would not provide sustainable development as defined in NPPF7.
  - We agree the proposed development would impose on and degrade the setting of Pale Lane Farmhouse.
  - We question why the Appellants have agreed financial contributions with Hampshire CC to facilitate road improvements for the (untested and undecided) new settlement proposals (but which proposals the Appellants are opposed to anyway).
  - The proposals are speculative and premature. Hart has a 9.74-year land supply with a smooth development trajectory. The proposals represent unnecessary development of agricultural land.
  - Their scheme would undermine the Local Plan process.
  - The Appellants have ignored and given no weight to the new Local Plan which has been sent for examination.
  - We remain unhappy with the transport and environmental protection proposals.”
- (NOTE: at the conclusion of this item two members of the public left the meeting.)

## 15 FINANCE

### 15.1 Statement for the period 09.05.18 to 15.07.18

#### Deposit Account (Lloyds)

8 May	Balance		£2,058.82
9 May	Interest		£0.08
11 June	Interest		£0.09
9 July	Interest		£0.08
15 July	<b>Balance</b>		<b>£2,059.07</b>

#### Current Account (Lloyds)

8 May	Balance		£9,656.45
8 May	VAT Refund	2,169.34	2,169.34
22 May	Alison Ball – May Expenses	Exp 18/03	£27.48 -£27.48
22 May	Came & Co – Insurance Premium	Exp 18/04	£291.20 -£291.20
22 May	DWCV Horticultural Society – Grant	Exp 18/05	£200.00 -£200.00
22 May	ECAS – Internal Audit Fee	Exp 18/06	£201.00 -£201.00
22 May	HALC – Affiliation Fees & NALC Levy	Exp 18/07	£255.00 -£255.00
22 May	Oak Designs – Footpath Leaflets etc	Exp 18/08	£1,709.94 -£1,709.94
22 May	Village Hall – Hall Hire 2017/18	Exp 18/09	£60.00 -£60.00
22 May	Winchfield PCC – Grant	Exp 18/10	£1,000.00 -£1,000.00
23 May	Alison Ball – May Salary	Exp 18/11	£287.08 -£287.08
23 May	HCC – Basingstoke Canal Grant	Exp 18/12	£250.00 -£250.00
1 June	Winchfield Festival – Grant	Exp 18/13	£600.00 -£600.00
18 June	VAT Refund		£3,882.65 £3,882.65
22 June	Alison Ball – June Salary	Exp 18/14	£287.08 -£287.08
15 July	<b>Balance</b>		<b>£10,539.66</b>

**TOTAL** deposit and current accounts

**£12,598.73**

Invested at Cambridge & Counties Bank	£42,472.26 <sup>1</sup>
Invested at Hampshire Trust Bank	£30,000.00
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>	<b>£85,070.99</b>

### Comparison with 2018/19 Budget

Budget heading	Allocation	Spend from 01.04.18 to date (ex VAT)	Available
Clerk's Salary	£5,000.00	£863.00	£4,137.00
Training	£300.00	£0.00	£300.00
Subscription to SLCC	£90.00	£0.00	£90.00
Hire of Village Hall for meetings	£80.00	£60.00	£20.00
Admin costs	£350.00	£7.90	£342.10
Insurance	£300.00	£291.20	£8.80
HALC/NALC Subscriptions	£270.00 <sup>2</sup>	£255.00	£15.00
Audit & Information Commission fees	£455.00	£201.00	£254.00
Section 137 payments	£810.00	£200.00	£610.00
Grants (Churchyard maintenance)	£1000.00	£1000.00	£0.00
Contingencies	£475.00	£0.00	£475.00
<b>Total A</b>	<b>£9,130.00</b>	<b>£2,878.10</b>	<b>£6,251.90</b>
		<b>Total A + B</b>	<b>£83,142.60</b>
<b>Money at bank</b>			<b>£85,070.99</b>
<b>VAT to be reclaimed</b>			<b>£0.00</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>£85,070.99</b>
		<b>Less Total A+B</b>	<b>(£83,142.60)</b>
<b>Current surplus/working balance</b>			<b>£1,928.39</b>

Cllr Jackaman drew attention to the interest that had been added to the amount held with Cambridge and Counties. This should have been included in the May Finance Report but notification that it had been added to the account came too late. The Clerk had contacted Cambridge and Counties to request that future interest be paid to the Lloyds account and in doing so was advised that the easy access account that the Parish Council currently had was only supposed to be a short-term account and the money ought to be moved into a different account. Since the bond had matured a new 31-day notice account was available at 1.3% AER. It was agreed that all the funds with Cambridge and Counties should be transferred to this 31-day notice account.

A request had been previously made to transfer £25,000 from the Hampshire Trust account into the Lloyds account which had required three months' notice and would be received in August. It was agreed to give the appropriate days' notice that the £5,000 remaining in that account be transferred back to the Lloyds account as the nominated account and that once this was received it be added to the amount at Cambridge and Counties if not needed immediately.

<sup>1</sup> 08/04/18 interest of £459.47 paid and 30/04/18 interest of £12.79 paid which was not included in May report as, at that time, we were unaware the interest had been added to this account

<sup>2</sup> £180 saving by not taking up HALC HR Service moved to Planning Counsel Fund – agreed May 2018

## 15.2 Request for Grants and Donations

None.

## 15.3 Payments for Approval

The following payments were approved:

A Ball	Expenses	£30.09
	Salary: July 2018 (£287.08) + increase in salary for April 2018 (£16.24)	£303.32
Acting Clerk	Salary: July 2018	£287.08
	Salary: August 2018	£287.08
	Salary: September 2018	£287.08
JB Planning Associates	Advice on Local Plan – 5 April to 19 July 2018	£806.64
Ben Robinson	Work on Footpath 4	£5112.00

## 15.4 Variation to Bank Mandate

It was agreed to add the Acting Clerk to the list of signatories for the Lloyds Bank accounts and to request that she be given online access.

## 16 CORRESPONDENCE

Items of correspondence detailed in the Clerk's report were received and noted.

## 17 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Cllr Williams reported that the Winchfield sign on Pale Lane was missing and asked that this be reported. It was also noted that there were 12 temporary signs in Sprats Hatch Lane that had not been removed following works and this should also be reported.

The Chairman advised that the issue with the high voltage cable that had halted the road works in Pale Lane at the junction with the Fleet Road had now been resolved and works should recommence shortly.

The Village Hall Management Committee would be holding an event on 29 September to celebrate 90 years since the opening of the old hall. It would also be appropriate to celebrate 180 years since the railway arrived at Winchfield on 24 September 1838.

Kerry Wedlock confirmed that the official unveiling of the new weather vane would take place at the event and it would be installed any day. She confirmed that there would be a litter pick later in the year and she would advise of a date as soon as this had been agreed.

The Chairman reported with sadness the death of David Corfield who had done much for the local church and had been a supporter of the Parish Council.

The Chairman expressed best wishes to the Clerk as this was her last meeting before going on maternity leave.

## 18 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the meetings for 2018/19 would be held on 24 September 2018; 26 November 2018; 21 January 2019; 25 March 2019.

**There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.05 pm**