Members of Fareham Borough Council are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Council to be held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fareham, on THURSDAY, 28 JULY 2016, commencing at 6.00 pm.

The Mayor: Councillor Connie Hockley

The Deputy Mayor: Councillor Geoff Fazackerley

Councillor Keith Barton
Councillor Brian Bayford
Councillor Susan Bayford
Councillor Susan Bell
Councillor Fred Birkett
Councillor Maryam Brady
Councillor Pamela Bryant
Councillor Jonathan Butts
Councillor Trevor Cartwright, MBE
Councillor Louise Clubley
Councillor Shaun Cunningham
Councillor Peter Davies
Councillor Tina Ellis
Councillor Jack Englefield
Councillor Keith Evans

Councillor Michael Ford, JP
Councillor Tiffany Harper
Councillor Carolyn Heneghan
Councillor Leslie Keeble
Councillor Arthur Mandry
Councillor Kay Mandry
Councillor Simon Martin
Councillor Sarah Pankhurst
Councillor Roger Price, JP
Councillor Dennis Steadman
Councillor Katrina Trott
Councillor Nick Walker
Councillor Christopher Wood
Councillor Seán Woodward
1. **Prayers**  
The meeting will commence with a short service of prayers.

2. **Apologies for Absence**

3. **Minutes (Pages 1 - 4)**  
To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the Special Council Meeting and Council Meeting held on 16 June 2016.

4. **Mayor’s Announcements**

5. **Executive Leader’s Announcements**

6. **Executive Members’ Announcements**

7. **Declarations of Interest**  
To receive any declarations of interest from members in accordance with Standing Orders and the Council’s Code of Conduct.

8. **Presentation of Petitions**  
To receive any petitions presented by a member of the Council.

   *Note: any petition so presented will be dealt with in accordance with the Council’s petition scheme.*

9. **Deputations**  
To receive any deputations of which notice has been given.

10. **Reports of the Executive**  
To receive, consider and answer questions on reports and recommendations of the Executive. Minutes of the meetings of the Executive and a schedule of individual Executive member decisions are appended.

   (1) Minutes of meeting Monday, 11 July 2016 of Executive (Pages 5 - 12)  
   *Note: the following recommendation is to be determined:*

   Minute 10(1) – Delivery of Welborne: Detailed Programme and Costs and Interim Governance Review.  
The Executive recommends to Council that:  
(d) the Welborne Standing Conference be dissolved; and  
(e) Henry Cleary OBE be thanked for his work as Chairman and the other members also be thanked for their contribution to the work of the Conference over the past four years.

11. **Report of the Scrutiny Board**  
To receive, consider and answer questions on reports and recommendations of the
12. Reports of Other Committees
To receive the minutes of the following Committees and to consider and answer questions on any reports and recommendations made.

(1) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 25 May 2016 of Planning Committee (Pages 21 - 34)

(2) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 22 June 2016 of Planning Committee (Pages 35 - 48)

(3) Minutes of meeting Monday, 27 June 2016 of Audit and Governance Committee (Pages 49 - 52)

   *Note: the following recommendation is to be determined:*

   Minute 6(a) – Fraud and Corruption Sanctions and Redress Policy and Anti-Fraud Policy.
   The Committee recommends to Council:
   (b) the adoption of the revised Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy.

(4) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 13 July 2016 of Appeals Committee (Pages 53 - 54)

13. Questions under Standing Order 17.2
To answer questions pursuant to Standing Order 17.2 for this meeting.

14. Motions under Standing Order 15
Members will be informed, prior to the meeting, of any motion duly notified in accordance with Standing Order 15 but received after print and dispatch of the agenda.

(1) Notice of Motion received 17 July 2016 from Councillor R H Price, JP:

I propose that this council fully supports the Armed Forces and Supports the Royal British Legions request for questions to be added to the 2021 census by writing to Her Majesty’s Government and also asking the Local Government Association to make similar representation.

1. The obligations it owes to the Armed Forces community within Fareham Borough Council area as enshrined in the Armed Forces Covenant which we have signed; that the Armed Forces community should not face disadvantage in the provision of services and that special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given the most.
2. The absence of definitive and comprehensive statistics on the size or demographics of the Armed Forces community within Fareham Borough Council area. This includes serving Regular and Reserve personnel, veterans, and their families.

3. That the availability of such data would greatly assist the council, local partner agencies, the voluntary sector, and national Government in the planning and provision of services to address the unique needs of the Armed Forces community within Fareham Borough Council area.

In light of the above, this council moves to support and promote The Royal British Legion’s call to include a new topic in the 2021 census that concerns military service and membership of the Armed Forces community. We further call upon the UK Parliament, which will approve the final census questionnaire through legislation in 2019, to ensure that the 2021 census includes questions concerning our Armed Forces community.

15. **Appointments to Committees**

To make any changes in appointments to the seats on committees in accordance with the wishes of political groups. Such appointments will take effect from 29 July 2016.

16. **Appointments to Outside Bodies**

(1) Hammond Memorial Hall Trust

The Hammond Memorial Hall Trust is a charity registered in 1971 formed from proceeds of the sale of the former Hammond Hall, Stubbington, Fareham.

Funds are invested and distributed by way of grants to Charitable Associations, Bodies and Organisations for recreational purposes for social welfare and improving the life of inhabitants in the Stubbington and Hill Head area.

The Charity is made up of a board of Trustees: 4 Council representatives and 3 representatives from the local community. The ward councillors for Stubbington and Hill Head are ex officio trustees. The Council appoints three additional trustees to administer the charitable scheme.

The Council is asked to confirm the appointment of a new trustee following the departure of an existing trustee.

(2) Earl of Southampton Trust

The charitable trust aims to promote and improve the welfare of anyone in need in Titchfield, Sarisbury Green, Stubbington, Warsash, Locksheath, Park Gate and Lee on Solent and seeks to make a real difference and make a positive impact on people’s lives.

The Charity provides one-off grants to help individuals and improve the quality of their life and provides support for organisations locally.
The Council is asked to confirm the appointment of a new trustee following the departure of an existing trustee.

17. Community Governance Review - Funtley (Pages 55 - 140)
   A report by the Head of Democratic Services.

P GRIMWOOD
Chief Executive Officer

www.fareham.gov.uk
20 July 2016

For further information please contact:
Democratic Services, Civic Offices, Fareham, PO16 7AZ
Tel:01329 236100
democraticservices@fareham.gov.uk
FAREHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Council

Date: Thursday, 16 June 2016
Venue: Council Chamber - Civic Offices

PRESENT:

Mrs C L A Hockley
(Mayor)

G Fazackerley
(Deputy Mayor)

Councillors: K A Barton, B Bayford, Mrs S M Bayford, Miss S M Bell, F Birkett, Mrs M Brady, Mrs P M Bryant, J E Butts, T M Cartwright, MBE, Mrs L E Clubley, S Cunningham, P J Davies, Mrs T L Ellis, J M Englefield, M J Ford, JP, Miss T G Harper, Mrs C Heneghan, L Keeble, A Mandry, Mrs K Mandry, Ms S Pankhurst, R H Price, JP, D L Steadman, Mrs K K Trott, N J Walker, C J Wood and S D T Woodward
The meeting commenced with a minute’s silence observed as a mark of respect for Jo Cox, Member of Parliament for Batley and Spen who was tragically murdered earlier in the afternoon.

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K D Evans and S D Martin.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the Mayor be authorised to sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12 May 2016.

3. **MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor was pleased to announce that she will be holding a Tea Party on Thursday 7 July 2016 where Canine Partners will be giving a talk on how they train dogs to help disabled people. There will also be a demonstration by the dogs. This Tea Party will be held in the Mayor’s Parlour, commencing at 2.30pm, and admission is £4.00. There will also be a raffle and all monies raised goes to the Mayor’s Charities.

On Monday 13 June, the Mayor held a Queen’s 90th Tea Party at Ferneham Hall that was attended by residents of the Borough who will be 90 years old this year. The Mayor expressed her thanks to all who had been involved in organising this event which was attended by over 100 people.

4. **EXECUTIVE LEADER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Executive Leader provided an update on the Funtley Governance Review and confirmed that the Consultation period has been extended to allow residents further time to comment. Therefore this matter will now come to the July Council meeting.

5. **EXECUTIVE MEMBERS’ ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor T. M Cartwright announced that there have been many problems with travellers within the Borough recently and he wanted to congratulate the officers who did an excellent job under very difficult circumstances.

Councillor Cartwright was invited by the Chief Inspector to visit the Cams site purely as an observer. At the site there were two lots of travellers, one set on the rugby pitch and the other set on the football pitch. On inspection they found building rubble, tree cuttings, general rubbish, soiled nappies, faeces, and dogs running wild. The travellers were particularly intimidating and refused to carry out Police instructions. An example of this was when a Sergeant told them to put out a bonfire near some bushes, their response was
to stoke it up and then throw aerosol cans onto it which exploded. Obviously they were waiting for a confrontation with the Police which could have turned very nasty if the Police had responded the wrong way. The fire service were summoned who extinguished the bonfire.

Later that day, the Police issued a Section 61 notice, and the travellers were gone that evening - only to turn up at Wicor where a further notice was issued by the Police, and they were gone by 2:00pm the next day.

Councillor Cartwright advised all Councillors not to get involved with travellers if they arrived in their Wards and to leave it to the professionals, ie, our Officers and the Police.

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no interests declared at this meeting.

7. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

There were no petitions presented at this meeting.

8. DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations given at this meeting.

9. REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE

(1) Minutes of meeting Monday, 16 May 2016 of Executive

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive meeting held on the 16 May 2016 be received.

(2) Minutes of meeting Monday, 6 June 2016 of Executive

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 6 June 2016 be received.

10. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

(1) Minutes of meeting Thursday, 24 March 2016 of Planning Committee

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 24 March 2016 be received, subject to amendment at item 4 of the inclusion of the names of those making Deputations to this Committee and, at item 5, the title being included.

(2) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 27 April 2016 of Planning Committee

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 27 April 2016 be received.

(3) Minutes of meeting Thursday, 12 May 2016 of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee
RESOLVED that the minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee held on 12 May 2016 be received.

(4) Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 31 May 2016 of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee held on the 31 May 2016 be received, subject to an amendment which is to record Councillor Mrs K Trott’s attendance at that meeting.

11. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 17.2

There were no questions raised at this meeting.

12. MOTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 15

There were no motions presented at this meeting.

13. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

Councillor S D T Woodward stated that there is no longer a requirement to appoint deputies to the Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee.

Councillor R H Price sought clarification that deputies were appointed to Committees but not to panels. It was agreed that legal advice would be sought and this would be addressed at the next Council meeting.

There were no appointments or changes to committees made at this time.

(The meeting started at 6.35 pm and ended at 6.56 pm).
Minutes of the Executive
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Monday, 11 July 2016
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

Present:
S D T Woodward, Policy and Resources (Executive Leader)
T M Cartwright, MBE, Public Protection (Deputy Executive Leader)
Miss S M Bell, Leisure and Community
K D Evans, Planning and Development
Miss T G Harper, Streetscene
Mrs K Mandry, Health and Housing

Also in attendance:
B Bayford, Chairman of Health and Housing Policy Development and Review Panel
Mrs S M Bayford, Chairman of Scrutiny Board
Mrs P M Bryant, Chairman of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee
M J Ford, JP, Chairman of Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel
G Fazackarley, Chairman of Appeals Committee
L Keeble, Chairman of Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel
A Mandry, Chairman of Planning and Development Policy Development and Review Panel; for Item 10(3)
Ms S Pankhurst, Chairman of Leisure and Community Policy Development and Review Panel
S Cunningham, for items 9(1) and 10(1)
Mrs K K Trott, for items 9(1) and 10(1)
C J Wood, for items 10(2) and 12(1)
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies given for this meeting.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive held on the 6 June 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. EXECUTIVE LEADER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Solent Strategic Governance Review

The Executive Leader announced that the Council has recently received a letter and documents from the three local Unitary Authorities (Southampton, Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight) relating to a possible devolution deal with Government for the South Hampshire region. These documents have been circulated to all members.

In order to fulfil the Government’s process to implement a devolution deal, there are a number of steps that the three Unitary Authorities have to go through, including consideration of the local governance arrangements required to take forward the draft deal. As a result, the three Councils have undertaken a governance review, considering how arrangements could be improved to deliver better outcomes for local people across the key themes covered by the proposed deal.

The three authorities have requested Fareham Borough Council’s provisional views on whether we agree with the draft conclusion that the creation of a Combined Authority across the three councils would help to deliver improvements for the Solent economy and quality of life for local people.

The timescale for responses is very short, with a deadline of 14th July 2016. Given this restricted timescale, and following discussion with the Chief Executive Officer, the Executive Leader felt that the best way of presenting this issue to members was by way of an announcement at this Executive meeting. The Executive Leader gave reassurance that, should the three Unitary Authorities decide to proceed with the creation of a Combined Authority, then a full public consultation programme will take place which will offer the opportunity for a full discussion and debate within our Council to enable us to take a fully informed decision.

The Executive Leader stated that, at this stage, it is not possible for Fareham Borough Council to be part of the Combined Authority. Hampshire County Council is not supportive of the proposal, and the law requires County Council agreement to allow the District Councils to be part of a Combined Authority. The three Unitary Authorities are, however, permitted to do this without the agreement of the County Council. Once formed, the law would allow the relevant District Councils to join the newly formed Combined Authority, without the agreement of the County Council.
The Executive Leader believes that there is a compelling case to form a Combined Authority for the Solent area and that the benefits are clearly set out in the documents that have been received. Any initiative which attracts much needed infrastructure funding into the local economy has to be welcomed. The Government is actively seeking to agree “devolution” deals with all councils in England. This means that certain powers and funding previously controlled by Central Government would be passed down to local councils. This has to be the way forward, giving local people the power to make decisions on local matters.

The Executive Leader confirmed that he therefore intends to respond to the three Unitary Councils giving Fareham Borough Council’s support to their proposal to start the process of forming a Combined Authority.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor C J Wood declared a Non-Pecuniary Personal Interest when he addressed the Executive on item 13(1): Lease of Land at Daedalus, due to the close proximity of his parents’ property to the Daedalus site.

5. PETITIONS

There were no Petitions submitted at this meeting.

6. DEPUTATIONS

The Executive received deputations in relation to items 8(1) – Protecting Fareham’s Town Centre from Anti-Social Behaviour from Mr Mike Smart of Homefayre House and 9(1) – Delivery of Welborne: Detailed Programme and Costs and Interim Governance Review from Bruce Slattery on behalf of Christopher Smith, Chairman of BST Warehouses Ltd.

7. MINUTES / REFERENCES FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

There were no minutes or references from other committees brought to this meeting.

8. STREETSCENE

(1) Bus Shelter Services Contract

RESOLVED that the Executive agrees to award the contract for option (a) to the contractor ranked at 1st position (as set out in confidential appendix A), being the best price quality ratio tender received.

9. PUBLIC PROTECTION

(1) Protecting Fareham’s Town Centre from Anti-Social Behaviour

At the request of the Executive Leader, this item was brought forward on the agenda and heard first.
A deputation on this item was received from Mike Smart, Area Manager, from Homefayre House.

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillors S Cunningham and Mrs K K Trott addressed the Executive on this item.

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) notes the evidence within the report;

(b) approves the introduction of a range of control measures, as set out in paragraph 9 of the report; and

(c) approves the commencement of a consultation process to ascertain public views in making a Public Spaces Protection Order.

10. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

(1) Delivery of Welborne: Detailed Programme and Costs and Interim Governance Review

At the request of the Executive Leader, this item was brought forward on the agenda.

A deputation on this item was received from Bruce Slattery on behalf of Christopher Smith, Chairman of BST Warehouses Ltd.

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillors S Cunningham and Mrs K K Trott addressed the meeting.

Following a response from Bruce Slattery to a question raised by the Executive Leader, an additional recommendation was agreed by the Executive.

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) notes the detailed programme of work and resourcing plan outlined for the progression of the Welborne Delivery Strategy;

(b) approves the expenditure for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix A;

(c) notes the revised community engagement arrangements outlined in paragraphs 16-18 of the Executive Briefing Paper;

(d) recommends to Council that the Welborne Standing Conference be dissolved;

(e) recommends to Council that Henry Cleary OBE be thanked for his work as Chairman and the other members also be thanked for their contribution to the work of the Conference over the past four years; and

(f) instructs officers to seek clarification within 7 days from BST Warehouses Ltd as to which areas of land within the Welborne plan
area they currently have full legal control over for the purposes of development.

(2) Hill Head Coastal Protection Project Phase 1 Scheme

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillor C J Wood addressed the Executive on this item.

The Executive was advised that officers are planning a public information event to be held on 11 August on the phase 1 works to include an exhibition of posters and timescales giving examples of possible disruptions i.e. access restrictions to car parks at the site.

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) approves the beach re-nourishment to replenish the historically low beach levels at Hill Head and implement extensive maintenance repairs to FBC owned groynes at Hill Head;

(b) approves proceeding with Detailed Design of the replacement seawall along frontage ‘A’ including Ground Investigation works; and

(c) in the interest of expediency, approves that the Director of Planning and Regulation is given delegated authority to award the contracts to deliver Phase 1 of the Hill Head Coastal Protection Project, after consultation with the Executive Member for Planning and Development.

(3) Fareham Town Centre Management Partnership

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillor A Mandry addressed the Executive on this item.

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) agrees that the Fareham Town Centre Management Partnership is formally dissolved;

(b) agrees that the programme of Fareham town centre management activity be delivered directly by the Council as part of the Executive’s Leisure and Community portfolio;

(c) confirms that the Fareham Town Centre Management Reserve of £208k continues to be held for future investment to support Fareham town centre activities; and

(d) thanks the members of the Partnership for their hard work and dedication over the years of the life of the Fareham Town Centre Partnership.

11. POLICY AND RESOURCES

(1) General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2015/16
RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) approves the carry forward of £260,700 to fund the completion of the General Fund expenditure programmes in 2016/17, as contained in this report;

(b) approves that £2,367,000 from the HRA Capital Account is carried forward to fund the outstanding balances from the 2015/16 programme in 2016/17; and

(c) notes the contents of the report.

(2) Lease of land for NATS training facility at Daedalus.

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) approves the draft Heads of Terms, as set out in confidential Appendix A to this report;

(b) delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Resources in consultation with the Executive Member for Policy and Resources to agree the detailed terms, as appropriate; and

(c) agrees to reinvest the annual rent received from the disposal of land under this lease into the Airport Estate to support the vision for Daedalus.

(3) Capital and Treasury Management Outturn 2015/16

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) agrees that the General Fund Capital Programme for 2015/16 be approved and financed as set out in Appendix A to this report;

(b) agrees the additional expenditure incurred, amounting to £12,657 be financed retrospectively from surplus capital resources; and

(c) agrees the actual General Fund Capital expenditure and treasury management activity for 2015/16 be noted.

(4) Warsash Wasps Matched Funding

RESOLVED that the Executive:

(a) agrees to award matched funding of up to £20,000 to Warsash Wasps Sports and Football Club towards the cost of upgrading New Road, in order to improve access to the new changing rooms, the all-weather artificial football pitch and full size grass football pitch; and

(b) agrees that the award of funding is subject to agreeing satisfactory terms for community use to ensure that the facilities are made available for use by the community.

12. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS
RESOLVED that the public and representatives of the Press be excluded from the remainder of the meeting on the grounds that the matters to be dealt with involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

(1) Lease of Land at Daedalus

At the invitation of the Executive Leader, Councillor C J Wood addressed the meeting.

Councillor C J Wood declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item due to the proximity of his parents’ home to the site at Daedalus.

RESOLVED that the Executive:

   (a) agrees the Heads of Terms for the lease of land at Daedalus, as set out in the confidential report; and

   (b) delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Resources, in consultation with the Executive Member for Policy and Resources, to agree minor amendments to the terms as appropriate.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.55 pm).
Minutes of the Scrutiny Board

(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

**Date:** Thursday, 19 May 2016

**Venue:** Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

**PRESENT:**

- Councillor Mrs S M Bayford (Chairman)
- Councillor S D Martin (Vice-Chairman)

**Councillors:** B Bayford, S Cunningham, L Keeble, A Mandry, C J Wood and J E Butts (deputising for M J Ford, JP)

**Also Present:**
1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies of absence were received from Councillors M J Ford, JP and Mrs S Pankhurst.

2. **MINUTES**

It was AGREED that the minutes of the Scrutiny Board held on 17 March 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman welcomed Chris Noble, Head of Project Integra to the meeting.

She also read out the following notice:

‘In accordance with legislation, members of the public and press are able to audio and video record all meetings held in public by Fareham Borough Council.

I can confirm that there have been no requests to film any part of this meeting, however, should members of the public or press wish to do so, they must respect the wishes of other members of the public present who do not wish to be filmed.’

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES OF ADVICE OR DIRECTIONS**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

5. **DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations made at this meeting.

6. **PRESENTATION FROM HEAD OF PROJECT INTEGRA**

The Board received a presentation from Chris Noble, the Head of Project Integra.

The presentation gave the Board an overview of Project Integra, the areas of work covered under the Partnership, the achievements that they have made and the challenges for the future.

Councillor Keeble requested that a Member visit to the Materials Recovery Facility and the Energy Recovery Facility be arranged again for this year. Chris Noble informed the Board that there were dates already set for this year for visits to both facilities and that Members would need to liaise with the Refuse, Recycling and Transport Manager regarding this.

It was AGREED that Chris Noble be thanked for his informative presentation.
7. **MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PANELS**

The Board was asked to receive the minutes of the meetings of the Policy Development and Review Panels held since 1 March 2016.

(1) **Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 2 March 2016 of Leisure and Community Policy Development and Review Panel**

The Chairman addressed the Board and explained that unfortunately there was no representative of the Leisure and Community Policy Development and Review Panel available to present the minutes, but advised members that she was happy for the to receive them if there were no questions arising from them.

It was AGREED the minutes be received.

(2) **Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 8 March 2016 of Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel**

The Chairman advised that the Chairman of the Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel was unable to attend this meeting but would like to present the minutes of the Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel meeting held on 8 March 2016 at the next meeting of the Scrutiny Board on 23 June 2016.

It was AGREED that the minutes be deferred to the meeting on 23 June 2016.

(3) **Minutes of meeting Thursday, 10 March 2016 of Health and Housing Policy Development and Review Panel**

The Chairman of the Health and Housing Policy Development and Review Panel, Councillor B Bayford was invited to review the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2016.

It was AGREED that the minutes be received.

8. **REVIEW OF THE BOARD’S WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17**

The Board considered a report by the Director of Finance and Resources in which reviewed the work programme for 2016/17.

Councillor Mandry referred to Appendix B of the report which outlined progress on actions since the last meeting. He enquired as to whether the Director of Finance and Resources had followed up on the Board’s request that the Executive Leader include an update on the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) in his announcements at Council meetings. The Director of Finance and Resources confirmed that the Executive Leader is aware of the Board’s request and has agreed to provide an update on the Solent (LEP) at Council meetings if there is something of significance that he feels Members should be aware of.
Councillor Mandry also requested an update on the trial being undertaken in Portchester with regards to tackling dog waste issues. The Director of Operations addressed the Board and explained that the trial has only been operating since the beginning of April and therefore it is too early to know whether it has made a significant impact or not. He did inform members that at the end of May they would be looking to review the publicity campaign for this trial to assess the effectiveness of it, and that this would be report to the Streetscene Panel. In addition to this he will provide a briefing note that can be presented to the Scrutiny Board to provide an update on the trial.

The Director of Finance and Resources also informed the Board that the Executive Leader had made the decision that the Scrutiny Board would be tasked with reviewing the Health and Housing Portfolio, giving particular attention to health provision, and suggested that an item titled 'Review of Corporate Strategy and Corporate Priorities' be added to the work programme for the September meeting.

It was AGREED that the Board:-

(a) add a report on Review of Corporate Strategy and Corporate Priorities to the work programme for the September meeting;

(b) note the progress on actions since the last meeting, as set out in Appendix A, and

(c) subject to the inclusion of the report outline in (a) approve the work programme for 2016/17, as set out in Appendix B.

9. **EXECUTIVE BUSINESS**

The Chairman invited members to indicate if they wish to consider any other item of business dealt with by the Executive since the last meeting of the Board. There were no other items of Executive Business considered.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.29 pm).
FAREHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the
Scrutiny Board
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Thursday, 23 June 2016
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:
Councillor Mrs S M Bayford (Chairman)
Councillor S D Martin (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: B Bayford, S Cunningham, M J Ford, JP, L Keeble, A Mandry,
Ms S Pankhurst and Mrs C Heneghan (deputising for C J Wood)

Also Present: Councillor Mrs K K Trott (Item 6)
1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology of absence was received from Councillor C J Wood.

2. **MINUTES**

It was AGREED that the minutes of the Scrutiny Board meeting held on 19 May be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman’s announcements.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES OF ADVICE OR DIRECTIONS**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

5. **DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations made at this meeting.

6. **PRESENTATION BY, AND QUESTIONING OF, THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND HOUSING**

The Board received a presentation by Councillor Mrs K Mandry, Executive Member for Health and Housing, on the areas of responsibility that fall within the Health and Housing Portfolio remit.

The presentation gave an overview of the areas of service within the portfolio, providing details on how the service was performing, any achievements made and the key priorities for the future. These services included:

- Health Services
- Tenancy Services
- Responsive Repairs
- Housing Options
- Private Sector Housing
- New Developments

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Mrs Trott addressed the Board on this item and raised the issue of homelessness, and enquired how the Council are looking to handle this in the future. The Head of Housing, Revenue and Benefits addressed the Board and explained the challenges that they face in trying to tackle this issue, with the biggest challenge being that a large number of people who are homeless are choosing to sleep rough and do not want the help of the Council as there is an expectation that by accepting support they will agree to taking help to combat drug/alcohol/mental health issues and they are not ready for this. She also informed the Board that the Homelessness Strategy will be reviewed next year and time will be given to looking into the issue of homelessness and how it can be tackled.
Councillor Mrs Mandry further addressed the Board and offered all new members the opportunity to have a visit to the newly completed Collingwood Court.

It was AGREED that Councillor Mrs K Mandry, Executive Member for Health and Housing be thanked for her informative presentation.

7. **MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PANELS**

The Board was asked to receive the minutes of the meetings of the Policy Development and Review Panels held since 1 March 2016.

(1) **Minutes of Meeting Tuesday, 1 March 2016 of Planning and Development Policy Development and Review Panel**

The Chairman of the Planning and Development Policy Development and Review Panel, Councillor A Mandry was invited to present the minutes of the meeting held on 1 March 2016.

It was AGREED the minutes be received.

(2) **Minutes of Meeting Thursday, 3 March 2016 of Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel**

The Chairman of the Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel, Councillor L Keeble was invited to present the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2016.

He informed the Board that at the next meeting of the Panel there will be a Member’s Open Forum, this is an opportunity for any member to ask questions of the Streetscene Officers on any Streetscene related topic. All questions must be submitted to the Committee Officer 5 clear working days prior to the meeting.

It was AGREED the minutes be received.

(3) **Minutes of Meeting Thursday, 8 March 2016 of Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel**

The Chairman of the Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel, Councillor M J Ford, JP was invited to present the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2016.

Councillor Bayford asked for clarification as to where the two Air Quality Monitoring Areas were within the Borough, and was informed by the Director of Planning and Regulation that they were in Hartlands Road and Gosport Road.

Councillor Ford also referred to the same minute item from the previous minutes but in relation to the Panel's question on how many Hybrid cars there were currently within the Borough. He informed the Board that as of March 2016 there were 17 Hybrid Cars within the Borough.
It was AGREED the minutes be received.

8. **REVIEW OF THE BOARD’S WORK PROGRAMME**

The Board considered a report by the Director of Finance and Resources which reviewed the Board’s work programme for 2016/17.

Councillor Ms Pankhurst requested that the unallocated report on Universal Credit be added on to the work programme. The Head of Housing Revenue and Benefits informed the Board that a report on this will going to the Health and Housing Panel, but at present does not feel that it needs to come before the Scrutiny Board yet as it is still in the early stages and is only being applied for a very small number of people, it is anticipated that it will be another 5 years until it is fully rolled out across the Borough. It was agreed therefore to leave the item as unallocated until such time that there is more information to report to the Board.

It was AGREED that the work programme for 2016/17 be approved.

9. **EXECUTIVE BUSINESS**

The Chairman invited members to indicate if they wished to consider any other item of business dealt with by the Executive since the last meeting of the Board.

Councillor Cunningham referred to the report on Local Governance in Hampshire which was presented to the Executive on 6 June 2016. He enquired as to whether all members will be briefed on details of this and the devolution bid.

It was AGREED that the Director of Finance and Resources ensured that the Chief Executives recent “E-bulletin” which outlined outlining the progress on the Devolution Bid and the Local Governance in Hampshire review be circulated to all members.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 6.40 pm).
Minutes of the Planning Committee
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Wednesday, 25 May 2016
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:
Councillor N J Walker (Chairman)
Councillor A Mandry (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: T M Cartwright, MBE, P J Davies, K D Evans, J E Butts, F Birkett (deputising for M J Ford, JP) and Mrs K K Trott (deputising for R H Price, JP)

Also Present:
1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors; B Bayford, M J Ford, JP and R H Price, JP.

2. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 27 April 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman’s announcements.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with Standing Orders and the Council’s Code of Conduct, Councillor J E Butts declared a Personal Non-Pecuniary Interest in Item 6 (7).

5. **DEPUTATIONS**

The Committee received a deputation from the following in respect of the applications indicated and were thanked accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Spokesperson representing the persons listed</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Supporting or Opposing the Application</th>
<th>Minute No/ Application No/Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZONE 1 – 2.30pm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Tutton</td>
<td>(Agent)</td>
<td>87 SOUTHAMPTON ROAD PARK GATE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 6AF – CHANGE OF USE FROM RETAIL (CLASS A1) TO HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY (CLASS A5) &amp; INSTALLATION OF FLUE</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>6(1) P/16/0315/CU Pg 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Tutton</td>
<td>(Agent)</td>
<td>1 GRASSYMEAD FAREHAM PO14 4SQ – CONVERSION OF EXISTING RESIDENTIAL END OF TERRACE DWELLING TO FORM 2 NO. DWELLINGS</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>6(2) P/16/0405/FP Pg 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 2 – 2.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs B Clapperton</td>
<td>Fareham Society</td>
<td>LAND AT FURZE COURT WICKHAM ROAD FAREHAM PO16 7SH – CONSTRUCTION OF 33 DWELLINGS TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, CAR PARKING, CYCLE AND REFUSE STORAGE</td>
<td>Opposing</td>
<td>6(3) P/15/1261/FP Pg 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms C Gould (Agent)</td>
<td>-Ditto-</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>-Ditto-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr E Honey</td>
<td>20 SILVER BIRCH AVENUE FAREHAM PO14 1SZ – CHANGE OF USE OF LAND INTO GARDEN AREA, RELOCATION OF GARDEN WALL WITH VEHICLE ACCESS GATES</td>
<td>Opposing</td>
<td>6(4) P/16/0434/CU Pg 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms L O’Donnell</td>
<td>60A ALEXANDER GROVE FAREHAM PO16 0TX – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION)</td>
<td>Opposing</td>
<td>6(5) P/16/0465/OA Pg 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE 3 – 4.00pm</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Taylor</td>
<td>DAEDALUS AERODROME BROOM WAY FAREHAM PO13 9YA – THE ERECTION OF A NEW 25 METRE HIGH RADAR TOWER, RADAR EQUIPMENT CABIN WITHIN A SECURE FENCED COMPOUND AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>6(7) P/16/0270/FP Pg 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Hind</td>
<td>18 HILL HEAD ROAD FAREHAM HANTS PO14 3JH – REPLACEMENT DRIVEWAY ACCESS</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>6(9) P/16/0422/CU Pg 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted a report by the Director of Planning and Regulation on the development management matter applications and miscellaneous matters including information on Planning Appeals. An Update Report was tabled at the meeting.

(1) P/16/0315/CU - 87 SOUTHAMPTON ROAD PARK GATE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 6AF

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:

Further comments have been received from the Councils’ Environmental Health Officer with regards to odour control:

The level of odour abatement is high and has been designed in accordance with the DEFRA guidelines on commercial kitchen extraction systems. The final point of extraction is 1 m above the ridge of the building and the proposed odour abatement is an electrostatic precipitator (ESP) with a secondary Ozone system (not just a generic system of activated carbon filters).

At this stage it does not appear that an end user has been identified (for example a fish and chips shops, Indian Takeaway) however in my professional opinion the supplier/installer are reputable and the system will be able to control odours from the more odorous end user.

In response to these comments the applicant’s agent has confirmed that it is their client’s attention 2to offer fish and chips, salads, jacket potatoes, hot and cold filled baguettes, ice cream and hot and cold drinks, in similar vein to their enterprise at ‘The Frying Fish’ in Shore Road, Warsash”.

Upon being proposed and seconded the Officer Recommendation to grant Planning Permission, subject to the funds for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) being paid upfront, and the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the funds for the TRO being paid upfront and the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(2) P/16/0405/FP - 1 GRASSYMEAD FAREHAM PO14 4SQ

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:

1. The applicant has provided the contribution of £176 towards the SRMP.
2. Details of bin and secure cycle storage have also been provided, therefore condition no. 3 is no longer required.

3. The proposed sub-division of the dwelling is subject to Policy DSP41: Sub-division of Residential Dwellings which states that the sub-division of a dwelling to create two smaller units will be permitted provided that:
   i. the proposal would not adversely affect the character of the area or have unacceptable environmental, amenity or traffic implications.
   ii. the resultant sub-divided units conform to the spaces standards and design requirements set out in Policy CS17 and the Design SPD.
   iii. appropriate outdoor amenity space, bin storage and parking provision is provided.

The report concludes that the proposed sub-division satisfies each of these criteria.

Upon being proposed and seconded, the officer recommendation to grant Planning Permission, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(3) P/15/1261/FP - LAND AT FURZE COURT WICKHAM ROAD FAREHAM PO16 7SH

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: A revised site plan has been provided showing private verandas already in place outside of several ground floor units in the existing Block C. The wording of draft condition 15 has been revised accordingly as has the approved plan number in condition 2.

In addition, Officers have been in contact with the applicants’ agent to resolve an issue concerning overlooking from windows in the southern and western elevations of Block D into adjacent units in the existing converted buildings. A revised set of drawings addressing this issue has been provided and draft condition 2 has been updated accordingly.

A further condition (16) has been added to deal with similar overlooking issues with regards windows in Block E.

Another condition (17) is recommended to ensure that, before development commences, the developer provides details of the proposed means of foul water disposal.

The revised recommendation is as follows:

Subject to the applicant / owner first entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council to secure:

a) A financial contribution towards the off-site provision of affordable housing;
b) A financial contribution towards the Solent Recreational Mitigation Project (SRMP);

PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall begin before the expiry of a period of three years from the date of this permission.  
   REASON: To allow a reasonable time period for work to start, to comply with Section 91 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990, and to enable the Council to review the position if a fresh application is made after that time.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents:

   a) Proposed location plan – drawing no. 15.2082.110 P1
   b) Proposed site plan – drawing no. 15.2082.101 P6
   c) Proposed floor plans Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.102 P6
   d) Proposed floor plans Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.103 P4
   e) Block D – Block E proposed context elevations – drawing no. 15.2082.104 P5
   f) Proposed elevations Block D – Proposed refuse stores – drawing no. 15.2082.105 P6
   g) Proposed context elevations Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.106 P5
   h) Proposed landscaping plan – drawing no. 15.2082.107 P5
   i) Blocks A, C & D plan extracts – drawing no. 15.2082.108 P1
   j) Typical apartment ventilation detail – Apartment 13 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.410 P2
   k) Typical apartment window detail – Apartment 13 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.411 P2
   l) Typical apartment ventilation detail – Apartment 15 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.412 P3
   m) Typical apartment detail – Apartment 15 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.413 P2
   n) Typical apartment detail – Apartment 08 Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.414 P3
   o) Typical apartment window detail – Apartment 08 Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.415 P1
   p) Domestic Ventilation and the Building Regulations Part F and L – by VentAxia
   q) Ventilation system specification – details of Sentinel Kinetic MVHR Range
   r) Ventilation system – details of MVHR – Lo-Carbon Sentinel Kinetic
   s) Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment prepared by Ecosupport Ltd

3. No development shall take place until details of all external materials to be used in the construction of the development, including all hard surfaced areas, have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To ensure a high quality design and appearance to the development.

4. No development shall take place until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The landscaping scheme shall include the following:

a) Details of all existing trees, shrubs and hedges to be retained;
b) Details of all new planting including species, planting sizes, planting distances, density and numbers;
c) Details of a specific planting schedule of native species reflecting the recommendation given in section 5.4 of the approved Phase I Ecological Assessment;
d) Details of hard landscaped areas within the external amenity space;
e) Details of future maintenance of all landscaped areas on the site.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented within the first planting season following the commencement of the development or as otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority and shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed schedule. Unless otherwise first agreed in writing any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from first planting, are removed, die or, in the opinion of the local planning authority, become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced, within the next available planting season, with others of the same species, size and number as originally approved.
REASON: To ensure a high quality design and appearance to the development; to ensure a high quality outdoor amenity space is provided for the occupants of the new apartments.

5. No development shall take place until details of any external lighting to be installed on the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: In the interest of the appearance of the development and to protect the living conditions of future residents.

6. No development shall take place until details of future maintenance of the ventilation system to be installed in the buildings hereby approved have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before any of the apartments hereby permitted are first occupied the approved ventilation system shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory living conditions of occupants of the development.

7. No development shall take place until a Site Setup Plan has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall provide details of where provision will be made on the site during construction for contractors parking, storage of plant and materials, site welfare facilities and any other temporary buildings. The plan will also identify measures to prevent mud and spoil being deposited on the public highway by vehicles leaving the site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: in the interests of highway safety and to protect the living conditions of existing residents.

8. Before any of the apartments hereby permitted are first occupied 156 parking spaces shall be laid out and made available for use on the site in accordance with the approved site plan (drawing no. 15.2082.101 P6). The parking spaces shall be retained at all times thereafter. No less than 57 of these parking spaces shall be provided on an un-allocated basis for the purposes of parking by residents living in the existing and hereby approved apartments on the site and visitors of those residents and shall remain so unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any parking spaces provided on an allocated basis shall be for use by residents living in the existing and hereby approved apartments only.
REASON: To ensure an appropriate level of parking provision.

9. Before any of the apartments hereby permitted are first occupied the refuse storage areas shown on the approved plans shall be provided and thereafter kept available for refuse storage at all times.
REASON: To ensure adequate bin storage facilities and to ensure a high quality design and appearance to the development.

10. Before any of the apartments hereby permitted are first occupied the cycle storage areas shown on the approved plans shall be provided and thereafter kept available for cycle storage at all times.
REASON: To promote alternative modes of transport to the motorcar.

11. Before any of the apartments, hereby permitted are first occupied the sound of attenuation measure identified on the approved plans and in the approved Noise Impact Assessment (Clarke Saunders Acoustics – revised 23rd March 2016) shall be fully installed. Any replacement windows or openings in the external elevations of the buildings hereby permitted shall be to the same glazing and acoustic specification as that identified in the approved plans and Noise Impact Assessment.
REASON: to ensure the satisfactory living conditions of occupants of the development.

12. Before any of the apartments hereby approved are first occupied, details of two batboxes to be erected at the site shall be submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority in writing. The details shall include the size, design and siting of the batboxes. The approved batboxes shall be installed before any of the permitted apartments are first occupied and shall thereafter be retained at all times.
REASON: To conserve and enhance biodiversity.

13. Before any of the apartments hereby permitted are first occupied three bat accessible ridge tiles shall be incorporated into the new pitched roof sections of the development hereby permitted.
REASON: To conserve and enhance biodiversity.

14. No work relating to the construction of any of the development hereby permitted shall take place before the hours of 0800 or after 1800 Monday to Friday, before the hours of 0800 or after 1300 Saturdays or at all on Sundays
or recognised public holidays, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

**REASON:** To protect the living conditions of existing residents.

15. Before any of the apartments hereby permitted are first occupied the external amenity area enclosed by the existing Blocks A, B & C and Block D hereby approved shall, with the exception of those private amenity spaces indicated as such on the approved site plan (drawing no. 15.2082.101.PE), be provided and retained for use by all residents living on the site.

**REASON:** To ensure a high quality outdoor amenity space is provided for the occupants of the new and existing apartments.

16. The ground and first floor windows proposed to be inserted into the southern elevation of Block E to serve the living/dining rooms for apartments 2 & 6 shall be glazed with obscure glass and be of a non-opening design and construction to a height of 1.7 meters above internal finished floor and shall thereafter be retained in that condition at all times.

**REASON:** To protect the privacy of occupants of nearby existing apartments.

17. No development shall take place until details of the proposed means of foul water disposal and an associated implementation timetable have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail and timetable.

**REASON:** To ensure the satisfactory disposal of waste water.

The Committee raised several questions over the amount of parking provision, the split between allocated and unallocated spaces, and the number of spaces that would actually be available to the residents. Member also sought further information with regards the current arrangement to allow employees of Hampshire County Council to park on the application site.

A motion, to defer the item to allow more time to investigate the amount of parking provision and interim parking arrangement with Hampshire County Council, was proposed and seconded, which was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

**RESOLVED** that the item be DEFERRED.

(4)  **P/16/0434/CU - 20 SILVER BIRCH AVENUE FAREHAM PO14 1SZ**

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

A motion was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, which was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

**RESOLVED** that PLANNING PERMISSION be REFUSED.

**Reasons for Refusal:**

The relocation of the garden wall would result in the loss of an area for planting which was an original design feature for Silver Birch Avenue, and
would also result in a tall boundary wall in very close proximity to the back edge of the public footway. The loss of this open area coupled with the siting of the wall so close to the footway would be harmful to the appearance of Silver Birch Avenue. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy CS17 of the adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy.

(5) P/16/0465/OA - 60A ALEXANDER GROVE FAREHAM PO16 0TX

The Committee received a deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

Upon being proposed and seconded, the Officer Recommendation to grant planning permission was voted on and CARRIED. (Voting: 7 in favour; 0 against; 1 abstention)

RESOLVED that PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(6) P/16/0128/CU - 27 STUBBINGTON GREEN FAREHAM PO14 2JY

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: - Additional Third Party Comments:

Two additional third party comments have been received. No further comments raised.

Upon being proposed and seconded, the officer recommendation subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED. (Voting: 7 in favour; 0 against; 1 abstention)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(7) P/16/0270/FP - DAEDALUS AERODROME BROOM WAY FAREHAM PO13 9YA

Councillor J E Butts declared a Personal Non-Pecuniary Interest in this item as he holds a private pilot’s licence and occasionally flies from the Daedalus Site. He remained in the room for the discussion of this item and took part in the vote.

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: - REPRESENTATIONS:

One further representation has been received since the publication of the main agenda. A letter of support has been received from Solent Microlights based at Daedalus. The support is with the proviso that it does not comprise the provision of a grass strip runway for occasional cross wind operations.

RECOMMENDATION:

PERMISSION subject to conditions as follows:
01 The development shall commence before the expiry of three years from the date of this decision notice.

REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
- DS08700AA100ASPT Issue 2, Sheet 2 of 5 (East and South Elevations)
- DS08700AA100ASPT Issue 2, Sheet 3 of 5 (Site Plan and Block Plan)
- DS08700AA100ASPT Issue 2, Sheet 4 of 5 (Shadow Trace Study)
- DS08700AA100ASPT Issue 2, Sheet 5 of 5 (North and West Elevations)
- DS08700AA101ASPT Issue 1 (Site Location Plan)
- DS08700AA102ASPT Issue 2 (Access Gates and Fence)

REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the development in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy.

03 No development shall take place until a Detailed UXO Threat Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Recommendation of the 1st Line Defence Express Preliminary UXO Risk Assessment (reference OPNN3119). The detailed UXO Threat Assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This assessment shall include any development specific measures or mitigation to be employed during the construction period in the event that UXO is present on site, all of which should be implemented in full and confirmed as completed in writing to Local Planning Authority before first transmission.

REASON: To ensure the safety of the site during construction and to ensure that the construction period does not have a detrimental impact upon the environment of future users of the site.

04 Should unidentified contamination be encountered during the works, construction should stop and the contamination investigated and an agreed scheme of remedial measures shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work recommences. The remediation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the first use of the radar and confirmed as completed in writing to satisfaction of Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the construction period does not have a detrimental impact upon the environment of future users of the site.

05 Prior to the first use of the radar hereby permitted the site access, gates and fencing as shown on drawing DS08700AA102ASPT Issue 2 in the area hatched black (to the south of the application site) on drawing DS08700AA101ASPT, Issue 1 “Site Location Plan” shall be provided and retained as such.

REASON: To ensure that the site can be accessed and will be secure in the interest of the operational airfield.
06 No development shall take place until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall provide for:

- Details of the parking arrangement for site vehicles and contractors
- the management and coordination of deliveries of plant and materials and the disposing of waste resulting from construction activities so as to avoid undue interference with the operation of the public highway, particularly during the Monday to Friday AM peak (08:00 to 09:00) and PM peak (16:30 to 18:00) periods.
- areas for loading and unloading;
- areas for the storage of plant and materials;
- security hoarding position and any public viewing platforms (if necessary);
- site office location;
- construction

A further verbal update was provided by the Head of Development Management in respect of proposed Condition 3. The Head of Development Management explained that discussions were still ongoing between Planning Officers and the applicants over the precise wording of this condition. Should Member resolve to grant planning permission, the Head of Development Management requested that that authority be delegated to him to agree the detailed wording of proposed Condition 3 with the applicant.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the Update Report, and the detailed wording of Condition 3 being agreed between Officers and the applicants, was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the Update Report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(8) P/16/0301/FP - 65 OLD STREET FAREHAM PO14 3HQ

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 7 in favour; 1 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(9) P/16/0422/CU - 18 HILL HEAD ROAD FAREHAM HAMPSHIRE PO14 3JH

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information: - An additional 3 objections have been received. No additional issues have been raised.
The Committee was informed that Condition 5, set out in page 64 of the report, is no longer required as the information has been provided.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report but excluding Condition 5, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 7 in favour; 1 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report but excluding condition 5, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(10) Planning Appeals

The Committee noted the information in the report.

(11) UPDATE REPORT

The Update Report was tabled at the meeting and considered with the relevant agenda item.

(The meeting started at 2.30 pm and ended at 5.50 pm).
Minutes of the Planning Committee
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Wednesday, 22 June 2016
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:
Councillor N J Walker (Chairman)
Councillor A Mandry (Vice-Chairman)


Also Present: 
1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies of absence.

2. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 25 May 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

3. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman’s announcements.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In accordance with Standing Orders and the Council’s Code of Conduct the following members declared an interest in the applications referred to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Application Number/Site</th>
<th>Minute Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ford, JP</td>
<td>P/16/0359/FP 20 Church Road Warsash Southampton SO31 9GD</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ford, JP</td>
<td>P/15/1023/FP 20 Church Road Warsash Southampton SO31 9GD</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Cartwright</td>
<td>P/16/0015/FP Tide Mark Swanwick Shore Road Swanwick SO31 7EF</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors Ford, JP, Cartwright and Evans</td>
<td>P/16/0243/OA Egmont Nurseries Brook Avenue Warsash SO31 9HN</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **DEPUTATIONS**

The Committee received a deputation from the following in respect of the applications indicated and were thanked accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Spokesperson representing the persons listed</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Supporting or Opposing the Application</th>
<th>Minute No/ Application No/Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZONE 1 – 2.30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 CHURCH ROAD WARSAH SOUTHAMPTON SO31 9GD – ERECTION OF 4 DETACHED DWELLINGS, TOGETHER WITH</td>
<td>Opposing</td>
<td>6(1) P/16/0359/FP Pg 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Supporting/Opposing</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Pickburn</td>
<td>-Ditto-</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND NEW ACCESS FROM SANDYCROFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C Gould (Agent)</td>
<td>-Ditto- Supporting</td>
<td>EGMONT NURSERIES BROOK AVENUE WARSASH FAREHAM SO31 9HN – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF EIGHT DETACHED HOUSES AND CREATION OF Paddock (OUTLINE APPLICATION WILL ALL MATTERS RESERVED)</td>
<td>6(4) P/16/0243/OA Pg 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Airey (Agent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE NAVIGATOR – LAND ADJACENT- SWANWICK LANE LOWER SWANWICK SO31 7EB – 37 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING FOR EXISTING PLAY AREA – RESERVED MATTERS IN RELATION TO OUTLINE APPLICATION, P13/1121/OA: APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT &amp; SCALE</td>
<td>6(5) P16/0398/RM Pg 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C Gould (Agent)</td>
<td>-DITTO- Supporting</td>
<td>更具详细论述。</td>
<td>6(5) P16/0398/RM Pg 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs C Gould (Agent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAND AT FURZE COURT WICKHAM ROAD FAREHAM</td>
<td>6(6) P/15/1261/FP Pg 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ZONE 2 – 4.00pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Supporting/Opposing</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted a report by the Director of Planning and Regulation on the development management matter applications and miscellaneous matters including information on Planning Appeals. An Update Report was tabled at the meeting.

(1) P/16/0359/FP - 20 CHURCH ROAD, WARSASH, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 9GD

Councillor Ford declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as he lives close to the application site and the applicant and several of the deputees are known to him. He left the room during the consideration of the item and took no part in the vote.

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:-

Condition 08 is amended as follows:

No development shall take place above damp proof course (dpc) level on any new dwelling hereby permitted until a detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme identifying all existing trees, shrubs and hedges to be retained (including a minimum height at which they will be retained but not less than their current height, which should be specified on the landscaping scheme) together with the species, planting sizes, planting distances, density and numbers of any new planting and including new boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping scheme shall include provisions for the implementation of the new hard and soft landscaping across the whole site and provisions for future maintenance of all planting (both proposed and retained), including all areas to be grass seeded and turfed. The maintenance plan should include details of the actions to be taken should any of the landscaping (existing or proposed) be removed, damaged or die. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed planting scheme and implementation plan.

REASON: In order to secure the satisfactory appearance of the development and in the interests of the amenities of neighbouring properties.
The Officer also provided a verbal update to page 25 of the report on Condition 4 which should read “No development shall take place, including site clearance and preparatory work, until the protective fencing along the western and southern boundaries”, and Condition 7 which should read “No development shall take place above damp proof course (dpc) on any building until details of all external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved by the local planning authority.”

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report, update report and officer verbal update, was voted on and CARRIED.  
(Voting: 4 in favour; 4 against with the Chairman having the deciding vote)

RESOLVED that subject to the conditions in the report, the update report and the Officer verbal update, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(2)  P/15/1023/FP - 20 CHURCH ROAD, WARSASH, FAREHAM, SO31 9GD

Councillor Ford, JP declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this item as he lives close to the application site and the applicant is known to him. He left the room for the consideration of this item and took no part in the vote.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.  
(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(3)  P/16/0015/FP - TIDE MARK, SWANWICK SHORE ROAD, SWANWICK, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 7EF

Councillor Cartwright declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as the applicant is known to him.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:

*Following the recent revisions to the proposals, three further comments have been received from residents who had already objected to the application. The objectors reiterated their concerns and two raised additional points regarding the suitability of the property to accommodate a basement.*

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.  
(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)
RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(4) P/16/0243/OA - EGMONT NURSERIES, BROOK AVENUE, WARSASH, FAREHAM, SO31 9HN

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

Councillors Cartwright, Evans and Ford, JP declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as the applicant is known to them.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:-

Two further emails have been received from residents who had already commented on the application.

One of these residents raises concerns over the cumulative effect of any housing development which may take place at the Rosemary Nursery site (on the eastern side of Brook Lane) as well as other sites in Warsash.

The other resident expresses a change of view and would like to withdraw their previous stated support for the application and instead raise an objection. The concerns expressed relate to development of other sites in Brook Avenue in a similar manner.

ECOLOGY

The Council’s ecologist has raised concerns over the potential loss of habitat for Dormice, a European Protected Species.

The illustrative site layout shows the removal of a long stretch of hedgerow along the site frontage with Brook Avenue. Whilst it is appreciated that the application is in outline form only and the site layout is purely illustrative, removal of at least some of the hedgerow seems likely in order to facilitate vehicular access. In addition the ecological enhancement measures proposed involve reinforcement planning adjacent the existing boundary hedgerows elsewhere on the site.

It should be demonstrated that both removal of the frontage hedgerow and reinforcement planting elsewhere would not disturb Dormice during this activity as it is considered there is a reasonable likelihood they would be present and affected by the development. At present insufficient information has been provided to this effect.

Had the application been found to be acceptable in all other regards the applicant would have been invited to provide further information so that the LPA would then be in a position to consider if Dormice are affected – with consideration to timing and methodology and through clarification that the Brook Avenue hedge is or is not to be retained. The LPA would also have been in a position to consider the likelihood of the development being granted a licence by Natural England for disturbance or removal of Dormice habitat.
The following revised recommendation takes account of this issue and recommends that a further reason for refusal be included concerning the insufficient information provided by the applicant to address the above ecology concerns.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE:

The development would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS6, CS14, CS17 and CS18 of the Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DSP6, DSP13 and DSP15 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan and is unacceptable in that:

(a) the proposal represents development outside the defined urban settlement boundary for which there is no justification or overriding need. Furthermore development of this site by the erection of eight detached dwellings would be harmful to the character of this countryside location;

(b) in the absence of a financial contribution or a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory mitigation of the ‘in combination’ effects that the proposed increase in residential units on the site would cause through increased recreational disturbance on the Solent Coastal Special Protection Areas;

(c) in the absence of a financial contribution or a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal would fail to contribute to the off-site provision of affordable housing in the Borough;

(d) insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that Dormice, a protected species, and their habitat would be protected and enhanced during the development.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to refuse planning permission, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that PLANNING PERMISSION be REFUSED.

Reasons for Refusal:

The development would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS6, CS14, CS17 and CS18 of the Adopted Fareham Borough Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DSP6, DSP13 and DSP15 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan and is unacceptable in that:

(a) the proposal represents development outside the defined urban settlement boundary for which there is no justification or overriding need. Furthermore development of this site by the erection of eight detached dwellings would be harmful to the character of this countryside location;

(b) in the absence of a financial contribution or a legal agreement to secure such, the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory mitigation of the ‘in combination’ effects that the proposed increase in residential units on the site
would cause through increased recreational disturbance on the Solent Coastal
Special Protection Areas;

c) in the absence of a financial contribution or a legal agreement to secure
such, the proposal would fail to contribute to the off-site provision of affordable
housing in the Borough;

d) insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that Dormice, a
protected species, and their habitat would be protected and enhanced during
the development.

(5)  P/16/0398/RM - THE NAVIGATOR - LAND ADJACENT - SWANWICK
LANE, LOWER SWANWICK, SO31 7EB

The Committee received the deputations referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained
the following information:- Suggested additional condition to secure play area
parking spaces:

Prior to the play area car parking being first brought into use in accordance
with Condition 22 of the outline planning permission (P/13/1121/OA), details of
the measures of how the management company will ensure the play area car
parking is to be utilised only for those visiting the play area during daylight
hours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning
authority. The agreed measures shall be imposed at all times, unless
otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To ensure the playing area parking spaces are available for use by
the public.

An archaeological evaluation has been submitted and Hampshire County
Council Archaeologist has confirmed that condition 5 of the outline planning
permission has been discharged in full.

Full list of plans in relation to Condition 1:

Location plan – P1234.07;
Topo survey – 05SW01 Sheet 1.pdf;
Topo survey – 05SW01 Sheet 2.pdf;
Planning layout – P1234.01 Rev G;
Materials layout – P1234.02 Rev D;
Building height layout – P1324.03 Rev D;
Tenure layout – P1234.02 Rev D;
Parking plan – P1234.05 Rev D;
Refuse layout – P1234.06 Rev D;
Play area parking plan – P1234.08 9 (where there is a difference between the
Play Area parking Plan and any other approved plans, the former shall prevail
upon implementation);
Street scenes – P1234.SS.01 Rev A;
Street scenes – P1234.SS.02 Rev A;
Block A ground floor plan (Plots 1–10) – P1234.BLKA.01 Rev A;
Block A first floor plan (plots 1-10) – P1234.BLKA.02 Rev B;
Block A second floor plan (plots 1-10) – P1234.BLKA.03 Rev B;
Block A roof plan (plots 1-10) – P1234/BLKA.04 rev B;
Block A front elevation (plots 1-10) – P1234.BLKA.05 rev A;
Block A side elevation (plots 1-10) – P1234/BLKA.06 rev B;
Block A rear elevation (plots 1-10) – P1234.BLKA.07 rev B;
Block A side elevation (plots 1-10) – P1234.BLKA.08;
P1234.2BF.01;
P1234.2BF.02;
P1234.2BM.01;
P1234.2BM.02;
P1234.H06.01;
P1234.H06.02;
P1234.H08.01;
P1234.H11.01;
P1234.H11.02;
P1234.H12.01;
P1234.H12.02;
P1234.H13.01;
P1234.H13.02;
P1234.H15.01;
P1234.H15.02;
P1234.H15.03;
P1234.H15.04;
P1234.H17.01;
P1234.H17.02;
P1234.S01.01;
P1234.S02.01;
P1234.GAR.01 rev A;
P1234.GAR.02;
P1234.GAR.03 rev A;
P1234.GAR.05 rev A;
P1234.GAR.07;
Carport and storage plans and elevations (plots 16, 17 & 35) – P1234.GAR.08;
Carport and storage plans and elevations (plots 27, 36 & 37) – P1234.GAR.09;
Double carport and storage plans and elevations (plots 21, 22, 32 & 33) – P1234.GAR.10;
Engineering layout – 5090-02-01 Sheet 1 Rev A;
Engineering layout – 5090-02-02 Sheet 2 Rev A;
Longitudinal sections – 5090-03;
Highway construction details – 5090-05;
On-street lighting layout – 5090-20 Rev A;
Swept path analysis for plots 18 to 20 – 5090-21;
Proposed shared surface refuse track – 5090-SK01 Rev A;
Soft landscape proposals – BELL20431 11 Rev C Sheet 1;
Soft landscape proposals – BELL20431 11 Rev C Sheet 2;
Hard landscape proposals – BELL20431 12 Rev C Sheet 1; and

Notes for information:

For the avoidance of doubt the following conditions require discharging in relation to the outline planning permission:
Condition 4 (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) – Affordable Housing;
Condition 6 – contamination;
Condition 9 – Tree protection (in part);
Condition 17 – Access/off site highways works (timetable);
Condition 18 – Signage.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant approval of the reserved matters, subject to the conditions in the report, was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 8 in favour; 1 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report, the reserved matters be APPROVED.

(6) P/15/1261/FP - LAND AT FURZE COURT, WICKHAM ROAD, FAREHAM, PO16 7SH

The Committee received the deputation referred to in Minute 5 above.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:- Updated drawings have been provided to show the changes to the proposed parking layout. Accordingly the wording of draft condition 2 has been revised to take account of these drawings as follows:

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents:

a) Proposed location plan – drawing no. 15.2082.110 P1
b) Proposed site plan – drawing no. 15.2082.101 P7
c) Proposed floor plans Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.102 P7
d) Proposed floor plans Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.103 P5
e) Block D – Block E proposed elevations – drawing no. 15.2082.104 P6
f) Proposed elevations Block D – Proposed refuse stores – drawing no. 15.2082.105 P7
g) Proposed context elevations Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.106 P6
h) Proposed landscaping plan – drawing no 15.2082.107 P6
i) Blocks A, C & D plan extracts – drawing no. 15.2082.108 P2
j) Typical apartment ventilation detail – Apartment 13 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.410 P3
k) Typical apartment window detail – Apartment 13 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.411 P2
l) Typical apartment ventilation detail – Apartment 15 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.412 P4
m) Typical apartment detail – Apartment 15 Block D – drawing no. 15.2082.413 P2
n) Typical apartment detail – Apartment 08 Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.414 P4
o) Typical apartment window detail – Apartment 08 Block E – drawing no. 15.2082.415 P1
p) Domestic Ventilation and the Building Regulations Part F and L – by VentAxia
q) Ventilation system specification - details of Sentinel Kinetic MVHR Range
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Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the report and update report, was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 8 in favour; 0 against and 1 abstention)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report and update report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(7) P/16/0319/LB - UPLANDS LODGE, 67 PARK LANE, FAREHAM, PO16 7HJ

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:

Further suggested conditions:

1. Prior to construction of the wall and railings hereby approved on the eastern boundary of the property details of their design and the materials to be used in their construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
   REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the development; to safeguard the architectural and historic interests of this Grade II listed building.

2. Before the new external doors hereby approved are fitted to the building, drawings showing their detailed design, including the sections of timber to be used in their construction, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
   REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the development; to safeguard the architectural and historic interests of this Grade II listed building.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant listed building consent, subject to the conditions in the report and update report, was voted on and CARRIED.
(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report and the update report, LISTED BUILDING CONSENT be granted.

(8) P/16/0453/FP - UPLANDS LODGE, 67 PARK LANE, FAREHAM, PO16 7HJ

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Update Report which contained the following information:

Further suggested conditions:
1. Prior to construction of the wall and railings hereby approved on the eastern boundary of the property details of their design and the materials to be used in their construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the development; to safeguard the architectural and historic interests of this Grade II listed building.

2. Before the new external doors hereby approved are fitted to the building, drawings showing their detailed design, including the sections of timber to be used in their construction, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the development; to safeguard the architectural and historic interests of this Grade II listed building.

Upon being proposed and seconded the officer recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions in the report and update report, was voted on and CARRIED.

(Voting: 9 in favour; 0 against)

RESOLVED that, subject to the conditions in the report and update report, PLANNING PERMISSION be granted.

(9) Planning Appeals

The Committee noted the information in the report.

(10) UPDATE REPORT

The Update Report was tabled at the meeting and considered with the relevant agenda item.

7. TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

The Committee considered the confirmation of the following Fareham Tree Preservation Order(s), which had been made under delegated powers and to which no formal objection had been received.

Fareham Tree Preservation Order No.723 – 3&4 The Brackens and 8 Coomdale, Locks Heath.

Order served on 12 April for which there were no objections.

RESOLVED that Fareham Tree Preservation Order No 723 be confirmed and made served.

Fareham Tree Preservation Order No. 725 – Strawberry Hill, Turnstones, Fenmead, Drift House, Hamble Edge, Ferry Lane House and Land to the South East, Brook Lane, Warsash.

Order served on 6 May 2016 for which there were no objections.
RESOLVED that Fareham Tree Preservation Order No 725 be confirmed and made served.

**Tree Preservation Order Revoked.**

The Committee considered the following Tree Preservation Order which seeks to revoke the following old Tree Preservation Order as it falls under Hampshire County Council Ownership.

**Fareham Tree Preservation Order 484 – Crofton School, Gosport Road, Stubbington, Fareham.**

RESOLVED that Fareham Tree Preservation Order No 484 be revoked.

**Tree Preservation Orders Served.**

The following Tree Preservation Orders have been made this month.

Fareham Borough Council Laureli, Crossways, Brambles, Godreich and Camrose, Holly Hill Lane, Sarisbury Tree Preservation Order (No. 644) 2016.

Fareham Borough Council Glen Acres and land south of Inwood House, Holly Hill Lane, Sarisbury Tree Preservation Order (No.708) 2016.

Fareham Borough Council September Lodge, Holly Hill Lane, Sarisbury Tree Preservation Order (No. 709) 2016.

Fareham Borough Council Foxlease, Holly Hill Lane, Sarisbury Tree Preservation Order (No. 710) 2016.

(The meeting started at 2.30 pm and ended at 4.32 pm).
Minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Monday, 27 June 2016
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:

Councillor Miss T G Harper (Chairman)

Councillor P J Davies (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: F Birkett, J E Butts, S Cunningham, Mrs T L Ellis and S D Martin

Also Present:
1. **APOLOGIES**

An apology of absence was received from Councillor Mrs M Brady.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that:-

(a) the minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee held on the 14 March 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record; and

(b) the minutes from the Audit and Governance Standards Sub-Committee held on the 13 April 2016 be received.

3. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman’s announcements made at this meeting.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES OF ADVICE OR DIRECTIONS**

In accordance with the Standing Orders and the Council’s Code of Conduct, Councillor S D Martin, declared a non-pecuniary interest for minute item 8 – External Auditors Audit Plan 2015/16 and fee 2016/17 as he works alongside Ernst and Young through his job.

5. **DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations made at this meeting.

**MATTERS CONSIDERED FOR CONFIRMATION**

6. **FRAUD & CORRUPTION SANCTIONS AND REDRESS POLICY & ANTI-FRAUD POLICY**

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Finance and Resources on revisions that have been made to the Councils Fraud & Corruption Sanctions and Redress Policy & Anti-Fraud Policy.

The Head of Finance and Audit addressed the Committee to inform them that the recommendation in the report is incorrect and should read;

*That the Committee:*

(a) approve the revised Fraud and Corruption Sanctions and Redress Policy as set out in Appendix A of the report; and

(b) recommend to Council the adoption of the revised Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy.
RESOLVED that the Committee:-

(a) approve the revised Fraud and Corruption Sanctions and Redress Policy as set out in Appendix A of the report; and

(b) recommend to Council the adoption of the revised Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy.

**DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

7. TERMS OF REFERENCE - VERBAL REPORT

The Committee received a verbal report from the Head of Finance and Audit on the Audit and Governance Committees Terms of Reference and an overview of the Committee’s responsibilities throughout the municipal year.

RESOLVED that the Committee note the verbal report.

8. EXTERNAL AUDITORS AUDIT PLAN 2015/16 AND FEE 2016/17

Councillor S D Martin, declared a non-pecuniary interest as he works alongside Ernst and Young through his job.

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Finance and Resources on the External Auditors Audit Plan 2015/16 and Fee 2016/17.

RESOLVED that the Committee approve:-

(a) the External Auditors Audit Plan 2015/16, as set out in Appendix A of the report; and

(b) the External Auditors proposed fees, as set out in Appendix B of the report.

9. COUNTER FRAUD PROGRESS

The Committee considered a progress report by the Head of Finance and Audit on Counter Fraud arrangements.

RESOLVED that the Committee;

a) note the content of the report; and

b) approve the recommendation that the report be changed to an annual report.

10. HEAD OF AUDIT’S ANNUAL OPINION 2015/16

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Finance and Audit containing the Head of Audit’s Annual Opinion for 2015/16.
There was some discussion on the measure concerning the number of final reports finalised at the time of the annual opinion, as in Table 3, page 76. The Head of Finance and Audit confirmed that this is something that they are working on to provide more consistency.

RESOLVED that the Committee note the content of the report.

11. **ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2015/16**

The Committee received a report by the Director of Finance and Resources on the Annual Governance Statement for 2015/16.

RESOLVED that the Annual Governance Statement 2015/16, as set out in Appendix C of the report, be approved.

12. **QUARTERLY AUDIT REPORTS**

The Committee received a progress report by the Head of Finance and Audit which gave an update on the work of the internal audit team.

The Head of Finance and Audit also provided a brief presentation on results of the Ethics Audit work in 2015/16.

RESOLVED that the Committee note the progress and findings that have arisen from the Internal Audit work.

13. **AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance and Audit on the Audit and Governance Committee Work Programme.

RESOLVED that the Audit and Governance Committee Work Programme, be approved.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.35 pm).
Minutes of the Appeals Committee
(to be confirmed at the next meeting)

Date: Wednesday, 13 July 2016
Venue: Collingwood Room - Civic Offices

PRESENT:
Councillor G Fazackarley (Chairman)
Councillor K A Barton (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors: Mrs L E Clubley, J M Englefield and C J Wood

Also Present: Councillor D L Steadman
1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies given for this meeting.

2. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Chairman’s announcements received at this meeting.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES OF ADVICE OR DIRECTIONS**

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

4. **DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations made at this meeting.

5. **PRESENTATION ON THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a presentation from the Head of Democratic Services and the Head of Personnel and ICT on the role and responsibilities of the Appeals Committee. The presentation included details of the Purpose and Functions of the Committee, Points to Note, What Happens if an Appeals Committee is called and a Summary.

RESOLVED that:

(a) the officers be thanked for their presentation; and

(b) it be noted that details of the presentation would be made available to all members of the Committee, including deputies.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 6.21 pm).
Subject: Funtley Community Governance Review

Report of: Head of Democratic Services

SUMMARY

On 30 July 2015 Fareham Borough Council agreed to undertake a Community Governance Review in response to a petition signed by residents of Funtley, which requested that a specific area be designated as a parished area and that a Parish Council be established.

The terms of reference for the Review were published on the 3 August 2015 along with a timetable setting out key dates. These key dates included the first phase consultation which ran from 21 September 2015 to 14 December 2015 and a Community Action Team meeting held in Funtley on 24 November 2015. Analysis of the initial consultation period was published along with draft recommendations for further comments to be considered before a final decision being made in respect of the creation of a Parish Council. The second phase consultation was extended at the request of Funtley Village Society, running between 23 May and 20 June 2016.

This report considers the responses to the first and second stages of public consultation carried out as part of the review, having regard to the law and the guidance on Community Governance Reviews, as outlined in the Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (as amended) issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

(a) notes the results of the consultations and considers the representations received;

(b) considers the contents of this report and resolves to approve one of the following options:

i. make no change to the existing governance arrangements;

ii. establish a parish and form a Parish Council; or

iii. establish a parish and form a Parish Meeting.
Introduction and background

1. At its meeting on 30 July 2015, Council agreed both the terms of reference and a timetable for a Community Governance Review for Funtley, following the receipt of a valid Petition.

2. The first stage of the review involved consultation. It was designed to allow the Council to understand the views of residents, businesses and others who may be affected regarding the potential formation of a Parish Council and was neither a vote nor a referendum. Local government electors within the area identified in the petition were invited to take part. Appendix A shows the original petition leaflet which included a proposed boundary for Funtley Parish Council.

In response to the petition, a consultation questionnaire was designed to capture the following:

- The current community governance arrangements for the area;
- Whether a Parish Council should be created;
- The benefits and disadvantages the creation of a Parish Council would bring to the community; and
- Any other comments or alternative options respondents wish the Council to consider.

3. A copy of the questionnaire is attached at Appendix B to this report for Members’ information.

4. Questionnaires were personally addressed to each elector in the area defined by the petition and delivered to each of the registered electors, businesses and community organisations. This amounted to 565 questionnaires being distributed.

5. An option was also available for residents to complete the questionnaire online via the council’s website.

6. In addition, a Community Action Team public meeting was held at Funtley Social Club on 24 November 2015 at which the Executive Leader gave a presentation to the 20 residents present and answered questions. A copy of the minutes from the meeting is attached at Appendix C to this report and these minutes were circulated to 292 properties in Funtley following the meeting.

7. The deadline for receipt of all completed questionnaires was 14 December 2015.

8. The Council’s preferred option, following the first consultation, was for arrangements to stay the same. This formed the basis of the second phase consultation which commenced on 23 May, with an original close date of the 6 June 2016. At the request of the Funtley Village Society, this phase was extended by two weeks until the 20 June 2016.

9. In the course of considering the views of respondents and formulating recommendations for the future governance arrangements of the area, the
Council should be aware of the duties with regard to the Council and the review under sections 93 and 100 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.

Criteria for undertaking a Community Governance Review

10. Under section 93 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the 2007 Act”), the Council must comply with various duties when undertaking a community governance review, as set out below:

   a. When reviewing community governance arrangements principal councils may wish to take into account a number of factors to help inform their judgement against the statutory criteria which includes the impact on community cohesion of community governance arrangements;

      i. Arrangements should reflect, and be sufficiently representative of, people living across a whole community and not just a discrete cross section or small part of it;

      ii. It will be difficult to think of a situation in which a principal council could make a decision to create a parish and a Parish Council which reflects community identities and interests in the area and, at the same time, threatens community cohesion; and

      iii. Principal councils should be able to decline to set up such community governance arrangements where they judge that, to do so, would not be in the interests of either the local community or surrounding communities and where the effect would be likely to damage community cohesion.

   b. Principal councils must have regard to the need to secure that community governance within the area under review reflects the identity and interests of the community in that area and is effective and convenient.

   c. Size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish should be considered.

   d. The Council must take into account any other arrangements, apart from those relating to parishes and their institutions, that have already been made, or that could be made for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review.

   e. The Council must take into account any representations received in connection with the review.

11. Under Section 100 of the 2007 Act, the Council must have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State. The guidance refers to a desire to help people create cohesive and economically vibrant local communities and states that an
12. The guidance does stress that Parish Councils are an established and valued form of neighbourhood democracy and management in rural areas that increasingly have a role to play in urban areas and generally have an important role to play in the development of their communities. The need for community cohesion is also stressed along with the government’s aim for communities to be fulfilling their own potential and overcoming their own difficulties. The value which is placed on these councils is also highlighted in the fact that the guidance states that the government expects to see the creation of parishes where clear and sustained local support is shown.

13. The guidance also states that the Council must have regard to the need to secure community governance within the area under review reflects the identities of the community in the area and is effective and convenient.

14. Guidance was published in updated form by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in 2010. Aimed largely at principal authorities, it offers advice about undertaking a review and implementing its recommendations.

15. Section 94 of the 2007 Act places principal councils who resolve to create a parish under a duty to recommend that a parish should have a council in parishes that have 1,000 electors or more. In parishes with 151-999 electors, as applies to the Funtley area which had 565 local government electors at the time the petition was submitted, the principal Council may recommend the creation of either a Parish Council or a parish meeting.

Analysis of responses to consultations

16. Of the 565 questionnaires delivered to registered electors as part of the first phase consultation, 230 responses were received which equates to a 41% return. The following diagram illustrates the proportion of residents who responded to the consultation and if they were in favour of a Parish Council. It also shows the 59% of residents who did not express an opinion:

![Resident involvement in phase one consultation diagram]

- In favour of a Parish: 171
- Make no changes: 59
- Did not take part: 335

Each person represents approximately 2% of Funtley’s population
17. Of the total responses, 74.5% were in favour of forming a Parish Council. This equates to 30% of the population of Funtley as a whole.

18. Comments were encouraged as part of the response to enable the Council to have a greater understanding of the views of residents both in relation to the perceived benefits and disadvantages of any proposal to change.

19. Of those expressing their support, 67% either did not comment, or gave no specific examples of how a Parish Council would achieve this, or what issues respondents would like more influence over.

20. The remaining comments focussed on the following themes:
   - Planning
   - Infrastructure
   - Facilities/Leisure
   - Community Cohesion

21. Comments from the respondents who did not want to make any changes to the current arrangements tended to focus on:
   - Concerns over having to pay a precept
   - Potential costs of the Parish Council
   - Questioning the difference it would make to the local community
   - The extra bureaucracy it could create

22. The response rate for the second phase consultation was low at 7.4%. Of those that responded 61% (32 responders) said they were against the Council’s preferred option to make no changes to the current arrangements. This is equal to 5.6% of the population of Funtley expressing their dissatisfaction with the Council’s recommendation to make no changes to the current arrangements. The majority of the supporting comments focused on the conclusions the Council had drawn from the results of the first consultation and how these were presented.

23. In total, 39% (20 responders) said that they supported the Council’s preferred option to keep things as they are. The comments they made in support of this covered similar themes to those that emerged in the first phase consultation. All of the comments from both consultations can be found in Appendix D.

Considerations for the Council if minded to recommend the creation of a Parish Council, including the role of a Parish Council

The Role of a Parish Council

24. Elected democratically by local electors within the boundaries set, Parish Councils, which can vary in size, are the most local tier of Government in England. They have two main roles: community representation and local
administration and they play an important part in the development of local communities.

25. A chairman is elected annually and parish meetings held which are open to all local residents. Accounts should be maintained and formal records of meetings and associated documentation.

26. Parish Councils raise funds by way of a precept and they may raise funds from other sources, including accepting gifts or via grant-making bodies or Government initiatives.

27. Parish Councils have the power to obtain and supply land for allotments if local demand cannot be met.

28. A Parish Council with income and expenditure under £25,000 is subject to the requirements of the Transparency Code for Smaller Authorities.

29. The National Association of Local Councillors (NALC) represents the interests of 9,000 local councils across the country and works to provide information and to support the work of Parish Councils. The booklet “All About Local Councils” produced by NALC is included at Appendix H and includes case studies showing the positive work achieved by Parish Councils to enrich the well-being of local communities.

30. Co-opted Members are appointed to Parish Councils in instances where there is a shortage of candidates at election time.

**Size of a Parish Council**

31. In terms of numbers of Councillors on a Parish Council, section 16(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 establishes five councillors as the legal minimum size of a Parish Council but it does not make any link between the number of electors and the size of the council. In practice, there is a wide variation of council size between Parish Councils. Research has found that the typical Parish Council representing between 501 and 2500 electors had 6 to 12 councillors and this increased in line with the population. The size of the Funtley electorate would indicate a number towards the lower end of the scale would be appropriate.

32. Parish Councils can vary widely both in terms of the populations they represent and the functions they perform. Some have a limited, local role whilst others are more active, carrying out activities similar to that of a smaller borough council. The output of work is largely dependent on available budgets from the amount of precept charged alongside external funding streams.

**Financial implications for local residents**

33. In order to fund their activities, Parish Councillors can instruct the billing authority (Fareham Borough Council) to collect extra money on their behalf that is added to the council tax bill. This is known as a “local precept” and is paid by all households within the designated area, irrespective of whether they were in favour of the creation of the council or not. To give an example, Funtley Village
Society has proposed a precept of 77p a week (£40.04 per year) for a Band D property; this is in addition to the council tax paid by other residents in the Borough and a 28.5% increase on Fareham’s part of the bill (this does not include the Hampshire County Council, Police & Crime Commissioner or Hampshire Fire & Rescue element to the bill). This precept is charged even if the services provided are the same as currently delivered.

34. It should be noted that whilst a newly formed Parish Council is able to set and charge a precept, it does not mean that residents’ Council Tax bills which are paid to Fareham Borough Council would be reduced. Every council tax payer will be required to pay the precept alongside their Council Tax to Fareham Borough Council, regardless of the services provided. The only exceptions would be those who are exempt, for example, in receipt of housing benefit or single people would continue to receive a 25% reduction in their payment.

35. One of the suggestions from the Funtley Village Society is that a Parish Council may be able to replace and update the children’s play area. The Leisure Services team estimate this would be a one off cost of approximately £70,000 with on-going maintenance costs of £1,640 per year. Taking into account the number of properties in the designated area, the proposed precept would collect £12,832.82 a year for the Parish Council. Therefore in order for a Parish Council to undertake a project of this nature, they may also need to rely on external funding sources to supplement the capital budget for the works. All grant applications are subject to a successful bidding process.

36. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure. Amendments made to The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2013) now allow the levy to be used to fund a very broad range of facilities such as play areas, parks and green spaces, cultural and sporting facilities, academies, free schools, police stations and other community safety facilities.

37. Section 59A of the regulations states that 15% of CIL payments received by the charging authority are passed directly to Parish Councils (where a neighbourhood plan does not exist). This is applicable only where developments are taking place wholly within the parish area. Adjacent or neighbouring sites will not automatically generate a CIL receipt for the parish (as those developments are outside of the proposed parish area).

38. If a Parish Council forms a Neighbourhood Plan, having gone through the due process and the Planning Authority having subsequently approved the Neighbourhood Plan, then CIL contributions for developments taking place wholly within the parish area would rise to 25%. This does not apply to developments taking place outside the parish boundary, the contributions for which can be used for Borough wide infrastructure.

39. Once established, a Parish Council can also apply for funding, by way of grants, and it can seek to borrow. Whilst Council Tax increases are currently capped by the Government, there are no such restrictions on Parish Council precepts which can be raised or lowered by a simple majority vote of the Parish Council, following consultation.
40. In addition to using precept funding for local improvements, monies collected from the precept are often used to fund a Parish Clerk. The Clerk to the Council is the Proper Officer of the Council and as such is under a statutory duty to carry out all the functions, and in particular to serve or issue all the notifications required by law. The Clerk is responsible for ensuring that the instructions of the Council in connection with its function as a Local Authority are carried out. The Clerk is expected to advise the Council on, and assist in the formation of, overall policies to be followed in respect of the Authority's activities and in particular to produce all the information required for making effective decisions and to implement constructively all decisions. The person appointed is accountable to the Council for the effective management of all its resources and will report to them as and when required. The Clerk can also be the Responsible Financial Officer and responsible for all financial records of the Council and the careful administration of its finances.

41. The salary for an employed part-time Parish Clerk would need to be funded from the precept. Pay Scales for Parish Clerks, agreed by the National Joint Council for Local Government (NJC) and the National Association for Local Councils (NALC) are published by the Society of Local Council Clerks and indicate that for part-time clerks the pay ranges from £8.61 to £12.32 per hour. A current advert\(^1\) for a Clerk to Cameley Parish Council (including the Responsible Finance Officer role) is being advertised at between £10.30 - £12.04 per hour, dependent on experience and qualifications. This post is for 7 hours per week.

42. The population of Cameley, Somerset is approximate 1,292. It is difficult to gauge how the level of population, and therefore work generated within a parish is a factor in how many hours would be the ideal for a Parish Clerk. Another current advert\(^2\) for a parish with a population of 6,000 is asking for 20 hours per week at pro rata of £25,694 for a deputy town clerk. When considering the responsibilities of the Parish Clerk and how many hours are appropriate, consideration could be given to enlisting guidance from the Hampshire Association of Local Councils (HALC) who may be able to draw on experiences of similar sized Parish Councils.

43. Should Funtley require administration from a Parish Clerk of 5 hours per week, paid at the lowest spinal column point (£8.613 per hour), this basic salary would equate to £2,239.38 per annum.

44. All salary levels are subject to the National Terms & Conditions of Employment for Local Authority Employees. If the Parish Clerk role is undertaken on a voluntary working basis with no remuneration then the National Terms & Conditions would not apply.

45. Appendix E provides some examples of Parish Council precepts within Hampshire and Appendix F shows the year on year rise in precept of Whiteley Town Council to give a broad comparator from the local economic area.

\(^1\) http://www.slcc.co.uk/job-details/clerk-to-cameley-parish-council-and-responsible-finance-officer/763/
\(^2\) http://www.nailsworthtowncouncil.gov.uk/
Identities and Interests of the community

46. A detailed consultation response was submitted by Funtley Village Society following the publication of the Council’s preferred option at the close of the first consultation exercise. The letter covered many community themed issues which are addressed throughout the following sections of this report. As the original petitioner, the FVS submission is included in full at Appendix D2.

47. Some of the themes, aside from the financial implications, that have emerged from analysis of all consultation responses indicate areas of interest to residents that they believe the creation of a parish would address include:

Local Community Issues

48. Many comments focussed on local community issues and how a Parish Council could resolve these. Key themes included being able to comment on planning applications, expedite solutions in respect of traffic and parking and litter and having access to funds.

49. In respect of planning applications, a Parish Council must, as a statutory consultee, be asked for comments on planning applications in their parish but are unable to determine the outcome as this is the function of the Planning Authority. The Funtley Village Society is already afforded the same status. Anyone living or working within the Borough is able to make Deputations, either supporting or opposing planning applications, to the Planning Committee.

50. Comments were received in respect of traffic calming measures, parking and speeding that suggested a Parish Council would have more powers. As responsibility for these areas sits with Hampshire County Council, it would be they who would take a decision as to whether or not they are prepared to delegate authority to a Parish Council in respect of implementing traffic calming measures and improving street lighting. Consent of a Parish Council is required for some highway matters and verge maintenance. Temporary speed limit reminder signs have been placed in the village previously by Fareham Borough Council in response to concerns raised by local residents. Another option available could be for residents of Funtley to explore the benefits of joining the Hampshire Constabulary Community Speedwatch initiative, which may have been previously considered. Funds raised by the Parish Council could be used towards improvements to street lighting which would avoid the need to be solely reliant on Hampshire County Council.

51. Issues of littering can currently be raised by residents directly to Fareham Borough Council Officers or via their Ward Councillors. Funds could be used by a Parish Council to make provisions for more litter bins and to support any anti-litter campaigns.

52. Collectively, Funtley Village Society is already able to address issues which affect the local community and residents and to request the Council address these. Similar to planning applications, a deputation scheme exists within Fareham Borough Council which enables people who live or work in the Borough to make deputations at Committee, Executive and Council meetings.
53. Funding available to a Parish Council would be gained via a precept, applications made to the principal council and other funding that is available to community groups. Funtley Village Society is already able to access funding streams available from a number of sources although consideration should be given to whether other sources of Grants are available to Parish Councils that wouldn’t be available to the Funtley Village Society or any other Residents’ Association/Community Group that could be used to enrich life in the village and the facilities available to residents. Any monies raised through a precept could also be used for events that bring the community together, such as a village fete.

**Community Cohesion**

54. When considering community cohesion in the responses of the first and second consultations, several similar comments were received that gave both positive indicators towards strengthening community cohesion, as well as indicators of threat to community cohesion if a Parish Council were created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Could strengthen community cohesion</th>
<th>Could threaten community cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Local people want a vibrant village community and this could kick start it”</td>
<td>“Funtley Village Society (FVS) is made up of newcomers to the village and the residents who have lived here all their lives have never been included in this select group/they have not been asked to represent the residents of the village”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Will bring decision making closer to communities”</td>
<td>(precept would rise) and cause embitterment within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Enhance the local community spirit”</td>
<td>“Would introduce unnecessary bureaucracy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“To have more say in what happens to the village”</td>
<td>“Cannot afford the extra payments”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. As well as considering the benefits of creating a Parish Council, the principal council must also consider if creating such a Parish Council would threaten community cohesion. Considerations should also be given to the guidance which states the creation of parishes is expected where “clear and sustained local support is shown”. This is especially pertinent when considering the relatively low rates of the population of Funtley as a whole, expressing their support for a parish during the consultations; 30% during the first phase and 5.6% in the second phase. However, it must be noted that the Community Governance Review is neither a formal referendum nor a vote on the issue.

56. It is clear that there is enthusiasm from some respondents to bring the community closer together and retain the village feel. Other comments indicate that the existing society arrangement is self-appointed and perhaps considered a select group by elements of the Funtley community.
Size, population and boundaries

57. The general rule should be that a parish is based on an area which reflects community identity and interest and which is of a size which is viable as an administrative unit of local government. Most parishes are below 12,000 in population but a Parish Council should be in a position to provide some basic services and it is not practical or desirable to set a rigid limit for the size of a parish.

58. As far as boundaries between parishes are concerned, these should reflect the “no-man’s land” between communities represented by areas of low population or barriers such as rivers, roads or railways. These need to be easily identifiable and a single community would be unlikely to straddle a river (with no crossing points) or a divide from a motorway (unless connected at each end by walkways).

59. In many cases a boundary change between existing parishes, or parishes or unparished areas, rather than the creation of an entirely new parish, will be sufficient to ensure that parish arrangements reflect local identities and facilitate effective and convenient local government. For example, over time, communities may expand with new housing developments. This can often lead to existing parish boundaries becoming anomalous as new houses are built across them resulting in people being in different parishes from their neighbours. District Councils should seek to address parish boundary issues at regular intervals.

60. When submitting the Petition to the Council, a map was attached which outlined the suggested area for a parish. To avoid divisions within a community, as indicated in paragraph 38 above, a revised proposed map was produced by Fareham Borough Council which did not include geographic divides to the community. This is shown at Appendix G.

61. The development of a revised Core Strategy and Local Plan Framework is likely to result in the need to review how Fareham Borough Council works with its diverse communities both in the emerging Solent Combined Authority context as well as recognising the need to establish clear identities of a number of its wards and village conurbations and how they link with each other to build strong and prosperous communities.

Other options for community representation or community engagement

62. In conducting a community governance review we have considered, as recommended in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, other arrangements that could be made for the purposes of community representation or community engagement. Opportunities exist for the creation of community governance by way of area committees; neighbourhood management; community forums/associations and resident’s and tenant’s associations. Some of these are part of the structure of a principal council and others by any group in the same area.
63. Fareham Borough Council is committed to involving our residents and communities in the local issues that affect or interest them. Effective engagement and consultation is also critical to ensuring that the services we provide meet the needs of our residents.

64. The Council utilises a range of methods and tools for engaging and consulting. The approaches used depend upon the needs of the different groups that want to get involved and the issues that are being considered. However, the Council's engagement and consultation will always recognise local neighbourhoods, engage with established local groups and support community cohesion.

65. Residents of Funtley have established the Funtley Village Society, although the number of members or details of its constitution are unknown, it states five primary objectives on the website:

1. To help sustain a corporate interest in the village as a community;

2. To foster those features of village life which the majority of the villagers consider to be of benefit to them and the neighbourhood;

3. To resist those changes that the majority of villagers consider to be detrimental to them and their neighbourhood;

4. To represent the views of the villagers to local authorities and other outside bodies; and

5. To provide a means of communication to the village for local authorities and other outside bodies.

66. Some of the comments received during the consultations included a concern that the creation of a Parish Council will introduce a layer of bureaucracy. The Funtley Village Society maintains it will still exist if a Parish Council is created and will work in conjunction with a Parish Council on issues affecting the local community.

67. A general view of those in favour of creating a Parish Council is it would have more powers. Under the current arrangements, local issues can be raised with Fareham Borough Council by residents. Consideration could be given to The Funtley Village Society, which already displays the enthusiasm to build a local identity, to develop in structure, engage more with residents and canvas their concerns, taking these forward collectively to Ward Councillors, Hampshire County Council and Fareham Borough Council. This would also help to build on community cohesion.

68. The only power that is available only to Parish Councils and not to other tiers of government is the power to obtain and supply land for allotments if local demand cannot be met.

69. Further comments from the consultation on the benefits of establishing a Parish Council are included below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Being able to comment on planning Applications”</td>
<td>A Parish Council is a statutory consultee on planning applications. Residents of Funtley are able to comment on planning applications now by way of written comments and by making Deputations to the Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Give…opportunity to address issues in the village which I feel the borough council ignores/more say over our village”</td>
<td>The Council’s Community Engagement Strategy includes a strong commitment to engaging with local communities with the popular and well-attended CAT meetings (Community Action Team) providing opportunities to take part in question and answer sessions with ward Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“To speak on behalf of the residents regarding the council”</td>
<td>Issues which exist currently can be raised to Fareham Borough Council via Ward Councillors or to officers at the Council directly. Both a Petition and a Deputation scheme is in operation which allows members of the public to support or oppose matters being considered at all Council and Committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Help stop dog walkers not picking up their dog poo”</td>
<td>There are three Acts of legislation which underpin littering and dog fouling enforcement. These also enable local authorities or the Courts to issue Fixed Penalty Notices or fines. Fareham Borough Council has an enforcement team who issues fines of £100 to those who do not pick up dog waste. Dog fouling can be reported to the Council and following a public consultation across the Borough in March 2016, free dog waste bags are available to collect from the Council. These are limited in number although the campaign will continue to run with posters and on refuse lorries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hope it would achieve a lower road speed limit through the village”</td>
<td>A Parish Council would not have the powers to impose speed limits through the village. As is the case now, concerns would need to be raised to Hampshire County Council and Fareham Borough Council. Traffic reminder signs have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


been used in Funtley in recent months following concerns raised by Hampshire County Council and local residents.

70. A residents’ association can be an effective body which represents the residents in the same way as a Parish Council and consideration could be given to alternative types of viable community representation. The aims of Funtley Village Society appear to be similar to that of the role of a Parish Council and the continuation of this Society could be a suitable alternative to consider without the need for payment of a local precept.

71. Another alternative for the Council to consider is the formation of a parish meeting rather than a Parish Council. A parish meeting is sometimes more applicable for small communities as they must meet twice a year, elect a Chairman and Trustees but cannot charge a precept. A principal Council may recommend the creation of a parish meeting in parishes with between 151 and 999 electors. Parish meetings consist of the local government electors for the parish and their purpose is to discuss parish affairs and exercise any statutory functions conferred on them. Parish meetings have a number of functions, powers and rights of notification or consultation conferred directly by statute. In areas where there is no Parish Council these include; the administration of allotments, provision and maintenance of a bus shelter, be an interested party in an application for a licensed premises or rights of way.

72. If the parish has no Parish Council, the Chairman of the parish meeting and the proper officer of the district council are the body corporate of the parish meeting and are known as “the Parish trustees”.

73. There are 21 parish meetings currently operating throughout Hampshire and a sample list of these is included for information in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Meeting</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exton</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farleigh Wallop</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litchfield and Woodcott</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popham</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratfield Turgis</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunworth</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Corbett &amp; Weston Patrick</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslade</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. A parish meeting may precept the district council for the funds necessary to cover its expenses. The accounts of a parish meeting are subject to audit in the same way as those of Parish Councils and pay non-refundable VAT on purchases.
Conclusions

75. In order to recommend the creation of a Parish Council for Funtley, the Council should be satisfied that such a body would reflect the identities and interests of the community in that area, would be effective and convenient and give better local service delivery.

76. It is clear that the work of Parish Councils can provide an important link for local communities and play a vital part in representing the interests of local people and improving the quality of life and the local environment.

77. From the issues set out within the petition and the comments referred to in this report and the appendices, Members may wish to consider the options set out in the previous section as well as the request for a Parish Council as they may be more effective in terms of community representation or community engagement. The petition which started the review was not specific in its aims other than the request to be "an independent Parish Council for Funtley Village which will work closely with its residents and Fareham Borough Council".

78. The Government has emphasised that recommendations made in Community Governance Reviews ought to bring about improved community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and result in more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

79. It is clear from the majority of responses received that there is a strong community spirit in Funtley. By participating in the consultations residents have shown that many want a greater say in local matters, particularly related to planning issues and applications, leisure and recreation facilities, and infrastructure such as traffic calming measures and street lighting.

80. Funtley Village Society is already treated in the same way as a Parish Council for planning issues, albeit not as a statutory consultee. The Society also has the ability to apply for community funding and many other funding streams. The play area had a mini makeover in 2015 and is scheduled for a complete refurbishment in the 2017/18 programme and Funtley residents will have the opportunity to request equipment or other features when this is consulted on later in the year.

81. In terms of infrastructure, Fareham Borough Council is able to work with Funtley Village Society and Hampshire County Council to determine whether further traffic calming measures are necessary in the future. Street lighting is also looked after by Hampshire County Council.

82. It is the Council’s belief that the requirements of the Funtley Village Society and Funtley residents, as identified through the consultations, can be met by existing arrangements, without the need for imposing any additional costs on residents. There is a plausible concern about the potential for unchecked increases in precept levels as has been experienced in neighbouring Parish Council areas.

83. Looking to the future however, it is vital that Fareham Borough Council supports and builds on the valuable work Funtley Village Society has achieved through
engaging with its community, and to continue to strengthen the working relationship with both FVS as a significant interested party and with all Funtley residents.

Options

84. The recommendations of this report is for Council to:

(a) note the results of the consultations and considers the representations received; and

(b) consider the contents of this report and resolve to approve one of the following options:

   i. make no change to the existing governance arrangements;
   ii. establish a parish and form a Parish Council; or
   iii. establish a parish and form a Parish Meeting.

85. The preferred option is to make no change to the existing governance arrangements and thereby not to create a Parish Council but to enable the residents of Funtley to have a greater say through the work of ward Councillors and Funtley Village Society, thus cementing community cohesion.

Appendices:

A – Funtley Village Society petition leaflet
B – Questionnaire
C – Minutes of the CAT meeting 24 November 2015
D – Consultation responses
D1 – Funtley Village Society Consultation Response
E – Examples of Parish Council precepts within Hampshire
F – Year on year rise in precept of Whiteley Town Council
G – Map showing the proposed parish boundaries, as revised by Fareham Borough Council.
H – Information booklet on Local Councils (produced by the National Association of Local Councils)

Background papers:

Petition and file of correspondence

Reference Papers:

Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007
Guidance on Community Governance Reviews (Dept for Communities and Local Government & Local Government Boundary Commission for England)
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Contact: For further information please contact Leigh Usher, Ext 4553
What is a Parish Council?

- Parish Councils are a great way to give residents a more powerful voice that Fareham Borough Council (FBC) and Hampshire County Council MUST listen to.

- It does not replace the County Council or Borough Council but it allows people to have more say over local issues.

- Their role is to represent the community, provide services to meet local needs and improve the quality of life and community well-being.

- They are the first tier of local Government in England. The Localism Act of 2011 gives more authority and power to local government.

- Parish councillors are elected every four years - anyone who fulfills the necessary legal criteria can stand.*

A Parish Council is a non-political forum, with extensive legal powers and responsibilities.

- They have the legal right to be informed about all planning applications in the community.

- Parish Councils can help support groups in the area through funding, or by publicity.

- A Parish Council has powers to provide or maintain community facilities and is able to formally comment and lobby on matters of interest to the local community. A Parish Council can play a vital part in improving the quality of life and the local environment. In other words a Parish Council can make a difference.

*for information on becoming a councillor, ask to see separate leaflet

To form a FUNTLEY PARISH COUNCIL we need you to sign a petition which will be presented to Fareham Borough Council.

If we have sufficient support from Funtley residents the Council HAVE to take this further. For this to succeed we would like each individual resident (who is eligible to vote) to sign the petition calling on the Council to hand down local decision-making powers to our village.

To raise money for a Parish Council, a 'precept' (payment) is added to the Council Tax bills for everyone who pays council tax in the village. In Funtley, this would amount to 77p a week per household. All monies collected through the precept MUST be used in the Funtley Parish area.

YOUR SUPPORT COUNTS! DON'T LEAVE IT TO SOMEONE ELSE

Proposed boundary of Funtley Parish Council
Have your say on whether Funtley should become a Parish

Why are we asking?
The Council has started a Community Governance Review in response to a petition from a number of Funtley residents asking to create a parish in Funtley. You can find out more about what this means on our website.

Have your say
We would like to know whether you want to see a Parish set up in Funtley. We would also like to understand the reasons for your decision. To help us do this please take part in this short survey. The deadline for responses is Monday 14 December.

What happens next?
We will consider all the comments and then prepare some draft recommendations. We will consult on these proposals next year. You can find out more by reading the Governance Review Timetable.

Q1 Please tell us which option you prefer:
   □ Option 1: To create a new Parish Council
   □ Option 2: To make no changes to the current arrangements

Q2 What benefits do you think having a Parish Council would bring to Funtley?

Q3 Why do you want to keep the current arrangements?
About you

Q4  What is your interest in the Funtley Governance Review?
   - I live in Funtley
   - I work in Funtley
   - I represent an organisation based or operating in Funtley
   - Other
      If other, please state

Q5  How old are you?
   - I am under 18
   - I am over 18

Q6  Can you please tell us your postcode (we will only use it to map responses)

Thank you for having your say
Notes from the CAT meeting held on 24 November 2015

Those present:
Councillor Mrs P Bryant (Chairman)
Councillor J Bryant
Councillor P Latham (Hampshire County Council)
Councillor S D T Woodward
20 members of the public

The meeting was opened at 7pm by the Chairman who welcomed all present. She introduced Councillor Woodward, Executive Leader of Fareham Borough Council who gave a presentation on the Funtley Governance Review. Following the presentation, the chairman opened the floor for questions:

a) Are you in favour of parish councils?
Councillor Woodward explained that he was unable to answer that question as he, along with his fellow councillors will be making the decision at the end of the process in this instance. Generally, in dealing with parish councils which usually serve rural communities, they contributed to the upkeep of the area.

b) Would lottery money be available if the parish meeting status was approved?
Councillor Woodward did not know but would find out.

c) Would comments from the parish council have more sway over planning applications?
No, all comments are considered equally but a parish council would be a consultee in any applications made within the defined boundary.

d) How would forming a parish council give value for money, for example in taking on grass cutting?
If Fareham Borough Council agrees to delegate the grass cutting function to the parish council, they would pay for contractors and take responsibilities paid for by the precept.

e) Can a parish council precept cause friction between those who voted for the creation of the parish vs those against?
If a parish council is created, every council tax payer will be required to pay the precept alongside their Council Tax to Fareham Borough Council, regardless of their preference. The only exceptions would be those who are exempt, for example, in receipt of housing benefit or single people would continue to receive a 25% reduction in their payment.

f) If a parish council took over the running of the recreation ground, would Council tax go down?
No, as this figure is paid to maintain the whole of the borough. Any precept paid would, however, only be used in Funtley.

g) How is a parish council formed?
An Order is made by Fareham Borough Council to constitute the parish, elections take place to appoint parish councillors and a public meeting must be
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held annually. A parish clerk is usually appointed to deal with day to day matters. It should be noted that anyone can be nominated to become a parish councillor if they meet the criteria which includes living within 3 miles of the boundary of the parish.

h) Are you aware of any good practice parish councils?
One good example is Hambledon Parish Council which worked together with the local council during the floods last year, providing support for a localised problem. The council represents a large village which is situated within a countryside area.

i) Does a parish council add another tier of bureaucracy which must be paid for by the community?
Yes, the precept must be paid and the parish councillors will decide how to spend the money raised. Unlike the Borough Council, there is no cap on a parish precept which was demonstrated on a slide showing a parish charging £15 a year, which has now increased to £88 annually.

j) How much will a parish clerk cost?
It is for the parish to appoint someone, perhaps part time, or share with another parish but a general indication would be a salary of at least minimum wage, plus pension contributions, provision of an area to work, equipment and any other on-costs must be factored into the overall cost.

k) As an alternative, are there any parish meetings (as opposed to parish councils) in Hampshire?
None were known but the council can investigate. As demonstrated in the presentation, if a parish meeting is appointed, there is no precept paid.

l) What criteria will be considered before Fareham Borough Council makes a decision?
As part of the Community Governance Review, all representations will be taken into account and presented in a report to Council. A decision will be made based on the information provided and the three main factors which form the basis of the review:
• Impact on community cohesion
• Size, population and boundaries
• Benefits / drawbacks

As there were no further questions, the Chairman thanked Councillor Woodward and closed the meeting at 7.45pm.
Comments from both consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funtley Governance Review 1st phase consultation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favour of a parish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning

- Input on planning (local neighbourhood plan for Funtley)
- A voice to protect the village from the impact of the Welborne development.
- Having more control over building etc
- To provide a voice for Funtley in trying to protect our interests against the new development
- Help to keep Funtley’s character in the light of the Welborne development.
- I hope that a Parish Council would have better control over the unsustainable development proposals in the Borough, and also be able to better protect the biodiversity of the area, something that appears to be of little interest to the borough council.
- Better control on local planning
- Being able to comment on planning applications.
- **TO BE ABLE TO COMMENT ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS**
- I believe we were not listened to when previous planning applications were discussed and made. With our own parish council I believe we will be more empowered and hopefully listened to.
- To have a voice in future planning applications which would affect Funtley.

### Have more say

- A Parish Council will be able to voice any community concerns or proposals to Fareham Borough Council on behalf of the people living in Funtley. I think direct contact with FBC will have the ability to hasten any issues or concerns raised.
- To speak on behalf of the residents regarding the council
- A parish council would be able to promote local residents views
- Hopefully more consideration will be given to local issues
- More say in what happens in our village
### Have more rights and say about what happens in Funtley

1. A greater voice from local residents on local issues so that Fareham Borough Council & Hants C.C. must listen to.  
2. Be able to lobby and comment on local Funtley matters.  
3. Represent the local community, provide services to meet local needs and improve quality of life & community wellbeing.  

| The village having a voice to FBC in issues affecting our area. Sense of community.  |
| Being able to have our say in our villages future  |
| Funtley residents have more decision making powers over issues that are important to them from a local plan, footpaths, local events, etc. Local people will be dealing with local matters and therefore not lumped together with Fareham as a whole and then perhaps we can be consulted efficiently in future no have matter foisted on us by people who live outside the village and who are no particularly interested in our views.  |
| A certain amount of self-determination to stop rail-roading by the council “Autonomy”  |
| So that we could have more say in what happens to the village and surrounding areas then we might not have Welborne being built  |
| I feel that it would give the local community more say in key issues and the area we live in.  |
| Funtley will have more say about the key issues that affect our local community.  |
| To protect to the rights of funtley residents and not be walked over by the high and might Fareham Borough Council.  |
| Greater say in local issues.  |
| Would improve the ability of local people to enhance decision which affect local issues.  |
| To have more influence and input in to what is happening in the village.  |
| Decisions would be made in Funtley’s interest rather than by leader of Council who looks after western wards interests. Would take decisions away from Fareham Borough Council which is dominated by Leader of Council  |
| It will allow this small community to have some actual voice in its affairs which the current increasingly remote and autocratic, district council does not allow.  |
| More say in local matters, improving life in the village.  |
| I hope it would give a voice to our community that will be heard by the council; when we have concerns or requests on improving our area.  |
| With local people providing more input, the result will hopefully be a community that is served according to local needs, rather than the needs of the larger borough (Fareham as a whole).  |
| Decisions would be made on behalf of the village residents and would make positive and well needed improvements throughout. Well needed Parish Council.  |
| Making our own decisions and having a say on what is needed within our village.  |
Appendix D – Funtley Governance Review

Setting up a new parish council in Funtley would give the residents more say in village matters at present we are just part of a much larger ward of North Fareham which is only represented by 2 councillors. Since we are going to be sandwiched between the huge development of Welbourne and Fareham we need to keep our village identity and by forming a parish we have a mechanism in place to represent the village. I fully support this.

More community involvement in local decisions for our village.

Would give the local community more input to choices which affect their surroundings.

1. Create a forum to oversee/manage community development in Funtley
2. Create a group that has in house incentives to provide the local area, for the residents benefit

Local people representing the interests of people living Funtley
Reduce reliance on Fareham Borough Council

A parish council would offer a focused interest in the village for the benefit and interest of the residents

To allow the residents of Funtley to decide upon initiate and execute any activities or projects of a local nature. I also feel that to bring democracy down to this very local level can only be a good thing.

More control over the area. Opportunity to create a better Funtley.

This will give us a much greater say in how Funtley is run at FBC meetings and hopefully curtail some of their more ridiculous ideas.

A community joining together and the ability to have a better say in future plans for Funtley and the surrounding area. The ability to enhance the area by requesting ‘wishes’ to the Parish Council for consideration.

more localized representation on issues which affect funtley community

This would give villagers a greater say in what actions/facilities the Borough provides for the village like traffic calming, planning etc instead of being ignored and rail roaded by Councilors that know little or nothing about the village or what is needed.

To enable any local affairs to be judged and discussed by local residents.

To be better informed and have more power/say in local affair.

To have a say and make a difference to where we live.

To have a say and make a difference to where we live.

It would help the residents of Funtley to voice their views and look after the people and local facilities and services.

MORE POWER WITH LOCAL DECISIONS

More say within our Community

To have more say in Funtley

To be able to have more say in our community

More say in our community.

More say in our community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To allow true locals to look after the area they cherish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letting people have a say in the future of Funtley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The residence will be able to have a larger input to what happens in the village without having to go up against Fareham council for them to compete against other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would highlight the needs of Funtley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An organization close to the specific interests of Funtley village with a voice on the borough council and a direct interest in providing amenities for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages local people in local matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the issues affecting us residents in the village will be given a greater voice with the borough council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will give us the opportunity to address issues in the village which I feel the borough council ignores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local people to make decisions about local issues rather than FBC who seem only interested in themselves and their egos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we need a Parish council to look at local issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More say and influence on matters concerning village proposals, and prioritise any improvements or maintenance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBC has many responsibilities within a large borough. This means that an area like Funtley has to compete for its amenities. If a Parish Council is created, it could apply for outside funding to augment the council’s basic provision and provide extra facilities for the residents. There would also be a democratic body representing the residents on issues which affect Funtley. We would have a voice!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have better control on development in the area and to have a say in issues that will affect the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like Funtley to have its own voice in its community. The current arrangements administered by Fareham Borough Council are perfectly adequate. But could be better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like Funtley to have a voice within its own community. The arrangement administered by Fareham Borough Council are perfectly adequate but could be better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Funtley community will have greater involvement with matters relating to Funtley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater say in what happens in my community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More open &amp; transparent communication from FBC via the Parish Council. Input into local decisions and where money is spent. Public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopefully give some say to what affects residents of Funtley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More say in what happens in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funtley is a small village and has a village feel to it, I think having a Parish Council will allow us to make more decisions locally ourselves on issues that directly affect us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would give the community a voice on the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the local community to have a voice and to be able to have an involvement with decisions that affect the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Local Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we will have more say in what happens in our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bigger voice about what is happening in and around Funtley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give a voice to the people of Funtley in what happens in the village not just Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would give the residents of Funtley more control over what effects them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in Funtley, anything on Funtley’s side is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow residents to have an input into the local community around them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the local residents to review and provide feedback to the council on a wide range of services and become involved in decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would enable people who live in the village have a say in decisions made by the BC. To be consulted about issues that will impact on the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A parish Council would listen more to your concerns about any issues that are going on in Funtley and hopefully get things done quicker for you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will give Funtley residents a more powerful voice which the Borough and Country Councils have to listen to. It gives us legal powers too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We could have our own individual opinion instead of being tied to FBC. Fareham is a town whereas Funtley is a village that is being ruled by a majority who do not live in Funtley. At least we could have a voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a little more visibility about local issues that affect all of us that live in the village, as most of us do not want significant change to our surroundings but I accept that some change is inevitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there could be more of a chance our views + ideas from the people who LIVE HERE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedite solutions for local issues like littering, overgrown vegetation and improve litter collections. A Parish Council would be more sympathetic to local issues in the village and its residents. Quicker resolutions to implement long term solutions to meet the needs of the residents. Local residents having a greater say in what matters to them for their village and any future developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a local voice, the opportunity to comment on planning applications. Promotion of local discussion by local people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More say and control in what goes on in our village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More independence from YOU Fareham Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local decisions made by local people, not someone living miles away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give a voice to the residents of Funtley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take particular interest in the village to improve environment for all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
so the people of Funtley Village can have more say in keeping our village as a village
Greater local decision making on issues that affect Funtley on a day to day basis.
Not only the obvious; securing social-archy, improving local metropolis and gaining the connection between the public and the government. I feel it will mean a better future for Funtley overall and will mean the people are heard
Having a parish council would allow greater local decision mainly within the village on issues relevant to funtley but which may be overlooked or misunderstood by a larger borough council. There would be greater reprenation of the village to various local council and committees and help all members of the village feel that they have a greater democratic voice on issues that are immediately relevant to them.
To have greater knowledge and control over what happens in our village.
We get to voice our own opinions
More say in local issues.
To have more of a say in local issues.
A certain amount of self-determination escaping the over powering will of a council voted for less than 50% of the populous.
Local community having a say in local issues.
**Facilities/Leisure**
Input on leisure facilities and grants to local groups and my others.
Maybe we will finally get a bin for the children’s play area?  Opportunity on giving our input into local planning decisions.
Better use of local parks
To improve facilities in the community Improve community structure and relationships
Provide access to local amenities that Fareham Borough Council tend to overlook
Better play park
Quicker results on repairs and renewals plus extra things such as lighting.
Improved local amenities
Ability to spend small amounts of public money on the village
Control over improvements & a local say in them
Hopefully will help stop dog walkers not picking up their dog poo! It's everywhere on the footpaths, fed up with my buggy constantly covered in it!!  Need 30mph speed limit by entrance to roebuck Avenue Fit Trail in park
As a neighbour to Funtley, Wickham Parish Council fully supports the creation of a parish council for the village. The benefits include harnessing local enthusiasm to bring forward projects and particularly to fund raise and access external funding for facilities that FBC and HCC may not be able to afford. Local governance provides a focal point for residents, can strengthen the work carried out by existing community groups, en
## Infrastructure

1. Slow down traffic coming round bend at top of Funtley Hill ad throughout the village. 2. Keep lampposts free from overhanging trees which block out lights especially on the hill. 3. Clean up village appearance - Litter and grass cutting.

A suitable solution to the reduction in available parking created by the unnecessary extension of the double yellow lines on Funtley Hill.

**Input on traffic calming measures, street lighting,**

**Having more control over the speed and excess traffic through the village and the very big problem of parking.**

I hope it would achieve a lower road speed limit through the village and River Lane.

**Traffic calming (speed limits) Footpath maintenance Ditches & drains ** *Bins*

Benefits would include having more decisions on what money would be spent on which would be decided by local people for local people.

I would like to see more slow Traffic measures put in place.

To deal with problems in the area i.e. speed bumps to keep traffic to speed limit as Funtley is used as a short cut.

**Ability to apply for grants under Parish status to improve facilities in the village.**

Well hopefully will could get more street lighting as when you put the new ones in, we are now one less and walking in the dark down by the railway bridge is a nightmare. Plus we might get the roads gritted as every morning between 7-10am and in the evening between 4-7pm everyone uses it as a rat run between Whitely and Fareham.

**More chance of getting enhancements for the village**

I believe having a parish council will allow the residents of Funtley to have more say about what happens within our village e.g. traffic calming and street lighting.

**Additional services and facilities for Funtley. Better control of Funtley.**

**local issues can be addressed (e.g. fly tipping)**

1) Start a neighbourhood watch to reduce crimes 2) Be able to report local street lighting that is failing. 3) Checking any repairs needed to footpaths.

**Greater jurisdiction on what happens in our village to safeguard existing green space and develop better facilities and amenities.**

Introduce traffic calming due to funtley being used as a short cut to whitely.

**To safeguard the village community and ensure better amenities & facilities.**

Address the parking situation. **Stricter control of maintenance of green spaces.**

Maintain children’s play areas. **provide a community area, traffic calming**

**Improve local needs with ongoing litter issues, graffiti and better control go over grown vegetation. Better resolutions when**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dealing with local issues concerning traffic management and parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hope we would have more say over our village including speeding through the village, lighting etc. lollipop lady, zebra crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mph speed limit by Roebuck Avenue Outdoor fitness in park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Cohesion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would bring a sense of cohesion and community to the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better sense of community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it will build on the identity of Funtley village and help improve the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More community involvements for the village and will make the village an amazing place to live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a structure for ongoing community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having read the accompanying leaflet it would seem to be worth the extra benefits to Funtley village of an increased Council Tax bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I've been to other villages with Parish Councils they are better kept and looked after. We feel forgotten here by the Council. I hope that others can see the Funtley’s beauty once Parish Council takes over. Sooner the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local people will understand the impacts of local problems. A friendly face in the village to turn to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in Funtley, we need local support and local information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable local people to manage their own local area will help to enhance the local community spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voices will be heard Opportunity to have a say on local matters Build the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with all the information provided recently and feel that it would benefit this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funtley Governance Review 1st phase consultation

#### Make no changes to the current arrangements comments

Do not feel that this extra & costly layer of local government will make any difference. Whilst FBC does not always get it right, I feel that we would be better off staying as we are.

I think they work well as there are at present. Why add another level of bureaucracy

Parish council not needed i.e. House of Lords

The current arrangements are sufficient i.e. House of Lords

Because I cannot afford the Rate increase to cover the costings. Being on my own

I do not want to pay extra payments on top of my council tax

Costs extra money so not interested. Don't have the money

Why do we need to pay extra for the same works carried out by FBC do? The only think that I would like is parking stopped on the green verge on Funtley Road behind the double yellow lines, churned up grass is an eyesore

I believe my home area responsibility of council. Do not want local people controlling Funtley OR to have to pay more Council Tax.

Additional cost

Uncapped council taxes! Silly idea, why change!!!

The proposed Parish Council is a wholly unnecessary additional layer of bureaucracy that will only result in delays to the decision making process that the Borough Council already has to go through. Furthermore, those individuals that are making this proposal are not representative of the residents of Funtley but rather a small group of self-opinionated nimbies. The existing Council and Borough Councillors are already burdened by e

Facilities provided are already adequate. Cannot see a demand for further provision, so no benefit at all

I see absolutely no reason with the current arrangements should be changed as it would seem that everything the parish council can do. FBC is already does and does it within a reasonable time of asked or able

I was born here and christened here went to school here and still live here. I do not understand why people move here and then want to change everything. this is about a bunch of power hungry individuals who have dreamt up one more scheme, as they see it to score points over FBC in particular Cllr Woodward, this being the main objective
The better of two evils and neither of you can or will stop the new planned estate.

The functions described for the Parish Council in my view are not worth having another layer of bureaucracy and I am not sure the Parish Council will represent all residents’ views but those who will govern it.

I believe that the current arrangements allow me to contact Fareham Borough Council directly if I have any questions regarding Funtley and to express my own thoughts regarding any issue that may affect the area. I do not feel that a Parish Council would offer anything additional to the current arrangements but would add a layer of unnecessary bureaucracy. I have been concerned reading the newsletters that the Funtley Village Society.

Avoid unnecessary, additional bureaucracy at extra cost.

It wouldn't cost me an extra £40 a year on top of the existing council tax which is already like paying a mortgage. Plus I was never asked if I wanted or needed anything on their wish list. What kind of parish council doesn't ask the residents what they would like or need in things like extra services or amenities? It seems to me that a select elite group of people are making decisions and choosing what they want not necessarily what others do

I say no to wannabe important busybodies interfering with Fareham Borough Councils business.

I've lived here for 20 years and I have never met any of these interfering people, therefore how can they be representing my interests.

The parish council is an unnecessary additional layer of government administration/lobbying with little relevant experience. Elected Councilors and trained officers are already in place and have demonstrated their knowledge and support during the Welborne development. Funtley Meadow improvements are an excellent example of officer knowledge and skill in action - I can't imagine why a Parish would consider taking this on even if funding went with it. There is no valid reason to pass management of services to a Parish as the expertise and knowledge is already wit officers and paid for through the council tax. Employment issues fir litter pickers and the maintenance/inspection of additional equipment would be an extra burden and all the extras suggested would require funding - I assume from an additional levy. I feel that the present arrangement is fair for all and do not believe that it is necessary to pay for a gold plates service.

Having a parish council is an unnecessary additional layer of government and would not add anything.

I believe that the council do a good job already and I am not willing to pay twice for a service that is already carried out to a high standard

Do not want extra charges

Cannot afford and do not want extra charges
1. I do not want to pay any additional tax (precept) 2. I can see little benefit over and above normal council arrangements 3. Welborne is going ahead whether we like it or not (we don't like it but hey) 4. I do not want to vote on yet more local issues 5. I do not know or trust the people that are putting themselves forward

As a parish meeting can be arranged without a precept I would favour this option. A full parish council introduces an unnecessary additional level of bureaucracy at a cost. The size of the proposed parish is too small to achieve any economies of scale. Although matched funding can be obtained, the proposed precept of £40 per year would only bring in approximately £12000 per annum, over half of which would be spent paying a parish clerk even on a part time basis. A parish clerk needs expertise and I do not believe this role could be undertaken voluntarily. The parish councillors have no more power over planning matters than any other ordinary citizen, albeit they are consulted. I am also concerned that FBC may mutually agree to allow the Parish council to take over maintenance of the recreational ground. The precept would be used for this purpose but my council tax to the full council would not be reduced pro rata.

As a Parish Meeting can be arranged without a precept I would favour this option. A parish council would introduce an unnecessary additional level of bureaucracy and additional cost. I feel that Funtley is too small a community to make a Parish council a realistic addition to the levels of bureaucracy already in place. Although matched funding could be obtained, the proposed precept of £40 per year would only bring in approximately £12000 per annum. Over half of this would be used to pay for a parish clerk, which I consider to be an essential expense as the council members should have call on a professional parish clerk with the necessary expertise. I do not believe this role should be undertaken by a volunteer. With respect to planning matters, Parish councillors have the same consultancy rights as all Borough residents, but with no additional powers and therefore I do not feel that they are needed.

I have lived in Funtley for 30 years and have been happy with the services provided by the council. I see no need for a parish council and the extra costs involved.

They seem fine by me, apart from not gritting Funtley Hill and Road when needed plus with a parish council I can see my council tax increasing - why should I pay more.
I can see no purpose to having a Parish council as it has limited powers and the services that they would provide are covered under the current arrangements e.g. park maintenance and the play area is adequate.

I do not wish to pay an additional precept charge.

We cannot afford to pay extra when our current council tax should cover the requests.

I cannot see the benefit to having a parish council. It will only add another layer to the decision making and more money to pay for it.

Can’t see any benefit over current system.

I don’t feel a parish council would had any value to Funtley village

It’s a totally unnecessary tax to boost the egos of a few some of whom are only here at weekends. The village has survived all these years without these newcomers taking over and dividing the village into a them and us society.

The current arrangements are working alright so we don’t need the extra cost on the rates.

I feel this has worked well all these years. If there is any problems and you talk to the council, they work to resolve the problem. I feel the parish council if formed is going to add more cost to council tax and this will hit the people who can’t afford it. It is the Funtley Village Society that wants the parish council and I believe most of these people are newcomers to the village and they seem to be dividing the village providing they get what they want.

I believe the village should remain as original arrangements as a pensioner the extra taxes are not affordable

Because I cannot see what they can do anything different than what we have already. Also I do not wish to pay out any more cash for people to play at parish councillors or pa a wage plus to a parish clerk who in my opinion won’t have much work to do.

I can see no better results than Fareham Council can give us. All I can make out is a Parish will want us to pay more for the same they already put the yearly price up from around £15 to £88. It will only be other job for the boys that we will have to pay for.

I have no wish at all for Funtley becoming a Parish.

Funtley is not a pretty village and will, with the proposed developments forced upon us against our wishes by Fareham Borough Council, become even less attractive. Over the last twenty-five plus years Funtley village has changed dramatically and not necessarily for the better. We are now being asked at a price to support something which has little if any additional advantage to village life. I have therefore, not been convinced by the arguments and suggestions put forward by the Funtley Village Society, that the advantages out way the disadvantages and for that reason I am against Funtley being given Parish status. If my name appears on the original application you have my permission to remove it.
I am very concerned that people in Funtley village are under the assumption that by making Funtley a Parish Council they would gain certain powers. When I was approached to sign the petition certain gains were being put forward. "A path down through the park, additional lighting over Funtley bridge, additional benches in the park, bus shelter, traffic calming and village activities and importantly, being informed of any planning developments and having a significant say." So you can see how people so readily signed the petition. Additional lighting is best approached by talking to Hants CC. More benches in the park will encourage tramps to sleep on them or young people to occupy them late evening. Regarding a bus shelter, most people catch the bus outside the Minors Arms and can stand under the eaves as they do now. In fact there is no suitable place for a bus shelter there. Traffic calming? There are so many cars parked in the village road at most times which slows the vehicles down without additional measures. A path down through the park? Wellington boots solve this problem without incurring costs to people who don't wish to
## Funtley Governance Review - 2nd phase consultation responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>For/Against Council's draft recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The review period is not long enough.</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not consider the current representation to be sufficient. We are not even referred to in the name of our ward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The review was too negative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The review should have considered the views of the majority, not the minority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A democratic parish council meets my needs better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government is promoting local plans in radio adverts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Formal complaint submitted by respondent.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main points of response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second phase consultation period not long enough</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of the 74.5% of respondents not taken into account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased presentation of results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers of Parish Council not misrepresented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided by the Council was misleading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be quite happy to have my say through the ward councillors. I feel the Funtley village society is made up of all newcomers to the village and the residents who have lived here all their lives have never been included in this select group.</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to register our frustration at Fareham council’s decision not to democratically allow Funtley to form a parish council and would question your decision. This is the wish of the residents of the majority of our community and I believe it would benefit us all. We are afforded a vote to install politically divided councillors to represent us at local council elections in hope they will make correct decisions for the benefit of our community. Please reconsider your direction in this matter.</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I recommend things stay with the elected ward Councillors, the Funtley village society is a self-styled group who have not been asked to represent the residents of the village.

For

I would like to reiterate my objection to the possibility of the creation of a parish council for Funtley, as I am content that the current democratic setup provides more than adequate opportunity for representation for residents. A parish council here would only introduce unnecessary bureaucracy and delays to the existing local government system. I am pleased that the Officers recommendation is to reject the proposal.

For

Thank you for extending your second phase consultation. However we do not agree with the proposed Officer recommendation to the Council later this month. The recommendation flies in the face of the people who have spoken and makes no sense under the Localism Act, democracy or even statistically. In our opinion the Council are simply dragging their feet for reasons unbeknown to us.

Against

Given the results of your own consultation on this matter I find it amazing that you can arrive at a recommendation that Funtley not create a Parish Council. An overwhelming majority of those residents who feel strongly enough to register their opinion are in favour, yet you dwell entirely on the concerns of a dissident minority. You are surely aware that the essence of democracy is that the expressed will of the majority should carry the day. There will always be a minority who disagree and their concerns should be respected, but on no account must they be allowed to prevail over the wishes of the majority. Such an outcome turns justice and fairness on its head. You should hardly need reminding that it is the localism policy of central government that where a local community votes for a Parish Council there is to be a presumption in favour of its establishment.

Against

Your contention that the work of the Funtley Village Society (FVS) can provide an adequate substitute for a Parish Council in giving the community a voice is wrong on three very important grounds:

1. FVS is a wholly self-appointed pressure group which, although sincere and responsible, has no democratic mandate to speak for the people of Funtley and no authority to take action on the community's behalf.

2. When it comes to financing of community projects a Parish Council would have access to funds
and grants that are not available to FVS. The benefits brought to a community by such grants can be considerable and other Parish Councils in Hampshire as well as further afield can provide testimony to this fact.

3. A Parish Council has a statutory right to be consulted on matters concerning its community and under such circumstances can provide higher authorities with valuable insights into the impact of certain developments on the community and has the ability to work in collaboration with those authorities to mitigate its constituents' concerns. While FVS may be operating in a favourable climate today; that it will always be so is by no means guaranteed as it has no rights in statute as does a Parish Council.

As you will know FVS has made several attempts to bring the above facts and their backgrounds to the attention of all councillors in order to inform their deliberations at the upcoming Council meeting in a spirit of nonpartisan information sharing and under the chairmanship of authorities outside the community. These attempts have so far met with very limited success and a want of willing co-operation on the part of your authority.

I urge you to reconsider your recommendation before the 28 July meeting of the Council.

My response to the letter sent to my home on the forming of a parish council in Funtley.

The letter was extremely one sided it seems that the council officer who wrote this document has written or has been told to write a very biased view and the fact that 74.5% of residents were in favour was totally omitted and I only found this by going to web site many residents do not have access to Internet. The letter put over a one sided negative stance to residents. Also my neighbours either side of my house never received the letter! Is this really the work of an open and honest council?

I'm strongly in favour of a local parish council and just remember 74.5% of voters were also in favour. In the recent local election the Fareham North candidate was elected on only 34% of the vote.

I'm of the opinion this cannot be an officer delegated recommendation alone on such an important Democratic decision. I do hope the councillors who will be voting on this important subject will understand what they are voting for and have been fully briefed on all the benefits of a parish council as

| Against |
I hear only a handful have any knowledge on the subject and very few have been willing to get involved in process. The local people want a vibrant village community and this could kick start it.

The village has recently been forced with not one of our recommendations, to accept the Welborne development on our village boundary an unwanted and not needed in its size. To take this chance away would be another kick in the teeth for Funtley. Fareham Borough Council omitted to tell resident’s in areas where a new development are built in the parish, the parish council retains all CIL payments.

Fareham Borough Council seem to be ignoring central government policy and cross party policy to encourage localism.

From the localism act ‘places significantly more influence in the hands of local people over issues that make a big difference to their lives’

The leader of Fareham Borough Council even signed a prospectus for discussion with Government.

We will bring decision-making closer to communities

• HIOW will widen and deepen devolution locally, seeking opportunities for district and parish councils to take on functions and co-design/co-deliver services with communities.

It seems to me Sean Woodward welcomes local devolution of powers, he preaches his wish to central government, but as long as it only flows down to, and stops at his office.

From localism act 13 February 2008, district councils, unitary county councils and London borough councils (‘principal councils’) have had responsibility for undertaking community governance reviews and have been able to decide whether to give effect to recommendations made in those reviews. In making that decision, they will need to take account of the views of local people.

FBC seem only to have taken the negative comments into consideration. I see very little democracy being practiced in FAREHAM

In reply to your letter of the 2nd June I would just like to say that as nearly 75% of the residents of Funtley expressed their wish to have a

| Against |
Parish Council, clearly a majority, it seems difficult to understand why the application has been turned down.

The application for setting up a Parish Council for Funtley should be reconsidered, and approved as per the guidance given in the Localism Act.

It is unreasonable for Fareham Borough Council (FBC) to turn down Funtley’s application, since all criteria’s have been met, and the reasons for the refusal given by FBC do not appear to have taken account of Funtley’s residents need to have more say in the running of our village, since FBC have not been pro-active in the past.

There has been very little interest taken by FBC regarding the community requirements of Funtley residents in the past, and we believe that this refusal is just a naive attempt to try and keep the “residents” under control, to allow FBC to impose their will, which is wrong.

FBC is empowered and elected to serve the communities, not dictate, and should welcome constructive participation by the residents it serves, we want a say.

I agree with the submission of the Funtley Village Society that a Parish Council should be established for the community. I believe that the Fareham BC would be acting improperly if it accepted the recommendation of its Officers to ignore the clear majority vote of the residents in favour of the setting up of a Parish Council for Funtley. The Officers document appears to be both misleading and biased. As such it should be disregarded. The Borough Council should accept the majority vote of the residents and agree to the setting up of a parish Council in accordance with Government directive. It is because of the way that the FBC has appeared to disregard the properly expressed views of this community over a long period of time that there is a need to establish a statutory body, distinct from the FBC, to protect its interests and make its voice heard.

I would like to add my support to setting up a Parish Council in Funtley. I am totally at a loss as to why you have recommended that that the application for the Parish Council has been turned down when 75% of Funtley residents have voted in favour of the Council. I would therefore ask that you reconsider your decision.
On the issue of Funtley becoming a Parish Council, we are quite happy with the decision that the council has made and we feel that it is unnecessary for Funtley to have Parish council at this moment in time. As a widow and retired resident of Funtley the issue with the increase in the annual cost of council tax, I would be disappointed if the council were to back down on this decision that they have already made. We are happy with the current setup of Funtley Village Society and feel no parish council is needed, feedback should be given through the Village Society and no further action is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I wish to express my dissatisfaction and total disbelief with your conclusions regarding the first phase consultation results, in which you dismiss the Funtley Parish Council in preference for the Village Society. I fail to understand how you can dismiss the request of 74.5% of residents to form a Parish Council. Again, I express my preference for the creation of Funtley Parish Council, and hope that the voice of the majority will now be respected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We were very pleased to receive your letter of 23rd May advising of the Council’s draft recommendation to consider not creating a Parish Council. Please accept this as confirmation that we are both firmly AGAINST the creation of a Funtley Parish Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We wish to register our support of The Funtley Parish Council. We can't believe that after a 74.5% MAJORITY in favour of a Funtley Parish Council, with 322 out of 566 residents of Funtley voting in favour, that Fareham Borough Council have deemed it democratic to go with the MINORITY and disallow this parish council.

The views of the majority of Funtley residents has not been taken into account, so may we ask how this can be deemed to be a democratic decision? We, the under signed, would like a parish council for Funtley to give us a better control of what is happening to and could be beneficial to our community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Following on from receiving your draft recommendation, I wanted to pass my own feedback, having now been a resident of Funtley for sufficient time to pass judgement on the Funtley Village Society and their so-called 'representative view' of the residents.

I support the decision to recommend not forming a Parish Council. I do not feel that Funtley Village Society are truly representative of the views of the community, they are not elected, rather a group of
people who elevate themselves above the community, claiming they speak for them.

I do not feel we would receive value for money from the precept - whilst I understand the elected councillor would be a voluntary role, how are the administrative functions of the proposed council to be funded? One would assume, via the precept. I am happy to discuss any of the above content if you so wish.

We write again to confirm the views we expressed in recent emails. Of the 565 voting requests sent out by FBC 230 were returned. Of these 171 voted in favour of a Parish Council, leaving 394 who either voted against or abstained (a non-return vote is NOT a YES in favour) 171 as a percentage of 565 is 30%. Hardly the overwhelming majority claimed.

We cannot believe someone from the Parish Council brigade went to the expense of producing the glossy leaflet that was pushed through our doors. Obviously a sign to come of more money wasted if a Parish Council was appointed. As someone else has expressed, who are these people who are trying to impose onto us something so unnecessary. Over the 30 years we have lived here, Funtley’s needs have been adequately met both by Fareham BC and Hampshire CC. We do not need another tier of bureaucracy.

1\textsuperscript{st} submission: I’m not in favour of Funtley having a parish council as it would increase the council tax bill. I believe the cost will outweigh the benefit to the village.

2\textsuperscript{nd} submission: I don’t want a parish council for Funtley as I’m happy with Fareham Borough Council looking after the village. I feel a parish council for Funtley is unnecessary for the extra money that it would incur.

I do not need a group of wannabe important busy bodies insert themselves as Funtley parish council. I have had recent written communication with these people to voice my views on their wants and the village’s needs. Sadly they were very dismissive on the village needs and wish to prioritise their wants instead. So for that reason I do not feel that the village would benefit from having a parish council.

I am writing to express my entire dissatisfaction at the recent decision to refuse the setting up of a parish council in Funtley, despite the fact that all criteria for this, including a large majority vote within the
parish, have been met. This appears to me to be yet another instance of FBC ignoring the local will of voters following on from the decision to press ahead with the unpopular foundation of the Welborne New Town.
I call upon FBC to reverse this most recent decision and to accept the democratic will of the Funtley residents.

Regarding your letter of the 23 May saying that the Council were refusing permission for us to have a Parish Council seeing as you quoted the negative reactions of the Minority to bolster your decision. The alternative suggestion supplied (residents having a greater say through a lesser body) brought a smile to my face and here is why: The Government supports Parish Councils the MAJORITY of Funtley inhabitants support Parish Councils, I do not think that Your reasons hold water.

A couple phoned to express their support for the Council’s proposal. Feel like the Council keep them informed. They are pensioners and don’t want to have to pay extra. Particularly, concerned about the thought of having to pay for a clerk. Also questioned the need for a public toilet in Funtley which the FVS are apparently proposing.

I am in receipt of your letter dated 23rd May 2016, to which I would make the following observations.

1. You mentioned a number of areas where residents wanted to have a greater say in determining outcomes, all of which are relevant. You then specifically picked local planning applications as an area where influence would be restricted and ignoring the remainder. My opinion is that a Parish Council made up of local stakeholders focusing on Funtley would have a marked influence on change desired.

2. You mentioned that a quarter of those responding did not wish to make changes to the current arrangements. (of which there are none specifically structured for Funtley I believe). By my maths this indicates a clear three to one majority in favour of the proposal. I find this inclusion somewhat bizarre as a rationale for no change.

3. Of the concerns listed in opposition, these should be considered the opinions of the minority of residents given the support given by others.
4. The remainder of your summary is in my opinion frankly hot air. There are a great number of Parish councils established across the UK which presumably continue to act in local interests with a positive effect. These serve to assist the interests of local people in a wide range of areas, most importantly to preserve and improve the quality of life for these people. You alternative proposal which offers no material change has or will not deliver the substance which I believe is required.

Lastly I would also make the point that I find it ironic that you cited local planning applications as a restriction of influence. (point 1 above). Whilst the influence of a Parish Council may be limited there are doubtless many examples where developments have been modified, improved, restricted or re-considered following engagement with Parish Councils. I see no interest from Fareham Borough Council in representing local residents generally, an example being the manner in which it has dealt with the Welborne proposals and its impact on Funtley which has been nothing short of diabolical. Moreover, the never ending thirst for development of the borough continues with the recently published intention to build even more homes without necessary infrastructure or thought of preservation of any kind. To my mind I believe your negative response is driven by these motivations and an unwillingness to engage with anyone with an alternative viewpoint.

I find it staggering that you can write to Funtley Residents and demonstrate and confirm how undemocratic our Borough Council is. The overall majority of Residents have voted for a Parish Council by twice the margin of our newly elected representative on the council, it is obscene Sir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Phoned to express his strong support for the Councils recommendations made in the governance review. He has lived in Funtley for 30 years and doesn’t think anything needs fixing. He and his partner signed the original petition put around by the FVS, but was not given enough information at the time to make an informed decision. As he knew the person on the doorstep holding the petition, he felt obligated to sign it, as he thought it would be rude not too.

Now that he has seen the various letters and information for and against he firmly believes we should keep things as they are.

For
**Submission 1**: We have just received a copy of your letter dated 23rd May 2016, and would be most interested how you reached the conclusion that in spite 75% of residents being in favour of a Parish Council, you have decided not to allow the proposal.

How can this be democratic??

**Submission 2**: Following receipt of your further letter dated 2nd June 2016 concerning your draft recommendations not to allow the creation of a Parish Council we would reiterate our previous unease at the decision you reached. One cannot ignore the 75% of residents that voted for the formation of a Parish Council without a very convincing argument, which you have failed to do.

| Phoned to say she is very supportive of the recommendations put forward by us. She has grown up in Funtley and feels strongly about not having a Parish. She believes that the FVS form a small clique of residents and you are okay as long as you agree with their views. | For |
| As a resident of Funtley Village I would like to express my preference for Funtley Village to have its own Parish Council. We moved to this village as we wished to live in the countryside and not in the town. Funtley was as far into the country as we could afford but we greatly value our ‘village feel and certainly do not consider ourselves a part of Fareham town. When we wish to go to town for doctors, dentists, shops....we drive in, pay our parking fee and then return home back to the village. I know we are going to lose this when the new houses are built in our fields but we are a village and do not wish to belong to one huge great mass. We wish to preserve the village identity, represented by Funtley Parish Council, not just as a part of Fareham. | Against |
| I would like to express my astonishment in your recommendations regarding the Funtley residents desire to become a Parish Council. I understood we lived in a democracy, and that the Localism Act demands that Councils listen to the majority view of their residents. In any community, there will always be those that disagree with the majority view, but to base your recommendations on the 25% who didn’t want a Parish is blatantly against democratic principles. I also object to the biased way you have presented the facts. In your original letter, you should have | Against |
given the results of the survey up front, so all residents could see. But it's not until you go onto the website, that this is discovered in your presentation. Not all residents have access to the website, so you have denied them the most important fact about the whole survey, i.e. the result!

All quotes supplied were from those residents who were against a Parish and the reasons you gave were not sufficient to deny us the status that most of us are asking for. Was this purely your own views or did a selection of councillors make the recommendations?

The reasons I want Funtley to have a Parish were clear in my original submission, so I will not repeat them. But you imply that responders to do understand what powers a Parish can have or the advantages that Parish status would bring? I would like you to know that I have read all the literature presented by the Funtley Village Society, (which was independently produced by HALC and unbiased) and am fully aware of the precept (which I'm happy to pay) and also the powers that a Parish Council will have. I want our village to follow the many examples of successful Parishes throughout the country in working with the Council to help improve our community.

| I am a resident of Funtley and as such, I would like it known that I object to your decision to deny us a local parish. As a resident I would like Funtley to have its own Parish and in not recognising this you have gone against a democratic decision which is unconstitutional. | Against |
| As a new member of Funtley village I am strongly in favour of the creation of a Funtley Parish Council. I have recently moved to this village for its rural community feel and believe that having our own Parish Council would build on this further. I have seen it work well in other small communities across Hampshire and I know it can gain our community access to funding pools / grants / funding streams we do not currently have available to us. This approach to taking more localised action is really what grass roots democracy is all about & is exactly what the Localism Act was set up to encourage. I vote in favour for establishing our own Parish Council. | Against |
You have been forced to extend the consultation period on the Governance Review with regards Funtley forming a Parish Council, so as requested, here are my views.

I am very much in favour of forming a Parish Council, there was a stunning 74.5% vote in favour in the Governance Review, plus it has to be remembered there was a petition presented showing YES from more than 50% of the electorate, and Funtley Village Society were scrupulous in following every required stage of consultation with people of the village, and have backing from the Association of Local Councils in their campaign.

The legislation is clear, where a majority can be shown, and it has been now, twice, then the presumption should be yes to a Parish Council, that is government policy - much trumpeted localism - so what right have you to go against this?!

Please see these graphs I have put together, they clearly show that the 74.5% yes was roughly 50% more than our Fareham North councillor polled to get elected in the 2016 borough elections. Even taking into account turnouts (both at 41%, so you can't claim it wasn't enough in the Governance Review), our 30.3% Yes from the total electorate was again roughly 50% more than the paltry 20.8% of the electorate the Fareham North candidate polled to get elected to the borough council in 2016.

I believe if you continue to deny the democratic will of the people like this you will be subjected to a Judicial Review.

I’m somewhat surprised, confused and disappointed at the decision not to recommend the creation of a Funtley Parish Council, given the vast majority of those that responded to the FBC questionnaire and the residents who signed the earlier petition, were clearly in favour Funtley having its own Parish Council.

To date, the justification FBC has given for refusing the formation of such a Council is not only a totally inadequate, but is also completely contradictory to the basic principles of democracy, on which the political / electoral process of this country is based (as below):-

Definition of democracy – a: government by the people; especially: rule of the majority

b: a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving
periodically held free elections

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracy

Therefore, despite almost 75% questionnaire respondents being in favour and 56% of the residents of Funtley village signing a petition in favour of the formation of a Parish Council, why are FBC (almost arrogantly, it appears) ignoring the wishes of the majority and adhering to the wishes of the minority and / or those who do not have a strong view on this issue either way?

Is this truly a democratic response by FBC – is the exercise of democracy clear to all?

After receiving a recent letter, I was very disappointed to find that as one of many residents of Funtley village who had communicated their wishes towards a parish council (74.5%), that Fareham council feel it acceptable to ignore the MAJORITY!

This is not the first time that Funtley has been over looked! Our park doesn't get the same care as 'park lane', with the grass being left at a ridiculous length, over sixteen years without a basketball ring and the need for safer crossing to mention but a few!!

Please do not ignore the residents!!!

I am writing to voice my concern that Fareham Borough Council have ignored the wishes of the majority of people of Funtley and rejected the creation of a parish council.

It is clear that the Borough council has no willingness to look after the interests of the people of Funtley, as the two main concerns of the residents are completely ignored by the council. The council are clearly waiting for someone to be seriously hurt before they act on traffic calming through Funtley, even though there was another serious accident in the last month concerning a motorcyclist. Secondly the council is only interested in maximising council tax revenue by squeezing in as many houses around the village with Welborne. There is no thought evident given to the fact that the motorway junction will be gridlocked, not to mention the death of the village atmosphere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix D – Funtley Governance Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

At the moment there is clearly no democratic representation of the views of the people of Funtley by a borough council only concerned with self-aggrandisement. The idea of a parish council seems to threaten this establishment, and therefore explains there rejection of a vote of 74.5%.

I clearly think that this decision should be reversed.

I am writing to express my entire dissatisfaction at the recent decision to refuse the setting up of a parish council in Funtley, despite the fact that all criteria for this, including a large majority vote within the parish, have been met. This appears to me to be yet another instance of FBC ignoring the local will of voters following on from the decision to press ahead with the unpopular foundation of the Welborne New Town.

I call upon FBC to reverse this most recent decision and to accept the democratic will of the Funtley residents.

Thank you for extending the time to reply.

In your letter you quoted that a quarter of the residents did not want any changes which means that three quarters of the residents do so therefore their opinions should hold sway.

WELBORNE. We still don't know what impact this will have on Funtley either whilst being built or after construction.

LOCAL PLANNING APPLICATION. The status you afford the Funtley Village Society could be rescinded at any time where the statutory rights from the parish could not.

TRAFFIC CALMING. In the 17 years since living here, traffic has been a continually dangerous problem which is getting noticeably worse i.e. the fast through traffic making it dangerous exiting Lakeside, The Waters and Funtley lane. This is further aggravated by inconsiderate parking on double yellow lines opposite Lakeside and the bus stop area which is close to the lakeside junction. This makes it impossible to see traffic coming from the right.

STREET LIGHTING. Funtley lane is very dark and could do with extra light.

FUNDING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE LOCAL AREA. Parish council could have access to Lottery...
funding. The play park is a joke, we have a small amount of play apparatus for the younger children and absolutely nothing for the others as the park itself is not kept up to standard such as grass cutting unlike other parks in Fareham are i.e. The leisure centre park and Blackbrook road which seem to be kept really well and have footpaths so can be used all year round, this really needs addressing for our children's wellbeing.

MANAGING THE LOCAL AREA. Parking on the grass verges and pavements throughout the village which is not only unsightly but dangerous and inconvenient. Footpath around the lake is unusable in certain areas after rain. Despite granting permission for the fishing club to put a container on site to store tools in order to maintain the property this is not happening, therefore perhaps the unsightly container should be removed. We are wholly in favour of a Parish council and we think it would benefit all.

I think Fareham Borough Council's recommendation for Funtley not to have its own Parish Council is ridiculous. The majority vote by Funtley residents in favour of our own Parish Council was 74.5%.

I just wanted to show my support for the decision made to not make a parish council, instead strengthening the village society. My support for this decision is based upon the fact that the representations pushing for a parish council only seem to be involving the village residents when something is required, e.g. the petitions, but not the rest of the time.

**Submission 1:** We completely agree with your 3 main concerns. Trusting we keep the Status quo. Why should we pay more for the same level of service at the same time creating another level of bureaucracy? We feel it would also lead to elitism for some of the members of FVS. We have been well served by our local council over the years particularly by Pam Bryant and John. Particularly when the children's play equipment was at the rear of our house 108 Funtley Rd. Whom consulted with us and neighbours to get it replaced and moved away from the houses. In short we do not need a Parish Council here in Funtley. Thank you for keeping us informed and a resounding “yes” to your recommendation.
**Submission 2:** I write yet again in order to stop this nonsense of a Parish Council for Funtley. Your draft recommendation is absolutely correct. I have feedback from 5 friends living in Funtley whom have indicated they do not want to pay the precept/increased council tax, for the same level of service. This alone would lead to a lot of resentment in the village, me for one, if in any way this business of creating a Parish Council were to go ahead. Let sleeping dogs lie.

*Formal complaint submitted by respondent.*

Main points of response:

- The letter contained inaccurate use of data and was heavily biased.
- Ignored the overwhelming majority of Funtley residents who want a Parish Council.
- 2nd stage consultation period not long enough.
- Imposed will of minority of majority.

I was one of the quarter of residents who did not want any change to Parish Status in the village. Very few people turned up to the meeting to ask relevant questions regarding a Village Parish. I did and I was most surprised to see such a poor turn out. It quickly became apparent that allowing Funtley to become a parish was only going to create further costs for residents without improving their lives. People with rents and mortgages could ill afford this especially people with small children. Subscriptions could and would rise and create embitterment within the community. The initial votes from the "fors" seem to be based on a couple of village members going house to house, canvassing and selling the scheme and getting people to vote yes.

They should have come to the meeting and asked questions and understood what they were signing up for. It is obvious to me that Funtley will be like most "one time" village places. A couple of roads sandwiched between Red Barn Farm Estate and another to be Welborne estate. In fact given time it will disappear altogether in suburbia. So I agree with Fareham Council and very pleased that residents can approach councillors if they feel problems need to be ironed out.
My partner and I received the letter regarding the recommendations dated 23rd May 2016 which invites a response. We are both disappointed and puzzled as to why, given the 75% of residents in favour of a Funtley Parish Council that the wishes of the minority are to take precedence. This appears to fly in the face of the democratic process. We remain in favour of the establishment of a Funtley Parish Council to represent the interests of the residents of Funtley.

I am writing to confirm my support of the recommendation to give Funtley residents a greater say through the ward councillors and the Funtley Village Society and therefore not to proceed and create a Parish Council. I agree that many residents believe a Parish Council will give them far greater power which is not the case and provides little in tangible benefits over the current arrangements whilst providing additional cost and bureaucracy to residents.

I fully support the proposed outcome.

I am very pleased with the decision. It would have been unnecessary additional bureaucracy. I hope residents involved with the FVS will be satisfied that their voice will be heard, but I don’t know what they have to complain about!

REALLY

"A quarter of people who took part did not want to make any changes".

"74.5% were in favour of creating a new Funtley Parish Council"

Please explain how it is democratic for the 74.5% to be outweighed by the 25.5%.

Before imposing your choice "to strengthen this relationship with the FVS", Funtley residents should be asked for their preference:

- to be represented by the formation of a Parish Council, or
- to be represented by a strengthened FVS.

My fear is that the Fareham Borough Council is deliberately misinterpreting the views of the residents.
Thank you for updating us on the result of the above review. We are pleased with the outcome and are very happy that common sense has prevailed. Keep up the good work already provided for us by FBC.

For

I have received your letter of 23/5 re the recommendation not to create a Parish Council. As someone who was against this from the start I am delighted at this recommendation.

I note that FBC will strengthen their relationship with FVS and that FVS has the same status as a statutory consultee as a Parish Council would but without the additional cost to the council tax payer - a good solution I would think.

For

I approve of this decision, I think it is a sensible one to make.

Thank you

For
Ms Leigh Usher  
Head of Democratic Services  
Fareham Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
Civic Way  
Fareham  
PO16 7AZ

1st June 2016

Dear Ms Usher,

Re: Draft recommendations following Funtley Community Governance Review

I am writing on behalf of the Funtley Village Society (FVS), in response to your letter to all residents dated 23rd May 2016.

Our first concern is the fact that you have set a deadline for responses of 6th June which, bearing in mind the bank holiday weekend and half term holiday week prior to this date, when many residents will be away, will allow virtually no time for residents to consider and respond to your proposal. We strongly request that this date be extended by two weeks to give residents adequate time to deliberate and respond.

In general we find your letter and conclusions to be heavily biased against the expressed wishes of a large majority of Funtley residents and it does not reflect the facts of our case in a true and accurate manner, thus misleading not only the residents but also the Councillors who will be asked to vote on this matter. By accentuating the reservations of a small minority of dissenters while completely ignoring the arguments of the majority you have been guilty of a gross distortion of the case for a Parish Council. Funtley residents have been presented with the facts about the benefits that a Parish Council could bring as well as the costs, in writing, hand delivered to each address, and in external leaflets produced by the National Association of Local Councils. As a result, they voted overwhelmingly in favour by 74.5%. You have omitted to mention this in your letter, choosing instead to make much of the objections of a small minority.

There are 9,500 parish and town councils in England, 262 in Hampshire, most of which work successfully with local boroughs to the benefit of their residents. Some of these are local to us and have provided us with first hand experience of their successes. Have you taken this into account and contacted them also?
We would remind you of the advice given in the Parish and Town Councils Guide, which states:

"Both the current Government and its predecessors have spoken favourably of parish and town councils. The 2006 local government white paper, 'Strong and prosperous communities', stated:

"We will make it clear that there will be a presumption in favour of the setting up of parish councils so that local authorities will be expected to grant communities' requests to set up new parish councils, except where there are good reasons not to, and that existing parish councils are not to be abolished against the wishes of local people."

The Coalition Government's 2013 consultation paper on setting up new parish councils said:

"We believe that localism is best achieved when it is led by the local communities themselves. We see town and parish councils as playing a vital role in helping local people to make this happen; it is for this reason we want to support those neighbourhoods who want to set up a parish council."

The Funtley Village Society has always been completely honest with residents in their numerous communications and stated clearly, both verbally and in our literature, the powers a parish council would have as well as the limitations on its authority, along with the funding that would be available. You mention in your communication, that at the Community Action Team (CAT) meeting you held, there were 20 residents. You failed to acknowledge that the Funtley Village Society had already held a meeting prior to this to explain the facts to residents, which was attended by a much larger turnout. This is contrast to our own literature, where we gave equal prominence to the council run CAT meeting, as well our own meeting. At this meeting, residents had the opportunity to meet local councillors from other parishes, as well as members of the Hampshire Association of Local Councils (HALC). We have since also hosted a workshop for Fareham Councillors, attended by only five invitees. We have offered 3 dates to Councillors, not to lobby them but offering to share knowledge and information – many Councillors did not even pay us the courtesy of replying. We are more than happy to ask HALC to share their presentation with those Councillors who were unable to attend in order that they have the full facts to enable them to make an informed decision.

The following statement explains why we feel you have not given adequate reasons (as you are required to do by the Localism Act) to refuse the request of 74.5% of our residents.

As a Society we carefully considered whether Parish Council status would be beneficial for our residents and engaged the help of the Hampshire Association of Local Councils in order to ensure that no one would be misled. We researched all the available literature and read the Localism Act 2011 to ensure that we were fully informed before approaching our residents with the facts about a Parish Council. You may remember that we were obliged to correct Fareham Borough Council over the letter which accompanied your survey, as it stated incorrectly that a Parish Council could only have responsibility for areas which were handed down by the Borough Council (the error was never publicly corrected as we requested – the only correction appearing on your website – without any notice to residents that you had done so). It could be argued that at least some of the residents who changed their minds (you do not state how many these were) may have done so on the basis of your factually incorrect letter. In summary, residents should be well aware of the powers a Parish Council would have and your letter is incorrect and patronising to suggest otherwise.
The following paragraphs address each point made in your letter:

- Welborne, Local Planning Applications etc – as a statutory body, a Parish Council would have to be involved in discussions surrounding future developments. You are correct in saying that the Funtley Village Society does have a seat at the table presently – but not as a statutory body as you mention in your presentation. Experience has told us over the past few years, that public engagement regarding developments has been woefully inadequate and little more than a tick box exercise. As a statutory body, we would have a right to be present in discussions (as a society we do not have that right). A Parish Council’s neighbourhood plan, would also afford more credibility and influence than a non statutory body’s neighbourhood plan would.

- Traffic calming – temporary speed limiters were requested by the Funtley Village Society. This would not have occurred otherwise. We have not received any data from these monitors as we requested and there has been no further action taken to reduce speeding in the village. It is a responsibility that as a parish, we would be able to share with Hampshire County Council (HCC) and provide some of our own funds to help this work progress.

- Improve street lighting – again you commit the error of assuming that because this function would be delegated to the parish, it would not have any greater influence on its timely implementation. With parish funds we can help improve lighting in a more timely manner, than would be possible if we had to wait for Hampshire County Council to put measures in place.

- Funding improvements – again you have misled the residents by implying that the only funds available to us would be those collected via the precept.

- This is incorrect. As a parish we would be able to apply for many more grants than we would be able to as a Society. In fact as a result of talking to other parishes, it is apparent that this is where the bulk of parish funding comes from. To include the benches and the notice board in your letter is misleading, as they have not yet appeared and we have had no guarantee that they will. When fully discussing a precept with our residents, by far the majority were more than happy to pay the extra for the community benefits it would bring.

We would remind you that Fareham Borough Council set the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at zero for the Welborne development, thus affording our local community no funding for local improvement. As a parish council we would be entitled to these monies for future developments near our village.

The Parliament and Constitution Centre states: (Statutory Note SN/PC/04827)

‘On 10 January 2013, the Department for Communities and Local Government announced that in areas where there is a neighbourhood development plan in place, the Parish Council will be able to receive 25% of the revenues from the CIL arising from the development they have chosen to accept’.

- Manage the local area – the Funtley Village Society has never suggested that as a parish we would be responsible for completely upgrading the play area at Funtley to the sum that you suggest. A Parish Council would, however, be able to provide additional equipment such as
adult exercise machines and have a management plan in place for the upkeep of the area. This they would be able to manage alongside Fareham Borough Council. The mini makeover you refer to in 2015 was not communicated to the Funtley Village Society and we cannot see what has been completed as part of this work. Again, the nature of the total refurbishment although promised (not yet delivered), has not been communicated with the Funtley Village Society or residents and therefore should not have been put into your presentation as a reason why the Parish Council should not be formed.

- Bringing the community closer together – you imply that the Funtley Village Society has the same ability to do this as a Parish Council would. We disagree. A Parish Council would have the funds, through grants, to hold local fêtes and many more events than we are able to do at present. As volunteers the Funtley Village Society presently have little time to organise such events ourselves – on the other hand a Parish Council clerk would be employed to do much of this work regarding fund applications and communications. Also on the subject of democracy we should not ignore the fact that the Funtley Village Society cannot exercise all the functions you suggest as a substitute for a Parish Council. You of all people should acknowledge that the Funtley Village Society is a self appointed organisation of local residents (albeit a responsible and conscientious one) that is not democratically accountable to an electorate. You should be demanding that the functions you so willingly ascribe to the Funtley Village Society must be exercised by a Parish Council with a democratic mandate that is subject to periodic election.

It is disingenuous to focus on comments in your presentation from the 25.5% of residents who argued against a Parish Council while ignoring the opinions of the majority 74.5%. Of course, in any consultation there will be people who dissent from the majority view. But this is how democracy works. You may remember that those who fought against the Welborne development were in the minority (according to your survey) but were not given the same influence as you are affording those in the village who oppose a Parish Council. Where would we be if you had given those who opposed Welborne the same privilege?

Also we would like to see some direct quotations in your presentation, from the 74.5% of residents that supported a Parish Council – in order to provide a balance that is presently unforgivably absent.

You mention that the consultation has made you consider the need to work more closely with our community and strengthen your relationship with us. We would like to know what your plans are for doing this.

In summary, Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

‘The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government’.

We believe you are in blatant breach of this, as 74.5% of Funtley residents have requested that in line with the Government’s Localism Act, you recommend granting Funtley the status of a Parish Council.

If you will not reconsider your recommendations, then we request that the council calls a binding referendum within the next 3 months.

We would like you consider this communication and make the necessary adjustments to your letter to residents and presentation in order to give a more balanced view of the results of the governance review. In addition and going forward, we request that this process is opened up immediately for
real and meaningful debate, rather than being the current closed shop with no real communication or scrutiny.

Yours sincerely,

Edward Morell

For and on behalf of the Committee
The Funtley Village Society.

Cc Steven Lugg, Chief Executive of the Hampshire Association of Councils
Chris Borg, National Association of Local Councils
Cllr Pam Bryant and Cllr Louise Clubley (Fareham North Ward Councillors)
Examples of Band D Parish Precepts locally within Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Band D Parish Precept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winchester CC</td>
<td>Swanmore</td>
<td>£128.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh BC</td>
<td>Hamble Le Rice</td>
<td>£114.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hants DC</td>
<td>Farringdon</td>
<td>£102.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest DC</td>
<td>Totton &amp; Eling</td>
<td>£113.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart BC</td>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>£98.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke &amp; Deane BC</td>
<td>Laverstock &amp; Freefolk</td>
<td>£59.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley BC</td>
<td>Somborne</td>
<td>£46.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Whiteley Town Council Precept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Precept</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>£88.45</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>£89.04</td>
<td>+4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>£84.93</td>
<td>+14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>£74.00</td>
<td>+25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>£59.00</td>
<td>+47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>£39.99</td>
<td>+24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>£32.17</td>
<td>+55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>£20.76</td>
<td>+28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>£16.14</td>
<td>+7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>£15.06</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALL ABOUT LOCAL COUNCILS

A booklet for anyone wanting to know more about parish, town, neighbourhood and community councils and the role of local councillors.
About this booklet

Throughout England parish, town, community and neighbourhood councils (local councils)* work towards improving community well-being and providing better services at a local level. They are the tier of local government below the level of district, borough or unitary council and are the tier of local government closest to the people.

This booklet is for anyone wanting to know more about parish, town, community and neighbourhood councils (local councils), the role of local councillors and what you need to do if you would like to stand as a candidate in local council elections.

We have also provided a range of case studies which highlight the different kinds of work that local councils do, showing that size is no bar to making a real difference in the local community.
What are local councils?
There are around 9,000 parish, town, community and neighbourhood councils (local councils) representing around 16 million people across England. They form the most local level of government and cover many rural and urban areas. The latter includes many of our larger cities such as Birmingham, Leeds and Newcastle. Recent changes to the law mean that it is now possible to create a local council in London, last seen in the capital in the 1960s. To find out if there is a parish, town, community or neighbourhood council in your area contact the National Association of Local Councils (contact details are on the back page of this booklet).

What’s the difference between parish, town, community and neighbourhood councils?
Not a great deal. They all have the same powers and can provide the same services.

The only difference is that a town council has decided that it should be known as a town council instead of a parish, community or neighbourhood council, and has a mayor.

What services do they provide?
Your local council has an overall responsibility for the well-being of your local neighbourhood. Their work falls into three main categories:

- representing your local community
- delivering services to meet local needs
- striving to improve quality of life in the parish.

Your council might provide, maintain or contribute to the following services:

- allotments
- leisure facilities
- bus shelters
- litter bins
- car parks
- local illuminations
- community centres
- parks and open spaces

Parish, town, community and neighbourhood councils are collectively
known as local councils. Any reference to local councils in this booklet refers to parish, town and community councils and not to the district or borough council tier of local government.

- community safety schemes planning
- community transport schemes
- public lavatories
- crime reduction
- street cleaning measures
- cycle paths
- street lighting
- festivals and celebrations
- tourism activities
- traffic calming measures.

They will often work with bigger councils in your area called 'principal authorities' and cooperate to ensure the effective delivery of services to the local community.

**How do they make decisions?**

Your local council is made up of a number of councillors who meet
regularly to make decisions on the work and direction of the council. As elected bodies local councils are responsible to the people they represent – that’s your local community.

Attending a council meeting is the best way to find out what they do. Give the council a call and find out when its next public meeting is scheduled to take place.

**Where do they get their money from?**
Each year a sum of money called a ‘precept’ is collected through your council tax. This money is invested back into your local neighbourhood by your local council to improve facilities and services for you and your neighbours. Local councils can also apply for grants and loans and, if they own property, can receive money from rents or leases.
CASE STUDY

Improving performance: Peterlee Town Council

Number of councillors: 22
Size of electorate: 15,934

Peterlee Town Council is based in the new unitary area of Durham, in the North-East of England. It has gained Quality status. The Town Council embarked on an ambitious Action Plan in 2006/7. The provision of new and improved facilities continues to be the Council’s top priority. A new Generation 3 Flood-lit Training Area and sports and community building have recently received the “go ahead”. The council has recently installed a new website. Regeneration has always been a top priority for the Council, and the Council regularly reviews its corporate governance arrangements.
CASE STUDY

Delegated control: Aylesbury Town Council

Number of councillors: 24
Size of electorate: 40,000

As a consequence of obtaining Quality Status, the Town Council has entered into an agreement with the County Council to deliver minor highways maintenance in Aylesbury. This means it can respond instantly to problems with footpaths and minor road surfaces. It is also now empowered to clear rights of way, to control roadside vegetation and to maintain street furniture and signs. The council now tackles all the ‘grot spots’, on which it had previously been powerless to act. The Council agreed a match funding package where the County pays £2 to every £1 the Council spends, making a total of £30,000 per annum. This gives the Town Council the resource to invest personnel and equipment for outdoor maintenance and it now has much more control over the appearance of the town.
How are local councillors elected?

Local council councillors are elected to represent a geographical area known as a ward or – mainly in smaller local councils – the parish, town, community or neighbourhood council area as a whole.

They are elected by people who live in the area. If the local council is divided into wards an election is held in each ward, the same way elections are held in district or borough wards. If the local council doesn’t have wards there is just a single local council election.

Most local council elections are on the same cycle, with elections this year, 2015, 2019 and so on. However, local council elections may instead be held together with associated principal council elections. To find out when your local council has elections contact your local electoral office at your district or borough council. For details visit www.aboutmyvote.co.uk.

Local councils can now be established anywhere in England, whether small rural communities or within urban city conurbations. Recent legislation removed the ban on local councils being established in London ensuring that Londoners would have the option of establishing local councils for their local neighbourhood. For more information see www.communities.gov.uk.

Who can vote in local council elections?

To vote in any election you need to be registered to vote. To get on the electoral register contact the electoral services at your local district or borough council or visit www.aboutmyvote.co.uk to download a registration form. You can register to vote when you are aged 16 years or over but you need to be 18 or over to vote.

To vote in a local council election you need to be a British citizen, Irish citizen, European Union citizen or citizen of a Commonwealth country (including Cyprus and Malta).
What do local councillors do?

Councillors have three main areas of work:

1. Decision-making: through attending meetings and committees with other elected members, councillors decide which activities to support, where money should be spent, what services should be delivered and what policies should be implemented.

2. Monitoring: councillors make sure that their decisions lead to efficient and effective services by keeping an eye on how well things are working.

3. Getting involved locally: as local representatives, councillors have responsibilities towards their constituents and local organisations. This often depends on what the councillor wants to achieve and how much time is available. The day-to-day work of a councillor may include;

- going to meetings of local organisations such as tenants’ associations
- going to meetings of bodies that affect the wider community, such as the police, the Highways Authority, schools and colleges
- taking up issues on behalf of members of the public, such as making representations to the district or borough council
- running a surgery for residents to bring up issues
- meeting with individual residents in their own homes.
CASE STUDY

Community arts centre: East Grinstead Town Council

Number of councillors: 18
Size of electorate: 18,000

Between 1995 and 1996, East Grinstead Town Council embarked on a remarkable project to build the Chequer Mead Community Arts Centre. The building cost £2.4 million, the bulk of which was financed by the council with the Arts Council Lottery Fund and Mid Sussex District Council contributing additional funding.

The centre itself comprises a magnificent 340-seat theatre with 210 seats in the stalls and 130 seats in the circle. In addition, the complex comprises a dedicated art and exhibitions gallery, three meeting rooms, a studio room, a restaurant/cafeteria/bar and the usual backstage accommodation. At the time of its development this was, in funding terms to be the largest capital project developed by any parish or town council in England and Wales. The centre has rapidly built a first-class reputation as a venue with a wide educational remit and hosts high-class community and professional performing and visual art events. Chequer Mead is run as a charity and East Grinstead Town Council continues its role as trustee.

“Chequer Mead is a fantastic facility for the whole community providing opportunities for young and old in performing and visual arts”

Councillor Ian Dixon
How do I contact my local councillor?
To find out who your parish, town, community or neighbourhood councillors are, contact your local authority. They will provide you with contact details of the clerk for your local council. The clerks will have the contact information you need to locate your parish, town, community or neighbourhood councillors. If you have access to the internet, most councils provide an online search facility for your clerk’s contact details.

Could I become a local councillor?
As a councillor you can become a voice for your community and affect real change. Councillors are community leaders and represent the aspirations of the public that they serve. Parish, town, community and neighbourhood councillors are the most local part of our democratic system and are closest to the public. Why don’t you stand for your local council and see what difference you can make to your local neighbourhood?

How much time does it take up?
Quite often councillors say that their duties occupy them for about three hours a week. Obviously there are some councillors who spend more time than this – and some less, but in the main, being a local councillor is an enjoyable way of contributing to your community and helping to make it a better place to live and work.
CASE STUDY

Under the spotlight: Campbell Park Parish Council

Number of councillors: 20
Size of electorate: 10,900

Campbell Park Parish Council in Milton Keynes has undertaken a number of spotlight events to help highlight and explore, understand and celebrate a variety of different aspects of the local community. They have directed the spotlight on the Punjab, age and ageism, Ghana, the Celtic fringe, Nigeria, Islam, multiple occupation housing, Hinduism, health and diversity. The brainchild of Councillor Tom Fraser, Cllr. the late Richard Osbourne and the Milton Keynes Racial Equalities Council, the latest manifestation of Spotlight was a highly successful Diversity Ball which saw 800 people enjoy the spectacle of fantastic costumes, dancing and food, all helping to reflect the broad spectrum of different cultures in the local area.
Am I qualified?
Most people are. However there are a few rules. You have to be:

- a British citizen, or a citizen of the Commonwealth or the European Union, and
- 18 years or older on the day you become nominated for election.

You cannot stand for election if you:

- are the subject of a bankruptcy restriction order or interim order
- have, within five years before the day of the election, been convicted in the United Kingdom of any offence and have had a prison sentence (whether suspended or not) for a period of over three months without the option of a fine
- work for the council you want to become a councillor for

There are specific rules around candidacy. The full range of disqualifications for candidates is quite complex and some exceptions may apply. Full details can be found on the website of the National Association of Local Councils (contact details are on the back page of this booklet).

But I’m too young...
Some local councils also run youth councils, which are often made up of young people representing their local schools and colleges. This provides young people with a time and place to meet and discuss matters that affect them.

In 2007, the age you can run as a candidate in an election was lowered from 21 to 18. These youth councils are in direct communication with their parish, town, community or neighbourhood council so they can also be involved in decision-making.

Contact your local council, or speak to your school or local youth service to find out more. If there isn’t a local youth council you could get together with friends and put forward a proposal to set one up.

There are no local councils in my area. How can I get one set up?
A local council can empower your community. District and borough councils now have responsibility for the creation of new local councils. You can petition your district or borough council and request that a local council be set up in your community. It will be able to raise its own funds locally all of which will be invested in the local community for the well-being of its residents.

If you would like more information on setting up a local council the National Association of Local Councils can provide advice (contact details on the back page of this booklet). Also, download a copy of the Association's Power To The People pack at www.createacouncil.org.uk
CASE STUDY

Youth engagement: Ringwood Town Council

Number of councillors: 13
Size of electorate: 11,000

Ringwood Town Council represents the town of Ringwood in the New Forest District of Hampshire. The Town Council initiated a Student Advisers programme to involve young people in the running of the Council. Town Councillors could also gain a better understanding of the needs of local people. The Town Council was aware that it was often making decisions that would have greater consequences for young people than councillors themselves, so some sort of buy-in was sought. The local secondary school sends two representatives from amongst its students to sit on each of the Town Council's committees. The young people attending committee meetings contribute to specific discussions before decisions are made - the system works very well.
Further Information

The National Association of Local Councils is the national representative body for parish and town councils in England. Elections advice and resources are available on its website at www.nalc.gov.uk. For additional advice or support please contact 020 7637 1865.

The Electoral Commission (www.electoralcommission.org.uk) is an independent body set up by the UK Parliament. Our aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process.

For public awareness materials visit www.dopolitics.org.uk.

For more information on registering to vote or elections visit www.aboutmyvote.co.uk.