## Appendix C – Summary of responses from Individual Beach Hut Owners

| Individual Owner Response   | Officer Comments  |
|---|---|
| The beach hut site rent proposal is excessive and   | Justification for the proposal is the Council fees and charges  |
| cannot be justified. Increases should be linked to  | guidelines which includes the wording "to be increased to       |
| the rate of inflation/should be linked to Council   | achieve a realistic increase in income wherever possible and    |
| Tax increases   | every effort to be made to identify new sources of income.      |
|   | The proposed charges should be considered alongside those       |
|   | for similar services in neighbouring authorities and, where     |
|   | appropriate, the charges levied by private sector providers".   |
| Where does my rent go, how do you intend to   | Income from beach huts goes into the general fund to help       |
| spend this money, what improvements will this   | pay for the services which the Council provides and is not      |
| fund?   | spend specifically on beach area improvements.                  |
| The rental increase will make it more difficult   | This would be very unfortunate but there is no evidence to      |
| keep the hut.   | suggest that sales decisions are based solely on the level of   |
|   | site rents.   |
| System of charging double plot rental to non-   | The Council has a policy which has been in place for many       |
| residents is very unfair.   | years of charging non-Fareham residents double the site         |
| ·   | rent paid by a Fareham resident. Not all local authorities      |
|   | allow non- residents to own huts and some that do charge a      |
|   | higher rate to those owners.                                    |
|   | Previous beach hut site rent increases have not taken           |
| Discount should be given to disabled beach hut  | disabilities into account. A full equalities impact assessment  |
| owners  | will be completed by officers prior to any increase.            |
| Majority of beach hut owners are senior citizens  | Previous beach hut site rent increases have not taken into      |
| on pensions   | account age or income. A full equalities impact assessment      |
|   | will be completed by officers prior to any increase.            |
| Hill Head is not comparable to Hayling Island   | The location of a beach hut at Hill Head overlooking the        |
| e.g. Hill Head not a blue flag beach, no  | Solent is considered to be comparable, if not better, than      |
| commercial facilities are provided, not a tourist   | Hayling Island. It is accepted that Hill Head does not have     |
| resort, Hayling has a beautiful sandy beach &   | the tourist type attractions that Hayling Island enjoys but     |
| showers, Hill Head beach huts are adjacent to a   | the non-commercialised location of Hill Head could be           |
| public right of way.  | argued to make Hill Head more desirable.                        |
| A broader range of southern coastal authorities   | See Appendix A for details of our research. There are           |
| should be looked at   | differences in the tenancy & rental arrangements,               |
|   | transfer/administration fees, local facilities & parking        |
|   | provisions between the authorities. Some authorities have       |
|   | their own huts which they rent out, so this information has     |
|   | not been included. Officers still consider Hayling Island to be |
|   | the most appropriate comparable to Fareham.                     |
| The beach huts at Hayling are larger.   | The site rent paid for beach huts historically has not taken    |
|   | into account the size of the beach hut. Size is however one     |
|   | of the factors that reflects in the sale value of beach huts.   |
|   | Havant Council also does not take account of the size of the    |
|   | beach hut to determine the site rent paid.                      |
| Other issues e.g. dogs, toilets, vegetation   | These comments have been drawn to the attention of the          |
| clearance, seaweed, shingle on path, cyclists on  | appropriate services of the Council.                            |
| path, parking   |   |
| Shingle build up at Monks Hill  | The shape and levels of the beach are subject to constant       |
|   | change and the current profile does not warrant                 |
|   | expenditure of Council funds to recontour the beach.            |
| Lack of facilities provided for beach hut owners.   | The services which are provided at Hill Head are for all users  |
| , and the product of the control of | of the beach and not exclusively for beach hut owners           |
| Where does my rent go, how do you intend to   | Income from beach huts goes into the general fund to help       |
| spend this money, what improvements will this   | pay for the services which the Council provides and is not      |
| fund?   | spend specifically on beach area improvements.                  |
|   | apana apaamaan, an acaan area improvements.                     |

| Condition of huts/are all owners paying their rent?           | Site inspections are carried out periodically, and additionally in response to information from other owners or members of the public. Owners are then contacted, and repairs requested. All owners are currently paying their site rents. |
|---|--|
| Increased noise and air pollution due to the adjacent airport | Flight numbers are limited by the Planning Consent. Air quality is monitored, and the levels are within national guidelines.   |