



SUMMONS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A MEETING OF THE HART DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, HARLINGTON WAY, FLEET ON THURSDAY 30 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 7.00 PM

Joint Chief Executive

CIVIC OFFICES, HARLINGTON WAY
FLEET, HAMPSHIRE GU51 4AE

AGENDA

**COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE IN LARGE PRINT AND
BRAILLE ON REQUEST**

1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

To confirm the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 26 October 2017. **Paper A**

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To declare disclosable pecuniary, and any other, interests.

4 PRESENTATION - CITIZENS ADVICE

Chief Officer, Citizens Advice Hart, to present.

5 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

To receive any questions from members of the public submitted pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 12.

*Note: The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 12 must be given to the Chief Executive not later than **Noon on Friday, 24 November 2017.***

6 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

To receive any questions from Members submitted pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 14.

*Note: The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 14.3 must be given to the Chief Executive not later than **5.00 pm on Monday, 27 November 2017.***

*The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 14.4 must be submitted to the Chief Executive before **10.00 am on Thursday, 30 November 2017.***

7 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

8 CABINET MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

9 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

10 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

The Minutes of the following Committees, which met on the dates shown, are submitted.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.1, Members are allowed to put questions at Council without Notice in respect of any matters in the Minutes to the Leader of the Council or any Chairman of the relevant meeting at the time those Minutes are received by Council.

Meeting	Date	Page Numbers	For Decision
Overview and Scrutiny	17 October 2017	19-22	
Cabinet	2 November 2017	22-24	
Planning	8 November 2017	55-64	

Date of Despatch: 21 November 2017

COUNCIL

Date and Time: Thursday, 26 October 2017 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS –

Crisp - (Chairman)

Ambler	Forster	Oliver
Axam	Gray	Parker
Bailey	Gorys	Radley (James)
Blewett	Harward	Radley (Jenny)
Burchfield	Kennett	Renshaw
Clarke	Kinnell	Southern
Cockarill	Leeson	Wheale
Crampton	Makepeace-Browne	Woods
Crookes	Morris	Wright
Dickens	Neighbour	

Officers Present:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Gill Chapman	Committee Services

43 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 September 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

44 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Billings, Butler and Collett.

45 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

46 PRESENTATION BY THE ROSEFIELD DAY CENTRE

Lynne Ewing informed Members of the work of the Rosefield Day Centre, one of the Chairman's Charities for this year, which started as a coffee morning within Rosefield Court.

Now based at Odiham cottage hospital, the day centre was taken over 5 years ago by Age Concern Hampshire, and is open 3 days a week. It caters mainly for clients with dementia, and some physically frail. It provides respite day care, emergency respite care, social interaction, for people from care homes, who live on their own or live with family. They aim to provide a fun filled day for them, with physical and mental activity, and provide all sorts of activities - skittles, quoits, beetle drive, as well as mental activities. Clients are referred from adult services as well as private clients. They fund raise to bring entertainment in or take clients out. Examples of activities include a visit to a garden centre, a visit from the military wives choir from RAF Odiham, schools and nurseries visit, making fireworks and a farm visit. There are many benefits to clients, both social and mental and physical stimulation.

Councillors asked questions around where clients come from, running costs, staffing levels, and changes in adult services budgeting.

The Chairman thanked Lynne and Vanessa for the information and congratulated them on their valuable and inventive way of helping their clients and the community.

47 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Questions were received from Mr Tristram Cary, Ms Gemma Read and Mr David Turver, details of which are set out in Appendix A attached to these Minutes.

48 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Questions put by Councillors are detailed in Appendix B attached to these Minutes.

49 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had attended the following events on behalf of the Council:

29 September	Mayor Havant Charity Dinner, Waterlooville
1 October	Hampshire Harvest Celebrations at Winchester Cathedral
5 October	HCC Civic Day, The Great Hall, Winchester
11 October	Autism Friendly Fleet Launch at the Harlington
20 October	Yateley Mayor Charity Dinner, The Ely, Yateley
24 October	Hart Chairman's Civic Day
26 October	Home-Start Rushmoor and Hart AGM, Farnborough

The **Vice Chairman** attended the following events on behalf of the Council:

12 October	Lord Lieutenant of Hampshire Awards Ceremony, Winchester
24 October	Hart Chairman's Civic Day

The Chairman reported that the Civic Day had been a great success. Chairmen and Mayors from all over Hampshire had enjoyed visits to Gibraltar Barracks and Blackbushe Airport, and some had been invited to fly. The Vice Chairman added that the day had admirably showcased Hart to other Chairs and Mayors from Hampshire.

Councillor Southern reported on the fund raising total in his year as Chairman. He had received after final sums he had raised over £13,000 for his charities over the

Councillor Parker announced his Shadow Cabinet:

Leader of the Opposition and Planning - Councillor Stephen Parker
Deputy Leader and Contracts - Councillor Brian Burchfield
Finance - Councillor Ken Crookes
Services - Councillor Steve Forster
Partnerships - Councillor Anne Crampton
Housing - Councillor Stephen Gorys
Regulatory and Community Safety - Councillor John Kennett
Town & Village Regeneration – Councillor Mike Morris
Leisure & Countryside Services - Councillor Shawn Dickens

50 CABINET MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader of the Council, **Councillor Neighbour**, reported that the Council had responded to this year's technical consultation by the DCLG in relation to this year's financial settlement. He indicated that the response built on work that had been carried out in tandem with the District Councils Network, with the full response being available on the Council website, but in essence stressed our opposition to negative Revenue Support Grant. Concern had also been expressed over the lack of legislation on business rate retention and the subjective use of planning performance data to materially affect the outcome of the New Homes Bonus.

The Cabinet Member for Services, **Councillor Radley**, reported that, in the updating of parking machines, the last new parking machine had been installed in the canal car park in Fleet.

The Cabinet Member for Partnerships, **Councillor Ambler**, announced that he had attended the AGM of Hart Citizens Advice Bureau, who would be giving a presentation to Council on Universal Credit at December Council, and that the Hart Voluntary Action's AGM was coming up in November.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, **Councillor Bailey**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, **Councillor Cockarill**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Countryside Services, **Councillor Kinnell**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Contracts, **Councillor Oliver**, had no announcements.

51 JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVES' REPORT

The Joint Chief Executives' report is attached as Appendix C to these Minutes.

52 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

Meeting	Date
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (draft minutes)	19 September 2017

No questions asked.

Audit Committee (draft minutes)

26 September 2017

No questions asked.

Cabinet (draft minutes)

5 October 2017

Councillor Parker enquire why Councillor Radley had introduced item 59 on SANGs at the meeting. Councillor Radley explained his involvement, in this instance the item was about managing a service which falls under his portfolio.

Planning Committee

11 October 2017

No questions asked

The meeting closed at 8.12 pm

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Mr Tristram Cary asked:

Question 1 - At the Council Meeting on 29 June I asked for an indication of when the responses to the Reg 18 Local Plan Consultation would be published and Councillor Cockarill responded that the answers were being collated and that "we hope to be able to publish this information in the next couple of months". Four months have now passed since that answer was given and there is still no sign of any of the consultation responses. Can the Council state when the Consultation responses will now be published?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

The key priority is to get the local plan published, which is the priority work officers are doing in the final process of collating that information. It will be published on the website by 6 November, in full and unedited, except for personal information which will be redacted.

Question 2 - With reference to the responses to the Reg 18 Local Plan Consultation responses, will the Council confirm that the collation process referred to by Cllr Cockarill will not involve changing the responses in any way, and that the Council intends to publish all the Consultation responses in full?

Mr Cary indicated that this question had already been answered, but asked as a supplementary question why any details needed to be redacted as it was clear that responses would be published in full.

Councillor Cockarill responded:

There are rules around data protection and some people may not wish for their name published. Those organisations or people responding in an official capacity are a different matter. Ordinary citizens will have their information redacted for privacy reasons.

The Joint Chief Executive added that under the Data Protection Act personal details should not be published. In this case names would be shown, but addresses would not be published. This was in accordance with the approach the Council had used at the time of the consultation.

Ms Gemma Read asked:

What action, if any, is Hart District Council taking to oppose the proposals contained in South Western Railway's current timetable consultation, which will significantly reduce the frequency of peak train services to both Winchfield and Hook from December 2018 if brought in, and will therefore have a significant impact on the district, not only users of those stations, but also users of Fleet and Farnborough stations?

Councillor Radley responded:

He would join the Winchfield and Hook Stations Action Group in encouraging anyone who feels that they would be adversely affected by these proposals to respond to the consultation. This would extend to passengers who use Fleet and Farnborough stations because of the knock on effect from those stations directly affected adding to the capacity issues in the car parks of both these stations.

For Hart District Council's part, we shall be responding to this consultation before the 22nd December deadline. We shall be drawing attention to the likely impact on Fleet station of this proposal. We shall alert South Western Railways to the proposal for a new settlement in our emerging local plan which would in time help boost the number of passengers using Winchfield station.

Mr David Turver asked:

Question 1 - It is, of course, highly regrettable that the Grove Farm planning application was granted at appeal. However, given that officers recommended that planning permission be granted and the planning committee failed to make a determination on time, it is not unexpected that the appeal was allowed. Can you please set out the cost of defending the appeal including:

- a) External legal and consultant costs
- b) Internal time costs of officers
- c) Any potential loss of New Homes Bonus
- d) Lost time on the Local Plan due to resources being diverted to defend the appeal
- e) Appellant costs

Councillor Cockarill responded:

This is a fairly lengthy answer, which I will send in full in writing to you. In short, the response to your bullet points are:

- a - we have not yet received the respective invoices
- b - the internal time costs of officers are not divided
- c - none
- d - none
- e - the appellant costs are not known as Hart is not responsible.

Question 2 - Did the council receive legal advice on the chances of success in defending the appeal? In accordance with the Hart Code of Conduct objectives for openness and transparency, can you answer the following:

- a) What, in summary, did the advice say?
- b) Will you make the advice public?
- c) Was the provider of this legal advice the same organisation that helped defend the appeal?
- d) How much did the advice cost?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

This was not a matter of law, it was a matter of Planning judgement and not a point of law, so no legal advice was sought in this situation as it was not necessary.

Question 3 - A recent joint Chief Executive statement said “In terms of the impact for planning across the District this appeal decision tells us little that is new. The Inspector used the same reasons that had previously been used by the Inspector at Moulsham Lane”. In accordance with the Code of Conduct statements about “Managing risks and performance through robust internal control and strong public financial management”, will the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be examining the decision to defend the Grove Farm appeal and making recommendations to avoid future waste of public funds?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee exists to scrutinise the Executive (Cabinet), not the actions of the statutory Committees of the Council. As background, we believed as a Council that the grounds on which we were fighting the appeal, namely the gap argument, was valid. The Planning Inspector judged that the need to provide more houses outweighed maintaining the gap. Nothing in that approval was unreasonable.

Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

Will councillors or officers who made the decision to refuse the appeal make a contribution to the public funds.

Councillor Cockarill responded:

This is not a question to be answered. We would not expect anyone to ‘contribute’ to a logical decision made by the Council, particularly as the refusal reflected the view of the local residents including those expressed by interest groups such as WeHeartHart.

Question 4 - Given the saved policies have been ruled to be out of date twice now, what steps can the council take to avoid becoming a sitting duck in future planning decisions and appeals in advance of the Local Plan being adopted?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

The Government is looking to boost the supply of new homes as we know. We are looking at the challenges and getting a local plan together with confidence should we have to go to appeal.

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14

QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Councillor Parker asks:

1. To ask the Leader of Council: Will the Leader please advise who exactly in his Cabinet is dealing with Health & Wellbeing, and who exactly is dealing with Town and Village Regeneration?

Councillor Neighbour responded:

Health and Wellbeing is a cross-cutting agenda which touches on many aspects of the Councils programme. Specifically, much of the Councils resource is provided by the Health & Policy Project Officer. In the summer we saw the Partnerships Portfolio as having the main overview of Health and Wellbeing. Recently, Councillor Bailey has taken on the Chair of both the Hart Health and Wellbeing Partnership and the Ageing Well Network. The next meeting of the Ageing Well Network takes place in this Chamber tomorrow.

Councillor Parker asked a supplementary question:

Interpreting that, I assume that Councillor Ambler is no longer responsible for Health and Wellbeing, can I ask that the website be updated. Where does Regeneration fit?

Councillor Neighbour responded:

Town and Village Regeneration is another cross-cutting agenda, an agenda which the previous administration failed to mention in their Corporate Plan or indeed in this years' service plans. Work in this area is currently led by myself in my capacity as Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, as well as Councillor Ambler with regards to partnership working with our Town and Parish Councils. Not to forget the role of any emerging Neighbourhood Plans, which come under Councillor Cockarill.

2. To ask the Leader of Council: In the light of recent legal advice from DCLG, how many non-Housing Association residential blocks have ACM and what action has this council taken to enforce appropriate testing and action?

Councillor Neighbour responded:

The advice from the DCLG referred to the testing of ACM (Aluminium Composite Material) in buildings over 18 metres in height, of which there are none in Hart. Working in partnership with Hampshire County Council and Hampshire Fire and Rescue Services, this work was extended to include educational establishments where cladding may be a concern. To our knowledge there are no buildings clad with ACM in Hart.

3. To ask the Cabinet Member for Housing: Following the New Burdens funding of £35k announced last week under the Homelessness Reduction Act, how is it planned for this funding to be used?

Councillor Bailey responded:

The Government supports Councils with additional funding. This additional funding is to help with extra costs for homelessness. The allocation for Hart is fairly modest at just

£11,500 a year over the next three years. The emerging Homelessness Strategy is going to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee imminently.

4. To ask the Cabinet Member for Planning: Does the Cabinet Member for Planning support the proposed methodology for determining Objectively Assessed Housing Need detailed in H.M. Government's current consultation?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

In principle yes. As expected, the Government has proposed a proportionate and straightforward approach to estimating local housing need. There are questions remaining over whether household projections are still the best starting point, but their continued use reflects a longstanding approach with which most are familiar. However, consideration will still be required, particularly in the Hart context, to ensure that sufficient flexibility is retained in any final local housing numbers to ensure:

- Key affordable housing needs are addressed - particularly the need for rented affordable homes
- A buffer is maintained to accommodate potential non-delivery of key sites, and to cushion the effects of any unmet need arising from neighbouring HMA partners
- That the Local Plan can over time robustly address any pressure to increase delivery in light of the bi-annual publication of fresh household projection forecasts without becoming out of date or failing to maintain a five year supply of housing land.

Councillor Forster asked:

Can the Cabinet member for Contracts provide an update for residents concerned about speeding vehicles on when each of Hart's Speed Indicator Devices will be redeployed under the Basingstoke & Deane Contract, and provide a schedule of future deployment.

Councillor Radley responded:

Hart's grounds and street cleaning services are provided by Basingstoke and Deane under the terms of a delegated service agreement between the two authorities. This agreement does not include for the installation of speed indicator devices (SIDS). Whilst this work has previously been delivered by Basingstoke this had been agreed as a goodwill gesture which due to increasingly stretched resources Basingstoke are now unable to continue to deliver. It has, however, been agreed that the specification for the street care service should be reviewed and it may be possible to incorporate the installation of speed indicator devices within this. We are looking to other local councils to see if they can help us to provide a solution.

Any town or parish council who has access to an individual whom is authorised to work on the highway such as through Hampshire's Parish Lengthsman scheme could put up their own SIDs device. It may even be possible to borrow one of Hart's units if one is available.

Councillor Forster asked for a clarification that there is no schedule for deployment at this moment? Councillor Radley confirmed that at this moment in time Hart does not have the ability to do that.

Councillor Forster asked a supplementary question:

The data from the SID device is not just about speed but also traffic volume, and could be used as evidence for highway matters and the planning department. Why are Hart not harnessing that data through these low cost SIDS?

Councillor Radley responded:

Any major application that relies on highways data, highways will provide that data for themselves. Any data that Hart gathers will not be considered robust enough as it would not have been collected in the proper way.

Joint Chief Executives' Report

Ms Patricia Hughes reported:

- 1 A multi agency live emergency exercise (LIVEX) had been held last week, an example of many groups working together on a scenario of a chinook crashing on the M3 and the resulting effects on the Hart district. This was a good and exciting test which went very well, with compliments going especially to our own Emergency Centre at Hart.
- 2 Planning permission has been granted for the new sports hall at Calthorpe. Interest is also continuing in Hart's new leisure centre, and staff have been showing round Councillors and officers from Shepway, South Buckingham and Chiltern Councils, with a great level of interest. There is a customer satisfaction survey underway for the new leisure centre, so please do encourage your residents to participate.
- 3 As branch chairman of SOLACE this year I will be taking part in a conference next week. My colleague, Mr Phillips will still be available here.
- 4 Members will have received an email about the recruitment of a new Head of Community Services, inviting them to meet the candidates on 9th November. Please remember to let us know if you are intending to attend.
- 5 Members will have noticed we are refurbishing the toilets at the moment. This floor is scheduled for week beginning 6 November, with redecoration of the public areas of the Council offices to follow.

Councillor Forster commented on his observation of the LIVEX exercise. He reported that comments made about Hart's overall performance were good, and he congratulated everyone involved on the day.

COUNCIL

Date and Time: Thursday, 30 November 2017 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS –

Crisp - (Chairman)

Ambler	Crampton	Neighbour
Axam	Crookes	Oliver
Bailey	Dickens	Parker
Billings	Forster	Radley (Jenny)
Blewett	Gorys	Renshaw
Burchfield	Harward	Southern
Butler	Kennett	Wheale
Clarke	Kinnell	
Cockarill	Leeson	

Officers Present:

Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Gill Chapman	Committee Services

53 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The word 'not' had been omitted from Page CL.45, penultimate paragraph, which should read:

Councillor Forster asked for a clarification that there is no schedule for deployment at this moment? Councillor Radley confirmed that at this moment in time Hart does **not** have the ability to do that.

With this correction, the Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 October 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

54 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Collett, Gray, Makepeace-Browne, Morris, Radley (James), Woods and Wright.

55 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

56 PRESENTATION BY THE CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU

Sally Plank, Chief Officer of Citizens Advice Hart District (CAB), updated Members on the work of the Citizens Advice on the introduction Universal Credit and delivering it locally to Hart residents. The CAB has helped just under 3,000 residents so far, looking for advice in a variety of ways - face to face, phone, email and webchat. Universal Credit is six means tested benefits being rolled into one payment, with the claims being made and managed online. The aim is to help people to go from dependency to self sufficiency, there will be a full service rollout next year to encompass every claimant, with CAB helping with issues such as difficulty in reading and writing and form filling, digital exclusion and chaotic lives.

Members congratulated the CAB on the very valuable work that was being done by the CAB in Hart. Discussion ranged around the impact of closure of local banks, basic bank accounts, involvement of parishes and the renewal of the core service level agreement in March.

57 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Prior to questions, the Chairman took the opportunity to remind Members of the custom and practice around Questions and Points of Order as detailed in the Constitution.

A question had been received from Mr David Turver, details of which are set out in Appendix A attached to these Minutes.

58 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Questions put by Councillors are detailed in Appendix B attached to these Minutes.

59 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had attended the following events on behalf of the Council:

4 November	Gibraltar Barracks – Regiment Guest Night
11 November	Remembrance Day, War Memorial, Gurkha Square
12 November	Remembrance Sunday Civic Service
13 November	Opening of Bramshot Farm SANG
21 November	Mayor of Winchester Civic Day, Winchester
21 November	Mayor Bracknell Charity Dinner, Bracknell
28 November	The Never Such Innocence event at RAF Odiham

The Vice Chairman had attended the following events on behalf of the Council:

27 October	Odiham Art Group Exhibition, Robert May's School, Odiham
28 October	Pelly Concert Orchestra at Church on the Heath, Elvetham Heath
3 November	Cancer Fundraising event, Rural Fringe Hair Salon, Hartley Wintney
12 November	Remembrance Service, Christ Church, Church Crookham

60 CABINET MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader of the Council, **Councillor Neighbour**, announced:

I am please to confirm that Hart district Council has been shortlisted in the national Local Government chronicle (LGC) Awards for the Best Service Delivery Model category. Our entry, titled 'The new collaborative Council', focusses around the key themes of building blocks for success, including being more entrepreneurial, innovating and transforming how services are provided through collaboration and most importantly planning for the long-term financial resilience.

Our vision for Hart is clear, it is about investing in our communities to improve quality of life. Our ambition for the district is to make it a great place to live, work, enjoy and contribute and be part of a strong community. We know that working in isolation is no longer an option to delivering the high quality services our residents expect and deserve. We now start with a n ethos of not, what can do, but how can we work together collaboratively. Our collaborations have been successful which is recognised by being shortlisted in the national award. Our judging day will be on Monday, 15 January.

The Leader would circulate details of winners at the recent Inspire Business Awards.

The Cabinet Member for Partnerships, **Councillor Ambler**, had no announcements.

The Cabinet Member for Housing, **Councillor Bailey**, reported:

In view of the cold weather we are experiencing at the moment we have applied our Severe Weather Emergency Protocol. This means that we will arrange overnight accommodation for anybody sleeping rough! Please help keep rough sleepers safe by reporting it to our Engagement & Support Team! Get in touch on 01252 774420 or email housing@hart.gov.uk.

Along with Hart Voluntary Action we are holding a ONE YOU Wellbeing Day on Friday, 19 January in Hart Shopping Centre between 10am and 3pm. We have had a really good level of interest from local service providers who are keen to reach out to Hart residents including both physical and mental health services.

In partnership with Hart Voluntary Action and Energise Me (County sports partnership) we held a successful networking and development event for local sports clubs and physical activity providers. At the event we shared local insight on physical inactivity levels and discussed marketing techniques to encourage and support clubs to think about how they could help to get more people more active in Hart. Further events will be held in 2018.

Members asked questions on the Severe Weather Protocol and the rough sleeper event being organised by Fleet Phoenix.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, **Councillor Cockarill**, announced:

We submitted our formal response to the Government's consultation on the proposed new housing methodology last month, in line with the discussions and suggestions made at Cabinet.

Members might have heard of Sajid Javid's speech last month in Bristol on the Government's plans to increase housing provision across England. In the speech, he urged local councils who have to adopt a new Local Plan to get on with it. On the same day, a letter was sent to the 15 councils deemed by the Department for Communities & Local Government to be the worst performers, giving them a deadline of January to submit their Plans or have the decision-making powers removed and handed over to County councils. I'm pleased to announce that, to some surprise, Hart was not one of the 15. This is almost certainly due to the positive engagement of our Planning Officers with officials from the Department for Communities & Local Government on issues such as the new housing methodology consultation, as well as the united focus and drive of this Administration in completing the Local Plan.

Members might also have picked up from the Budget Speech last week that the Chancellor wants to see 300,000 more homes per year built across England. This represents a 13% uplift on the 266,000 set out in the consultation Planning for Housing. We think it is likely, in view of a new national building delivery target being announced, that the Standard Approach to calculating OAN will be rebased to ensure that collectively LPAs are planning to deliver 300,000 homes per annum. If the 13% uplift is applied to the current uncapped OAN figures, the OAN would be about 1,059 for the Hart/Rushmoor/Surrey Heath Housing Area. This equates to an increase in Hart's proposed OAN from 293 to 330 dwellings per annum. However, because of the consistent line this Administration has taken on our housing target, this potential uplift in the consultation will not materially affect Hart's Local Plan.

Finally, a date for Members' diaries. There will be an all-Members Briefing on the Local Plan on Tuesday, 19 December, at 7pm in the Council Chamber. This will be an opportunity to get an update on the Plan's progress, where we are now and the future steps, including a timetable.

The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Countryside Services, **Councillor Kinnell**, reported:

Bramshot Country Park is now open to the public providing 91 acres of open meadows and woodlands and plentiful space for dog walking and other outdoor pursuits. The new Country Park was recognised by an official ribbon cutting ceremony on 13 November, to which all Councillors were invited and a number of you here attended. This is only Stage 1 and the site will continue to develop over the years ahead. Additional projects are to be carried out to further enhance the site including notice boards, an entrance feature sign, a dog wash, pic benches and additional planting. The phase 2 feasibility study on the site will be commissioned by the new financial year with the business plan being submitted to the Project Board when complete. I'm sure you will all join me in congratulating our Countryside Team for their hard work over the past 6 months developing this amazing high quality green space.

The new Gelvert stream upper bridge has been installed at Fleet Pond Nature Reserve. The bridge it replaces was sinking into the stream channel causing a dam at high water times and had lost its hand rails. This bridge is of a galvanised steel, engineered frame on concrete foundations and should last a considerable amount of time. It is a vital link for circular walks around Fleet Pond and key to moving the maintenance tractor and trailer around the site. I'm delighted to report that positive comments have been received from volunteers on the site and members of the public.

Permission has been sought from the Secretary of State for a grazing enclosure on Hazeley Heath SSSI as a result of the 10 year study on the site. I've been advised by Adam Green that "this is an exciting time for the Countryside Team and a first in the Countryside world. If consent is given, it will be like winning an Olympic Gold Medal!". We have some queries to respond to from the SOS but we hope to have a decision early in the New Year.

Everyone Active has won the "Facility Operator of the Year" at the Swim England National Awards. The new leisure centre had over 3,300 extra swimmers through its doors compared with the same period (1 April to 31 October) at the old leisure centre. The new leisure centre is also up for the "New Centre of the Year Award" at the Annual National Fitness Awards. The winner will be announced tomorrow and I will ensure that I let members know the outcome.

As members are aware, customer feedback surveys were run at both leisure centres from 16 July through to 14 November. We still need to go through the feedback in detail, but on the whole the results were very good. The centres' overall scores were brought down, as expected, by the outstanding snagging and defect issues, so I would expect the next survey results, in about 9 months time, to show a big improvement. We will shortly be going through the results with the management at Everyone Active and then advertising the results to our customers, with the actions that will be put in place to further improve the customer experience.

And finally, Patricia Hughes is meeting with Steve Clow from HCC on 4 December to agree or the go ahead with the new sports hall for Calthorpe Park School. If agreement is reached, the contract will be signed on 5 December, with mobilisation starting on 6 December. Work will then commence on site on 215 January with a completion date of 30 July 2018. The project is currently on budget, with some minor savings to be agreed on, which will only improve the bottom line. Demolition of the former Hart Leisure Centre will commence once the new sports hall has been finished or Calthorpe Park School no longer require the use of it. Demolition is expected to take about ten weeks and this programme of work is still being finalised.

Members asked questions on other SANG projects (Hawley Park, Watery Lane and NE Hook), the internal project board, and the position with regard to the negotiations with HCC over the construction of the new sports hall and parking provision at the sports hall site.

Councillor Wheale updated members on the successful Fleet Christmas Festival held on 30 November and thanked the District for its support.

The Cabinet Member for Contracts, **Councillor Oliver**, had no announcements.

61 JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVES' REPORT

The Joint Chief Executives' report is attached as Appendix C to these Minutes.

62 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

Meeting	Date
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	17 October 2017
No questions asked.	
Cabinet (draft Minutes)	2 November 2017
No questions asked.	
Planning Committee (draft minutes)	8 November 2017
No questions asked.	

The meeting closed at 8.35 pm

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Mr David Turver asked:

The school places plan also shows continuing pressure on Fleet schools. Given that there is significant development proposed at Sun Park and Hartland Village, have you considered siting a new secondary school, if required, at Hartland Village or using part of the Bramshot Farm SANG?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

Setting aside that it will be for Hampshire County Council to determine how the educational needs of Hart children will be met, the answer to the first question is Yes. There were some early thoughts about assessing if the development at Hartland Village might be able to offer a site for a secondary school. However, it was soon discounted for good reasons. With a land take of 9.5ha which amounts to just under 20% of the main Hartland Village site area it was clear that it was neither desirable, practicable (it was in the wrong place to create a suitable catchment - remember one needs a catchment of 5,000 homes or more) not viable to deliver such a solution (it would have resulted in the loss of 300 dwellings with no additional funding created). The applicant, with Hampshire County Council's agreement, therefore followed the offsite solution and made a £7.2m contribution towards secondary education provision instead.

There was never any intention to consider a new secondary school at Bramshot Farm so the answer to the question is No. The Council secured a £5.6m loan from the LEP to deliver a SANG to meet the needs of the housing market area. It is in the wrong place for a secondary school and to set aside a 9.5ha area of land would reduce the SANG capacity by 30% and also reduce the size of Bramshot's catchment to only 4km. With the loss of carrying capacity of over 500 dwellings such as an option would have made it unaffordable for the Council to have funded the purchase of the land and it would have undermined the intention to ensure that wider housing market needs were met. Our bid for the LEP loan would not as a result have been supported by Rushmoor or Surrey Heath.

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14

QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Councillor Crookes asked:

Given the appalling situation with trucks parked on the highway at Potbridge, what steps are the Council now taking to recruit more Civil Enforcement officers?

Councillor Radley responded:

The question raises two important points, the short staffing that we have within the Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) team and the long standing issues at Potbridge. Although there is some overlap between the two they are distinctly different issues.

The approved staff structure for the parking service provides 5 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) CEOs, when fully resourced these are covered with 4 full time posts and two part posts. Currently 3.5 posts are filled, although 1.5 FTEs have been seconded to provide office support. Hopefully by the end of next week we shall be in a position to advertise to fill the vacant 1.5 FTE CEO positions; we have been waiting on confirmation of the outsourcing agreement, which is now close to resolution.

A full review of the staffing levels required within the CEO team will be undertaken once it is clear if HCC will be taking the on street parking function back in house or not.

Regarding the situation at Potbridge, enforcement action would need to be against the registered owner of the vehicles, which may not be the operator of the scrap yard itself. However, Hart will try this route. A more productive approach is for Hart to pursue enforcement of a court injunction against the owner of the scrap yard for encroachment on Hart land. This matter (committal proceedings for failing to comply with the injunction) has been provisionally set down for half a day on either Wednesday 14 March, Thursday 15 March or Friday 16 March.

Councillor Crookes asked a supplementary question:

We are aware of, and welcome, the injunction taken out some time ago and have noted the dates for the court hearing. We are also aware of the situation of the potential transition of the CEO team. My understanding is that there are only two CEOs on the streets enforcing. We need more on the street, not only for Potbridge, but to to enforce all our street and parking regulations, including for safety near schools.

In Councillor Radley's absence, Councillor Neighbour would ask Councillor Radley to respond in writing.

Councillor Forster asked:

An FOI request has revealed Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) intend to construct a 6 mile fence intending to enclose 900 acres of Long Valley. Section 2 of Aldershot and District Military Lands Byelaws (1976) states:

...the public are permitted to use all parts of Military Land not specially enclosed...for the purposes of open air recreation at all times when the Military Lands are not being used for Military purposes...

We are concerned about restricting public access so can Hart District Council urgently request to:

1. Meet formally with DIO and ascertain the level of impact on the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents and how this has been taken into consideration when planning such a fence;
2. Obtain, in writing, details of whether/when the Long Valley proposed area will remain open for public use/recreation
3. Include in this meeting representation from key stakeholders including the active local community of recreational users. (Cyclists, runners and walkers).

Councillor Neighbour read out **Councillor Radley's** response:

I am sorry that I am not available in person to answer Cllr. Forster's question as this is a matter that is very close to my heart. I have been asked to respond on behalf of the administration to this question as I have an existing relationship with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) in respect to their management and use of Longmoor Camp for military training.

This past weekend I both rode my mountain bike and enjoyed an exhilarating walk with my wife and our dog Paddy through the area which would be effected. I should emphasise that when on my bike I always keep to the designated footpaths and avoid any training when I see it. I am aware of the disruption that inconsiderate riders cause by literally riding through encampments and even over soldiers in their fox holes!!! I am also very much conscious of the dangers posed by the Eelmoor HSTT (High Speed Test Track) and Long Valley off road driver training areas.

It is because of repeated 'near misses' by people trespassing on these areas that the army have been forced to take action. An early precaution having been the closure of the Bourley Road car park; a closure in response to which I first approached DIO.

Unfortunately, from the army's perspective, to subdivide the area by fencing off just the High Speed Test Track would subdivide the area and result in an area too small for effective training. Therefore they have informed me upon enquiry this week that they intend to fence in all of the training land north of the Bourley Road, but not including the Tweseldown race course nor the adjacent Rushmoor SANG. There is no intention to fence off the area south of Bourley Road and hence as long as they are abiding by the by-laws people can still enjoy the staggering view from the top of Caesar's Camp.

In regards to the area north of Bourley Road, it is the intention of the army to allow public access to this area when it is not being used for training.

For clarity, the MoD are well aware that as the proposed fence is 1.4m high, on their own land and not abutting the highway that it is permitted development and so do not need to obtain planning permission from Hart or Rushmoor.

Hart open spaces team have reached out to DIO to start liaison meetings. The DIO are particularly keen to point out that the MoD have already given up over 700 acres of prime training estate to SANGS in recent years, I am sure that the promotion of these sites for alternative recreational use will be on the agenda. The important matter of how readily the promise of allowing public access when the training lands are not in use is granted will also be a subject for monitoring and on-going discussion. Once established such meetings may be able to offer opportunities for particular interest groups to raise and discuss their concerns.

On a personal note, I and my family have enjoyed the use of these lands for over 25 years and we will be as devastated as anyone else to see them fenced in and public access restricted. However, it has to be recognised that this is a consequence of the army consolidating their resources in this part of the country as they withdraw from a wider presence in Europe. Therefore I am very relieved to see that it is the army's intent to continue to allow the public to enjoy this area whenever it is safe to do so.

Councillor Forster asked a supplementary question:

Would the District Council support the registration of these areas as assets of community value, ensuring they are not fenced off and sold for future development – is that feasible?

In Councillor Radley's absence, Councillor Neighbour would ask Councillor Radley to respond in writing.

Joint Chief Executives' Report

Mr Phillips reported:

I have attended two important meetings in the last month. The first was representing the Council at the House of Lords review committee into the workings of the countryside act, and secondly a meeting with Alok Sharma, the Housing and Planning Minister. The Minister confirmed that the proposed new methodology for calculating housing need was only the start point in the assessment, and that Local Authorities were expected to look at uplifts to reflect local needs. Any figures therefore should not be seen as a minima. At this point it was confirmed that the new methodology could not be relied on at the moment and this is reflected in the change in housing numbers promoted through the government's recent budget statement where the government is now looking for 300,000 new homes per annum to be built in England, rather than the previous figure of 266,000.

With regard to Calthorpe Park sports hall, discussions are going well with the County Council and are currently centring on any price differentials. It is not anticipated that there will be a problem.

Councillor Parker supported the comment about the numbers and the new methodology, and the expectation was that we should be planning to deliver more houses per annum than the starting point suggested in the illustrative new methodology figures.

COUNCIL MEETING - 30 NOVEMBER 2017

QUESTIONS NOTIFIED

From The Public:

Mr David Turver to ask:

The school places plan also shows continuing pressure on Fleet schools. Given that there is significant development proposed at Sun Park and Hartland Village, have you considered siting a new secondary school, if required, at Hartland Village or using part of the Bramshot Farm SANG?

From Councillors:

Councillor Crookes to ask:

Given the appalling situation with trucks parked on the highway at Potbridge, what steps is the Council now taking to recruit more Civil Enforcement officers?

Councillor Forster to ask:

An FOI request has revealed Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) intend to construct a 6 mile fence intending to enclose 900 acres of Long Valley. Section 2 of Aldershot and District Military Lands Byelaws (1976) states:

...the public are permitted to use all parts of Military Land not specially enclosed...for the purposes of open air recreation at all times when the Military Lands are not being used for Military purposes...

We are concerned about restricting public access so can Hart District Council urgently request to:

1. Meet formally with DIO & ascertain the level of impact on the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents and how this has been taken into consideration when planning such a fence;
2. Obtain, in writing, details of whether/when the Long Valley proposed area will remain open for public use/recreation
3. Include in this meeting representation from key stakeholders including the active local community of recreational users. (Cyclists, runners and walkers).

Rejected Questions to Council and Reasons for Rejection

Mr Turver asked:

Hampshire County Council have recently published a school places plan that shows a surplus of secondary school places up to 2021. There is now extra space for expanding Calthorpe Park. Would a new secondary school be required if the Local Plan was based on:

- a. ***The 10,185 units in the draft Local Plan?***
- b. ***The 8,022 units in the SHMA?***
- c. ***The 6,132 units (or ~6,500 if Hart needs to build some extra for Surrey Heath) implied by the recent Government consultation on the approach to calculating housing need?***

Reasons for Rejection:

Notwithstanding the fact that the question is badly framed because it seeks to compare a short term School Places Plan with a much longer Local Plan which would run to 2032 (therefore there is no possibility of a genuine comparison), Hampshire County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a sufficiency of school places for Hampshire children. Therefore the hypothetical question set out in the question about the need for a secondary school should be put to Hampshire County Council as Hart District Council is not promoting a new secondary school other than working with Hampshire County Council to secure the long term availability of land for a possible future secondary school.

We are therefore rejecting the question as it relates to a matter for Hampshire County Council and also the answer will not inform any current decisions or scenarios that are being considered by Hart District Council.

The question will not be put to Council.

For background information Hampshire County Council made comments in respect of 10,185 units. These can be viewed on the Council's web site at: https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Policies_and_published_documents/Planning_policy/Local_Plan/EMI43%20-%20Hampshire%20County%20Council.pdf

HCC has also published an Infrastructure Statement showing the cost of a 150-pupil expansion of Robert Mays to be £7.6m. Scaling this up, a 9-form entry secondary school at Murrell Green or Winchfield would cost ~£68m. The expected developer funding from an 1,800 unit development with 40% affordable would be around £16m. How do you propose to fund the remaining budget for the school plus necessary the road improvements and community infrastructure?

Reasons for Rejection:

Hampshire County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a sufficiency of school places for Hampshire children. The scenario presented in the Q2 about education costs is based upon speculation that does not reflect true costings (benchmarking costs as published on Hampshire County Council's web site at

<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/education/NationalSchoolDeliveryCostBenchmarking-PrimarySecondarySENSc.pdf>.

(It will confirm that the scenario of £68m is quite unrealistic)

In any event, the question is badly framed. It is not a proper question to put to Council as it is more of a hypothetical and speculative debating point. It starts with a false premise about secondary school cost (£68m for a secondary school that is not being promoted through the emerging Local Plan) and then goes on to make uninformed speculative statements on developer funding and cost without any supporting evidence base. The suggested conclusion is not logical either. The published facts confirm that for Murrell Green for example, the development will, in addition to its own infrastructure costs, deliver 40% affordable homes, £34.5m in S106 contributions, and still leave the developer a healthy and viable surplus.

The next version of the Local Plan at formal Regulation 19 Publication stage will show how much housing we are planning for and where it is going. The accompanying infrastructure plan to support the development proposed will be published alongside it.

The Chairman is therefore, rejecting the question for the above reasons as we consider that the preparation of an answer to such hypothetical and speculative scenarios would require a disproportionate amount of time, money, and effort in circumstances where the work required to answer the question would not inform any decisions to be made by the Council.

The question will not be put to Council.

The same Infrastructure Statement showed an overall funding gap of £72m for Hart. The figures don't include healthcare, extra-care places for the elderly nor countryside services. How do you propose to quantify the un-costed items and to close the funding gap?

Reasons for Rejection:

The question again is badly framed and fundamentally mis-quotes the purpose of Hampshire's Infrastructure Statement. It also confuses matters that are not infrastructure funding or relevant to funding from new development.

For the record, the HCC Infrastructure Statement set out the requirements identified to support growth, but it does not attempt to set priorities with regard to funding. The Statement also specifically recognises that local authorities cannot require developers to fund existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision.

In this regard, there is no expectation that development in Hart or any other District should seek to meet the overall funding gap as identified in the Infrastructure Statement (because much of the infrastructure deficit is historic) but infrastructure funding will be required to mitigate the adverse effects arising from the development itself.

The next version of the Local Plan at formal Regulation 19 Publication stage will show how much housing we are planning for and where it is going. The accompanying infrastructure plan to support that development will be published alongside it.

The Chairman is, therefore, rejecting the question for the above reasons as we consider that the preparation of an answer to such hypothetical and speculative scenarios would require a

disproportionate amount of time, money, and effort in circumstances where the work required to answer the question will would not inform any decisions to be made by the Council.

The question will not be put to Council.

What is the expected incremental infrastructure funding requirement and contribution from developers if you were to construct the Local Plan based on:

- a. ***The 10,185 units in the draft Local Plan?***
- b. ***The 8,022 units in the SHMA?***
- c. ***The 6,132 units (or ~6,500 if Hart needs to build some extra for Surrey Heath) implied by the recent Government consultation on the approach to calculating housing need?***

Reasons for Rejection:

This question is based upon retrospective or hypothetical scenarios that are not being advanced by the Council. These again are debating points and not a proper question to be put to Council. In any event, the next version of the Local Plan at formal Regulation 19 Publication stage will show how much housing we are planning for and where it is going. The accompanying infrastructure plan to support development in the Local Plan will be published alongside it.

The Chairman is therefore, rejecting the question for the above reasons as we consider that the preparation of an answer to such hypothetical and speculative scenarios would require a disproportionate amount of time, money, and effort in circumstances where the work required to answer the question will would not inform any decisions to be made by the Council.

The question will not be put to Council.

Which of the above options would result in the lowest infrastructure funding gap?

Reasons for Rejection:

This question is based upon hypothetical scenarios that are not being advanced by the Council. These again are debating points and not a proper question to be put to Council. In any event, the next version of the Local Plan at formal Regulation 19 Publication stage will show how much housing we are planning for and where it is going. The accompanying infrastructure plan to support the Local Plan proposals will be published alongside it.

The Chairman is, therefore, rejecting the question for the above reasons as we consider that the preparation of an answer to such hypothetical and speculative scenarios would require a disproportionate amount of time, money, and effort in circumstances where the work required to answer the question will would not inform any decisions to be made by the Council.

The question will not be put to Council.