BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Bishopstoke Parish Council held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.30pm on 26 July 2016

Present:	Councillor A Winstanley (Chair) Councillor T Mignot (Vice Chair) Councillor P Brown Councillor G Chaffey Councillor A Daly Councillor A Dean Councillor J Francis Councillor J Francis Councillor C Greenwood Councillor L Parker-Jones Councillor G Tidridge Councillor S Toher
In Attendance:	Mr David Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council) Min Partner (Bishopstoke, Fair Oak & Horton Heath Local Area Co-ordinator) Louise Cutts and Steve Birch from Bargate Homes Deborah Humphries of Old Anchor Surgery
Public Session	16 members of the public were present.

FULL_1617_M03/

Public Session

The Chair welcomed everyone on behalf of Bishopstoke Parish Council and handed over to Louise Cutts for the presentation from Bargate.

Louise handed out flyers to those present, thanked us for the invitation, and said that Bargate were aware that development is always controversial but that they promised to maintain contact with residents throughout any development they undertook. She informed those present that she is the planning consultant for Bargate Homes and introduced to Steve Birch, also from Bargate.

Louise stated she knew that with the number of developments in the area both currently and in the future, Bargate would not receive a warm welcome, but that because of her 20 years working as a planning officer for Eastleigh Borough Council she knew about all the problems that exist with developments in this area. Whilst Bargate cannot fix these problems, it can contribute to the solution.

The dwellings they were aiming to build were intending to be built with the aim of attracting home workers, and also taking account of the increasing age of the population. They are looking to build up to 30 houses, but as this is at a very early stage were unable to provide any plans or elevations of how the properties might look. In fact, it was stated that those plans could change depending on the feedback received from the local community. Whilst no guarantees could be made, the houses would be aimed at those who would not need to travel in peak hours. Louise stated it was the intention of Bargate to keep Bishopstoke special, and this was the first of many meetings they would hold to ensure the residents of Bishopstoke were listened to.

Cllr Daly (ADy) asked about the price of the dwellings.

Steve Birch (SB) replied that about 35% of them would be affordable homes, and the others would be at market price, which would depend on what actually got built. ADy stated that recent new homes are all too expensive

Louise Cutts (LC) stated that Bargate cannot control the price of the market, but that more housing would equal less demand. She also confirmed that affordable meant housing association.

Cllr Francis (JF) asked how you ensure homeworkers buy the properties. LC stated that whilst it cannot be insisted upon, the homes can be designed to be more conducive to that lifestyle.

Cllr Parker-Jones (LPJ) asked about parking spaces for each house.

LC stated it was Bargate's intention to over-provide if possible. Most would have 2 or 3 spaces, some possibly a double garage plus 2 spaces outside.

Cllr Toher (ST) stated that there were currently 88 acres of land up for sale outside the urban edge of Bishopstoke and asked if Bargate had any options on other land in the area. Cllr Toher also stated that terracing could lead to extra houses, and asked what discussions had taken place with Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC).

LC stated that terracing was the idea, but that was not yet certain – it could be changed based on feedback from residents. LC also stated that Bargate would not build more than 30 homes, come what may. There had been a pre-application meeting with Dawn Errington of EBC, which had looked at applicable policies and guidance, and at which Bargate had stressed the need for them to be working with Bishopstoke residents.

Cllr Winstanley (AW) stated that a development of this size would be an EBC Committee decision, not a delegated one

SB stated that Bargate had no other options on land in the area.

Cllr Chaffey (GC) stated that the number of parking spaces being discussed seemed contrary to encouraging homeworkers.

LC asked whether Bishopstoke wanted to minimize on street parking or minimize cars altogether. AW stated that most local residents have to park on the road.

GC asked if it might be possible to include extra parking for existing residents and was told yes, it might.

Cllr Brown (PB) asked if these were potential live/work units

LC stated that they were not. Homeworking has boomed recently and Bargate are looking at the demographic where children have already left home, so there would be a different impact on traffic.

Cllr Tidridge (GT) stated that traffic along Church Road is already a danger to cyclists. She also stated that she could not understand how more houses could be put in an area already creaking at the seams. LC stated that they were happy to take advice on this from Hampshire County Council and others, and that the reason for building more houses was simply that was the business they were in.

Cllr Dean (ADn) asked how Bargate could be certain their target demographic would buy the house. LC stated they could not be sure, but wanted to make it as attractive to that demographic as possible. However, they cannot and will not promise that homeworkers will actually buy the houses.

Cllr Greenwood (CG) asked if Bargate could make sure that the garages were wide enough for the car, and storage, and getting the car door open. He also asked where the study would go in 2-bed properties.

LC stated that as there are no plans or elevations yet they cannot say yet where the study would be. The plans will be site specific.

SB stated that the dwellings could be made as suitable for homeworking as possible – high internet speeds, a downstairs bedroom. They should also be attractive to "downsizers". He stated that Bargate would listen to ideas and accommodate where possible, but that they would have to meet all planning regulations and be aware of market forces. He also stated that less parking does not lead to less cars.

JF asked about the designation of the land and whether this would be contrary to the local plan. LPJ asked about the timetable for the building, as the local residents had had site traffic on their roads for more than 2 years, and this had come with problems such as the routing of site traffic and

inconsiderate people on site. She stated that restrictions would have to be explored and that residents' concerns should be listened to and addressed.

LC stated that the land is countryside, and has ecologists looking at it currently. This will be followed by a conservation meeting. LC also asked if anyone knew of anything that might impact the development for them to bring it to Bargate's attention.

LC stated that they still needed to obtain planning permission, which would take time, and that conditions would obviously apply.

SB stated that Bargate are good neighbours, they employ local people, and if their staff do not behave appropriately then that is dealt with. He stated that there will be problems, but they are committed to doing what they can regarding mud on the road.

AW asked if the site gate keeper would turn away any deliveries known to have approached from the wrong route.

SB stated that he didn't know but would check.

LC stated that Bargate are a local developer and will want to come back, so they need to do it right.

A resident stated that a staggered junction would be created and asked if it could have yellow lines or parking measures.

A resident stated that people already risk their lives on Church Road due to people parking to go to Eastleigh and all the lorries. He asked if it had to be now?

A resident stated that, as the retirement village is about to go to the next stage, the only route to all these different sites is Church Road. It will be a traffic nightmare.

LC stated that one of the difficulties of coming to the residents for an early meeting is that Bargate do not yet have answers to those kind of questions, A traffic consultant has been appointed to look into the staggered junction. HCC have been consulted and Bargate will pay towards a traffic management scheme. HCC will consider where any traffic is pushed to.

A resident asked where traffic moved by double yellow lines would end up. LC stated Bargate were not able to answer yet, but that they did understand residents felt overwhelmed by developments. She stated there was no guarantee of receiving planning permission, but it granted Bargate would co-operate with EBC regarding the other developments in the area. Talking is the key.

A resident stated that a danger of meeting like this is that it is all speculation. They did not want Bargate to simply go back to EBC and tell them they had had a wonderful meeting.

LC stated that these meetings did not remove anyone's right to object, but even if objections are raised Bargate will still try to communicate with residents.

AW stated that it was understood people were against development but it was still worth attending the meeting.

Min Partner (MP) stated that reports would come to her at the Local Area Committee. She would be asked by the planner for her advice which would be frank regarding public opinion.

ST asked about contacting Bargate. LC replied that Liz Dixon is her secretary.

AW thanked LC and SB for coming.

Councillor Winstanley then stressed that if the plans do go ahead people will have the full right to object.

Louise Cutts, Steve Birch and 5 members of the public left at this point

The Chair then informed the room of her intention to move Item 16 and Item 10 as far up the agenda as possible.

52. Apologies for Absence

52.1 Apologies had been received and accepted from Cllr Moore (work), Cllr Thornton (work), and Cllr Roling (health).

53. Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

53.1 Cllr Winstanley stated that, regarding Item 16 on the agenda, she was a member of the Bishopstoke Community Association management committee.

53.2 Cllr Mignot stated that, regarding Item 16 on the agenda, he was the appointed representative of the Parish Council to the Bishopstoke Community Association.

54 To discuss the way forward for the Bishopstoke Community Centre

54.1 The Chief Executive of 1 Community – Jean Roberts-Jones (JRJ) - stood and stated that they had a support worker with BCA over recent meetings. The issue had arisen due to the passionate committee wishing to recruit volunteers, however, other issues quickly became obvious.

HCC own the building and wish the BCA to consider taking ownership of it, but the BCA would then have responsibility for maintenance. The BCA members mostly want to step down, and 1 Community will find it difficult to recruit new volunteers.

They were here to ask Bishopstoke Parish Council to consider taking over the management of the BCC and freeing the BCA from their responsibility, and to enter into negotiations accordingly.

54.2 Helen Baker stated that she is on the BCA committee. She stated she was surprised to hear that they had been working with 1 Community, or asked for help finding new volunteers, or that they all wanted to step down. Her understanding had been that BPC would only be asked to take over the building from HCC if the BCA didn't want it.

54.3 JRJ agreed this was only 1 of the possible proposals.

54.4 Cllr Winstanley informed the Council that the BCA committee members had concerns that if the BCA had responsibility for maintenance then the trustees could be liable for anything to do with the building. Only Cllr Winstanley and Geoff Harris were left as trustees and if the BCA took over the building it was the intention of Cllr Winstanley and Mr Harris to resign their trusteeship.

54.5 Mr Harris stated that the primary income for the BCA was from Happy Days pre-school. The HCC lease runs out in just over 1 year and the pre-school will need notice if they are to find other premises.

54.6 Cllr Toher stated that the Bishopstoke Memorial Hall was facing similar problems and was having a meeting on the 27th of July to discuss the way forward. Bishopstoke Parish Council has identified both the Bishopstoke Memorial Hall and the Bishopstoke Community Centre as Assets of Community Value and would want to keep them both for community use. She stated that the Parish Council can offer a fall-back position for both buildings and that a joined up approach would be best.

54.7 Cllr Dean asked if HCC had done a structural survey and was told "No". Cllr Winstanley stated that the BCA were arranging their own survey as it was not sensible to rely on HCC producing a survey given they wanted to pass on the building. The BCA are awaiting the results of a first level survey and are securing their own solicitors. Cllr Dean advised her understanding that there were major structural problems and Cllr Winstanley replied that HCC had done some work, but it was not clear what exactly.

54.8 Cllr Winstanley informed the Council that HCC would sell the building for $\pounds 1$, but with an 80-year condition on the community having use of the land, but not necessarily the building.

54.9 Min Partner reported that she was aware of concern amongst the majority of trustees, and that she felt exploratory conversations were urgent due to the play group. With regard to guarantees that the building would not be sold off she stated that guarantees can be written in, and had been before when other assets had been transferred. The Parish Council would offer stability and would be in a position to include non-councillors in any working group that ran the Centre.

54.10 Helen Baker was grateful for the reassurances but stated that the 80 clause was not set in stone as there was a clawback mechanism. She stated that she would never stand down but would keep fighting for the Community Centre. Cllr Winstanley stated the Parish Council was the ultimate body that would protect community assets.

54.11 Cllr Brown asked whether HCC has set an end date for the process and what happens if no one takes it on. Mr Harris replied that the lease ends in October 2017 and no one knows what Hampshire will do.

54.12 Cllr Dean asked if the building was listed. Min Partner replied that although the building was precious to the local community, there are many buildings of that type and age throughout the country and so it would not be listed. Cllr Tidridge suggested the building could be locally listed or protected in the Neighbourhood Plan.

54.13 Cllr Parker-Jones questioned the usability and functionality of the rooms and asked how well used the building was. She also asked whether it could be a permanent place for the Parish Council. Cllr Winstanley replied it was used 5 days a week during term time by the pre-school and that there were evening and weekend bookings, as well as being a polling station and useful for large community events. She stated the building needs to be an asset to the community, not just something to look at. The Parish Council had previously considered basing itself there, but had selected its current location instead.

54.14 Cllr Brown stated that his family use the BCC a lot, and the building is now creaking. Cllr Parker-Jones believed there were damp problems. Helen Baker stated the building would not need a lot of work to be more appealing, but accepted it does need work inside.

54.15 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that in the event of the BCC ever being offered to the Parish Council, it would be considered with interest.

54.16 The Chair thanked Jean Robert-Jones, Helen Baker and those attending for this discussion.

3 members of the public left at this point

55 An update on the Anchor Surgery petition

55.1 The Chair welcomed Practice Manager Deborah Humphries of Old Anchor Surgery and thanked her for previously providing an update on progress at the surgery.

55.2 Deborah Humphries stated that she was attending to clear up misunderstandings, alleviate concerns about the future and give a view of the next 5-10 years. She explained how Stokewood had come to be involved in Old Anchor in the first place, and had received very little in the way of help or feedback in the whole process, which they had been reluctant to enter into at first. She explained that they had made a huge commitment to Old Anchor both financially and in terms of staff. Deborah also stated that, as the minimum size for new practices is 10,000 patients, Old Anchor will never be viable as an independent surgery, and needs to continue as a satellite.

55.3 Mrs Humphries stated that they had improvement bids in for both Old Anchor and Stokewood, and that they wanted to close the patient list. They had spoken to both EBC and the West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group about how best to care for the extending population.

55.4 Cllr Winstanley thanked Mrs Humphries and stated her personal gratitude that Stokewood had taken on Old Anchor in 2014. She stated that there were concerns that best use was not being made of both buildings and that the Brookfield estate had been left with a field so that Stokewood could expand. Cllr Winstanley stated her hope that the comments from the petition were useful to Stokewood and again thanked Mrs Humphries for her response to the previous meeting.

55.5 Sid Dajani stood and also thanked Stokewood for taking the Old Anchor on. He stated he regularly had patients coming to his Chemist in tears at the lack of communication. He stated that there needs to be more communication, and that the petition is not to attack anybody, but is to get patients what they want. He asked where the Patient Needs Assessment was and stated his belief that everything could have been done better from the start.

55.6 Several Councillors related accounts of their personal experience at Old Anchor and Stokewood, and also gave accounts that residents had given to them. Cllr Winstanley had personally suffered a number of administration issues. Cllr Chaffey also commented on issues around administration. Both Cllrs praised the GP service. Cllr Parker-Jones stated local people had informed her they were happy with the service. Cllr Brown stated that his family were all patients and that the service standards had dropped, although he did appreciate that there is a service at Old Anchor where there might not have been. Cllr Toher stated she personally had found no problems. Cllrs generally agreed there was a need to move forward working and communicating better together.

55.7 There was some discussion over whether the wording of the petition had changed. Cllr Winstanley acknowledged that the front sheet had changed, at the request of Councillors visiting Mr Dajani, but that the wording on the sheet actually being signed had not. She also reminded those present that this was not a Parish Council petition. The Parish Council had merely voted to support it, by means of having a copy in the Parish Office.

55.8 Mrs Humphries accepted there have been cuts in administrative staff, but explained it was either that or medical cuts. She also accepted that the desire to have natural wastage rather than redundancy had made it bumpier than hoped for. She agreed Stokewood Surgery is not what it was 2 years ago. Mrs Humphries stated that recruitment has not been easy and that all surgeries are struggling with appointment times. Service slip was inevitable when they took over Old Anchor.

55.9 Mrs Humphries stated that they were making great strides now. They are proposing to create two new clinical rooms at Old Anchor which would mean extra appointments are available. Due to having no emergency appointments there are 46 extra GP appointments per week, although there are currently slightly less nurse appointments. There is a healthcare assistant present every morning so all blood test patients can now be catered for at Old Anchor. Extra people are hopefully being recruited for September, with a cardiac specialist freeing up more GP appointments to Old Anchor.

55.10 Stokewood state that EBC have denied them extra parking spaces, and that they have had to fight (now successfully) for the NHS to fund the Minor Injuries Service they were already running. Mrs Humphries stressed that they also were patient led, and that they would love to expand into the field, but were having problems with a covenant. She stated that 7 previous applications for funding from the WHCCG had been made and all were turned down. The District was also withdrawing services, which made things more difficult.

55.11 The lack of communication was again raised by Cllrs Parker-Jones and Francis, and Mrs Humphries accepted they could do more. She committed to including newsletters with the flu jab invitations they were about to send out. Cllrs Parker-Jones and Tidridge also raised concerns that possible negative publicity resulting from the petition may hinder recruitment.

55.12 Cllr Winstanley stated that EBC would be pleased if there were extra parking and would investigate to see if she could discover the problem. She would also look into expansion into the field. 55.13 Following a request from Mr Dajani to reinstate acute services, Mrs Humphries stated that it would be disingenuous to offer something she knew the surgery was not able to provide. She closed by stating her disappointment at not being contacted regarding the petition, and that the letter from the Parish Council had arrived late.

Mrs Humphries and 7 members of the public left at this point

56 Councillors' Questions and Announcements

56.1 Cllr Winstanley announced that the first Carnival quiz was happening on July 27th at the Toby Carvery.

56.2 Cllr Toher requested that all agenda be sent to all Cllrs.

56.3 Cllr Chaffey observed that on the flyers for the Carnival Quizzes there was no mention of time.

56.4 Cllr Parker-Jones reported concerns from a resident who had tried to access the Cemetery but was unable to. It had been the anniversary of the resident's father's death, and the site people were reportedly very unhelpful. The Clerk was asked to contact the developers.

Action: Clerk

56.5 Cllr Daly stated that he had always found the site staff very helpful.

57. To adopt as a true record, and sign, Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 28 June 2016

57.1 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously to adopt as a true record the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 28 June 2016.

58. To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

58.1 Minute 34.5 Cllr Winstanley clarified that she had authorised up to 10 hours per week of overtime for each of the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk

58.2 Minute 48.2 The Council had not yet received an update on the open day.

58.3 Minute 49.1 The Clerk stated the new website should be online in the 1st week of August.

59. Correspondence received

59.1 The Clerk had received an invitation for Officers or Councillors to attend the HALC AGM on 22nd October. This would be circulated after the meeting.

Action: Clerk

59.2 The Parish Council has received an invitation to attend the South East Tree Warden Forum and Geoff Harris, the current Tree Warden, is unable to attend. The invitation was opened up to Councillors.

60 Report on Planning Committee Meetings of 28 June 2016 and 12 July 2016 – to note resolutions and determine recommendations

60.1 The Planning Committee Minutes from 28 June and 12 July 2016 had been circulated prior to the meeting.

60.2 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 28 June and 12 July 2016 be received and accepted.

61 Report on Finance and General Purposes Committee Meeting of 12 July – to note resolutions and to determine recommendations.

61.1 The Finance and General Purpose Committee meeting minutes from 12 July had been circulated prior to the meeting.

61.2 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the resolutions from the Finance and General Purpose Committee meeting of 12 July be noted.

61.3 There were no recommendations to determine.

62 To receive the RFO's report and approve the June 2016 Statement of Account

62.1 The RFO reported that the accounts had now been submitted to the external auditors. The public right of viewing period would end on 10 August.

62.2 The June 2016 Statement of Account had been circulated prior to the meeting.

62.3 Proposed Cllr Mignot, Seconded Cllr Winstanley, **RESOLVED** that the June 2016 Statement of Account be approved as tabled.

63 To appoint initial members of the Cemetery Working Group

63.1 Cllrs Toher, Parker-Jones, Thornton, and Dean all volunteered to be part of the Cemetery Working Group, and were appointed.

63.2 The Assistant Clerk had previously accepted administering the Working Group, as part of her role regarding Cemeteries.

64 Determination of initial Councillor to sign bank reconciliations at F & GP meetings

64.1 It was agreed that the Chair and Vice-Chair of Finance and General Purposes would initially be responsible for signing the bank reconciliations

65 To decide the standard wording of the invitation issued to various people at the top of each agenda

65.1 Four potential versions had been circulated prior to the meeting.

65.2 Cllrs Winstanley and Greenwood expressed the concern that people may not understand that the Safer Neighbourhood Team includes the Police.

65.3 Proposed Cllr Parker-Jones, Seconded Cllr Tidridge, **RESOLVED** by 6 votes to 3 that the standard wording should read "An invitation to attend all meetings of Bishopstoke Parish Council is extended to relevant: Hampshire County councillors; Eastleigh Borough councillors; and, the Eastleigh East Safer Neighbourhood Team."

66 To review published Parish Office opening hours to increase the certainty for the public that the office will be open when stated

66.1 Cllr Tidridge expressed her concerns that the Parish Office is not able to open for all of its advertised opening hours, for various reasons. She stated her belief that there should only be 6 hours per week of opening hours, with other times possible by appointment, in order to minimize clashes with meetings and give more certainty to residents.

66.2 Cllr Tidridge proposed 9am – 11am on Monday, 5pm – 7pm on Tuesday and 1pm – 3pm on Friday as the new office opening hours.

66.3 There was a discussion over the viability of the proposed hours, and the complications that exist with any set of opening hours. Cllr Winstanley reminded the Council that the opening of the Parish Office was an operational matter for the Clerk. This would be looked at by the Clerk after September.

67 To approve the signing of the PCSO contract

67.1 Cllr Parker-Jones expressed her concern that the Eastleigh East Safer Neighbourhood Team only provides 2 PCSOs where there used to be 4. She stated that other Parishes had 4 and asked whether Bishopstoke was being short-changed, whether this amounted to double taxation and whether other Parish Councils were also paying.

67.2 Cllr Winstanley informed the Council that all Parished and non-Parished areas in the Borough pay towards PCSOs. The issue of double taxing was looked at, at the time of the initial contract, and assurances were given that more PCSOs are in Bishopstoke than would otherwise be the case without the contract. In fact, Bishopstoke's low crime rate means that without the contract there would be no PCSOs.

67.3 Cllr Toher recommended signing the contract but looking at the provision going forward.

67.4 Cllr Winstanley offered to invite the Chief Inspector of Police to come to a future meeting, with the manager of the PCSOs, to discuss matters with the Council.

Action: Cllr Winstanley

67.5 Cllr Parker-Jones questioned the date on the contract as April, when it was now July. It was stated that this was because the contract runs from April, and PCSOs have continued to be provided. Cllr Parker-Jones also raised the question of where the written management reports mentioned by the contract are.

67.6 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **RESOLVED** (with Cllrs Parker-Jones, Dean, Francis and Tidridge abstaining) that the PCSO contract be signed.

68 To receive reports from County, Borough and Parish Councillors on matters of interest

68.1 Cllr Chaffey reported he had a contact with the manager of Bishopstoke Park.

68.2 Cllr Brown reported he had been at a Twynhams charity meeting earlier that evening and was the quiz master for the first Carnival Quiz on the 27th July. He advised that Twynhams were looking for a new charity clerk following the resignation of the current post holder.

68.3 Cllr Toher reported that she had attended the devolution meeting which had been interesting but confusing. She had also attended the Local Plan meeting. She had also attended a meeting regarding the future of the Bishopstoke Memorial Hall with the Clerk, Min Partner and other representatives from the BMH.

68.4 Cllr Greenwood reported that he had had a meeting with Keith Wilcox regarding the as yet unpublished Highways Plan.

68.5 Cllr Winstanley reported she had attended the Hampshire Partnership meeting. Discussions included devolution from the HCC point of view and community cohesion – in particular looking at the recent increase in online hate crime. She had also attended an Eastleigh Borough Council meeting,

along with most of the Cllrs present, at which it had been agreed to continue with technical work towards the Local Plan to prevent legal challenges and appeals.

69 To receive the Clerk's monthly report

69.1 The Clerk reported that tarmacking of part of the new Cemetery road was going to take place on Friday. Vehicle access would be restricted for part of the day but pedestrian access would be maintained.

69.2 A bonfire has been lit recently by the Cemetery roundabout. The grounds maintenance team are to spend an hour removing as much dead wood as possible on their next visit, and estimate how much longer they would need to clear it.

69.3 CiLCA training was positive, and will begin in earnest in September.

69.4 The Clerk reported that he would be on holiday from 8 August to 23 August. The Planning meeting scheduled will be minuted by the Assistant Clerk, who will also open the office on the two Thursday's that the Clerk is away.

69.5 A request has been received for a paddling pool on the Brookfield estate. More support and evidence has been requested.

69.6 Cllr Brown asked whether the Parish Council was responsible for "Bishy Beach". Cllr Winstanley informed the Council that HCC are responsible for this area of land.

70 To consider content for the July 2016 press release

50.1 It was agreed that the press release would mention the PCSO contract, the creation of the Cemetery Working Group and Carnival Grants.

71 Date, time, place and agenda items for next meeting – Tuesday 27 September 2016 at 7:30pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 10:35pm