BISHOPSTOKE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Bishopstoke Parish Council held in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke commencing at 7.30pm on 17 May 2016

Present:	Councillor P Brown Councillor G Chaffey Councillor A Daly Councillor A Dean Councillor J Francis Councillor C Greenwood Councillor T Mignot Councillor A Moore (Para 1 to 26.3) Councillor L Parker-Jones Councillor A Roling (Para 1 to 6.22) Councillor M Thornton Councillor G Tidridge Councillor S Toher Councillor A Winstanley
In Attendance:	Mr D Hillier-Wheal (Clerk to Bishopstoke Parish Council) Graham Mole (to give a presentation regarding the Old Anchor Surgery)
Public Session	3 members of the public were present.

FULL_1617_M01/

Councillor Winstanley opened the meeting by welcoming all the Councillors following the recent elections. She noted that the Council is now half male, half female, and also has a broader span of ages than has previously been the case.

1. Election of Chair

1.1 Proposed Cllr Thornton, Seconded Cllr Mignot, that Cllr Winstanley be elected as Chair of the Parish Council.

1.2 Proposed Cllr Moore, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, that Cllr Toher be elected as Chair of the Parish Council.

1.3 A vote was duly held with both Cllr Winstanley and Cllr Toher each receiving 7 votes.

1.4 Cllr Winstanley, by virtue of being last year's Chair and having been re-elected to the Parish Council this year, was required by Standing Order 2.9 to give a casting vote, and this was cast for Cllr Winstanley.

1.5 **RESOLVED** that Councillor Winstanley be elected Chair for 2016 – 2017.

2. Election of Vice-Chair

2.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Roling, that Cllr Mignot be elected as Vice-Chair of the Parish Council.

2.2 Proposed Cllr Parker-Jones, Seconded Cllr Moore, that Cllr Toher be elected as Vice-Chair of the Parish Council.

2.3 A vote was duly held with both Cllr Mignot and Cllr Toher each receiving 7 votes.

2.4 Cllr Winstanley, as Chair, was required to give a casting vote, and this was cast for Cllr Mignot.

2.5 **RESOLVED** that Councillor Mignot be elected Vice-Chair for 2016 – 2017.

3. Delivery of Declarations of Acceptance of Office

3.1 All Declarations of Acceptance of Office have been received, properly signed and witnessed by the Clerk.

4. Apologies for Absence

4.1 None given.

5.

5.1 At this point Cllr Winstanley proposed, with Cllr Moore seconding, **RESOLVED** unanimously that Item 25 on the Agenda – To consider the proposal that Bishopstoke Parish Council support the Community Petition regarding the Old Anchor Surgery – be moved up the agenda and discussed now.

6 To consider the proposal that Bishopstoke Parish Council support the Community Petition regarding the Old Anchor Surgery

6.1 Cllr Winstanley, for the benefit of all Councillors, explained the Standing Orders regarding the rules of debating. Specifically, that all comments come through the Chair and Cllrs will be called in the order they are seen by the Chair. This is to allow those with quieter presences to have their say, and prevent any one Cllr from dominating the debate.

6.2 A copy of the documentation supporting the petition had been circulated prior to the meeting.

6.3 Graham Mole stood to speak at this point. He began by reminding Cllrs of a previous campaign against a phone mast, which had been won, so it was not impossible to win this, more serious, fight regarding healthcare. He passed on apologies from Sid, the pharmacist who is also backing the campaign, who could not attend the meeting because of a prior training commitment. He also gave his own background as a freelance investigative journalist still working for national magazines and TV.

6.4 The campaign has now been featured in the Echo, on That's Solent, on BBC Radio Solent and on Meridian. In recent news, there is a review out looking at using nurses, paramedics and pharmacists to fill in for junior doctors. This is a role already being performed by Sid. Mr Mole explained that Stokewood had been contacted regarding the complaints and their long reply was regarded by the petitioners as unsatisfactory. It had been shown to Healthwatch who said that "some elements of their statement don't ring true with what we are hearing about patient experience. We are now following up to get more detail."

6.5 Mr Mole quoted figures that suggest at a rate of £136 per patient per year, with roughly 3,000 patients being taken over from the Old Anchor, and having run things for two years so far, Stokewood have received over £800,000 by virtue of taking over the Old Anchor Surgery.

6.6 Other figures were quoted saying the average doctor at Stokewood has a salary of around £60,000 per year. Stokewood claim they are recruiting for more doctors, but despite there being many job vacancies listed, there are no positions being advertised for doctors.

6.7 Mr Mole requested that the Council formally give its support to the Petition

6.8 Cllr Winstanley explained that what the organisers (Mr Mole, Sid and Cllr Winstanley) were hoping for is that the Parish Council would publicise the campaign and petition on the website, on Facebook and by providing (with the Clerk's permission) the Parish Office as one of the places people could come to sign the petition. Following a question from Cllr Moore, Cllr Winstanley also said that, with the agreement of all the organisers, the campaign would be publicised in the Focus, and they would also be quite happy for any other organisation distributing leaflets door-to-door to do the same.

6.9 Cllr Greenwood asked if there is any expenditure information available regarding the Surgery. Mr Mole accepted it would be useful to have but stated it would – in his experience as a journalist – be difficult to obtain.

6.10 Cllr Thornton enquired as to whether as Stokewood are running their own business it was as a Ltd Company running for profit, to which Mr Mole said "possibly".

6.11 Cllr Moore suggested that it was development that was leading to problems for both Healthcare and the Police. He believes they should be extending the surgery at Old Anchor, not thinking of closing it. It would be helpful to know what their plans are. He asked the Chair if it is possible to ask the PCT what has been discussed with them. Cllr Winstanley replied that, with her Borough knowledge, she could say that while there is a lot of talk of development causing problems, in actual fact the amount of new residents in recent years is small – the only significant number is that what used to be the Mount is half full now. The Care Commissioning Group took over from the PCT, and yes this can be tabled with them. Also, Cllr Winstanley informed the Council that the Borough is encouraging Stokewood to expand their main site – in fact land was deliberately left available behind the Stokewood Surgery for that purpose, but so far Stokewood have been unwilling to take that course.

6.12 Cllr Brown said that, having been a patient at Old Anchor himself, he had found that things had changed very quickly and that the service fell away rapidly, almost overnight. He believed this was not to do with increased patient numbers but was to do with how it was being run. There was an immediate reduction in service when Stokewood took over. Cllr Winstanley also noted that patients registered at Stokewood are also complaining about a drop in service.

6.18 Cllr Dean asked if, in view of current agreed development and with Stokewood not expanding, it was wise to allow more development. She also asked if it is possible to ask another provider to step in, or another developer to include medical facilities in their development. Cllr Winstanley noted that there is a specific room set up at Bishopstoke Park (The Mount) for use as a consultation room, but that Stokewood refuse to use it.

6.19 Cllr Thornton observed that 2-3 years ago Old Anchor was going to close. A nurse there was persuaded to take it over, without being given the full facts. Cllr Thornton had helped her sort out the mess she had been left, but when it was offered for another group to take over, only Stokewood volunteered. He also asked if it is possible to ask in other areas to see if any other Parish has faced similar problems and come up with a different solution.

6.20 Cllr Moore offered, as he sits at County on the health overview panel, to bring this subject up there in order that pressure can be brought to bear from more than one place. This offer was accepted gratefully by Mr Mole.

6.21 Cllr Toher expressed her concern that we are hearing a lot of emotive language and that the Parish Council is only hearing one side of the story. She also wanted to know of the Councillors should declare an interest in this, as a number of them are registered patients at Old Anchor Surgery. She requested the Council wait for further information before committing to anything. Cllr Toher also mentioned a report from the Echo, dated 5th May, in which it stated that Anne Winstanley, who is Chair of the Parish Council, is leading the campaign. Cllr Toher sought clarification that Cllr Winstanley was not responding at that point on behalf of the Parish Council. Cllr Toher also had concerns that the petition the Council was being shown was long and emotive, whereas the National Pharmacy Petition displayed in the pharmacy is succinct. The proposed petition, she said, does not say what it is for. Cllr Winstanley explained there was no need to declare an interest as, just as when Borough Councillors vote on Council Tax, it is seen as a matter that affects everyone, and so there is no need to declare. The petition is Community based and will go ahead whether it receives the support of the Parish Council or not. Regarding the Echo, she stated that the Echo report had not stated the Parish Council were supporting the petition, just that Anne Winstanley, who is also the Parish Chair, supports it. Cllr Winstanley also reminded those Cllrs who were on the previous Council that the Council had been shown Stokewood's initial response to Mr Mole's complaints, so the Council already had Stokewood's point of view.

6.22 Cllr Winstanley also noted that the full petition has two parts to it. There is an explanatory, supporting, document, which the Council had seen, and there is a shorter paragraph detailing the actual petition, with a signing sheet. Cllr Winstanley then read the paragraph that goes with the signing sheet to confirm the wording to the Council.

Cllr Roling left the meeting at this point, as did one of the members of the public.

6.23 Cllr Thornton asked if the heading of the supporting document could be tweaked to clarify that it is just that, and not the actual petition.

6.24 Cllr Greenwood asked if the petition would also be online. Cllr Winstanley replied there are plans for it to be online, and hopefully the Parish Council would publicise that too when it happened.

6.25 Cllr Parker-Jones, responding to part of the support document relating to everyone's right to have proper healthcare in their own village, asked for clarification on whether the Stokewood main site was in Bishopstoke or Fair Oak. The Clerk reported that, on the internet, their address is listed as Fair Oak.

6.26 Cllr Toher asked if there was an opportunity to contact Fair Oak Parish Council to ask if they might also support this on the basis that their residents are suffering service reductions too. She also wanted to ask if, as the support document particularly mentions the elderly, it would be useful to point those residents in the direction of the Travel Token scheme, which could well offer them some help in attending appointments at Stokewood. Cllr Winstanley also believed that the Borough Council may have a scheme for medically assisted transport which Stokewood could then promote too.

6.27 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Greenwood, **RESOLVED** unanimously (with Cllr Toher abstaining) that Bishopstoke Parish Council support the Community Petition regarding Old Anchor Surgery.

Mr Mole left at this point.

7 Councillors' Questions and Announcements

7.1 Cllr Tidridge asked, given that both Chair and Vice-Chair are also Borough Councillors, what happens if neither can attend a Parish Council meeting. Cllr Winstanley replied that if illness or any other circumstance prevented both herself and Cllr Mignot from attending a Parish Council meeting, then Standing Orders require those Cllrs present at the meeting to elect a temporary Chair amongst themselves.

8. To adopt and sign Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 22 March 2016

8.1 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Winstanley, **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 22 March be accepted as a true record.

9. To consider Matters Arising from the above Minutes

9.1 Item 33.1 – The Clerk reported that a site meeting had been set for 2pm on Thursday 19 May, and he would be taking the concerns of the Council regarding the blocking of the Cemetery road entrance, the incorrect routing of site traffic through Bishopstoke, and the provision of parking outside the existing Cemetery to Peter Finch, the Bellway representative. Cllr Toher reported that lorries were also now coming in from the North of Bishopstoke, which is not permitted. Cllr Winstanley advised that this was being raised with Enforcement at the Borough Council, and that her belief is that, amongst other things, the signage is inadequate. The Clerk also reported a new complaint that the temporary path laid from the new car park to the Cemetery is unsuitable for those in high heels. Cllr Parker-Jones asked whether it was possible to have used plastic slabs instead of stones and Cllr Greenwood advised that this was known as "Trackway". The Clerk undertook to add this to his discussion with Mr Finch.

Action: Clerk

10. Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

10.1 None requested.

11. Correspondence received

11.1 The Clerk had been notified by Matt Blythe at Eastleigh Borough Council that 4 caravans have turned up on Parkway carpark. The Council was advised to check security arrangements and note that the Wickham Horse Fair takes place on 20 May 2016.

11.2 An email has been received from someone requesting permission to use a quote from the Parish Council byelaws regarding drones. Having checked the relevant byelaw the Clerk advised he had given permission for the extract to be used.

11.3 Advice has been passed through to the Council from County Archaeologist David Hopkins that there has been the discovery of a late Iron Age / Roman site at the Breach Lane development. As yet it is uncertain whether this is domestic or industrial, but there are pits, an area of industrial activity and an area which appears to be funerary. Further investigations will be taking place. Cllr Tidridge reported she was aware that the developers had been reprimanded for taking down a number of trees without permission and Cllr Winstanley advised that Planning Enforcement was following up on this.

11.4 An email has been received from former Cllr Geoff Harris, who is Chair of the Carnival Working Group. He wished to request the Council to appoint a new liaison Cllr for the Carnival, but in doing so wanted to make said Cllr aware that this is a much more hands-on role than most liaison roles. The Cllr will be expected to help, along with the rest of the Carnival Group, with things such as route checks for the parade, readying Glebe Meadow and helping with the clear up afterwards. Cllr Parker-Jones advised that she already has a prior charity commitment on the weekend of 10th/11th September, and so will be unable to attend.

11.5 An email has been received from Stoke Park Junior School, stating that they were told by the developers at The Chase that they have made funding available to support schools in Bishopstoke. As yet, nothing has been received by the School and there is a definite need to help support before and after school clubs. The developers have said the funding has been processed and the School have asked for the Council's help in finding out what has happened to it. Cllr Winstanley asked the Clerk to contact the Planning Officer in the first instance, to make enquiries.

Action: Clerk

Initial:	Date:
----------	-------

12 Report on Planning Committee Meetings of 22 March 2016, 12 April 2016 and 26 April 2016 – to note resolutions and determine recommendations

12.1 Minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings of 22 March, 12 April and 26 April 2016 had been circulated prior to the meeting.

12.2 Cllr Toher advised that, in the meeting of 26 April, Item 18.2, the intent was to thank those who had been involved in publicising the public consultation, as a gesture from the outgoing committee, and was not meant to be provocative.

12.3 Cllr Greenwood realised at this point that he in fact had an interest in Item 16.3 of the minutes of the meeting on 26 April, as the property belongs to his wife. He advised that in his opinion the comments made by the committee on that property are not factual, as due to the differing nature of the other properties in the area, no precedent could be set.

12.4 Cllr Parker-Jones noted an inaccurate date in the minutes the meeting on 12 April which the Clerk undertook to change.

Action: Clerk

12.5 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Brown, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the minutes of the meetings held on 22 March, 12 April and 26 April be received and accepted.

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

13.1 Minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Meeting of 12 April 2016 had been circulated prior to the meeting.

13.2 Cllr Winstanley advised that the procedure at this time is to ask for one proposer and one seconder for accepting the recommendations and noting the resolutions, and that for each recommendation a separate vote will take place.

13.3 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Toher, **RESOLVED** unanimously that the resolutions of the Finance and General Purposes meeting held on 12 April be received and accepted.

13.4 Cllr Parker-Jones noted that, at a number of places within the minutes, it was specified that other papers were "attached to the minutes" but that these had not been circulated. The Clerk apologised for this oversight. In view of this, the recommendations in Items 9 and 10 of the Finance and General Purposes minutes were deferred until the next meeting of the Parish Council.

13.5 As Item 11 on the Finance and General Purposes minutes was reached, Cllr Thornton thought it appropriate to give further information to the Parish Council on the decision that had been taken, and the options that were available.

13.6 Proposed Cllr Toher, Seconded Cllr Thornton, **RESOLVED** that both options should be discussed by the Parish Council.

13.7 Cllr Brown asked for clarification on the length of Burial Grant rights, and their starting date. The Clerk advised that the period of a Burial Grant from Bishopstoke Parish Council can currently be 30 or 60 years, and that they can be repurchased upon their expiry. Other Councils offer to add an extra 5 years every 5 years to maintain the length of the grant. The only limit in law is that the total period left on a Burial Grant cannot exceed 100 years. The period of the Burial Grant starts as soon as it is purchased.

13.8.1 Proposed Cllr Thornton, Seconded Cllr Toher, that the Council proceed with Option 1

13.8.2 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, that the Council proceed with Option 2.

13.8.3 By 12 votes to 2, **RESOLVED** that the Parish Council approve a one-off exception, in this case, to the no pre-purchase rule, to allow the resident concerned to be buried next to their partner.

13.9 The Clerk was asked to write to the resident, and in doing so make it clear that this decision in no way sets a precedent for any other residents wishing to pre-purchase plots. Additionally, the Clerk was asked to bring the letter before Council to approve the wording.

Action: Clerk

13.10 At Item 18 on the Finance and General Purposes minutes, the Clerk gave an update. A quote had been received from Jason Bruno which would be acceptable, but in light of the Council's comments at a previous meeting the Clerk was endeavouring to obtain other quotes too. As yet, a site meeting with one builder was yet to be fixed, and a third builder's name had only been passed to the Clerk that morning. The Clerk undertook to attempt to expedite this process.

Action: Clerk

14 To review and confirm the terms of reference for committees

14.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

15 Appointments to Planning Committee and Finance & General Purposes Committee

15.1 The following appointments to Council Committees were approved.

15.2 Planning Committee: Cllrs Brown, Greenwood, Toher, Thornton, Dean and Francis

15.3 Cllr Toher asked if we invite Planning Officers to Planning Meetings. Cllr Winstanley advised this is only done if relevant.

15.4 Cllr Chaffey asked if non-Committee members are allowed to attend meetings and Cllr Winstanley advised that this is permitted, although the non-committee member will not have voting rights.

15.5 Finance and General Purposes (F&GP): Cllrs Winstanley, Tidridge, Toher, Thornton, Chaffey, Mignot, Parker-Jones and Dean all volunteered. As the maximum Committee membership is seven, and to avoid a lengthy voting process, Cllr Dean offered to act as substitute to Cllr Parker-Jones. This would mean that in the absence of Cllr Parker-Jones, Cllr Dean would assume voting rights on the Committee. The Council gratefully accepted this offer, so the Committee membership was agreed as Cllrs Winstanley, Tidridge, Toher, Thornton, Chaffey, Mignot and Parker-Jones, with Cllr Dean acting as a substitute in the absence of Cllr Parker-Jones. Cllr Dean, as with all Councillors, is welcome to attend the meetings even with Cllr Parker-Jones present.

15.6 Cllr Toher asked whether, should the Committee be inquorate, Cllr Dean would then be allowed to vote even though Cllr Parker-Jones was present, in order to allow the meeting to become quorate. The Clerk advised that Standing Orders do not currently allow this, although there is certainly the opportunity to amend said Standing Orders for the future.

16 Appointments to Working Groups and external panel membership

16.1 The following appointments to Working Groups and external panels were approved.

16.2 Travel Token: Cllrs Moore, Toher, Thornton, Parker-Jones and Dean.

16.3 Following a proposal from Cllr Parker-Jones that the Social Media Working Group be expanded to be a Communications Working Group, which could also include the newsletter and the website, councillors appointed to the Social Media Working Group were: Cllrs Chaffey, Tidridge, Brown and Parker-Jones.

16.4 Carnival: Cllrs Winstanley and Brown. All other Councillors expressed their willingness to help at the Carnival itself, with the exception of Cllrs Parker-Jones and Dean, who have prior commitments that weekend.

16.5 Road Safety, Highways and Passenger Transport Forum: No volunteers at this time.

16.6 Eastleigh District Association of Parish and Town Councils: Chair and Vice-Chair.

16.7 Bishopstoke Memorial Hall: Cllrs Toher and Winstanley already sit on this Committee by virtue of other roles they have. There were no other volunteers.

16.8 Bishopstoke Community Association: Cllr Winstanley again already sits on this Committee. Cllrs Thornton and Mignot also volunteered.

16.9 Bishopstoke Parish Council / Local Area Committee Liaison Group: Chair and Vice-Chair.

16.10 Airport Consultative Committee: Cllr Toher (provided that the meetings are not Friday afternoon) with Cllr Moore as stand-by.

16.11 Bishopstoke Parochial Charities (inc. Twynhams): Cllr Brown.

16.12 Campaign for the Protection of Rural England: Cllr Tidridge.

16.13 Public Art: Cllr Parker-Jones

16.14 Neighbourhood Plan: Lead Cllr Toher, Support Cllrs Tidridge and Dean

17 To review and adopt Standing Orders and Financial Regulations

17.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

18 To approve the PCSO contract for 2016 - 2019

18.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

19. To receive a briefing regarding the General Power of Competence

19.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

20. To review and accept the current Fixed Assets Register

20.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

21 To receive a briefing on the current insurance cover held by the Council

21.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

22 To approve continuing membership of association and other bodies

22.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

23 To review and approve the Council's complaints procedure

23.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

24 To review and approve the Council's procedures for handling Freedom of Information requests

24.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

25 To review and approve Council policies

25.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

26 To decide the best way forward for Councillors to receive training this year

26.1 The Clerk was asked to see if in-house training on Planning could be obtained earlier than the September HALC training.

Action: Clerk

26.2 Cllr Francis queried the process for booking training and was advised it all has to be booked through the Clerk.

26.3 Cllr Greenwood requested that the Clerk ask if training can be given online.

Action: Clerk

Cllr Moore left the meeting at this point

27 To agree dates, times and places of ordinary Council meetings of the Full Council for the year ahead

27.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

28 To receive the RFO's report and approve the March 2016 and April 2016 Statements of Account

28.1 Proposed Cllr Winstanley, Seconded Cllr Mignot, **RESOLVED** unanimously that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Parish Council.

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

29.1 Cllr Winstanley advised everyone present that on 4 June 2016 at the Pavilion in the Park there is to be a charity event for cancer relief in memory of a previous Mayor – Tony Noyce. All are welcome to attend.

29.2 Cllr Winstanley asked if those newly elected, and perhaps some of those with experience, might enjoy and benefit from a tour of the parish, particularly focusing on areas of Parish Council responsibility. This idea was warmly received.

30 To receive the Clerk's monthly report

30.1 The Clerk reported that work has begun on transferring to a new website, hopefully allowing for quicker updating and less issues with storage space. This in turn should allow the introduction of official Bishopstoke Parish Council email addresses. It is hope the website can be up and running by the next Full Council meeting.

30.2 Following recent meetings with the Community Safety Group and the Y-Zone Committee the Clerk was pleased to be able to report that Bishopstoke remains a low crime area, although there are still a few people causing trouble around the Y-Zone area.

30.3 The Parish Office will be closed from Monday 30th May to Friday 3rd June. Emails will still be answered and the Clerk reported that he would be attending the Planning Committee meeting on 31st May.

31 To consider content for the May 2016 press release

31.1 The Council agreed to include welcoming newly elected members, re-elected members, and those members returning to the parish after an absence; a comment on the more diverse nature of the Council now – being gender balanced and having a greater age variety; the Old Anchor Petition; the discovery of Iron Age / Roman remains at Breach Lane; the complaints at the Cemetery development being raised with Planning Enforcement and a thank you to those Council members who either stood down this year, or simply were not successful in seeking re-election

32 Date. Time, place and agenda items for next meeting – Tuesday 28 June 2016 at 7:30pm in the Parish Office, Riverside, Bishopstoke

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 9:30pm