



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Meeting Held at Dogmersfield Primary School 13th January 2014


### Councillors present:

Cllr Geoff Beaven (GB)  
Cllr Alastair Clark (AJC)  
Cllr Martin Hannah (MH)  
Cllr Graham Leach (GL)  
Cllr Mike Ricketts (MR)  
CLERK Claire Inglis (CI)

### Members of Public present:


Paul Chambers (PC)      Chris Waller (CW)      T Scott (TS)  
Anita McDonald (AM)      Christine Smith (CS)      Neil Dickson (ND)  
Mary Morrison (MM)      Denise Whitehead (DW)      Angela Dickson (AD)  
Jo Thomas (JT)      Philip Whitehead (PW)      Brian White (BW)  
Jennie Thomas (JT)      Cllr Ken Crookes (KC)      Veronika Cook (VC)  
Elizabeth Waller (EW)      V Duggleby (VD)

01/14	Welcome	The meeting was opened at 7.32pm by Chairman who welcomed everyone.	
02/14	Agenda item 1	<b><u>Apologies for absence</u></b>  Apologies were received from Cllr. Stephen Gorys.	
03/14	Agenda item 2	<b><u>Declaration of interests – current agenda</u></b>  None received.	
04/14	Agenda item 3	<b><u>Public Participation</u></b>  GB requested that matters relating to the following two topics be discussed at per the appropriate agenda item as follows:  Vortal meeting – Further to the issue of the newsletter which announced a residents meeting to be held on 22 <sup>nd</sup> January at the school, GB requested that questions relating to the proposed development scheme and the SHLAA be raised at this arranged meeting as this forum has been provided for this purpose.  Implications of bad weather – Agenda item 6 has been provided for this purpose and to retain the format of the meeting, GB requested that public participation relating to such issues be raised then.  GB then requested any items other than the two above.  Residents voiced appreciation in receiving information via the newsletter which was helpful but commented on website information not being current as suggested in the newsletter. The Council agreed that some information has yet to be uploaded and that certain information is not provided in the ‘obvious’ section of the website (namely minutes of previous minutes). This matter would be addressed.	AJC/CI
05/14	Agenda item 4	<b><u>To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013</u></b>  GB asked all Councillors if the minutes were a true representation of the November meeting.  <b>It was resolved that the minutes (136/13 to 150/13) be accepted as a true record and they were signed by GB.</b> (AJC proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).	



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL


06/14	Agenda item 5	<p><b><u>Matters arising from the minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 139/13 AJC due to bring issue of gully cleaning to Traffic Partnership Meeting in two weeks' time.</li> <li>• Audit date to be agreed in conjunction with AGM.</li> <li>• Letter of thanks was issued to local contractor for work carried out at nil charge.</li> <li>• GB thanked AJC for arranging electrical safety test certificate for Christmas lights and a thanked Dogmersfield Events for dressing the tree and for removal of lights.</li> <li>• CI confirmed that a list has been collated of email addresses from those residents who are happy to receive communication via this method from the council. Approx. half a dozen received so far, three as a result of the newsletter. The intention is to circulate a preference list for residents to sign up to.</li> <li>• Portfolios were notified via the newsletter but are to be updated on the council website.</li> <li>• Payments made to Clerk would be clarified under Finance.</li> <li>• Election invoice had been queried by asking for justification of associated costs which was provided by HDC and determined the costs were substantiated and the invoice was subsequently paid.</li> <li>• Precept would be discussed under Finance.</li> <li>• Daegmar planning response was submitted.</li> <li>• Willow tree and Lengthsman scheme would be discussed under agenda item 9.</li> <li>• CI confirmed that she will seek to inquire about the possibility of in-house training and sharing this training with other local parishes earlier than June when HALC are hosting a course.</li> <li>• Newsletter has been issued.</li> <li>• Action list was reviewed for actions that remain. Action list to be updated by CI.</li> </ul>	<p>AJC</p> <p>CI</p> <p>CI</p> <p>AJC</p> <p>CI</p> <p>CI</p>
07/14	Agenda item 6	<p><b><u>Adverse weather /Public Participation</u></b></p> <p>GB started the discussion on the topic of adverse weather and the resulting problems by highlighting some of the major issues that affected Dogmersfield during the Christmas and New year period, namely flooding, sewage, trees and power outages.</p> <p>Power was lost from Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> December until in some cases Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> December. The Queens Head had use of a generator which supplied some houses in the immediate area but this ran out of fuel on the 25<sup>th</sup> and needed to be topped up and problems were experienced restarting the generator.</p> <p>GB invited TS and VD to share the problems they encountered. They reported that they suffered a flood on Christmas Eve with sewage back flowing into their property. This first became evident at 5.30am on Christmas eve. A week later they had the same problem of flooding. On the second occurrence they avoided significant damage by timely pumping out as electrical power was available. It seems likely that as a result of the power outage the pumping station stopped functioning on Christmas eve causing sewage to overflow the system. TS also reported that there was evidence of sewage flowing into the Hart which he reported to the Environment agency and Thames Water. VC reported that the Chatter Alley pumping station also failed causing sewage to flow over drives. The pumping station is not adequate enough to cope with the levels of output in Dogmersfield. This is a public health issue and Thames Water just seemed disinterested. It took lots of phone calls to Thames Water to convince them there was a problem.</p>	



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL


<p>07/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 6 cont'd</p>	<p>An enquiry was made regarding the output of sewage from The Four Seasons. GB commented that the system had been designed to cut off and hold the outflow in the local holding tank if the Dogmersfield pumping station fails with additional dosing taking place in such a situation. GB was not aware of any complaints of smells from the system.</p> <p>The power outages occurred after trees took out power lines. Electricity board were seen working all day Christmas day to rectify the problem.</p> <p>The discussion moved onto ditches. There were queries raised as to whose responsibility clearance and maintenance of ditches/culverts was. AJC responded that Highways dept. would claim that ditches were the responsibility of the landowner. During discussion about the ditch on the school side it was pointed out that this has not had any clearance work or maintenance for a long time. It was considered that this was outside of the school boundary. There were at least three major blockages causing water to course along the roadway. GB stated that to dig out and in some cases repair culverts would be very costly and whose responsibility it is to do so is uncertain, whether DPC ,Hampshire Highways dept. or landowners. A digger would probably be required.</p> <p>MR commented that outside agencies have a tendency to pass the buck onto landowners and/or the parish council and maintenance of the ditches will be an on-going and costly problem.</p> <p>The purpose of the ditch to the rear of the north side of Chatter Alley was questioned as it just appears to flow to the front ditch which then becomes overwhelmed forcing water onto the road. Was the work carried out by DPC's people (referring to the Community payback team) the cause of other issues? Was asked. A response was made that undergrowth was cut back by this team not digging out of ditches.</p> <p>The ditches to Acorns had been cleared out but from Lady Bower onwards the ditch starts to deteriorate. Some ditches that may previously existed for example in from of Foster and Heanes have completely disappeared which may be the cause of the run off of water seen at Copperfields. PW queried what had happened to a grant that was given to the Parish Council of approx. £10-£12k and made available for such work. GB confirmed that this grant was never taken up as the conditions were unacceptable.</p> <p>GB asked whether any residents had suffered any water in gas pipes, a problem that had previously occurred in bad weather. None reported.</p> <p>GB suggested that at this time a letter of complaint to Thames Water (TW) was an appropriate course of action.</p> <p>KC reported that district wide issues were being brought to TW by HDC. There is a meeting in public on the 20<sup>th</sup> which KC invited AJC to. HDC is also meeting privately with TW and any feedback, problems incurred with photos if available will add to the plethora of evidence that has been accumulated for the meeting.</p> <p>MH also commented that during his conversation with Ian Plumber at HDC (Hart drainage engineer) he commented that the only way to get TW to act is for lots of letters of complaint from residents.</p> <p>GB confirmed that a considered proposal for work to ditches would be drawn up and brought to the Annual Parish Assembly probably an apt time to do so as the current level of precept would not cover the scale of work that may be needed. This would be fully scoped for ideas and funding methods.</p> <p>GB confirmed that DPC would write to TW which would be copied to KC.</p>	<p>GB</p> <p>GB</p>
--------------	-----------------------------	---	---------------------






# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

08/14	Agenda item 7 cont'd	<p>in 2016 (which may be uncontested thereby rendering nil cost) but the amount can be reflected correctly in that year.</p> <p>MR inquired whether Election costs could be accrued over a number of years. It was confirmed that the accounts were not prepared on an accrual basis and that as the expenditure budget exceeds income in the year the Council will be drawing on reserves to deliver its service and any budget not spent is returned to the reserves.</p> <p>Income in the future may indeed have to be increased to enable required projects to be delivered. Income from other routes will have to be sought also such as grants or volunteer work by the residents.</p> <p><b>It was resolved that the proposed budget for 2014/15 be approved as per summarised details below:</b></p> <p><b>Income budget set as per precept requested of £7,400 plus additional tax base adjustment to be received of £168.06.</b></p> <p><b>Expenditure budget set at £11,000 and split as follows:</b>  <b>£8,000 Internal Operations &amp;</b>  <b>£3,000 Service Delivery</b> (GB proposed, MR seconded and all were in favour).</p>	
09/14	Agenda item 8	<p><b>Planning</b></p> <p>GB reiterated that a Meeting with residents has been scheduled for Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> January where it is hoped that there will be a good attendance and a well- supported meeting. MR continued stating that it is a good opportunity to find out what the village wants in respect of the threat of future development and this can be achieved only by a good turn- out representing a large element of the village. GB confirmed that the councillors will get together on Monday to prepare for the Wednesday meeting as there is a lot to talk through including the outcome of a meeting held today with Daryl Phillips at Hart District Council (HDC).</p> <p>Residents queried whether landowners and developers were going to be represented at the meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup>. It was confirmed that the developers had not been invited as it was an opportunity for the residents to voice their concerns to their council and provide direction for the council to best represent the village.</p> <p>A resident stated that issues like water courses and sewage are key issues when considering new development and GB agreed that the run off of water from developed land will be greater and needs to be considered.</p> <p><u>Report on current planning applications</u></p> <p>GB commented on the adjusted Planning report to include an additional column to highlight the response submitted by DPC and the resulting decision.</p> <p>An update on the status of current planning applications was provided:</p> <p><b>Ormersfield Lodge</b> – Planning permission granted since the last meeting in December.</p> <p><b>Land at Knight Close, Crookham Village</b> – A pre-application advice request for 25 dwellings, whilst not in the parish is of local interest. Consideration pending by HDC.</p> <p><b>Daegmar Angora Goats</b> – Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for existing use of residential dwelling with agricultural connections. Whilst DPC objected to this application HDC has granted the certificate.</p> <p>Comment received from residents -Time and time again DPC opinion is completely ignored and questioned why HDC make such decisions against wishes of local council.</p> <p><b>Edenbrook</b> – Outline application for erection of 193 dwellings. Nil response was</p>	




# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

09/14	Agenda item 8 cont'd	<p>submitted by DPC; comments had previously been provided when the Local Plan was under discussion.</p> <p>An application submitted after the issue of the planning report was mentioned:  <b>Catherine of Aragon</b> – Tree work as a result of storm damage including a branch from a tree on Pilcot Green North which is interfering with the owner’s telephone cable.</p> <p>Comment received from resident – They had previously submitted an application for removal of an Oak tree which has a significant lean towards the school and the resident is concerned every time there is a storm that the tree will fall on the school. Previous advice has been that permission would be refused for its removal as it has been assessed as a healthy tree. This is not disputed but any liability for damage it would cause if it fell would be that of the resident. GB suggested a formal application is made in respect of the tree. MR voiced experience of a similar situation and thought it worthwhile issuing a letter to HDC telling them that they are the party exposed to the risk of damage to the school.</p>	
10/14	Agenda item 9	<p><b><u>Environment</u></b></p> <p><u>Willow tree</u></p> <p>Further work was required on the Willow tree after the top blew out during storms in November; this was subsequent to initial works to untangle branches from the overhead telephone wires.</p> <p>Quotes have been obtained from three Tree surgeons in total after the first quote from Cedardale was considered high. Two options were discussed with the latter two contractors:</p> <p>Option 1 to pollard at current height reducing limbs to 3-4ft to allow for future regrowth in a formative shape.</p> <p>Option 2 to take branch down to lower level where original branch was removed to produce a more compact tree after future regrowth.</p> <p>The difference in quotes for the two options did not differ significantly or between the latter two contractors. Preference was voiced by residents and councillors for Option 2 and the Contractor chosen.</p> <p>It was confirmed that all three contractors had carried out work for the council and carried the correct level of insurance.</p> <p><b>It was resolved to accept work proposal for remedial works to Willow tree outside Brooks from contractor 1<sup>st</sup> Call Trees Limited OPTION2 and associated quote for works agreed at £500 + VAT and for work to be arranged as per the availability of agreed contractor as stated above (MR proposed, AJC seconded and all were in favour).</b></p> <p>VC requested communication to confirm when the tree surgeon was booked.</p> <p><u>Lengthsman Scheme</u> (referred to as the scheme below)</p> <p>AJC commented that discussions had been had relating to DPC’s request to join the scheme, whereupon joining the council would receive £1000 per annum to carry out sundry works to verges/ditches and areas associated to the highway but NOT on the</p>	CI



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

<p>10/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 9 Cont'd</p>	<p>highway.</p> <p>AJC had raised concerns about the over-legality of the contract that would be entered into with the Highways department with the result of discussions being an agreement between both parties that interpretation of the scheme was contemporaneous. AJC had requested that the clause relating to Lead parish in the contract be left blank at this stage until such time that more rural parishes join the scheme. The discussion could then take place between parishes as to which one will assume the role of Lead parish for administrative reporting purposes.</p> <p>AJC's recommendation is to sign the contract as soon as possible to obtain payment for this financial year and receive £1000 funding.</p> <p>GB voiced concerns surrounding having joined the scheme that Highways would use it as an excuse to ignore its statutory duties for problems that were pre-existing and discovered as for example whilst clearing ditches and culverts to unearth a major defect. GB considered it was a good idea to join the scheme as £1k would be disposable income to carry out tasks relating to ditches etc. It would be reasonable to accept the fair cost of carrying out such duties but the concern remains.</p> <p>MR suggested signing of contract to include a covering letter to make an exception should such an instance of unearthing a major defect occur. MR thought DPC should go ahead with the scheme as the funds are needed.</p> <p>AJC stated that there is a good working relationship between Highways dept. and DPC and there is always the option to resign from the scheme.</p> <p><b>It was resolved to authorise Dogmersfield Parish Councils inclusion in the Lengthsman scheme 2013/14 and authorises the Clerk, Claire Inglis to sign the contract on behalf of the Council and arrange for a covering letter referring to liability for pre-existing problems to be drafted by Chairman</b> (GB proposed, AJC seconded and all were in favour).</p> <p>KC inquired whether under environment AJC was in receipt of request for Dogmersfield's priority cutting schedule on footpaths around the parish. AJC confirmed that he had received it and it would be discussed next Monday with AJC providing a map/plan of the footpaths for ease of identification.</p> <p>MH asked how many footpaths there were and are they traversable considering potential significant tree fall due to the storms? AJC hopes to walk the footpaths and maintenance/ tree removal is mainly the responsibility of the landowner but Highways may provide some support.</p>	<p>CI/GB</p> <p>AJC</p>
<p>11/14</p>	<p>Agenda item 10</p>	<p><b><u>Highways</u></b></p> <p>AJC reported on a walk along Chatter Alley and surrounding areas performed with MR during the recent period to assess problems related to Highways.</p> <p>The following were noted and have been put on the agenda at the Traffic Partnership Committee(TPC) meeting to be held in two weeks' time:</p> <p>Kerbing to the north-side of Chatter Alley, the grips which should allow water to flow into the ditches sit higher than the road surface and hence there is significant water run off along the road as opposed to flowing into the ditch.</p> <p>Flooding in the Copperfields area of Chatter Alley highlighted a reporting anomaly on</p>	



# DOGMERSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

11/14	Agenda item 10 cont'd	<p>the Highways system as contractors arrived in Winchfield to assess the problem. Therefore there is an address glitch in the highways system to be resolved.</p> <p>Gulley emptying has been put on the agenda (although there have been cut backs in funding this work County wide).</p> <p>Pot holes created in road etc.</p> <p>AJC commented that Highways were probably inundated with problems but asked residents to flag any problems up to him and they can be addressed at the forthcoming meeting and that he would report back from the TPC meeting in February.</p>	AJC
12/14	Agenda item 11	<p><b><u>Other matters to report</u></b></p> <p><b>Community Liaison</b> CI made available information relating to Pilcot Road closure (also to be displayed on noticeboard).</p> <p><b>Training</b> AJC to determine possibility of sharing group training session with other local Parish councils on a date earlier than that of HALC provided in early summer at the HDAPTC meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2014.</p> <p><b>Newsletter</b> Newsletter has been issued.</p> <p><b>Other matters</b> None.</p>	
13/14	Agenda item 12	<p><b><u>Crime and Disorder Act, section 17</u></b></p> <p>No matters to discuss.</p>	
14/14	Agenda item 13	<p><b><u>Dates of future meetings</u></b></p> <p>Scheduled meetings are as follows:</p> <p><b><u>2014</u></b>  <b>February 10<sup>th</sup>, 7.30pm</b>  <b>March 10<sup>th</sup>, 7.30pm</b></p> <p><b><u>2014/15</u></b>          Provisional dates have been circulated for 2014/15 meeting dates including the APA and AGM. Excluding the APA and AGM the meeting dates hold to the format of falling on the second Monday of the month. These dates will be discussed and agreed at the next meeting.</p>	
15/14	Agenda item 14	<p><b><u>Information Sharing</u></b></p> <p>None submitted. Meeting closed at 9.15pm.</p>	

Signed.....  
Chairman

Date.....