



MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL AGM

Thursday 25th May, 7pm Village Hall

PRESENT Parish Councillors: Paul Burton (Chairman) Brian Baker, Stephen Harnett, David Hunt, Simon Richards; Parish Clerk: Susan Turner. Guest: County Cllr Tim Davies.

2021

29 WELCOME & APOLOGIES

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed all present. Apologies Ian Bowman, Ward Cllr Anne Crampton.

30 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN 2021/22

AGREED Unanimously to re-elect Paul Burton as Chairman for the coming year. Chairman’s Acceptance of Office made, signed and witnessed by Clerk.

31 COUNTY AND WARD COUNCILLORS

The Chairman congratulated Tim Davies on his election to County and thanked him for attending. Cllr Davies introduced himself as did all members of the Parish Council. Congratulations also to Ward Cllr Anne Crampton on her re-election.

32 PUBLIC SESSION No members of the public present.

33 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING of 21st April 2021 agreed and signed.

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST in items on the Agenda – None.

35 FINANCE

.1 Audit – AGAR 2020/21 Part 2 forms as circulated.

AGREED and signed

- i. Exemption from External Audit form **APPENDIX I**
- ii. 1. Annual Governance Statement (S1) **APPENDIX II.I**
2. Accounting Statements (S2). **APPENDIX II.II**

.2 Natwest current account switch to Metro completed 30th April.

.3 Closure of NatWest business instant access account

ACTION Both signatories required to visit branch.

.4 Parish Precept – Dukes Meadow

Recap Precept request for 2021/22 was calculated to include c35 new Dukes Meadow homes occupied in January, so an increase agreed at the January meeting of c32% on 2020/21. This with the intention the Precept payment stayed roughly the same per household, while achieving extra funding to contribute to proposed pedestrian refuge islands and ‘village gateways’.

The actual Precept per household as shown on the Council Tax bill increased by 47.7%. (It went down by 10.7% the year before.)

Update The Dukes Meadow houses occupied in January were not added to the system by the Valuation Office until 1st April, and so ‘technically excluded’ from Heckfield’s tax base for this year.

Ongoing The second phase of the Dukes Meadow homes should be added to the published tax base for next year. Residents will see a decrease in their Precept next year. (However the intention had been to maintain residents’ contribution at stable level and avoid the see-sawing in contributions year on year.)

ACTION Clerk to clarify what happens to Dukes Meadow precept payments collected this year.

.5 Insurance renewal Documents circulated.

AGREED Renewal with Zurich for 2021/22. Zurich was competitive on comparisons sought last year. For this coming year the premium remains the same, at £218.96 including IPT.

For signature (p1 of 3)

36 VILLAGE HALL AND COTTAGES

.1 Cottage renovation Awaiting Conservation Officer Report to LBC application.

.2 Village Hall maintenance

TO DO LIST – Roof tiles and lintel over front entrance.

NOTED Builders very busy and cement shortage.

37 TRAFFIC, HIGHWAYS & RIGHTS OF WAY

.1 B3349 Site visit from Ranil Jayawardena MP and colleagues. Witnessed the Robert Mays bus arrive and children being dropped off roadside on the B3349.

.2 Pedestrian Safety Projects MS Teams meeting of 25th May (earlier today) with HCC Traffic Management – attended by Simon Richards, David Hunt and Clerk. Full notes from the meeting **APPENDIX III**

i Pedestrian refuge islands B3349

AGREED Pedestrian refuge islands x 2 confirmed as priority at main B3349 crossing points.

1. Design Engineer visit is next step – utility checks, check feasibility of site, available width of road, ensure appropriate connections for a crossing point.
2. Design Engineer – all being well – available late summer for site visit and to assess cost. (Will undertake recce prior to this – asap – if in the area.)
3. HCC additional requirements – safe paths at the approaches to the refuge island crossing points – both sides to clear an area / provide hard standing / yellow bollards – to warn drivers of the hazard.
4. Potential show stoppers – utilities (particularly fibre) – width of road – costs associated with providing hard standing etc.

ii Village Gateways

AGREED White plastic 'gates' with Heckfield name-place sign, 'welcome' message and Heckfield emblem. For B3349 and A33, funding permitting.

AGREED To use standard package via HCC and their approved suppliers (most likely Glasdon).

AGREED Message with place-name to read 'Thank you for Driving Carefully'.

ACTION Clerk to forward details of preferred designs etc to HCC. **APPENDIX IV**

NOTED Available funding depends on costing for Pedestrian Islands.

iii Signage Signs previously requested for 'school bus' and 'pedestrians crossing' don't comply here with Dept Transport Regs which specify / regulate the use of signs. The triangular 'pedestrian crossing' signs are only used with zebra crossings.

AGREED 'Pedestrian in Road' signs

These signs can be used on B3349 and A33 – provided associated with areas of particular pedestrian use. Ideally 'paired up' – one approaching the location from each direction, and associated with 'slow' signs in the road. HCC has a small budget for signage where appropriate. Can progress with the signs independently of other projects. Should be able to put them up over the summer.

.3 C6 Odiham Road TRO As previously noted, the new 30mph TRO is developer-funded including the 30mph 'entrance' signs and '30' on the road.

NOTED HCC has negotiated with developer to also provide 'gateway'-type feature, in the style of a palisade – row of posts in the verge flanking the signs.

.4 'Road Racing' – Wellington roundabout Meeting scheduled for 2nd June for officers and councillors (Police, Hart, Heckfield, Hants) to discuss options to address the 'road racing' issues. The new Hants PCC Donna Jones has visited the site with County Cllr Tim Davies.

HCC view is that this is anti-social behaviour – a Police issue – and a migrating problem. Not an issue that HCC would use 'road safety' measures to address. A 'buildout' or any form of built restriction to traffic here does not meet their safety-led criteria. They would not provide a feature which could cause an additional hazard.

.5 FP 8 Coldpiece Farm HCC Countryside Services team has (today) created an access gap in the roadside hedge, field corner by bungalow opposite Kiln Farm – and installed a FP fingerpost sign. This is close to the route as shown on the definitive map.

- .6 Priority Cutting schedule** Email from Countryside Access 22nd April:
'We have added Heckfield Footpath 5 and 503 (Barossa Farm Restricted Byway), to our in-house Ranger Teams jobs; 502 and 10 have been allocated to our contractor; all four paths are due to be cut in June.'
- .7 Lengthsman Schedule** Coldpiece Wood and A32 Old Road – Church Lane North and South – and to the New Inn – to be scheduled for Lengthsman to cut.
- .8 Verge to Heckfield Roundabout** To access the 'Village Green'.
NOTED Requires the hedge cutting back – a job for end of year.

38 PLANNING

- .1 Parish Planning Applications** **APPENDIX V**
- .2 Cherry Tree Farm Appeal for on-site agricultural workers' dwelling**

20/01274/FUL (Appeal on non-determination) Cherry Tree Farm, Chandlers Green. Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling with associated landscaping and car parking. Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/20/3257541. Hearing 27th April via MS Teams. Subsequent Farm Visit.
 Hearing attended by Stephen Harnett and Clerk. The Clerk confirmed the Parish Council position remained as its written submission. Stephen spoke as a neighbour in support of the Appeal.
 Hart had dropped their opposition on grounds of viability – now agreeing as marginally viable. However the argument re 'need' was re-visited. The Hart representative argued that change in farming operation (notably no suckler herd) altered the balance of the argument. Cherry Tree Farm was supported regarding the excellence of their farming practices and animal welfare standards.
 There was also a question re the alternative SANG provision not being officially confirmed. The Inspector will await clarification on this before making a decision.
- .3 Bramshill House** has been reportedly sold as a private dwelling – together with Warbrook House (hotel). Cllr Davies noted Bramshill House is the only Jacobean mansion in England retaining its original style.
- .4 Wellington Riding** LDC application – 'Use of land for the temporary stabling of horses.' David Hunt to circulate his comments on traffic impact.

39 FURTHER REPORTS

- .1 Churchyard Maintenance** Simon Richards is working with Church Warden James Trumpeter. Orders have been placed re the Oak palisade (£1,542) and Chestnut fencing (£2,060). Parish Council agreed to fund 50% (£1801). **APPENDIX VI**
- .2 Police Liaison meeting** of 29th April. From PCSO Nick Greenwood Report:

'Following on from our meeting on 29/04/2021 a decision has been made to renew our current community priority – vehicle related nuisance. We have made good progress on this issue since the beginning of February with targeted policing activity in response to both on and off road nuisance. Action has been taken in relation to both issues with enforcement, education and dissuasion being used to deter offences. We are now working with our partners in Forestry England, the local authority and the private sector to identify a long term resolution to both issues. I am confident that further progress will have been made by the end of July.'

Next meeting 2nd August, 7pm via Teams.
- .3 Bramshill Road Triangle** Tim Davies noted the three posts at the Triangle on the Bramshill Road – designed to make cars break their speed before turning left – aren't easily visible. To include in LM schedule to clean. **APPENDIX VII**
- .4 Village Event** Simon Richards to arrange 27th June. Agreed expenses £150.

40 NEXT PARISH COUNCIL MEETING TBA in August.

Meeting closed 9.30pm with thanks to all present

APPENDIX I AGAR PART 2 – 2020-21 – EXEMPTION FROM EXTERNAL AUDIT**Certificate of Exemption – AGAR 2020/21 Part 2**

To be completed by smaller authorities where the higher of gross income or gross expenditure did not exceed £25,000 in the year of account ended 31 March 2021, and that wish to certify themselves as exempt from a limited assurance review under Section 9 of the Local Audit (Smaller Authorities) Regulations 2015

There is no requirement to have a limited assurance review or to submit an Annual Governance and Accountability Return to the external auditor, **provided** that the authority has certified itself as exempt at a meeting of the authority after 31 March 2021 and a completed Certificate of Exemption is submitted no later than **30 June 2021** notifying the external auditor.

HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

certifies that during the financial year 2020/21, the higher of the authority's total gross income for the year **or** total gross annual expenditure, for the year did not exceed **£25,000**

Total annual gross income for the authority 2020/21: **£20,843** **R AMOUNT £00,000**

Total annual gross expenditure for the authority 2020/21: **£4,558** **ER AMOUNT £00,000**

There are certain circumstances in which an authority will be **unable to certify itself as exempt**, so that a limited assurance review will still be required. If an authority **is unable to confirm the statements below then it cannot certify itself as exempt** and it **must** submit the completed Annual Governance and Accountability Return Part 3 to the external auditor to undertake a limited assurance review for which a fee of **£200 +VAT** will be payable.

By signing this **Certificate of Exemption** you are confirming that:

- The authority was in existence on 1st April 2017
- In relation to the preceding financial year (2019/20), the external auditor **has not**:
 - issued a public interest report in respect of the authority or any entity connected with it
 - made a statutory recommendation to the authority, relating to the authority or any entity connected with it
 - issued an advisory notice under paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 8 to the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 ("the Act"), and has not withdrawn the notice
 - commenced judicial review proceedings under section 31(1) of the Act
 - made an application under section 28(1) of the Act for a declaration that an item of account is unlawful, and the application has not been withdrawn nor has the court refused to make the declaration
- The court has not declared an item of account unlawful after a person made an appeal under section 28(3) of the Act.

If you are able to confirm that the above statements apply and that the authority neither received gross income, nor incurred gross expenditure, exceeding £25,000, then the Certificate of Exemption can be signed and a copy submitted to the external auditor **either** by email **or** by post (not both).

The Annual Internal Audit Report, Annual Governance Statement, Accounting Statements, an analysis of variances and the bank reconciliation plus the information required by Regulation 15 (2), Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 including the period for the exercise of public rights still need to be fully completed and, along with a copy of this certificate, published on the authority website/webpage* before 1 July 2021.

By signing this certificate you are also confirming that you are aware of this requirement.

Signed by the Financial Officer	Date	I confirm that this Certificate of Exemption was approved by this authority on this date:
SIGNED	25/05/2021 ✓	25/05/2021 ✓
Signed by Chair	Date	as recorded in minute reference:
SIGNED	25/05/2021 ✓	35.1.i MINUTE REFERENCE
Generic email address of Authority	Telephone number	
clerk.heckfield@gmail.com OWNED GENERIC EMAIL ADDRESS	07515 777060 NUMBER	

*Published web address

www.heckfield-pc.org.uk ENTER PUBLICLY AVAILABLE WEBSITE/WEBPAGE ADDRESS

ONLY this Certificate of Exemption should be returned EITHER by email OR by post (not both) as soon as possible after certification to your external auditor, but no later than 30 June 2021. Reminder letters incur a charge of £40 +VAT

APPENDIX II.I AGAR PART 2 – 2020-21 – GOVERNANCE**Section 1 – Annual Governance Statement 2020/21**

We acknowledge as the members of:

HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

our responsibility for ensuring that there is a sound system of internal control, including arrangements for the preparation of the Accounting Statements. We confirm, to the best of our knowledge and belief, with respect to the Accounting Statements for the year ended 31 March 2021, that:

	Agreed		
	Yes	No	
1. We have put in place arrangements for effective financial management during the year, and for the preparation of the accounting statements.	✓		<i>prepared its accounting statements in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations.</i>
2. We maintained an adequate system of internal control including measures designed to prevent and detect fraud and corruption and reviewed its effectiveness.	✓		<i>made proper arrangements and accepted responsibility for safeguarding the public money and resources in its charge.</i>
3. We took all reasonable steps to assure ourselves that there are no matters of actual or potential non-compliance with laws, regulations and Proper Practices that could have a significant financial effect on the ability of this authority to conduct its business or manage its finances.	✓		<i>has only done what it has the legal power to do and has complied with Proper Practices in doing so.</i>
4. We provided proper opportunity during the year for the exercise of electors' rights in accordance with the requirements of the Accounts and Audit Regulations.	✓		<i>during the year gave all persons interested the opportunity to inspect and ask questions about this authority's accounts.</i>
5. We carried out an assessment of the risks facing this authority and took appropriate steps to manage those risks, including the introduction of internal controls and/or external insurance cover where required.	✓		<i>considered and documented the financial and other risks it faces and dealt with them properly.</i>
6. We maintained throughout the year an adequate and effective system of internal audit of the accounting records and control systems.	✓		<i>arranged for a competent person, independent of the financial controls and procedures, to give an objective view on whether internal controls meet the needs of this smaller authority.</i>
7. We took appropriate action on all matters raised in reports from internal and external audit.	✓		<i>responded to matters brought to its attention by internal and external audit.</i>
8. We considered whether any litigation, liabilities or commitments, events or transactions, occurring either during or after the year-end, have a financial impact on this authority and, where appropriate, have included them in the accounting statements.	✓		<i>disclosed everything it should have about its business activity during the year including events taking place after the year end if relevant.</i>
9. (For local councils only) Trust funds including charitable. In our capacity as the sole managing trustee we discharged our accountability responsibilities for the fund(s)/assets, including financial reporting and, if required, independent examination or audit.	Yes	No	N/A
			✓

*For any statement to which the response is 'no', an explanation must be published

This Annual Governance Statement was approved at a meeting of the authority on:

25/05/2021

and recorded as minute reference:

35.1.ii(1) MINUTE REFERENCE

Signed by the Chairman and Clerk of the meeting where approval was given:

Chairman

Clerk

Other information required by the Transparency Code (not part of the Annual Governance Statement)

The authority website/webpage is up to date and the information required by the Transparency Code has been published.

Yes	No
✓	

www.heckfield-pc.org.uk PUBLICLY AVAILABLE WEBSITE/WEBPAGE ADDRESS

APPENDIX II.II AGAR PART 2 – 2020-21 – ACCOUNTING STATEMENTS

Section 2 – Accounting Statements 2020/21 for
HECKFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

	Year ending		Notes and guidance
	31 March 2020 £	31 March 2021 £	
			<i>Please round all figures to nearest £1. Do not leave any boxes blank and report £0 or Nil balances. All figures must agree to underlying financial records.</i>
1. Balances brought forward	11,112	7,278	<i>Total balances and reserves at the beginning of the year as recorded in the financial records. Value must agree to Box 7 of previous year.</i>
2. (+) Precept or Rates and Levies	9,600	9,840	<i>Total amount of precept (or for IDBs rates and levies) received or receivable in the year. Exclude any grants received.</i>
3. (+) Total other receipts	30	11,003	<i>Total income or receipts as recorded in the cashbook less the precept or rates/levies received (line 2). Include any grants received.</i>
4. (-) Staff costs	2,700	3,300	<i>Total expenditure or payments made to and on behalf of all employees. Include gross salaries and wages, employers NI contributions, employers pension contributions, gratuities and severance payments.</i>
5. (-) Loan interest/capital repayments	0	0	<i>Total expenditure or payments of capital and interest made during the year on the authority's borrowings (if any).</i>
6. (-) All other payments	10,763	1,258	<i>Total expenditure or payments as recorded in the cashbook less staff costs (line 4) and loan interest/capital repayments (line 5).</i>
7. (=) Balances carried forward	7,278	23,564	<i>Total balances and reserves at the end of the year. Must equal (1+2+3) - (4+5+6).</i>
8. Total value of cash and short term investments	7,278	23,564	<i>The sum of all current and deposit bank accounts, cash holdings and short term investments held as at 31 March – To agree with bank reconciliation.</i>
9. Total fixed assets plus long term investments and assets	0	0	<i>The value of all the property the authority owns – it is made up of all its fixed assets and long term investments as at 31 March.</i>
10. Total borrowings	0	0	<i>The outstanding capital balance as at 31 March of all loans from third parties (including PWLB).</i>
11. (For Local Councils Only) Disclosure note re Trust funds (including charitable)	Yes	No	<i>The Council as a body corporate acts as sole trustee for and is responsible for managing Trust funds or assets. N.B. The figures in the accounting statements above do not include any Trust transactions.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

I certify that for the year ended 31 March 2021 the Accounting Statements in this Annual Governance and Accountability Return have been prepared on either a receipts and payments or income and expenditure basis following the guidance in Governance and Accountability for Smaller Authorities – a Practitioners' Guide to Proper Practices and present fairly the financial position of this authority. Signed by Responsible Financial Officer before being presented to the authority for approval.

Date 25/05/2021

I confirm that these Accounting Statements were approved by this authority on this date:

25/05/2021

as recorded in minute reference:

35.1.ii(2) MINUTE REFERENCE

Signed by Chairman of the meeting where the Accounting Statements were approved

SIGNED REQUIRED

Thursday 25th May, 2pm via MS Teams

PRESENT Hants Traffic Management, Andy Smith (Team Leader, Safer Roads);
Parish Councillors, David Hunt, Simon Richards; Clerk Susan Turner.

1 To manage expectations

2 To discuss the Community Funded initiative.

.1 Launched in 2016 (same year as HCC's current safety-led policy). In these few years increasingly popular, mostly with Parish Councils, but also other community groups.

.2 But it does mean more work load. CF programme has to run alongside HCC's funded programme, which has to be a clear priority. The CF programme has to taken second place. It is managed on an ongoing, rolling basis, as can be fitted in, not according to financial year – obvious reasons.

.3 Recently some schemes have been delayed, just about to allocate last few of those previously-approved schemes to a Design Engineer (DE).

3 For Heckfield scheme looking to end summer for the DE initial work. Hesitant to give time scales because the nature of job of Traffic Management is has to be reactive on a daily basis. The CF works do slip. End of summer for DE work is a best guess.

4 DE work involves utility checks, measure road, check feasibility of site, make sure appropriate connections for a crossing point. There are standard drawing for islands but sometimes standard doesn't fit. Not rocket science but need to get an engineer to site to enable an estimate of cost.

5 Also need to speak to Highways, who are not big fans of refuge islands on A & B roads. Can be issues of winter maintenance. Traffic Management receives guidelines from Highways, but there are Refuge Islands on higher class roads.

6 Design Engineers PC noted that Ranil Jayawardena MP made a site visit. His suggestion that, a shortage of design resources holding things up, what about the Parish releasing funds for additional contractors to accelerate the process.

Answer: Would like to save the Parish the money. CFI isn't a money-making exercise for HCC, fees are based on the cost of the scheme. If the Parish Council undertook the work independently, would be paying external rates and even if used 'in house' engineers, they would be charged out at a higher rate. Transport Planning and some Design Consultants hire out design teams, but for a scheme like this would likely take the whole funding for the scheme. And even if took this route it's unlikely to be a priority over other work. From perspective of both time and funding outsourcing is unlikely to be a good option.

7 Package of measures To consider what we can do with the funding available, and depending on the funds the PC has.

Recommendation to look at a package of measures including:

- 1 refuge islands (two islands ideally to be considered as one scheme);
- 2 improving existing signs;
- 3 'gateways'.

.1 IF this is what the local community would like? Recognise that communities have mixed views. Gateways are popular with some, others think them a waste of time. (HCC experience – gateways are good.) Some communities are opposed to additional signage. The Parish Council's position is taken to be representing community wishes.

.2 Re signage – their use is fixed, very restricted as to what can do, Dept Transport Regs have to be complied with.

.3 Gateways are informal, their use less restricted providing placed where safe and away from the edge of the road. If it is felt that Heckfield is invisible from the road then place-name on a conspicuous gate feature could be a good measure. They are not intended as a magic wand to reduce speed, it is more about raising driver awareness.

.4 Various suppliers, have used Glasdon over recent years. Also J.A.C.S are reasonably competitive. If the PC could give a steer on preferred style. Would recommend white for a B road, recycled plastic is required on roads over 30mph as need to be 'safety passive' ie not a hazard if hit.

ACTION PC.

.5 To consider message for nameplate and emblem / coat of arms.

ACTION PC.

8. Refuge island 1 – point where B3349 bisects the Old Road. This is where the school bus stops. Southbound in the morning by School Lane, Northbound in the evening on roadside at entrance to path Old Road Church Lane South. Children have to cross one way or the other – no safety measures for children, no warning for drivers – dangerous and more so when dark.
- AGREED this refuge island the priority.
- Makes sense from HCC point of view as connecting routes in both directions. HCC cautious about provision to promote crossing where not fully connecting footways in both directions – Strategic Transport view – need provision for access on both sides. SO HCC would like to see safe paths at the approaches to the refuge island crossing points – both sides to clear an area / provide hard standing / yellow bollards – to warn drivers of the hazard. Makes sense to provide the refuge island directly opposite the entrance to Old Road Church Lane South then extend the hard standing path provision at the School Lane side where the verge is much wider.
9. Refuge island 2 where Heckfield FP 4 crosses the road.
- AGREED this refuge island the second priority.
- This second crossing point is some 200m north of Island 1. Andy wished to double check that people not walking up or down the road either side, from North or South, to cross at this point. If such use is regular then connecting footways either side would be needed. If minimal then not a worry, the focus will be on the crossing point. PC noted that people may walk to access the cemetery. Andy suggested hard standing at the cemetery side and some foliage clearing. He noted that – when providing hard standing – drainage can be an issue – requirement to look at runoff and gullies. Once start providing new drainage facilities can get very expensive. Consensus that this should not be required but up to a design engineer to look at.
10. Level of use at the crossing points Andy has the detail of the request for refuge islands from last year including description of their use. Has the Parish undertaken a formal survey of how many pedestrian use the crossing points?
- PC confirmed not a formal survey. Estimated 20 school age children in the Village, and with dog walkers and runners estimate 40-50 people per day use the crossing points. Andy noted that helpful to have confirmation that this is for 'general provision' – ie that the route is used regularly throughout the day rather than just at the school run times. Safety concerns for any 'formal' crossing point – not to install at a school site. Can be considered a safety hazard if not used at other times as drivers will presume that outside school-run hours no-one will be crossing. Doesn't need to be large numbers but ongoing use a good thing – and the more the better.
11. Plan B Potential show stoppers are – utilities – cost of providing hard standing etc – width of road, have to make sure unimpeded access for heavy traffic, sufficient width for large vehicles to safely pass with people on the island in the middle. Some utilities can be moved at reasonable cost, fibre not so. If width is an issue Plan B may be to go ahead with the other measures – hard standing and bollards – without the island.
12. Gateway Locations
- TO NOTE Provision subject to available funding once the refuge islands have been costed
- .1 Southbound between Coldpiece Wood Permissive Path entrance and Church Lane – where the verge is wide, not to conflict with existing signs, good visibility, high impact, breaks the driver's line of sight.
- .2 Northbound approaching New Inn. Replace and relocate existing 'Heckfield' sign to position of max visibility. (Plus consider relative to new 'pedestrian in road' sign.) HCC to check out extent of Highways rights here – will forward copy of map.
- .3 A33 eastbound approaching Malthouse Lane corner
13. Signage HCC has small budget for signage.
- .1 Previous discussion last year – PC had requested school bus and pedestrian crossing signs which hadn't been possible. (The standard triangular pedestrian crossing sign is only for a zebra crossing.) Also horse and rider and deer signs which had been possible but not pursued. (PC noted that [Highfield Farm?] stopped taking horses out on B3349 because too dangerous.)

.2 To consider 'Pedestrians in Road' signs

- i A33 Possible on A33 approaching Malthouse Lane corner from both directions. (Ideal to pair up and have one either side the bend.) Good practice to associate triangular signs with 'SLOW' signs in the road. (Though sometimes happens that SLOW signs not repainted in same place.) Also, though required to follow Dept Transport Regs, sometimes the situation on the ground makes that difficult. Do need to get someone out on site.

Note of caution re these signs. Need to be associated with areas of particular pedestrian use, eg at each end of a footway, otherwise where to stop putting them in rural areas? – always potential for someone to be walking along the road. Overuse reduces any impact they may have.

- ii B3349 from Old Road Church Lane North to new Coldpiece Wood path – again a sign for both directions.
- iii B3349 south of School Lane to Laundry Lane.

.3 Considerations

- i Always good to use existing posts where possible, encouraged to 'declutter'. However should not conflict with existing signage.
- ii Some people are averse to signs, try to avoid putting them adjacent to houses.
- iii Can install 'Pedestrians in Road' signs as job in itself independently of the other schemes – likely can get them up some time during the summer.

14 Further Questions.1 Re the Traffic Safety impact of equestrian events (reference current Wellington Riding LDC application for temporary stabling for two large international events).

Andy noted that as a general 'rule of thumb' – the more traffic on the road, normally, the slower the speed, so in this respect not such a bad thing. Understand that not necessarily want more traffic, but in terms of maintaining lower speeds it has a positive effect.

.2 Re considering a review of the speed limit A speed limit review may be triggered in response to new development. Should this ever be the case, there would be a review of the whole route – should it come to point that there is sufficient new development to prompt it. The Police would not support unless self-enforcing, either due to increased volume of traffic, or developer-funded measures to reduce speed..3 Existing speeds In theory – if the average speed is 50 on a 60mph road – makes sense to reduce to 50. Considering the arguments...

- Has to be justification for a TRO. If the traffic is doing 50mph anyway, in cost justification terms, what is the point?
- The point is to confirm the norm and remind other drivers.

But implementing a TRO is costly, in reality it's not going to happen. And in any case no funding, since 2016, budgets taken away.

.4 TRO not just a matter of hanging out signs.

- Requirement to consult Roads Policing Unit (Hants North). If Police don't support it's a non-starter.
- Then to consult County member before formal advertising and public consultation.
- This is according to Dept Transport Regulations.
- Signs and road markings are fairly low cost, but cost is in making the Order in terms of advertising, consulting / legal and staff time.

Traffic Management does consider patterns and causation of accidents from police data, and there is usually not a pattern of speed-related factors. More often a result of other driver error factors, distractions.

If future checks of police data show increases in accidents on any stretch of the B3349, it may be that a new speed limit may be considered, but more likely other measure needed as well. Usually it is not just the case of the speed limit.

15 Concluding Comments So for the time being and through the summer, if any new thinking on the types of feature, and locations, to let HCC know. HCC will confirm when an engineer is available. This will be the time for a site meeting.

Meeting closed at 3.40pm.

APPENDIX IV

Done Gateway Sales Order Guide Customers Priced May 2021.pdf

L-SHAPE GATEWAY FRONT

1.8m Height (1.3m above ground) 2.3m Height (1.8m above ground)

White

900mm Width

183/0200 £373.97	183/0201 £431.99	183/0202 £490.02	183/0203 £548.06	183/0207 £406.19	183/0208 £464.23	183/0209 £522.27	183/0210 £580.29
	183/0204 £535.14	183/0205 £593.18	183/0206 £651.21		183/0211 £567.40	183/0212 £625.42	183/0213 £683.47

1.5m Width

183/0214 £425.55	183/0215 £528.72	183/0216 £631.88	183/0217 £735.04	183/0221 £457.78	183/0222 £560.94	183/0223 £664.10	183/0224 £767.11
	183/0218 £638.32	183/0219 £741.49	183/0220 £844.64		183/0225 £670.55	183/0226 £773.72	183/0227 £876.88

2m Width

183/0228 £484.17	183/0229 £586.29	183/0230 £688.35	183/0231 £790.41	183/0234 £502.92	183/0235 £618.96	183/0236 £735.04	183/0237 £851.08
	183/0232 £696.35	183/0233 £812.41	Unavailable		183/0238 £735.04	183/0239 £851.08	Unavailable

L-SHAPE GATEWAY RIGHT SIDE

1.8m Height (1.3m above ground) 2.3m Height (1.8m above ground)

White

900mm Width

183/0240 £221.80	183/0241 £279.84	183/0242 £337.88	183/0243 £395.88	183/0247 £238.56	183/0248 £296.59	183/0249 £354.62	183/0250 £412.64
	183/0244 £383.00	183/0245 £441.02	183/0246 £499.05		183/0251 £396.77	183/0252 £454.79	183/0253 £512.81

1.5m Width

183/0254 £280.37	183/0255 £376.54	183/0256 £472.71	183/0257 £568.88	183/0261 £290.15	183/0262 £386.32	183/0263 £482.47	183/0264 £578.63
	183/0258 £486.16	183/0259 £582.32	183/0260 £678.49		183/0265 £502.92	183/0266 £608.10	183/0267 £713.27

DESIGN & PERSONALISATION

We offer a free, in-house personalisation service to help you visualise how your product will look with your corporate identity.



Note to source Heckfield emblem

APPENDIX V

PLANNING UPDATE – HECKFIELD – 24th MAY 2021

21/01148/LDC (Validated 4 May 2021) Wellington Riding Stables. Use of land for the temporary stabling of horses

21/01088/HOU (Validated 19 May 2021) Beeches, Bramshill Road, Heckfield. Demolition of conservatory and erection of a single storey side, front and rear extensions. New dormer window with terrace area to side elevation and replacement of existing dormer window with new dormer window to side elevation. Changes to existing external finishes.

21/00859/FUL and 21/00874/LBC (Granted 24th May, Validated 29 Mar 2021) Highfield Park, Church Lane. Construction of a gazebo.

21/00788/FUL (Granted 5th May) Park Farm, Bramshill Road, Heckfield. Erection of a food and beverage kiosk.

21/00494/LBC (Pending, Validated 04 Mar 2021) 20 Church Lane, Heckfield. To repair, renovate and decorate the interior, including the fitting of a new kitchen and bathroom. Also to replace the LPG boiler with an LPG combi boiler enabling the removal of the hot water cylinder. Associated radiators to be renovated/replaced. Complete rewiring starting from new circuit breaker board. *Parish Council response: 'HPC is very supportive of necessary works being done to the Cottage this spring/summer.'* **AGREED EXPIRY DATE 7TH JUNE.**

21/00478/FUL (Refused 22nd April) Cherry Tree Farm, Chandlers Green. Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling with associated landscaping and car parking. *Previous Parish Council response updated, resubmitted.*

21/00266/FUL (Refuse 4th May, Validated 03 Feb 2021) Cold Piece Farm. Erection of 10 floodlights, each 8m tall, around the existing manage - retrospective, to replace the 8 approved floodlights.
'Any lighting approved be minimal (shielded and directed) in keeping with rural nature of area, dark skies, and mindful of impact on wildlife and neighbours.'

21/00342/LDC (Granted 14th May, Validated 05 Feb 2021) Whitewater House Bramshill Road Heckfield. Excavation and installation of a concrete swimming pool with surrounding patio area and associated pump house.

20/01905/PREAPP (Pending, Validated 13 Aug 2020) Whitewater Stables, Bramshill Road, Heckfield RG27 0LA Replacement dwelling

20/01274/FUL (Appeal on non-determination) Cherry Tree Farm, Chandlers Green. Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling with associated landscaping and car parking. Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/20/3257541. *Comments submitted to PINS (8th March) confirming PC comments originally submitted to Hart.*
HEARING 27TH APRIL 10AM - MS TEAMS – AWAITING INSPECTOR DECISION

APPENDIX VI

WESSON FENCING

FENCING CONTRACTORS & STOCKISTS

Dingley Dell Nurseries
Windlesham Road
Chobham
Surrey,
GU24 8SP

Telephone: 01483 472124
Email: wesson-fencing@hotmail.co.uk
Web Add: www.wesson-fencing.co.uk
Reg No: 5851898 we're in the garden
Vat No: 920 8943 14

St Michael Church
Church Lane
Hexfield
Hook
Rg27 0LG

Reference: GS/PH/17792/STmC/03/21

26th March 21

Dear Mr Trumpter

Further to our site visit we are pleased to offer the following Estimate.

Item 1

To take down approximately 100metres of cleft chestnut paling to the right hand side of the cemetery area. To supply and fit approximately 100metres of 900mm high chestnut paling on 75mm – 100mm peeled and treated posts with 125 – 150mm straining posts.

Net Cost £2060.00

VAT @ 20% £412.00

Total Cost £2472.00

Item 2

To take done 18.5metres of old fencing across the front of the cemetery area. To supply and fit 18.5metres of 1.1m high pointed top picket style fencing consisting of 100 x 75mm oak posts on 73 x 50mm oak rails with 1.1m high x 55mm x 16mm pales. Post and pales to be pointed top to match existing.

Net Cost £1542.00

VAT @ 20% £308.40

Total Cost £1850.40

Where necessary; costs include concrete and fixings, posts will be set 2' in to the ground and surrounded by concrete, all rubbish generated will be cleared and the site left clean and tidy.

If you wish to proceed, please complete the enclosed acceptance form, specifying options if applicable, and return or email to the address at the top of the page.



APPENDIX VII

