

Hamble-le- Rice Parish Council

COUNCIL MEETING



Monday 12th February 2018 at 1900 - 21.30

Roy Underdown Pavilion, Baron Road, Hamble-le-Rice

Section 1. Welcome

- 1a Apologies for absence
- 1b Declaration of interest and approved dispensations
- 1c To approve minutes of the Council Meeting 22.01.18

Section 2 Public Session

Section 3 Community and Partnerships

- 3a Matt Blythe – EBC verbal update on projects
- 3b
- 3c Motion from Cllrs Cohen and Thompson
“Recognising the increasing concern about plastic in the marine environment and Hamble’s iconic status as a visitor and sailing centre the Council resolves to encourage the reduction in the use of plastic bottles by initially encouraging businesses in the parish to refill bottles and in the longer term, where possible with the help of appropriate to provide water bottle filling facilities across the parish”
- 3d Tree Policy
- 3e Hamble River Valley Forum – report from Cllr Underdown
- 3f Withdrawal of the 2008 Hamble Village Plan

Section 4 Feedback from Committees

- 4a Recommendations from the Asset Management Committee
 - Biodiversity Plan
 - Memorials plaques
 - Equipment purchase

- 4b Dinghy Park Working Group
- Feedback from Consultation and other issues – verbal update
- 4c Personnel Committee – to follow
- Appointment of Admin Assistant
 - Pay Policy
 - Work plan priorities
- 4d Festive Lighting Working Group – report attached
- 4e Terms of reference for Planning
- Section 5 Governance, Risk and Finance**
- 5a Monthly finance report
Petty Cash & Bank Reconciliations
Key Financial information
Payments for Approval
- 5b Changes to HCC Pension Employers Policy – report attached
- 5c Mid-year audit and responses
- 5d Health and Safety RIDDOR report
- Section 6 Planning**
- 6a F/18/82322 – Construction of 200no. dwellings with associated public open space, landscaping, roads, drainage and diversion of public footpath No.1, with associated access from Bursledon Road and vehicular link to land to the south, and laying out of new country park. (The development is contrary to the development plan and affects a public right of way).
Decision: Not yet determined
Land south of Bursledon Road, Bursledon, Southampton, SO31 8EY
- 6b T/18/82306 - Oak - Prune from neighbouring house roof by 1.5m. Clear away from electric cables and remove stubs.
28 SATCHELL LANE, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 4HH
- 6c. T/17/81834 - T1 & T3 Yew Trees - overall reduction of between 2–3m with a 1.5–2.5 inch branch diameter. T2 Cherry - Fell.
LAND ADJACENT TO 14 RIVER GREEN, HAMBLE-LE-RICE, SO31 4JA
- Section 7 Miscellaneous**
- 7a Clerks Report

Exempt Business - To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local

Government Act 1972 in respect of the following items of business on the grounds that it is likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

8a Exempt Recommendations from the Personnel Committee - Restructure and Job Evaluation – to follow

Clerk.....

Date.....

HAMBLE-LE-RICE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 8th JANUARY 2018 AT THE ROY UNDERDOWN PAVILION, COLLEGE PLAYING FIELDS, BARON ROAD, HAMBLE- LE-RICE AT 7.00 PM

PRESENT:

Cllr S Cohen – Chairman
 Cllr S Schofield – Vice Chairman
 Cllr P Beach
 Cllr M Cross
 Cllr S Hand
 Cllr I James
 Cllr D Rolfe
 Cllr I Underdown
 Cllr G Woodall

In Attendance

Mrs A Jobling – Clerk to the Council
 Mrs J Symes – Assistant Clerk to the Council
 Mrs J Panakis – Minutes Secretary
 4 Members of the Public – Applicants for Co-option to Parish Council vacancy

To Receive Apologies for Absence

1/11/18 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Phillips.

Declaration of Interest

2/11/18 Cllr Beach declared a dispensation regarding the Foreshore and Dinghy Park. Cllr Cohen declared a dispensation relating to membership of the Royal Southern Yacht Club. Cllr Cross declared an interest in Planning. Cllr Hand declared a dispensation relating to the Foreshore and Dinghy Park and membership of the Royal Southern Yacht Club. Cllr James declared a dispensation regarding membership of the Royal Southern Yacht Club. Cllr Underdown declared dispensations relating to the Foreshore and Dinghy Park and the River Hamble.

To Accept the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 11th December 2017

3/11/18 Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Rolfe seconded and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 11th December 2017, subject to the amendment to the attendance record and inclusion of the Petty Cash reconciliation circulated earlier that afternoon by the Assistant Clerk, be accepted as a true record. The Minutes were then signed by the Chairman.

To Accept the Exempt Business Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 11th December 2017

4/11/18 Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Hand seconded and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Exempt Business Minutes of the Council meeting held on 11th December 2017 be accepted as a true record. The Minutes were then signed by the Chairman.

Chairman's Signature: Date:

Public Session

5/11/18 The members of the public present raised no comments to the Council.

Community and Partnership

6/11/18 Appointment of Councillors through Co-option Cllr Cohen welcomed the applicants to the meeting, saying that the Council appreciated that there were people in the community who wished to serve on the Parish Council. There were 4 candidates wishing to be considered for co-option. Each candidate were separately asked the following 3 questions: (1) Why do you want to become a Parish Councillor? (2) What do you think are the issues facing the Parish, apart from congestion of Hamble Lane? (3) How would you increase community involvement in the work of the Parish Council?

Rebecca Butler (1) To make a contribution to the community, having lived in the Parish for 3 years and been involved in yacht racing for many years in Hamble. Interested in local and national politics.

(2) Housing and infrastructure. For example, the local surgery is not able to cope with the number of patients registered from the area at present.

(3) Engage with people especially younger people and keep the in touch/ promote the councils work via social media. Lately both President Trump and Jeremy Corbin MP have shown that social media can be used to engage with people, particularly young people using their smart 'phones.

Janine Dajka (1) To contribute to improve the quality of life for residents here: improving local amenities, involvement etc. Time and energy to commit to the Parish Council. Lived and worked in Hamble for the past 25 years. Previous involvement in community projects such as Hamble Week for 2 years. Also became involved in RAGE and the parking issues in The Square when they arose.

(2) Planning – Considered that Hamble was vulnerable at the present because of the lack of a Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan, and would be keen to be involved in these. Pollution is a problem. Consider that parts of Hamble feel a little fragmented – ways to bring the community together are needed.

(3) Consider seeking contributions from wealthy residents and businesses to fund local projects as well as mobilising the community around environmental projects

Edward Giles (1) Experience in local government, having served previously on a Parish Council and in a Unitary Authority. Has time available to give to the Council. Strong commitment to Hamble and want make a contribution to the Parish and village. In particular the Parish Council holds and maintains a lot of valuable assets for the community and can assist with this.

(2) Planning: how many more houses in Hamble can we take? Concerned about the issues around GE's site and what is going to happen there. Maintaining the character of the village and preserving the space for future generations. The future of the air field – at present it is an open space but in the medium term there will be pressures to utilise it.

(3) It is difficult to do this. People only get agitated if something averse affects them. Maintaining character of the village and enhancing its assets – consulting to get people involved.

Andy Thompson (1) Democracy starts locally – Parish Council has an important role in listening and responding to residents. Understanding concerns and aspirations for the village and working with the community to find solutions to problems that benefit everyone.

(2) Development and pressure on public services such as schools, surgeries, is a big concern. Concerned about pollution from traffic, Fawley and within the maritime area. Pressure on open space – struggling to retain common land to preserve these environments for future generations.

Chairman's Signature: Date:

(3) Experience of being involved with the Hamble Players. When they began they only filled up 2 rows in the auditorium for performances, now they play to full houses and some people have not been able to get tickets. Need to involve people from the local area and to make involvement more attractive. What the Parish Council does affects everything that happens in the Parish. Need to do more things to get people involved in the village, like markets.

Following presentations Janine Dajka and Andy Thompson were co-opted onto the Parish Council having received the most votes at the first round of voting.

Cllr Underdown requested that Standing Orders were reviewed in light of the request for a paper ballot. **CLERK**

Governance and Finance

7/11/18 Budget The final budget for 2018/19 was considered, along with the expenditure on projects that the Parish Council had already identified. Cllr Cohen proposed, Cllr Beach seconded and IT WAS RESOLVED that the 4 recommendations listed below be accepted by the Parish Council.

- the recommended changes to the Council’s budget for 2018/19, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the papers circulated with the agenda
- approval of payment of £40,000 to Eastleigh Borough Council in relation to improvement works to Coronation Parade, from the Reserve Fund, taking the balance of that fund down to £100,926.34
- agreement of the revised list of projects for the next financial year, as set out in Appendix 2 of the papers circulated with the agenda
- agreement to the increase the pitch hire fee as per detailed in Appendix 4 of the papers circulated at meeting **CLERK**

8/11/18 Precept The Clerk had circulated information giving comparisons of proposed precepts for each Parish Council in the Eastleigh Borough Council area, to facilitate discussion on Hamble Parish Council’s precept. The Clerk advised that the Council considered increasing their precept in order to ensure there were sufficient reserves to undertake the agreed projects in 2018/19.

Cllr Hand proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded, Cllr Underdown abstained, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Parish Council would increase in the precept to cover the additional expenditure required to support the above projects. This amounted to a band D property paying an addition £5.70 each year. **CLERK**

9/11/18 Structure of Council Business for 2018 The proposals to alter meeting schedules were discussed. It was noted that the full Council had to meet a second time in January to consider the Community Governance Review relating to Parish boundaries. In addition, the Council had just co-opted 2 new members, who would need to be allocated to committee’s/working parties. Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Schofield seconded and IT WAS RESOLVED that the following changes in the structure of Council business would be approved for a trial period of 6 months, commencing at the beginning of February 2018:

- Move to a monthly cycle of Council meetings, held on the second Monday of every month

Chairman’s Signature: Date:

- Establishment of a Planning Committee, meeting on the 4th Monday of each month (5 members)
- Establish a Finance Working Group meeting quarterly (3-4 members)
- Schedule meeting dates up to May for the following Committees: Asset Management Committee (monthly meetings); Personnel Committee (meeting once every 2 months) and Burial Committee (meeting once every quarter unless otherwise required)

CLERK

10/11/18 Payments for Approval Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Schofield seconded and IT WAS RESOLVED that the list of payments be approved and they were signed off by the Chairman.

CLERK

11/11/18 Petty Cash Reconciliation Statement The petty cash reconciled to £87.33: this had been checked and signed off by Cllr Underdown on 5th January. This was noted.

12/11/18 Bank Reconciliation Statement The bank statement reconciled to £132,706.97. This was checked and signed off at the meeting by Cllr Rolfe. This was noted.

13/11/18 Appointment of J Humphry's Associates Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council waived their Financial Regulations in order to appoint J Humphry's Associates' specialist services to give financial support to the Clerk for a period of 12 months at a cost of £3,600 + VAT (this was accounted for in next year's budget).

CLERK

14/11/18 Local Government Pension Scheme Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Cohen seconded, and IT WAS RESOLVED that all new staff appointed to Hamble Parish Council would be eligible to join the Local Government Pension Scheme from January 2017 onwards.

CLERK

Planning

15/11/18 *H/17/81904 Enlargement of garage including extension to roofline and insertion of front and rear dormer windows and part conversion to habitable accommodation at 6 Copse Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4QH.*

The Clerk informed the Council that this was for information only as a decision by the Planning Officers had already been taken on this application.

16/11/18 *F/17/82001 Conversion of existing ancillary police training buildings (use Class C2) to provide 40 no. dwellings (use Class C3) with associated elevational alterations, amenity areas and car parking at Osborne Quarters Police Training Centre, Royal Victoria Country Park, Netley Abbey, Southampton SO31 4TS.*

Cllr Hand proposed, Cllr James seconded, Cllr Cross abstained and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Parish Council objected to the application and asked the Clerk to cite all the points raised in her report to Councillors on the application.

CLERK

17/11/18 *F/17/81866 Siting of 1 no 12m long floating pontoon attached to piles M5 and M6 at Pile Mooring M5-M6, River Hamble, Hampshire.*

Cllr Schofield proposed, Cllr Cohen seconded, Cllr Cross abstained and IT WAS RESOLVED that the decision be left to the officers.

CLERK

18/11/18 *H/17/81852 Side and rear extensions with accommodation in roof space above, raised decking at rear, attached single garage following demolition of existing detached garage*

Chairman's Signature: Date:

and new vehicular access from Satchell Lane at 48 Satchell Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4HL.

Cllr Rolfe proposed, Cllr Schofield seconded, Cllr Cross abstained and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council request that this application be referred to the Local Area Committee. Although revisions had been made to the original application these had not adequately addressed the concerns highlighted previously by the Parish Council. **CLERK**

19/11/18 *H/17/8206 Single storey side extension at 12 Barton Drive, Hamble-le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4RE.*

Cllr James proposed, Cllr Underdown seconded, Cllr Cross abstained and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council objected to the planning application on the grounds that the design of the extension was out of character with the other properties in the area. The Council also expressed concern about the nature of the proposed new access to the rear garden from the road. **CLERK**

20/11/18 *Proposed Taylor Wimpey development south of Bursledon Road (Kestrel Park). For information only - this was noted by the Council.*

21/11/18 *F/17/80218 Construction of 64 bedroom dementia care centre. Appeal under section Blackthorn Health Centre, Satchell Lane, Hamble-le-Rice, Southampton.*

Cllr Cohen proposed, Cllr Underdown seconded, Cllr Cross abstained and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council objected to this planning application appeal with the same objections cited in their initial response to the first planning application and also on the basis of the results from the Local Area Committee hearing.

22/11/18 Exempt Business Cllr Cohen proposed, Cllr Underdown seconded, and all agreed and IT WAS RESOLVED that in view of the confidential nature of the business to be discussed the public and press be excluded.

The matter to be discussed was as follows: Clerk’s Report – Personnel Issue

The meeting closed at 9 pm.

HAMBLE-LE-RICE PARISH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 22nd JANUARY 2018
AT THE ROY UNDERDOWN PAVILION, COLLEGE PLAYING FIELDS, BARON ROAD,
HAMBLE-LE-RICE AT 7.00 PM**

PRESENT:

Cllr S Cohen – Chairman
Cllr S Schofield – Vice Chairman
Cllr P Beach
Cllr M Cross
Cllr J Dajka
Cllr I James
Cllr A Thompson
Cllr I Underdown
Cllr G Woodall

In Attendance

Mrs A Jobling – Clerk to the Council
Mrs J Panakis – Minutes Secretary

To Receive Apologies for Absence

24/12/18 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Phillips, Cllr D Rolfe, Cllr S Hand and Mrs J Symes (Assistant Clerk to the Council).

Declaration of Interest

25/12/18 Cllr Beach declared a dispensation regarding the Foreshore and Dinghy Park, and an interest in Planning Application T/17/82206. Cllr Cohen declared a dispensation relating to membership of the Royal Southern Yacht Club. Cllr Cross declared an interest in Planning. Cllr Dajka declared an interest in the Royal Southern Yacht Club. Cllr James declared a dispensation regarding membership of the Royal Southern Yacht Club. Cllr Underdown declared dispensations relating to the Foreshore and Dinghy Park and the River Hamble.

To Accept the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 8th January 2018

26/12/18 There was an error in the circulated Minutes of the Council meeting held on 8th January 2018: Cllr Woodall pointed out that he was no longer a member of the Royal Southern Yacht Club and therefore his previously declared dispensation should not be recorded in the Declaration of Interest (Item 2/11/18). The Minutes would need to be amended and brought back to the next full Council meeting for signature.

To Accept the Exempt Business Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 8th January 2018

27/12/18 Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Schofield seconded, all agreed, and **IT WAS RESOLVED** that the Exempt Business Minutes of the Council meeting held on 8th January 2018 be accepted as a true record. The Minutes were then signed by the Chairman.

Chairman's Signature: Date:

Public Session

28/12/18 There were no members of the public in attendance.

Community and Partnership

29/12/18 Community Governance Review Cllr Cohen informed the Council that she had discussed the implications of the Boundary Review with the Clerks and Chairmen of Hound and Bursledon Parish Councils, none of whom expressed any strong feelings about the proposed changes. It was agreed that the clearest boundary change, which was aligned to the road, was Option C: it tidied up the Boundary, strengthened the strategic gap and had no implications for the precept.

Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded, all agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council wishes to propose the Boundary change to Option C on the attached plan up to the current Bursledon Parish Council Boundary and to the east of Hamble Lane and will submit a proposal on that basis. **CLERK**

30/12/18 Hamble River Valley Forum A report from Cllr Underdown had been circulated, along with the minutes of the last meeting of this Forum. Concern was expressed regarding Item 8 in the Minutes: Cllr Underdown informed the Council that he did not recall this statement being made and would ask that the statement be deleted from the minutes at the next meeting to be held on 25th January.

Governance and Finance

31/12/18 Proposed Change to Hourly Hire Rate for Roy Underdown Pavilion The Clerk informed the Council that confirmation of the amendment to charges as previously agreed was required to facilitate the changes to be implemented from the start of the new financial year. Cllr Cohen proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded, all agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council approved the increase hire rate for the Roy Underdown Pavilion from £6.75 per hour to £7 per hour.

32/12/18 Representation on Committees and Outside Bodies The representatives on the Planning Committee would also be considered at this point in the Agenda. Cllr Cohen proposed that the current practice of having substitutes for Committees should be discontinued, as substitutes had no continuity of experience. If there were problems with committees not being quorate, urgent decisions could be delegated to the Clerk in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee to ensure the committee work continued. This was agreed.

33/12/18 Planning Committee – Terms of Reference and Appointment of Committee Members Cllr Woodall expressed concern about Item 10 – Delegated Powers: he felt that the Council as a whole had no common guidelines for members of this Committee to follow, in particular, what circumstances would trigger a referral to full Council. The Clerk said that, in general, guidelines were available in Eastleigh Borough Council's Adopted Local Plan, Safe Policies and Village Design Statements. Due to the short time limit imposed by Eastleigh Borough Council, it was possible that some Planning Applications would still have to be considered in full Council, as it was unlikely that time extensions would be granted to suit the Parish council's rounds of meetings. The Clerk pointed out that, although a Planning Committee would be appointed, any member of the full Council would be entitled to attend the meetings. It was decided that Members would meet at 8.30 am on Friday, 2nd February to further discuss the Terms of Reference.

Chairman's Signature: Date:

Cllr Schofield proposed, Cllr Underdown seconded, all agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that:

1. The Terms of Reference circulated would be re-considered by the Council at a subsequent meeting of full Council.
2. Five members were elected to the Planning Committee as follows Cllr J Dajka, Cllr I Underdown, Cllr A Thompson, Cllr Rolfe and Cllr I James. Cllr Thompson's appointment would be dependent on the Clerk checking with the Monitoring Officer to ensure that his family connections did not preclude him from being appointed to this Committee. The Chair to this Committee would be elected by the Planning Committee at their first meeting.
3. Approval of expenditure of up to £1,000 for equipment to ensure that plans can be shown at meetings in the future.

CLERK

34/12/18 Asset Management Committee Cllr Phillips no longer wished to serve on this Committee; Cllr Thompson volunteered to replace her. The Committee now consists of Cllr M Cross (Chair), Cllr S Schofield, Cllr I Underdown, Cllr G Woodall and Cllr A Thompson.

35/12/18 Burial Ground Committee No change to members of this Committee which remains with Cllr S Schofield, Cllr I Underdown and Cllr P Beach.

36/12/18 Personnel Committee No changes to this Committee membership, which remains as Cllr I Underdown (Chair), Cllr S Cohen and Cllr P Beach.

37/12/18 Appeals Working Party Cllr Hughes was no longer a member of the Council: Cllr Thompson volunteered to the vacancy. Membership to this Working Party is now Cllr M Cross, Cllr D Rolfe and Cllr A Thompson.

38/12/18 Christmas Lights Working Party No changes to this Working Party membership, which remains as Cllr D Phillips, Cllr D Rolfe and Cllr I James.

39/12/18 Travel Tokens Working Party Cllr Palmer was no longer a member of the Council: Cllr Cohen volunteered to the vacancy. Membership to this Working Party is now Cllr G Woodall, Cllr S Schofield and Cllr S Cohen. Travel Tokens were discussed and it was agreed that the council would cease issuing tokens "to new applicants" but let the 2 or 3 existing users continue to receive tokens if they applied for them. It was agreed that the Travel Tokens Working Party should meet to formally decide to cease issuing these Tokens and disband the Working Party.

CLERK

40/12/18 Dinghy Park Working Party Cllr S Schofield requested to stand down. Cllr M Cross volunteered. Members consisted of Cllr S Cohen, Cllr D Phillips, Cllr I Underdown, and Cllr M Cross.

41/12/18 Communications Working Party Cllr Woodall suggested that it would be appropriate to create a Communications Working Party in the light of the recent survey: this was agreed. Cllr G Woodall, Cllr P Beach and Cllr D Phillips were appointed to this Working Party.

CLERK

42/12/18 Representatives on Outside Bodies The Circulated list was out of date: it was agreed to remove Scout and Guide Liaison; Hamble Primary School (Associate Governor) and Older Peoples' Champion. Representatives would be re-confirmed in May. In the mean-time a representative on the Hamble Village Memorial Hall Management Committee was required: Cllr J

Chairman's Signature: Date:

Dajka volunteered and was appointed for this responsibility.

43/12/18 Public Rights of Way and Landing Rights in the Parish This was discussed. The Clerk advised that these issues should be considered and incorporated into Standing Orders.
CLERK

44/12/18 Recommendations from the Asset Management Committee This meeting was an informal one, as it was not quorate consequently the information from the meeting should only be considered as informal notes, not draft minutes. The heading on the notes would be altered to reflect this: the document was noted by the Council and the general recommendations therein approved.
CLERK

45/12/18 Clerk's Report The Clerk brought the Council's attention to items of expenditure incurred as a result of vandalism at Mount Pleasant, new fire safety measures at the Roy Underdown Pavilion and the need to replace the emergency lighting in that building, costs of which are being investigated. Item 4 was highlighted - the Assistant Clerk had successfully renegotiated new printing costs for the Parish Magazine saving the Council £3,490 per annum.

Cllr Underdown proposed, Cllr Cross seconded, all agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the following recommendations were approved:

1. The expenditure incurred at Mount Pleasant following vandalism, with Playdale Playgrounds Ltd, totalling £486.84 + VAT
2. The expenditure incurred at Roy Underdown Pavilion with Classic Fire Security Ltd totalling £287.50 + VAT on fire safety measures, and
3. The costs to upgrade the emergency lighting at the Roy Underdown Pavilion.

CLERK

Planning

46/12/18 F/17/82061 *Erection of palisade fence and gates at Mallards Moor, Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice, SO31 4NE.* This application was submitted from Viola Waste Company and was outside of the Parish Boundary.

Cllr Underwood proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded, Cllr Cross abstained, the majority agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council requested that colour and design of the fence be sympathetic to the general surroundings and further commented that the proposed fence would not completely secure every access to fly tipping in this area.
CLERK

47/12/18 T/17/82206 *1 x Beech, 1 x Sycamore and 2 x Horse Chestnut – prune back to boundary away from the Old Fire Station roof at The Lodge, High Street, Hamble-le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4JF*

Cllr P Beach declared an interest in this Planning Application and left the meeting whilst it was being considered.

Cllr Underwood proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded, Cllr Cross abstained, Cllr Beach was absent, the majority agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council requested that minimal work be permitted and that the trees were sympathetically re shaped and not left unbalanced. The decision be left to the arboriculturist. **CLERK**

48/12/18 H/17/82163 Part two storey and part single storey rear extension, following re-submission of planning permission F/17/81396 at 37 Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4HF.

Cllr Underwood proposed, Cllr Dajka seconded, Cllr Cross abstained, the majority agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council objected to the Planning Application as there was no significant reduction in the bulk of the extension from the initial Planning Application and that the Council considered the application was over development of the site. It was suggested that the rear extension be reduced to a single storey to reduce the bulk and that the internal layout be re-arranged to accommodate this reduction. **CLERK**

49/12/18 T/17/82182 1 x Oak – crown reduce by 2m (approximately 10%) at 1 Cerdic Mews, Hamble-Le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4LW.

The Council had no comment to make on this application. **CLERK**

50/12/18 T/18/82250 1 x Oak – cut back branches overhanging 33 Beaulieu Road by a maximum of 5m at 33 Beaulieu Road, Hamble-Le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4JL.

Cllr Underwood proposed, Cllr Beach seconded, Cllr Cross abstained, the majority agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council requested that the minimum of work be done and that the cutting back was balanced - decision to be left to the arboriculturist. **CLERK**

51/12/18 H/17/81996 Single storey side extension with accommodation above. Enlarge existing roof space including raised ridge height at 101 Kendrick Cottage, Satchell Lane, Hamble-Le-Rice, Southampton SO31 4HL.

Cllr Underwood proposed, Cllr Woodall seconded, Cllr Cross abstained, the majority agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the decision be left to the officers. **CLERK**

52/12/18 F/17/82001 Osborne Quarters Police Training Centre, Royal Victoria Country Park, Netley Abbey, Southampton SO31 4TS.

A site visit had been made to this location, along with Councillors from Hound Parish Council. Concerns expressed included: access which was through the Country Park; the number of trees to be cut down to accommodate the development; provision for only 65 parking lots for 40 dwellings; creating a suburban development within park land; no provision for sheds/gardens/patios etc; the development would close the strategic gap and that there was no provision for affordable housing in the development. In addition, Eastleigh Borough Council has identified its 5-year land supply, so there is no need for this development.

Cllr Woodall proposed, Cllr Cohen seconded, Cllr Cross abstained, the majority agreed, and IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council objected to the Planning Application on the grounds originally drafted by the Clerk. **CLERK**

The meeting closed at 9.04 pm.

Chairman's Signature: Date:

Motion

Recognising the increasing concern about plastic in the marine environment and Hamble's iconic status as a visitor and sailing centre the Council resolves to encourage the reduction in the use of plastic bottles by initially encouraging businesses in the parish to refill bottles and in the longer term, where possible with the help of appropriate to provide water bottle filling facilities across the parish.

Background

Concern about plastic in the environment, and particularly in the marine environment, has been growing for some time as has the movement to promote the use of refillable water bottles. This is on an international, national and local level.

This proposal comes in two phases :-

- (i) to encourage businesses in the parish to refill water bottles; and
- (ii) to provide, with partners, water bottle filling facilities across the parish.

It is envisaged that this would be managed as a 'Task & Finish' project and would enable the village to promote itself in a positive manner to visitors.

Phase 1 would require liaising with all the relevant businesses to encourage them to participate in the scheme; the provision of stickers etc to show which businesses were participating and a communications strategy to explain what was happening. In addition consideration could be given to sponsorship the provision of water bottles to children and educational involvement.

Phase 2, the provision of water filling facilities would be over a longer time scale and it is hoped that there could be links with partners/sponsors. We understand that Southern Water is about to announce an initiative and appear to be keen to work with us. In addition there is also the possibility of the linking with the approach from the television programme and there could be other potential sponsors.

The council has also been approached about commemorating the end of World War 1 and a public art water filling station, perhaps on the foreshore, could be an appropriate memorial. This would also tie in with some of the ideas that emerged from the meeting with the Dinghy Park users.

Sheelagh Cohen and Andy Thompson

Recommendation

1 To approve and publish the Tree Management Policy and guidance for residents

1. In June 2017 Hamble Parish Council (HPC) conducted a review of Environmental issues agreeing to progress towards a Biodiverse way of managing its Buildings, Land & Vegetation. The Council has now reviewed its Tree Management Policy to reinforce its objectives of managing and maintaining the stock of trees in the village. The importance of the environment to residents was highlighted in the We R Hamble Survey and this policy seeks to update it.
2. In addition to the policy there are guidance notes for residents about their responsibilities regarding trees on their land as well as their expectation of us as a land owner.
3. The work has been carried out by Paula Sanderson on our behalf and forms part of a wider piece of work which Members have previously approved. This includes the Community Orchard and the recently commissioned survey work on our trees by EBC. Taken together with the biodiversity survey which is also on the agenda the council is now better placed to make more information available to the community. This will be on a location basis.
4. The Asset Management Committee considered the report in January, welcomed it and recommend it to Council for approval.

HAMBLE PARISH COUNCIL TREE MANAGEMENT POLICY -2018

BACKGROUND

Trees, hedges, grass areas, and ditches are an important part of rural and urban landscapes. They provide vital habitats and food for wildlife, windbreaks in open areas, reduce pollution by cleaning the air, prevent flooding, help control extremes of temperature next to buildings, and assist with deadening traffic noise. Research also shows they can provide psychological and health benefits, helping to reduce stress.

The 'WeRHamble' Community Consultation in the Summer of 2017 also reinforced the desire by residents to consider these aspects with 75% of respondents valuing Wildlife & Open Spaces, and over 60% being very concerned by Air Quality.

The Council is committed to a long-term strategy of planting, protecting, retaining, improving, and developing its stock of trees, hedges, shrubs within the village. It will seek to continuously improve the quality and quantity of trees and vegetation within the Parish. Where replacement or new planting is required it will encourage the planting of appropriate native species. Where tree felling is necessary the Council will strive to replace two trees or hedging whips for each tree removed, and place them in an appropriate location nearby.

The Council also wishes to encourage other land and property owners within the Parish to adopt similar principles for the management of trees having consideration to wildlife and the whole community where possible.

INTRODUCTION

As part of the 2017 Review work has been undertaken to:

- Tree Management Policy – 2018
- Guidance to Residents & Businesses on Tree Ownership & Neighbouring Trees- 2018
- Update the HPC Tree Risk Assessment Plan 2017 -2022

This **Tree Management Policy** is designed to be a framework for the management of trees owned and managed by Hamble Parish Council. It will also inform the approach to the Tree Risk Assessment Plan, and will be used as a tool during Consultations with businesses, Assessment of Planning Applications, and Enquiries from Residents. This Policy should be read in conjunction with the **HPC Guidance on Tree Ownership & Neighbouring Trees** which is also available on the web site.

The Council has a duty of care to ensure that work is not undertaken on protected trees within the village without the appropriate permissions being sought. This includes all trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) and within the Hamble Conservation Area. The Council will also consider the impacts on trees and related ecosystems of any planning applications placed before it, including residential, commercial, or highways and pathways applications (Traffic Regulation Orders).

TREE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

A principle of English Common and Statute Law is that land and tree owners have a duty of care to visitors, residents, passers-by, and even trespassers on their land. The Council has a statutory duty of care under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 and the Occupiers Liability Acts

1954 and 1984 to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable its trees are safe and not a danger to the public.

The Council will ensure that trees on Public Land are retained wherever possible and are given appropriate protection from the effects of commercial and residential development and construction activities, including installation of underground utilities, paths, and cycle ways.

The Council will avoid felling trees unless deemed necessary. Tree felling will usually be for health and safety reasons, or to prevent the spread of serious tree diseases and pests. The Council reserve the right to fell trees to enhance or maintain a habitat, to prevent overcrowding, to restore landscapes in line with a particular site management plan, or to remove a tree that is inappropriate to its location and has a significantly detrimental impact on the appearance or amenity of a site.

The main principles adopted by the Council for Tree Management are:

- Wherever appropriate Trees will be retained
- Trees will be assessed on their likely risk to people or property
- Assessment will be based on competent advice from a Qualified Arborist
- To have in place procedures which identify and record significant trees
- To set up a regular programme of inspection which surveys significant trees on a cyclical basis (Tree Risk Assessment Plan)
- To identify trees that present the greatest risk,
 - taking remedial action as necessary using fully qualified practitioners
 - where felling is recommended ensure correct permissions for felling of any non-exempt trees are in place and the tree has been assess for Bats and other protected wildlife
- To maintain clearance heights over highways, roads, and footpaths in accordance with the table in the Tree Risk Assessment Plan
- Significant Woodlands on Parish land will be managed as appropriate, and in accordance with accepted arboricultural and silvicultural practices which respect their value as landscape features, wildlife habitats, and recreational amenities
- Endeavour to undertake work outside of the main nature reproduction period – 1st March to 31st August
- Where possible notify nearby local residents in advance where major tree works will take place adjacent to residential properties
- To ensure all tree works are carried out to BS3998:2010 'Recommendations for Tree Work' (plus revisions) and to produce a specification for all tree works
- Make clear the circumstance in which the Council will not consider remedial work – see Exceptions below
-

EXCEPTIONS from consideration for REMEDIAL WORKS

The Council **will not**, unless legally obliged to do so, consider undertaking remedial works to otherwise healthy and well-formed trees in the following circumstances:

- To create or reinstate private views
- Loss of light or shading of gardens, rooms or solar panels or where the canopy is blocking light
- *Due to the size or height of a tree (trees are naturally large organisms)*
- Trees and branches overhanging adjacent property, outbuildings, or gardens unless they pose a health or safety risk

- Reduced security by virtue of concealment or reduced visibility
- Alleged damage to property / gardens by roots or branches (direct or indirect)
- Interference with transmitted signals (TV, satellite, cable, or other forms of electronic communication or reception)
- Interference with BT & electricity company services
- During the bird reproduction season unless work is required for urgent health or safety reasons
- Where a tree contains roosting bats unless work is required for urgent health or safety reasons
- Presence of vermin
- In response to a natural event that does not pose a health and safety risk, such as falling nuts, shedding of leaf, seed, fir cone, twig, flower litter, fruit debris, general vegetative detritus, wildlife droppings including bird droppings
- Vandalism e.g. thrown apples
- Dripping secretions such as honeydew, sap
- Hay fever/ allergies
- Dampness/ algae/ moss/ fungal growth

TREE INSPECTIONS AND RISK ASSESSMENTS (Tree Surveys)

The Council will have in place a planned inspection programme which ensures trees are inspected as often as is necessary. Inspections will be undertaken by a Qualified Arborist who is a suitably experienced and competent person to undertake Tree Surveys based on a Risk Assessment Approach.

Areas of Land with Council managed trees will have Tree Surveys undertaken on a cyclical basis. Due dates for Surveys are identified in the Council Tree Risk Assessment Plan. Areas of land with high footfall, or buildings in close proximity to trees, will be inspected more frequently than distant pieces of land where there are no buildings or infrequent use by people. The criteria for assessment will be in the Tree Risk Assessment Plan.

TREE SURVEYORS & CONTRACTORS FOR REMEDIAL WORK

The Council will employ Qualified Arborists to undertake Tree Surveys. The Arborists will produce Tree Survey Reports which identify any actions that need to be taken, and qualified Contractors will be sought to undertake the necessary remedial works where it is not practical for the Council Ground staff to undertake the work.

RISK CONTROL

Where necessary, during Tree Surveys the Arborist will consider how the risk of accidents can be reduced and these will be identified in the Tree Survey Reports.

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS (TPO) & CONSERVATION AREA

The Council will apply to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) – for Hamble this is Eastleigh Borough Council – when remedial work is required on a Tree which it owns that has a TPO or is in the Conservation area. The Council will also consider trees on private land that may benefit from having a TPO placed on them and where necessary refer the tree to other local authorities or organisations.

TREE FELLING EXEMPTIONS

The Council will ensure any minor tree works are undertaken within Forestry Commission guidelines. Certain types of felling do not need permission from the Forestry Commission. The Forestry Act 1967, as amended and related regulation gives these exceptions in full.

LOCAL AUTHORITY POWERS

Trees and vegetation within the Parish are owned and managed and maintained by 3 Local Authorities. They have certain powers to deal with dangerous trees not on their land which overhang or affect the management of the road or land. The main highways and streets within Hamble Parish Council are owned and maintained by Hampshire County Council (HCC). Some aspects are maintained by Eastleigh Borough Council street scene teams on behalf of HCC, and these Councils will, if necessary, give notice to an owner of tree(s) requiring them to cut or prune the tree. If the owner fails to comply the Authority may carry out the work and charge the owner. (Highways Act)

Table for property, highway, footpath & pavements clearance distances (HCC & EBC recommended)

Property	2m clearance to houses & outbuildings, 3m over fences
Highways	5.3m over carriageway, 1.0m behind edge of carriageway
Footpaths & Pavements	3.0m over footways & pavements, 500mm behind edge of footway or pavement where possible
Rights of Way	Heights over – as above, 1.5m width minimum-

From time to time Hamble Parish Council may also be the landowner and require clearance work to be carried out.

CUTTING OF NEIGHBOURS TREES FROM PARISH LAND OR PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

The Council will enter discussion with Neighbours who wish to undertake work on their own trees which requires access from Parish land or Public Rights of Way. Neighbours should seek permission to do so before undertaking any work.

NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES - OVER HANGING BRANCHES FROM COUNCIL TREES

The Council will enter discussion with Neighbours where they have concerns in such circumstances. Neighbours are requested to contact the Council before attempting to undertake any work. Although neighbours do have a legal right to trim overhanging branches, only from within their property boundaries, they also have to offer the cut branches back to the Parish Council, so a dialogue should take place. Where neighbours undertake work in isolation this can result in an un-balanced tree which is not a desirable outcome. The Council will work with neighbours to resolve any problems associated with overhanging branches as there are often a variety of solutions and the best solution will be sought by the Council for the individual tree in question, which may well have been subject to a Tree Survey.

02.01.18

HAMBLE PARISH COUNCIL – GUIDANCE FOR RESIDENTS ON TREE OWNERSHIP - 2017

INTRODUCTION

As part of a 2017 review of Tree Management within the Parish, the Parish Council has produced this Guidance on Tree Ownership. It is supported by the Councils Tree Management Policy which is also available on the web site.

It provides Guidance for residents and businesses on the responsibilities of managing trees on their land and will provide information to residents and businesses whose property neighbours land with trees.

Hamble Parish Council is committed to a long-term strategy of planting, protecting, retaining, improving, and developing stocks of trees, hedges and shrubs within the village. Where possible it will seek to continuously improve the quality and quantity of trees within the Parish. Where replacement or new planting is required it will encourage the planting of appropriate native species. Where tree felling is necessary the Council will strive to ensure trees are replaced in an appropriate location nearby. The Council will also endeavour to not to undertake tree works within the main Wildlife Reproduction Period - 1st March to 31st August. Unless tree work is urgent remedial work should be undertaken during the Autumn & Winter periods.

The Council also wishes to encourage land and property owners within the Parish to adopt a similar approach to the management of trees, which has consideration for wildlife and benefits to community as a whole.

The Council has a duty of care to ensure that work is not undertaken on protected trees within the village without the appropriate permissions being sought. This includes all trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) and within the Hamble Conservation Area. The Council will also consider the impacts on trees and related ecosystems of any planning applications placed before it, including residential, commercial, or highways and pathways applications (Traffic Regulation Orders).

TREE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

A principle of English Common and Statute Law is that land and tree owners have a duty of care to visitors, residents, passers-by, and even trespassers on their land. The Land Owner has a statutory duty of care under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 and the Occupiers Liability Acts 1954 and 1984 to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable its trees are safe and not a danger to the public.

LIABILITY FOR HAZARDOUS TREES

The owner and/or occupier of land upon which trees stand is generally liable for any loss or damage resulting from falling branches or from the falling of the tree itself. Whilst the incidence of accidents is low falling branches have resulted in deaths and caused serious road accidents.

Under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, all occupiers have responsibilities to ensure the safety of those not in their employment. "Occupier" is generally taken to mean any person occupying or having control of premises, in this case land.

There are clear legal responsibilities to assess risks that arise from trees, and to take suitable and sufficient steps to control such risks.

In addition, occupiers have duties under the Occupiers Liability Act 1984. This states (s2) that the occupier owes a "common law duty of care" to visitors and those who enter his land or premises and this duty of care extends to trespassers. In Scotland there is no such distinction in the law.

LIABILITY OF TREE OWNERS

Occupiers and anyone with responsibility for trees (e.g. a tenant) must take reasonable steps to manage and reduce risk and this includes identifying and inspecting those trees that might cause injury or place property at risk. When hazardous trees are identified suitable remedial action should be taken to reduce risk. It is necessary to have in place suitable and sufficient systems and procedures to ensure risks from trees are identified and controlled.

In addition to existing statutory requirements the Courts expect owners in control of places to which the public has access, such as parks and gardens, to take greater care than those in control of more remote woodland. The Courts expect occupiers to be prepared for children to behave less carefully than adults and thus consideration must be given to whether children might suffer injury from climbing trees which may have weak or damaged branches.

INSPECTION OF TREES & RISK ASSESSMENT

Regular planned inspections should take place which ensure trees are inspected as often as is necessary. Inspections should be undertaken by a suitably experienced and competent person and should result in a risk assessment of each tree.

Inspections are best made in September or early October unless there are indications that checks need to be made immediately e.g. after severe storms. The initial visual inspection may indicate that more detailed examination is required. The inspection should include the entire tree, not just those parts that appear in a poor condition or in danger of falling.

There cannot be specific guidance on the exact nature and frequency of inspections since it is entirely dependent upon risk. There are various sources of guidance on this, and an Arborist will be able to advise on this.

TREE WORK PERMISSIONS FOR PROTECTED TREES - Tree Preservation Orders & Conservation Area

Local Authorities retain control of trees that are covered by Tree Preservation Orders or in a Conservation area. *They will also consider trees on private land that may benefit from having a TPO placed on them and where necessary refer the tree to other local authorities or organisations,*

Any work to Trees on private property which have either a Tree Preservation Order or a located in a Conservation Area will require permission from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) which for Hamble Parish is Eastleigh Borough Council. Application can be made via their web site:

<https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/sport,-countryside,-parks-culture/tree-services/tree-preservation.aspx>

Their guidance notes can be found at:

https://ecab.planningportal.co.uk/uploads/1app/guidance/guidance_note-works_to_trees.pdf

EBC Tree Services phone no. is 02380 688422 and email trees@eastleigh.gov.uk

Before you apply it is advisable to discuss your needs with a qualified arborist and preferable to obtain a written report before contacting the LPA. It is then advisable to discuss your proposals with them informally before applying. All Tree Work Applications will come before Hamble Parish Council for comment and having an Arborist report enables quality assessment of the application.

If the Parish Council become aware of any unauthorised work on protected trees they will refer the matter to the appropriate local authority.

TREES ON YOUR PROPERTY WITHOUT PROTECTION

To help protect Britain's forests, a felling license from the **Forestry Commission** is required to fell any tree. It is an offence to fell trees without a license if an **exemption** does not apply. The overall process is described in the Quick Guide and full details are available in the booklet Tree Felling - Getting Permission (PDF 1748kb).

<https://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-6dfk86>

Exemptions

Any felling carried out without either a licence or other permission is an offence, unless it is covered by an exemption. Contact your local Forestry Commission office if you are not certain whether the work you wish to undertake is covered by an exemption. If it is not you will need to discuss the proposed work with the Forestry Commission. Certain types of felling do not need permission from the Forestry Commission. The Forestry Act 1967, as amended, and related regulations give these exceptions in full.

<https://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-6dfkw6>

TREES ON YOUR PROPERTY WITH BRANCHES THAT OVERHANG NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY

It is well established in law that neighbours have a legal right to trim, only from within their property, overhanging branches, however they must offer to return the cut branches. This can often result in an unbalanced tree, therefore, where a problem exists Tree Owners are strongly advised to liaise with neighbours to avoid the risk of inappropriate action being taken to their tree.

TREES ON YOUR PROPERTY THAT OVERHANG PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, PAVEMENTS AND PATHS

It is advisable to ensure trees and vegetation which overhang public highways, pavements and paths are regularly maintained (out of nesting season) to ensure clearance widths and heights are maintained, otherwise they may be contacted by Local Authorities. Local authorities, including Parish Councils, have certain powers to deal with trees not on their land which overhang the highways, streets or pavements. They can give notice to the owner requiring them to cut or prune the tree. If the owner fails to comply the Authority may carry out the work and charge the owner. (Highways Act). The main roads and streets in Hamble Parish are owned and maintained by Hampshire County Council and/or Eastleigh Borough Council. The Parish Council may from time to time request an owner to cut back vegetation that overhangs a pavement or public right of way that it manages where it is causing a problem to other residents.

PROPERTIES WHICH NEIGHBOUR PARISH COUNCIL LAND WITH TREES - OVERHANGING BRANCHES

Under Common Law, providing the tree is not the subject of a Tree Preservation Order or within a Conservation Area, landowners may prune unprotected trees or hedges overhanging their land as far as their boundary without the consent of the owner of the tree or hedge. They must not

trespass on the neighbouring land to carry out the work, and should offer to return the cut material (arising).

Neighbours of Hamble Parish Council are requested to contact the Council where they have concerns in such circumstances, before attempting to undertake any work, and a dialogue should take place. If unauthorised works cause instability or lead to the decline or death of the tree, liability will be attached to the person arranging or carrying out the work.

Where neighbours undertake work in isolation this can result in an un-balanced tree which is not a desirable outcome. The Council will work with neighbours to resolve problems associated with overhanging branches as there are often a variety of solutions and the best solution will be sought by the Council for the individual tree in question, which may well have been subject to a recent survey.

OTHER CONTROLS ON THE FELLING OF TREES

There are other controls on tree felling which may need to be taken into account. When you apply for your licence to fell trees you must also ensure that you take account of all other legislation. The following examples deal mainly with the need to get permission to fell trees.

Hedgerow Regulations. If trees to be felled are within a hedgerow and it is proposed to remove the hedgerow, permission will also be required under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/countryside-hedgerows-regulation-and-management>

SSSI. If work is to be carried out that is on or near or may affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Natural England (NE), must be advised, in writing, so that they can assess the likely effect. A letter of consent may be required from them before any felling is carried out.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-areas-sites-of-special-scientific-interest>

SINC. If work is to be carried out that is on or near or may affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) it is advisable to consult Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC). Email enquiries.hbic@hants.gov.uk

Phone 01962 832320

Scheduled Ancient Monument. If work is to be carried out that is on or near or may affect a Scheduled Ancient Monument you must tell English Heritage (EH). A letter of consent may be required from them before any felling is carried out. <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk>

INFORMATION ON TREE CROWNING

General information - The common operations described and simply illustrated here show some of your options. An arborist should be able to help in defining the work that will be appropriate for the tree(s) and in line with British Standard 3998 – Recommendations for Tree Work.

Please note that the entire branch system is known as the 'crown'. LPA approval is not required to remove dead branches.

Crown Thinning - This reduces the density of the tree's crown without changing the overall shape and size of the tree. Thinning reduces the amount of foliage and allows more light through the canopy or crown. The amount of thinning proposed should be specified as a percentage (%) of the leaf area (usually no more than 30%). Useful for letting more light into gardens and windows

Crown Lifting - This means removing lower branches to increase the clearance between the ground and the crown. Identify the branches you wish to remove, or specify a height above ground

level to which you wish to “lift” the crown. Useful for allowing more light into gardens • Prevents low branches obstructing paths, drives etc.

Crown Reduction - The tree crown is reduced by shortening branches, and so changes the overall size and shape of the tree. Reductions are usually carried out all round the outer parts of the crown to maintain a balanced shape, but seldom should it include cutting through the main stem. The amount of reduction proposed should be stated in terms of the intended height and spread of the tree after pruning (rather than what percentage (%) of the overall crown is to be removed). Partial reduction may be useful for preventing branches contacting buildings, roofs and guttering

02.01.18

Hamble River Valley Forum - to receive a report from Cllr Underdown

The main agenda item for the recent meeting was 'Plastic pollution in the Hamble River, what can we do about it'? It was considered that the Forum could not agree a course of action until it had identified the exact problem regarding plastic pollution and other general litter relating to the river and its banks.

Following a wide ranging and detailed discussion members agreed to ascertain what plastics are found in the River Hamble by surveying themselves or contacting local beach clean organisations to find their results. Also, to write to relevant organisations to find out what they are currently doing and what they have identified as the significant issues/specific problem in our area.

Usual reports and updates of meetings relating to the river were given and in the Public Session a request for those interested to sign the online petition regarding lobster pots and yacht safety. Poorly marked lobster pots and fishing gear are a hazard to coastal sailors and the Cruising Association is petitioning for a Government consultation with all interested parties. See <https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/200001> (Deadline 12th March.)

Recommendation

- 1. To withdraw the 2008 Hamble Village Plan and the associated Standing Policies**
 - 2. Agree the guiding principles set out below for the emerging Village Plan and to consult further on them.**
-

Introduction

Back in 2008 the Council undertook a community survey and from that devised a Parish/Village Plan. The Plan set out the Council's priorities and has been widely used in the intervening period to shape the work of the Council and its priorities for spending.

The Plan was further reviewed in 2010 and 2012 and updated. Alongside the Village Plan was a set of Standing Policies (see attached)

Key considerations

The We R Hamble Survey carried out in 2017 was carried out to identify new emerging priorities for the village. These can best be summarised as follows:

Preserving the village boundaries and ensuring that there is no development within the Countryside gaps

Seek improvements to Hamble Lane and measures to reduce congestion.

Promote a mix of housing tenures to accommodate local people

Protection of public amenity, open spaces and to prevent the privatization of views of the river and from the river

Promote and improve public access to the waterfront and support the network of public rights of way

Protect the environment with a focus on reducing air and water pollution

Promote the highest standards of sustainability in development with measures such as solar, wind and ground heat source as well as recycling facilities

Support local businesses to provide employment for local people

Support a sustainable visitor economy

Maintain the village character and promote good design.

These will now be subject to further consultation as part of the Annual Parish Meeting.

As work continues to develop a new plan for the Village the existing plan should be withdrawn so that it is no longer referred to either by the Parish Council or its partners and stakeholders. At the same time the Standing Policies should also be withdrawn.

Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council

STANDING POLICIES OF THE COUNCIL

HAMBLE-LE-RICE PARISH COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PRIORITIES ARE:-

To retain the rural character of the village, its heritage and its community facilities whilst enabling appropriate development on existing sites

To maintain effective road access in and out of the village, together with sufficient parking facilities

To balance the needs of all those with an interest in the River Hamble and improving public access to and on the river for the 'boat user of modest means' and non-boating people alike

To seek classification of Hamble as a recreational area rather than for further housing or industrial development

To seek provision, within the village, for an ageing population, including health services and accommodation for the elderly, and improved public transport to services that cannot be provided within Hamble and for people travelling to and from work

To tackle the problems of unsociable behaviour including youth disturbance, vandalism and graffiti

To develop the community spirit in ways which encourage more parishioners to be involved in community activities and helping to run our village

ASSET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEETUESDAY 6TH FEBRUARY 2018 (10 Am – 11.45 pm)PRESENT:

Councillor Cross (Chairman); Councillors Schofield, Thompson and Underdown

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Woodall

RESOLVED ITEMS01. MINUTES

The last meeting of the Committee was not quorate so the minutes were produced in note form and were noted.

02. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A member of the public attended the meeting to hear the discussion on the Biodiversity Plan. They made a suggestion that reflected previous work on the Councils emerging Tree Policy that an area approach to our asset be adopted and that site specific plans come from the bio diversity plan.

03. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Underdown – Foreshore and Dinghy Park

04. BIODIVERSITY PLAN

The assistant Clerk ran through the action plan linked to the recently commissioned Biodiversity Plan. Members discussed the Plan and welcomed its findings. They made the following comments:

- Not appropriate to establish a bog garden in the cemetery
- Create notices to put on site where measures are being taken
- Investigate the success of existing bird and bat boxes before agreeing locations for further sites
- Review arrangements for managing brambles and hedgerows along pathways to avoid the need to cut/trim in the nesting season
- To use the Community Hub to promote a range of activities and to identify volunteers to help take projects forward

RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

- (1) To adopt the Biodiversity Strategy and action plan and to identify immediate actions.**

05. MEMORIAL BENCHES

Members considered the paper presented setting out options for memorials on our public benches going forward. The following was agreed:

RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

- (1) To adopt a new policy on the placement of commemorative plaques on memorial benches via a short Task and Finish Group**
- (2) Set a 10 year limit for new and existing plaques**
- (3) A fee of £350 per plaque with a maximum of 5 per bench**
- (4) Terms and conditions be reported to Council**

4a. TS MERCURY - MEMORIAL AND BENCH

Members considered the request from BP for work to be done to improve the Memorial and Bench especially given that this year will see the final parade of the TS Mercury Boys later in the year. Members felt that the process of repointing both sites needed to be done professionally although the views of the TS Mercury Working Group should be sought.

Prices should be sought and feedback given to BP

4b. REQUEST FOR A GREENHOUSE AT HAMBLE LANE ALLOTMENTS

It was agreed that the request for a polycarbonate greenhouse should be accepted as long as the size specification fell with the current dimensions stipulate for sheds at the allotment gardens and the structure was on a base of paving slabs.

EQUIPMENT PURCHASE

The Head Groundsman gave a summary of his findings to the Committee regarding replacement of items of equipment with battery powered items.

It will be more cost effective to purchase the batteries and chargers as part of the equipment package. The purchase of a battery back pack was also recommended.

The mower was highlighted as a priority issue in the recent vibration report.

Battery mowers are very expensive and the vibration ratings for current petrol mowers v battery are very similar. Currently the recommendation is to purchase a new petrol mower.

Resolved to purchase the new equipment as recommended in the Groundsman's report at a cost of £4606.30+vat in this financial year.

5b ELECTRICAL WOPRKS

Resolved to proceed with the cheapest quotation for the electrical works required to provide sockets in the sport pavilion changing rooms for the cleaners' equipment

Meeting closed 11:55am

HAMBLE-LE-RICE PARISH COUNCIL



Memorials in Public Spaces Policy

Hamble le Rice Parish Council recognises the wish for memorial plaques ~~on benches~~ in public spaces. The Parish Council will consider requests on an individual basis, ~~however retains the right to refuse or limit the number of memorial plaques.~~

~~It is important to remember that~~ The waterside and green spaces are enjoyed by a wide range of residents and visitors. The memorial plaque and tree application process is managed and regulated for the benefit of all.

This policy has been produced with the following guiding principles:

- To be respectful and sympathetic to those seeking to install a memorial
- To ensure the recreational use of open spaces is not compromised and ensure the quality of their appearance is maintained

Terms and Conditions

- The Parish Council has the right to limit, in both location and number, the types of memorial in any one area
- The appropriate payment must be received before the installation of any memorial takes place.
- The Parish Council does not accept applications for memorials for pets, nor can it agree to the interment or scattering of ashes within public open spaces within the parish.

Memorial Plaques

The Parish Council will consider requests for placement of a memorial plaque on an existing bench. As benches have been provided through public funds a charge, which includes a modest donation towards the original purchase and future maintenance of **all** benches plus the installation cost of the plaque, will apply. The donation is not allocated for maintenance of **any** specific bench.

1. An enquiry form should be completed and sent to the Assistant Clerk, preferably by email asstclerk@hamblepc.org.uk, or by post.
2. A maximum of **5** memorial plaques may be attached to each bench (one memorial per applicant). Plaques must be brass and {size inserted here}
3. The proposed inscription on a memorial plaque must be approved by the Parish Council before any order is placed. The inscription must include the date of manufacture in the bottom right hand corner.
4. The applicant will be responsible for **delivering the memorial plaque to the Parish Office**, once the wording and font have been agreed in writing by the Parish Council.

5. Memorial plaques will be installed on ~~the back rail of the~~ bench by the Parish Council
6. No additional mementos such as flowers, statues or vases will be permitted alongside or placed on any bench. The Parish Council reserves the right to remove any **such** mementos or flowers.
7. The Parish Council reserves the right to remove a memorial plaque ten years from installation or sooner if the plaque is in a poor state of repair or the bench is no longer considered safe or fit for purpose.
8. The Parish Council's standards of maintenance will be accepted as keeping the bench fit for purpose and clean. This will involve occasionally removing algae and grime **and** repairing minor faults within the resources available. The Parish Council is not responsible for the maintenance of memorial plaques.
9. Memorial plaques must not be removed or inscriptions amended without the written approval of the Parish Council.
10. The Parish Council will undertake regular assessment of all benches and reserves the right to remove any bench that is no longer considered safe and fit for purpose. In this event, the named person(s) on the enquiry form will be informed. The donor will be asked to collect the inscribed plaque within **4 weeks**. If contact cannot be made plaques will also be disposed of **within 8 weeks**.
11. The Parish Council retains the right to re-site a plaque should this become necessary.
12. The Parish Council accepts no liability for damage to benches or plaques by a third party.
13. The Parish Council will keep a record of donors and their contact details in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations. It is the responsibility of the donor to provide the Clerk with updated details in writing. Failure to do so could lead plaques being removed without notice to the donor.

Memorial Trees

The planting of memorial trees may be permitted. However, due to large numbers of existing trees and dependent on the level of demand, the planting of trees may not always be possible.

1. The species of tree will be a native variety and will be at the discretion of the Parish Council, chosen to enhance the planting scheme of the specific area.
2. Trees will be planted during the autumn and winter planting season by the Council, but the applicant and family members may be present and assist if practicable and desired
3. The total donation toward the cost and care of the tree will be £350 to include the tree, planting, stakes, guards and pruning. The applicant will be asked to make payment to the Parish Council before the tree is ordered.
4. The tree will be solely owned by the Parish Council and the plaque will remain in place for a maximum of 10 years unless it is in a poor state of repair.

5. The proposed inscription on a memorial plaque must be approved by the Parish Council before any order is placed. The inscription must include the date of manufacture in the bottom right hand corner. **Please liaise with the Council for the specification of permitted plaques and size for memorials for trees.**
6. The applicant will be responsible for ordering and **delivering the memorial plaque to the Parish Office**, once the wording and font have been agreed in writing by the Parish Council.
7. The Parish Council will keep a record of donors and their contact details in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations. It is the responsibility of the donor to provide the Clerk with updated details in writing. **Failure to do so could lead to the Council being unable to give you notice if your plaque needs to be moved/removed.**
8. No additional mementos such as cut or plastic flowers, flowers in pots, statues or vases will be permitted alongside any tree. The Parish Council reserves the right to remove any **such** mementos or flowers. However native spring bulbs may be planted around the base of the tree, with the Council's permission and agreement as to type.
9. Hamble le Rice Parish Council will not accept responsibility or liability in respect of any damage to or loss of a memorial tree or plaque whatever the circumstances. Including damage caused by a third party.
10. If the memorial tree is vandalised or does not thrive the Parish Council may help the applicant to replace the tree.

Recommendation

1 To undertake actions listed a-h in the list below.

1. The members of the Festive Lights working Group met to consider what went well and went less well this year and what they want to achieve next year. A copy of the analysis is set out in appendix 1.
2. Suggestions for this year are as follows:
 - a. Survey residents on whether they wish to see the tree moved following this year's display
 - b. If yes to price the relocation of the tree in the Square to the area adjoining the bus shelter.
 - c. Investigate the installation of a power supply to each of the 3 trees in the middle of the Square Car Park
 - d. Identify the cost of the lighting at Coronation Parade
 - e. Explore a market event linked to the Light switch on
 - f. Continue with the community tree dressing
 - g. Source trees locally (3?)
 - h. Sponsorship to pay for further expenditure.
3. Members are asked to confirm which of these they wish to pursue.

HAMBLE-LE-RICE PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE - COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Planning, Highways and Infrastructure Committee has been established by the Council in order to provide proper scrutiny of planning applications, enforcement action and policy development including the Local Plan, which will impact upon the community. This will be focused primarily on the village but may also include applications and programmes of work outside of the village that impact upon it, as well as policy that affected the whole borough.
2. Its principal role will be to respond to statutory consultations from ~~the~~ Planning ~~Authority~~ Authorities (including Minerals and Waste Authority) ~~on individual planning applications other statutory agencies such as the River Hamble Harbour Authority, specialist bodies or groups (Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership) and infrastructure and utility providers.~~
3. The Committee will also provide advice and guidance ~~eto~~ the full council where applications are sufficiently large to justify the involvement of all members of the Council and/or an exceptional public meeting.

MEMBERSHIP

4. Members and Chairman of the Planning Committee will be appointed by the Council at its Annual Council Meeting or at another time during the year if needed. Additional councillors with relevant professional experience may be co-opted as needed.
5. Where appropriate the contribution of expert witnesses or services will be sought by the Committee on an as and when basis.
6. Representations will also be sought where appropriate from householders, developers/land agents specialist advisors and members of the community.
7. The Chairman of the Council is an ex officio member but may also be a member in his or her own right.
8. The committee comprises 4-5 members. ~~Its Chair will be appointed by the Council.~~ A quorum of three members is required to transact business.

CONFIDENTIALITY

9. All members must preserve confidentiality of discussions held at meetings where that information is deemed to be 'exempt business'. (When the committee decides that "publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted or for other special reasons stated in the resolution and arising from the nature of that business or of the proceedings.") This could include pre application discussions with applicant, cases where planning enforcement is being sought or where there is legal action pending.

DELEGATED POWERS

10. The Planning Committee has delegated powers to respond to decide on individual planning applications presented to it. It will also respond on behalf of Council to specific consultations related to highways or infrastructure projects. ~~Where an~~ An application that is significant to the whole of the Parish the application will be referred to Council for consideration. Significant will be defined as sites in excess of 25 homes, large business applications or projects that effect the whole village such

REMIT OF THE COMMITTEE

The Planning Committee will consider

- All Planning Application Consultation Requests – it may decide to delegate certain decisions to the Clerk such as straight forward householder applications
- Review material and evidence submitted in support of an application
- Provide opportunities for residents to comment on applications and ensure that the committee understands local sentiment regarding specific applications
- Reviews Area Character Appraisal, Conservation Policy and other planning documents that relate to the village and its environment
- Receive updates on Planning breaches and enforcement action
- Consider emerging policy from Eastleigh Borough Council—as part of its plan making arrangements as well as adjoining and relevant planning authorities including waste and minerals
- Formulate new policy for inclusion either in the Local Plan, a Village Design Statement or a Neighbourhood Plan.
- Consider the detail of any planning applications that the Council needs to make in the management of its assets
- Undertake annual audits of its decisions on applications to understand the impact of its decision making.
- Identify areas of concerns to statutory bodies that fall within the remit of the Committee such as congestion, water, quality, air quality, telecoms and networks, coastal erosion etc.
- Ensure that the Council has a clear list of priorities which can be referred to when Planning Authorities are negotiating planning obligations or CIL payments.

WAYS OF WORKING

11. Members of the Committee must remain open minded on planning matters and not predetermine their position ahead of the matter being formally considered.
12. The Committee will give equal weight to all information that is submitted but it will make its decisions based on material planning considerations
13. Members of the committee will ensure that they are open to training and development to ensure they are capable of making good decisions

RECORDING OF DECISIONS.

14. All meetings will have proper minutes taken and other records kept, as required.

Amendment Record

Version 1: Initial Issue

Version 2 Updated to reflect wider issues of infrastructure and highways – 12.02.18

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Petty cash at 2nd February 2018			Voucher
£20	20.00	✓	1
£10	10.00	✓	2
£5	-	✓	3
£2	20.00	✓	4
£1	20.00	✓	5
50p	5.00	✓	6
20p	6.00	✓	7
10p	0.60	✓	8
5p	4.60	✓	9
2p	0.68	✓	10
1p	0.45	✓	11
			12
<hr/>			
	87.33	✓	
<hr/>			
	87.33	✓	
<hr/>			

Rolfe
2/2/18

Bank Reconciliation Statement as at: 02/02/2018 for Cash Book 2 Petty Cash

<u>Bank Statement Account Name (s)</u>	<u>Statement Date</u>	<u>Page No</u>	<u>Balances</u>
Petty Cash	02/02/2018	1	87.33
			<u>87.33</u>
<u>Unpresented Cheques (Minus)</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
			<u>0.00</u>
			87.33
<u>Receipts not Banked/Cleared (Plus)</u>			
			<u>0.00</u>
			87.33
		Balance per Cash Book is :-	87.33
		Difference is :-	0.00

Wolke
2/2/18

Recommendation

1 To respond to the consultation outlining the concerns outlined in point 2 below.

1. Hampshire County Council has invited the Council to respond to a consultation relating to the management of the Pension Fund. The email explaining the consultation is attached in appendix 1 along with the amendments to the policy document. The Policy is being revised to take account of new organisations or out sourced organisations and how the risk associated to these bodes should be manage.
2. There is a detailed briefing note as well as changes to the policy itself. From a Council perspective the Councils position should be that any new organisations admitted should be contributing at an equivalent rate, should not create any additional pressures on the fund and measures in place to guarantee contributions should the organisations cease.

Table of intended outcomes from proposed policy on wholly owned companies in the Hampshire Pension Fund

	Type of employer setting up a wholly owned company and nature of company	Intended outcome under proposed policy
	Ungrouped Schedule 2 Part 1 employer sets up a company which is closed to new members. Schedule 2 Part 1 employer transfers majority of its staff to the company.	Company will be permitted to enter a pool with the employer if they share financial covenant/attributes. Keep existing funding target but contribution rate calculated using attained age / recovery = future working life (unless there are good reasons to do otherwise – see above re a transition period/easement).
	Ungrouped Schedule 2 Part 1 employer sets up a company which is open to new members. Schedule 2 Part 1 employer continues to employ majority of its staff directly.	Company will be permitted to enter a pool with the employer if they share financial covenant/attributes. Keep existing funding target and contribution rate calculated using projected unit method / same recovery period. Re-assess contribution rate and consider increasing if financial conditions suggest this is necessary.
	Ungrouped Schedule 2 Part 1 employer with a DfE guarantee sets up a company which is closed to new members. Schedule 2 Part 1 employer transfers majority of its staff to the company.	Company is standalone with ongoing orphan target. Contribution rate calculated using attained age / recovery = future working life. Consider whether the contribution rate for the scheme employer should be re-assessed.
	Ungrouped Schedule 2 Part 1 employer with a DfE guarantee sets up a company which is open to new members. Schedule 2 Part 1 employer continues to employ majority of its staff directly.	Company is standalone with ongoing orphan target. Contribution rate calculated using projected unit method / same recovery period. Consider whether the contribution rate for the scheme employer should be re-assessed.

Type of employer setting up a wholly owned company and nature of company	Intended outcome under proposed policy
Grouped Schedule 2 Part 1 employer sets up a company which is closed to new members. Schedule 2 Part 1 employer transfers majority of its staff to the company.	Company is standalone with Scheduled Body Group funding target if a subsumption commitment is in place. Contribution rate calculated using attained age / recovery = future working life (unless there are good reasons to do otherwise – see above re a transition period/easement). Consider whether the contribution rate for the scheme employer should be re-assessed – may depend upon whether the new employer is fully funded or is allocated assets on a share of fund basis. Consider if the scheme employer still meets the criteria to remain in the Scheduled Body Group.
Grouped Schedule 2 Part 1 employer sets up a company which is open to new members. Schedule 2 employer continues to employ majority of its staff directly.	Company is standalone with Scheduled Body Group funding target if employer is a tax raising authority and a subsumption commitment is in place (otherwise ongoing orphan). Consider whether the contribution rate for the scheme employer should be re-assessed – may depend upon whether the new employer is fully funded or is allocated assets on a share of fund basis.
Grouped academy/MAT sets up a company which is closed to new members. Academy/MAT transfers majority of staff to the new company.	Company is standalone with ongoing orphan target. Contribution rate calculated using attained age / recovery = future working life. Contributions for the scheme employer need to be re-assessed – LERP adjustment likely to be required in future if new employer is fully funded on the orphan basis. Consider if the scheme employer still meets the criteria to remain in the Scheduled Body Group.
Grouped academy/MAT sets up a company which is open to new members. Academy/MAT continues to employ majority of its staff directly.	Company is standalone with ongoing orphan target. Contribution rate calculated using projected unit method / same recovery period. Contributions for the scheme employer need to be re-assessed – LERP adjustment likely to be required in future if new employer is fully funded on the orphan basis.

Funding Strategy Statement

Introduction

The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 require the Fund to prepare and publish a Funding Strategy Statement (FSS). The Fund's Actuary must have regard to this statement when setting employers' contribution rates.

As required by 2013 Regulation 58, the Statement has been reviewed (and where appropriate revised) having regard to guidance published by CIPFA in September 2016.

This FSS should be read in the context of the Fund's Investment Strategy Statement (ISS) which sets out in detail the Fund's investment arrangements and strategy. The current version of this is attached for information. The administering authority has had regard to the ISS in preparing this FSS.

Consultation

In accordance with Regulation 58, all Fund employers have been consulted on the contents of this FSS and their views have been considered in formulating it. However, the FSS describes a single strategy for the Fund as a whole.

The Fund's Actuary, Aon Hewitt Limited, has also been consulted on the content of this FSS.

Purpose of the Funding Strategy Statement

The purposes of this FSS are to set out the processes by which the administering authority:

- Establishes a clear and transparent funding strategy, that will identify how employers' pension liabilities are best met going forward.
- Supports the desirability of maintaining as nearly constant a primary contribution rate as possible, as defined in Regulation 62(5) of the LGPS Regulations 2013.
- Ensures that the regulatory requirements to set contributions so as to ensure the solvency and long-term cost efficiency of the Fund are met.
- Takes a prudent longer-term view of funding those liabilities.

Aims of the Fund

The Fund has three main aims:

- To manage the employers' liabilities effectively and ensure that sufficient resources are available to meet all liabilities as they fall due
- To enable primary contribution rates to be kept nearly constant as possible (subject to the administering authority not taking undue risk) at reasonable cost to the taxpayers, scheduled, resolution and admitted bodies, while

achieving and maintaining fund solvency and long-term cost efficiency, which should be assessed in light of the risk profile of the Fund and employers, and the risk appetite of the administering authority and employers alike.

- Seek returns on investment within reasonable risk parameters.

The main aims of the Fund are explained in more detail below.

To manage the employers' liabilities effectively

Hampshire County Council as administering authority makes sure that the Fund's liabilities are managed effectively. This is achieved by commissioning actuarial valuations every three years as required by law. These determine the employers' contribution rates required to make sure liabilities can be managed effectively. The administering authority also commissions additional work in relation to the specific issues described below.

The Fund's primary aim is long-term solvency. Accordingly, employers' contributions will be set to ensure that 100% of the liabilities can be met over the long term.

The Fund is deemed to be solvent when the assets held are equal to 100% of the Solvency Target.

The administering authority will make sure that the Fund always has enough cash available to pay pensions, transfer values to other pension funds, and other costs and expenses. Such expenditure will normally be met from incoming contributions from employees and employers and investment income, to avoid the cost of selling any of the Fund's investments. The position is reviewed every three months to make sure enough cash is available to meet the Fund's obligations.

The administering authority operates a group funding framework. Many employers are grouped for the purpose of determining employers' contributions in respect of the liabilities and more details are given later in this statement.

The administering authority publishes an Employer Policy which explains in more detail the funding policies for certain categories of employer on admission and exit.

Exiting the fund - subsumed liabilities

Where an employer is leaving the Fund and will no longer have any contributing members, another employer, or group of employers, in the Fund may agree to provide future funding in respect of any emerging deficiencies. On exit the non-active liabilities of admission bodies in paragraph 1(d)(i) of Schedule 2 Part 3 which commenced in the Fund on or after 1 April 2018 will be attributed to (i.e. assumed to be subsumed by) the relevant Scheme employer as defined in the regulations.

In such circumstances the liabilities are known as subsumed liabilities, as responsibility for them is subsumed by the accepting employer or group. For subsumed liabilities the exit valuation will be calculated using a funding target (and hence assumptions) consistent with that used to set ongoing contributions

for the employer. This will be the ongoing orphan funding target for employers admitted under paragraph 1(d)(i) of Schedule 2 where the relevant Scheme Employer is an academy. For all other employers the administering authority will assume that the investments held in respect of those liabilities will be the same as those held for the rest of the liabilities of the accepting employer or group. Generally this will mean assuming continued investment in more risky investments than Government bonds.

Exiting the fund - orphan liabilities

Where an employer is leaving the Fund and will no longer have any contributing members, and the residual liabilities are not subsumed, the administering authority will act on the basis that it will have no further access for funding from that employer once any exit valuation, carried out in accordance with Regulation 64, has been completed and any sums due have been paid. Residual liabilities of employers from whom no further funding can be obtained are known as orphan liabilities.

The administering authority will seek to minimise the risk to other employers in the Fund of having to make good any deficiency arising on the orphan liabilities. To achieve this, the administering authority will seek sufficient funding from the outgoing employer to match the liabilities with low risk investments, generally Government fixed-interest and index-linked bonds.

Where the administering authority considers that it is possible that an employer may leave the Fund at some point in the future and the employer would leave orphan liabilities on its exit from the Fund, an ongoing funding target (the "ongoing orphan funding target") will, unless the circumstances dictate otherwise, be used to determine the employer's ongoing contributions at the triennial valuation. The ongoing orphan funding target anticipates the approach which will be taken to valuing the employer's liabilities on exit. It will generally be calculated using a discount rate or rates set by reference to the yield on long-dated government bonds on the valuation date. Allowance may be made, at the administering authority's discretion and on the advice of the Fund's Actuary, for some out-performance of the Fund's assets relative to gilts in determining the discount rate which applies to the period during which the employees are assumed to remain active members and for future expected increases in gilt yields in determining the discount rate which applies to pensioner and deferred liabilities and for active members in the period after they are assumed to have left service.

Exiting the fund – valuations

Where an admission body exits the fund, an exit valuation will be carried out in accordance with Regulation 64. That valuation will take account of any activity as a consequence of exiting the fund regarding any existing contributing members (for example any bulk transfer payments due) and the status of any liabilities that will remain in the Fund.

In particular, the exit valuation will distinguish between residual liabilities which will become orphan liabilities, and liabilities which will be subsumed by other employers or otherwise continue to be funded to the satisfaction of the Administering Authority

For orphan liabilities the funding target in the exit valuation will anticipate investment in low risk investments such as Government bonds. For subsumed liabilities the exit valuation will take account of a number of other factors such as the funding target used to calculate the initial asset transfer where the exiting employer is a short term admission body under paragraph 1(d)(i) of Schedule 2; the funding target used to calculate the ongoing contributions for the employer; whether the exiting employer is a going concern or is ceasing to exist, and whether there is a Guarantor.

Regardless of whether the residual liabilities are orphan liabilities or subsumed liabilities, the departing employer (or Guarantor if the employer is unable to pay) will generally be expected to make good the funding obligation revealed in the exit valuation. In other words, the fact that liabilities may become subsumed liabilities does not necessarily remove the possibility of an exit payment being required.

For those employers who are grouped with other employers for funding purposes, the exit valuation may also include allowance for any cross subsidies anticipated from other employers with which it is grouped. This would allow the employer to take immediate credit for contributions expected to be paid over the long term from other group employers in respect of the outgoing employer's share of any group deficiency.

Interim reviews for employers

Regulation 64(4) provides the administering authority with the power to carry out valuations in respect of admission bodies and other employers which are expected to cease at some point in the future, and for the Fund's Actuary to certify revised contribution rates, between triennial valuation dates.

The administering authority's overriding objective at all times is that, where possible, the funding target for that body is clear, and that contribution rates payable are appropriate for that funding target. However, this is not always possible as any date of exit may be unknown (for example, participation may be assumed at present to be indefinite), and because market conditions change daily.

The administering authority's general approach in this area is as follows:

- Where the date of exit is known, and is more than three years away, or is unknown and assumed to be indefinite, interim valuations will generally not be required by the administering authority.
- For paragraph 1(d)(i) bodies (2013 Regulations – Schedule 2 Part 3) falling into the above category, the administering authority sees it as the responsibility of the Relevant Scheme Employer to instruct it if an interim valuation is required. Such an exercise would be at the expense of the Relevant Scheme Employer unless otherwise agreed.
- A material change in circumstances, for example the date of exit becoming known, material membership movements or material financial information coming to light may cause the administering authority to review the situation informally and subsequently request a formal interim valuation.
- Where an employer is due to leave the Fund within the next three years, the

administering authority will monitor developments and may see fit to request an interim valuation at any time in order to try to effect a smoother transition to exit.

In addition, the administering authority reserves the right to request an interim valuation of any employer at any time in accordance with Regulation 64(4).

Inter-valuation funding valuations

In order to monitor developments, the administering authority may from time to time request informal valuations or other calculations. Generally, in such cases the calculations will be based on an approximate update of the asset and liability values, and liabilities calculated using assumptions consistent with the latest valuation. It is unlikely that the liabilities would be calculated using individual membership data, or that the demographic assumptions would be reviewed.

Guarantors

Some employers may participate in the Fund by virtue of the existence of a Guarantor. The administering authority maintains a list of employers and their Guarantors. For any new admission body wishing to join the Fund, the administering authority will require a Guarantor. The administering authority, unless notified otherwise, sees the role of a Guarantor to include the following:

- If an employer leaves the Fund and defaults on any of its financial obligations to the Fund, the Guarantor is expected to provide the Fund with the amount certified by the Fund's Actuary as due, including any interest payable.
- If the Guarantor is also an employer in the Fund and is judged by the administering authority to have suitable financial security, the Guarantor may clear some of the financial liability by subsuming the residual liabilities into its own pool of Fund liabilities. In other words, it agrees to be a source of future funding in respect of those liabilities should future deficiencies emerge.

During the period of participation of the employer a Guarantor may at any time agree to the future subsumption of any residual liabilities of that employer. That action may reduce the funding target for the employer, which may, in turn, lead to reduced contribution requirements.

The Guarantor will be permitted to subsume all assets and liabilities of an employer including the inheritance of any deficiency. However, where the Guarantor is a grouped employer, the administering authority will insist upon the Guarantor meeting the contributions required to clear the deficiency inherited by the Guarantor (whether immediately or over an appropriate period), to protect the other employers in the Guarantor's group from this element of the group's deficiency.

Bonds and other securitisation

Paragraph 7 of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the 2013 Regulations creates a requirement for a new admission body to carry out to the satisfaction of the administering authority (and the Relevant Scheme Employer in the case of paragraph 1(d)(i) bodies admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013

Regulations), an assessment taking account of actuarial advice of the level of risk on premature termination by reason of insolvency, winding up or liquidation.

Where the level of risk identified by the assessment is such as to require it the admission body shall enter into an indemnity or bond with an appropriate party. Where it is not desirable for an admission body to enter into an indemnity or bond, the body is required to secure a guarantee in a form satisfactory to the administering authority from an organisation who either funds, owns or controls the functions of the admission body.

The administering authority's approach in this area is as follows:

- In the case of paragraph 1(d)(i) bodies admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations, and other admission bodies with a Guarantor, so long as the administering authority judges the Relevant Scheme Employer or Guarantor to have suitable financial security, any bond exists purely to protect the Relevant Scheme Employer against default of the admission body. It is entirely the responsibility of the Relevant Scheme Employer or Guarantor to arrange any risk assessments and decide the level of required bond. The administering authority can supply some standard calculations provided by the Fund's actuary to aid the Relevant Scheme Employer or Guarantor, but this should in no way be taken as advice on this matter. Levels of required bond cover can fluctuate and the administering authority recommends that Relevant Scheme Employers review required cover regularly, at least once a year.
- In the case of paragraph 1(d)(i) bodies admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations, where the administering authority does not judge the Relevant Scheme Employer to have suitable financial security, the administering authority must be involved in assessing the required level of bond to protect the Fund. Admission can only proceed once the administering authority has agreed the level of bond cover. Levels of required bond cover can fluctuate and the administering authority will require the Relevant Scheme Employer to review required cover jointly with it regularly, at least once a year.
- In the case of bodies other than paragraph 1(d)(i) bodies admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations, the administering authority must be involved in assessing the required level of bond to protect the Fund. Admission can only proceed once the administering authority has agreed the level of bond cover. Levels of required bond cover can fluctuate and the administering authority will review required cover regularly, at least once a year.

To enable primary contribution rates to be kept as nearly constant as possible

Achieving nearly constant primary contribution rates requires stability of employers' active membership profile and use of assumptions which are relatively constant over time. The administering authority has no control over employers' active membership although the methodology used to calculate the future service rate does vary according to whether or not the employer admits new members to

the Fund. In relation to the assumptions, the administering authority believes that the same assumptions should be used to determine the past service liabilities (and hence the solvency target) as are used to determine employers' primary contribution rates.

The demographic assumptions are reviewed by the Actuary on a triennial basis and updated as required to allow for recent Fund experience and other national factors as required. It is not expected that material changes would be made to these assumptions from one valuation to the next.

In relation to the financial assumptions, these can vary quite materially from one valuation to the next as market conditions alter. A substantial proportion of the Fund's investments are held in asset classes such as shares and property, with the aim of increasing investment returns and keeping costs to employers reasonable. However, the expected returns on these asset classes can be quite volatile and so the real discount rate can change materially from one triennial valuation to the next, leading to a material change in employers' primary contribution rates.

Where justified, and as long as it doesn't run counter to the main aims of ensuring solvency and long-term cost efficiency, the administering authority will permit a stepping in of changes to employers' primary contribution rates over a period of up to four years. Care needs to be taken in relation to admission bodies and other employers which participate in the Fund for a fixed period (for example, non-local authority employers awarded contracts to provide local authority services), where use of stepping to smooth primary contribution rate changes is less appropriate.

The administering authority recognises that a balance needs to be struck regarding the financial demands made of admission bodies. On the one hand, the administering authority requires all admission bodies to be fully self funding (either on a grouped or an individual basis), such that other employers in the Fund are not subject to expense as a consequence of the participation of those admission bodies. On the other hand, requiring contributions to target full funding at all times, without further smoothing, may cause failure of the body in question in periods of extreme economic conditions, leading to significant costs for other participating employers.

Employers within the Admission Body Group where there is no subsumption commitment from a long-term secure employer such as one of the Councils, or the Scheduled Body Group as a whole, should in theory pay contributions to target solvency on the ongoing orphan funding target. However, to enable contributions to remain affordable for them in the short term, the funding target adopted for the Admission Body Group has been relaxed and is the same as that adopted for the Scheduled Body Group. This is a temporary measure to enable contributions to remain affordable in the short-term than would otherwise be permitted. However should a body in the Admission Body Group leave the Fund during the relaxation period, that body would be required to make good its funding deficiency including any underpayment on account of contributions having been relaxed. Only if that body is unable to meet any exit deficiency and there is no Guarantor would other solutions to the ongoing funding of the body's liabilities be sought (such as the Scheduled Body funding group providing future funding for any deficiency which cannot be met by the outgoing community admission body).

The Admission Body Group will be re-assessed in advance of the 2019 valuation with a view to moving admission bodies with no subsumption commitment onto the ongoing orphan funding target.

Seek returns on investment within reasonable risk parameters

Returns should be higher over the long term than those from index-linked stocks by investing in other asset classes such as shares, property and alternative investments.

Risk parameters are controlled by restricting investment to asset classes generally recognised as appropriate for UK pension funds. From time to time the administering authority reviews the potential risks of investing in the various asset classes, with help from the Fund's Actuary and its investment managers.

The Fund's funding strategy requires the assets to deliver a long-term return of above the discount rate of 4.5%, the fund actuary's best estimate for the Fund's average return is 5.7% as at March 2016. An investment management structure has been developed and managers appointed to deliver a long-term return in excess of returns on cash and gilt investments within an acceptable level of risk. Details of the structure and managers are in the Investment Strategy Statement.

Purpose of the Fund

The purpose of the Fund is to:

- receive monies in respect of contributions, transfer values and investment income.
- pay out monies in respect of scheme benefits, transfer values costs, charges and expenses, as defined in the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 and as required in the Local Government Scheme (Management and Investment of Funds) Regulations 2016.

Responsibilities of the key parties

The three main parties with obligations to the Fund are the County Council as administering authority, the other employers in the Fund, and the Fund's Actuary. The administering authority delegates responsibility for fulfilling its obligations to the Panel and Board.

The County Council as administering authority is required to:

- Operate a pension fund
- Collect employer and employee contributions, investment income and other amounts due to the Pension Fund as stipulated in LGPS Regulations.
- Pay from the Fund the relevant entitlements as stipulated in LGPS Regulations.
- Invest surplus monies in accordance with LGPS Regulations
- Ensure that cash is available to meet liabilities as and when they fall due.

- Take measures as set out in the regulations to safeguard the Fund against the consequences of employer default.
- Manage the valuation process in consultation with the Fund's Actuary.
- Prepare and maintain a Funding Strategy Statement and an Investment Strategy Statement, both after proper consultation with interested parties.
- Monitor all aspects of the Fund's performance and funding, and amend the FSS/ISS accordingly.
- Effectively manage any potential conflicts of interest arising from its dual role as both administering authority and as a Scheme Employer.
- Enable the Pension Fund Panel and Board to review the valuation process.

The individual employer is required to:

- Deduct contributions from employees' pay correctly.
- Pay all ongoing contributions, including employer contributions determined by the actuary, promptly by the due date.
- Develop a policy on certain discretions and exercise discretions as permitted within the regulatory framework.
- Make additional contributions in accordance with agreed arrangements in respect of, for example, augmentation of scheme benefits and early retirement strain.
- Notify the administering authority promptly of all changes to active membership that affect future funding.
- Pay any exit payments on ceasing participation in the Fund.

The Fund actuary should:

- Prepare valuations including the setting of employers' contribution rates at a level to ensure fund solvency and long-term cost efficiency after agreeing assumptions with the administering authority and having regard to the FSS and the LGPS Regulations.
- Prepare advice and calculations in connection with bulk transfers and the funding aspects of individual benefit-related matters such as pension strain costs, ill health retirement costs, compensatory added years costs, etc.
- Provide advice and valuations on the exiting of employers from the Fund.
- Provide advice to the administering authority on bonds or other forms of security against the financial effect on the Fund of employer default.
- Assist the administering authority in assessing whether employer contributions need to be revised between valuations as permitted or required by the regulations.
- Ensure that the administering authority is aware of any professional guidance or other professional requirements that may be of relevance to his or her role in advising the fund.

Funding Strategy

Risk based approach

The Fund utilises a risk based approach to funding strategy.

A risk based approach entails carrying out the actuarial valuation on the basis of the assessed likelihood of meeting the funding objectives, rather than relying on a 'deterministic' approach which gives little idea of the associated risk. In practice, three key decisions are required for the risk based approach:

- what the Solvency Target should be (the funding objective - where the administering authority wants the Fund to get to),
- the Trajectory Period (how quickly the administering authority wants the Fund to get there), and
- the Probability of Funding Success (how likely the administering authority wants it to be now that the Fund will actually achieve the Solvency Target by the end of the Trajectory Period).

These three choices, supported by risk modelling carried out by the Fund's actuary, define the discount rate (investment return assumption) to be adopted and, by extension, the appropriate employer contributions payable. Together they measure the riskiness (and hence also the degree of prudence) of the funding strategy.

These three terms are considered in more detail below.

Solvency Target and Funding Target

Solvency and 'funding success'

The administering authority's primary aim is long-term solvency. Accordingly, employers' contributions will be set to ensure that 100% of the liabilities can be met over the long term. The Solvency Target is the amount of assets which the Fund wishes to hold at the end of the Trajectory Period (see later) to meet this aim, and is the value of the Fund's liabilities evaluated using appropriate actuarial methods and assumptions.

The Fund is deemed to be solvent when the assets held are equal to or greater than 100% of the Solvency Target. The Administering Authority believes that its funding strategy will ensure the solvency of the Fund because employers collectively have the financial capacity to increase employer contributions should future circumstances require, in order to continue to target a funding level of 100%. For Scheduled Bodies, and certain other bodies of sound covenant whose participation is indefinite in nature, appropriate actuarial methods and assumptions are taken to be measurement by use of the Projected Unit method of valuation, and using assumptions such that, if the Fund's financial position continued to be assessed by use of such methods and assumptions, and contributions were paid in accordance with those methods and assumptions, there would be a better than evens chance that the Fund would continue to be 100% funded after a period of 25 years. The level of funding implied by this is the Solvency Target. For the purpose of this Statement, the required level of chance

is defined as the Probability of Maintaining Solvency. The administering authority will generally assume indefinite investment in a broad range of assets of higher risk than risk-free assets for scheduled bodies and certain other bodies.

For certain Admission Bodies, bodies closed to new entrants and other bodies whose participation in the Fund could potentially be of limited duration through known constraints or reduced covenant, and for which no access to further funding would be available to the Fund after exit, the required Probability of Maintaining Solvency will be set at a more prudent level dependent on circumstances.

For such bodies the administering authority will normally adopt a funding target which:

- in the case of admission bodies, particularly those which do not admit new members, anticipates the approach to valuing the liabilities on exit – the "ongoing orphan funding target" as defined earlier in this statement;
- in the case of scheduled bodies without a government guarantee which are deemed to be of weaker covenant than the local authorities, produces a higher chance of achieving solvency/funding success through adoption of a lower discount rate than adopted for the local authorities.

Probability of Funding Success

The administering authority deems funding success to have been achieved if the Fund, at the end of the Trajectory Period, has achieved the Solvency Target. The Probability of Funding Success is the assessed chance of this happening based on the level of contributions payable by members and employers.

Consistent with the aim of enabling employers' primary contribution rates to be kept as nearly constant as possible, the required chance of achieving the Solvency Target at the end of the relevant Trajectory Period for each employer or employer group can be altered at successive valuations within an overall envelope of acceptable risk.

The administering authority will not permit contributions to be set following a valuation that have an unacceptably low chance of achieving the Solvency Target at the end of the relevant Trajectory Period.

Funding Target

The Funding Target is the amount of assets which the Fund needs to hold at the valuation date to pay the liabilities at that date as indicated by the chosen valuation method and assumptions. The valuation calculations, including the future service contributions and any adjustment for surplus or deficiency, set the level of contributions payable and dictate the chance of achieving the Solvency Target at the end of the Trajectory Period (defined below).

Consistent with the aim of enabling employers' primary contribution rates to be kept as nearly constant as possible:

- Contribution rates are set by use of the Projected Unit valuation method for most employers. The Projected Unit method is used in the actuarial valuation to determine the cost of benefits accruing to the Fund as a whole

and for employers who continue to admit new members. This means that the future service contribution rate is derived as the cost of benefits accruing to employee members over the year following the valuation date expressed as a percentage of members' pensionable pay over that period.

- For employers who no longer admit new members, the Attained Age valuation method is normally used. This means that the future service contribution rate is derived as the average cost of benefits accruing to members over the period until they die, leave the Fund or retire.
- For bodies closed to new entrants and other bodies whose participation in the Fund could potentially be of limited duration through known constraints or reduced covenant, the administering authority will take into account the potential for participation to cease, the potential timing of such exit, and any likely change in investment strategy regarding the assets held in respect of the admission body's liabilities at the date of exit.

Recovery and Trajectory periods

The Trajectory Period in relation to an employer is the period between the valuation date and the date which solvency is targeted to be achieved. A Trajectory Period of 25 years has been adopted at the 2016 valuation.

When an actuarial valuation shows that the Fund is in deficiency, employers' contribution rates will be adjusted to achieve a 100% funding ratio over a period of years (the Recovery Period), while ensuring that the probability of achieving solvency over the Trajectory Period remains acceptable. In consultation with the Fund's actuary, the administering authority has set a common maximum recovery period of 19 years for all employers in the Fund. The actual recovery period within this maximum of 19 years is determined at each actuarial valuation by balancing the Fund's solvency requirements against the financial strength of the Fund's main scheduled employers.

The Fund's liabilities mostly take the form of benefit payments over long periods of time. The main scheduled employers in the Fund are financed through central and local taxation and can be viewed as very financially secure. As these employers ultimately underwrite the Fund's finances, the administering authority has agreed a recovery period of 19 years for scheduled bodies in the 2016 actuarial valuation.

Grouping of Employers

In some circumstances it is desirable to group employers within the Fund together for funding purposes (i.e. to calculate employer contribution rates). Reasons might include reducing the volatility of contribution rates for employers, facilitating situations where employers have a common source of funding or accommodating employers who wish to share the risks related to their participation in the Fund.

Employers may be grouped entirely, such that all of the risks of participation are shared, or only partially grouped such that only specified risks are shared.

All employers in the Fund are grouped together regarding the risks associated with payment of ill health pensions and partner's pensions and lump sum benefits on death in service. The cost of such benefits is shared across the employers in

the Fund. This is because the administering authority, in view of the size of the Fund, does not see it as cost effective or necessary to insure these benefits externally.

Group Funding Framework

Within the Fund there are two groups of employers for funding purposes; the Scheduled Body Group and the Admission Body Group. Employers within a group share all risks of participation, with the exception of liability for ill health pensions, partner's pensions and lump sum benefits payable on death in service, with other employers in the group. A small, but increasing, number of employers sit outside of the groups.

Scheduled Body Group

The Scheduled Body Group includes:

- Scheduled bodies listed in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Regulations, excepting those employers (or category of employers) who in the view of the Administering Authority:
 - Are deemed by central government to be private sector organisations, or
 - Receive a significant proportion of their income from either non-government sources or otherwise are not considered to have a central or local government guarantee, or
 - Are otherwise considered by the Administering Authority to be less financially secure than the principal councils to the extent that there is a perceived (or potential) covenant risk to the Fund.
- Town and Parish Council employers under Part 2 (paragraph 2) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations who, due to their unique size and transience as active participating bodies, would benefit significantly from being able to share risks with a wider pool (and where the risk to that wider pool is deemed negligible)
- Paragraph 1(d)(i) bodies admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations where
 - the employer was admitted to the Group before 4 March 2016
 - there is a pass through arrangement with an employer which is itself a grouped scheduled body, and
 - that body and letting authority (as appropriate) adheres to any mechanisms as required by the Administering Authority to protect other grouped employers from the additional and unique risks which that body contributes to the Group.

With effect from 31 March 2016, the following category of employers have ceased to participate in the Scheduled Body Group to become ungrouped employers in the Fund:

- Bodies in the Higher Education and Further Education sector (including post-92 Colleges and Universities)

The Administering Authority will keep under review the funding arrangements of all employers and may remove additional employers from the grouping arrangements should their situations change.

Admission Body Group

The Administering Authority views the purpose of the Admission Body Group to be primarily to smooth contributions for charities and other not-for-profit organisations which would otherwise be exposed to the potential of volatile contributions. For historic reasons other admission bodies have participated in the Group. With effect from 31 March 2016, the following category of employers have ceased to participate in the Admission Body Group to become ungrouped employers in the Fund:

- Bodies in the Higher Education and Further Education sector (including pre-92 Universities and independent schools). These bodies will become ungrouped employers, consistent with the treatment of other post-92 Universities and colleges.
- Housing Associations. These are closed employers with no subsumption commitment.

New funding groups would be considered by the Administering Authority, but only with the consent of the employers involved.

Funding principles applying to grouped employers

Common employers' contribution rates are set for each of these groups, instead of individual contribution rates for each employer. The Administering Authority accepts that this can give rise to cross-subsidies between employers. However, employers in the Fund are required to make upfront contributions determined by the Fund's Actuary to cover the costs of unreduced early retirements, which is a major distinction between employers over time. The Administering Authority and the Fund's Actuary periodically review whether separate rates for individual employers or groups of employers are required.

Within each group, employers share risk according to a set of clearly defined principles which are as follows:

- The group exists to produce a common primary contribution rate for employers in the group
- Only the group funding target is relevant when producing a common primary contribution rate, and
 - An employer's cash contribution depends on its level of payroll when a stream of deficit contributions is being set, and any special arrangements put in place in relation to being a Relevant Scheme Employer for a grouped paragraph 1(d)(i) body admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations,
 - While an employer has contributing members in the Fund, the employer will share a responsibility to contribute towards any emerging deficiency within the relevant funding group, or will benefit from an emerging surplus within the relevant funding group through a deduction against previous deficiency obligations.

- Unless it is a paragraph 1(d)(i) body admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations, or as otherwise agreed between the administering authority and the employer, the employer is assumed to belong to the group indefinitely
 - As an employer can always be called upon to pay its share of any group deficiency, a flow of new entrants to the employer is required to finance this
 - Funding targets used to assess ongoing contributions at the triennial valuation are set using an ongoing actuarial basis that assumes participation is indefinite
- Employers are liable to fund deficiencies emerging at each valuation in proportion to their own payroll at the time of the valuation. Relevant Scheme Employers in relation to a grouped paragraph 1(d)(i) body admitted under Schedule 2 Part 3 of the 2013 Regulations will also be liable in respect of payroll transferred to the paragraph 1(d)(i) body, to the extent that the contributions are not fully covered by those made by the paragraph 1(d)(i) body.
- Streams of deficiency contributions, once certified at a valuation will normally remain in place for the duration of the relevant recovery period. New streams of such contributions may be certified at subsequent valuations in respect of new surplus or deficiency emerging at the relevant valuation. In certain circumstances, contribution streams set at a previous valuation may be modified at subsequent valuations if the administering authority and the Fund's actuary agree.
- Employers will pay a common future service contribution rate. Relevant Scheme Employers in relation to a grouped paragraph 1(d)(i) body will also be liable in respect of any increased rate payable in respect of the paragraph 1(d)(i) body by virtue of the admission agreement being a closed agreement.
- When employers exit the Fund they will be assumed to leave the group. The funding target adopted at that time will be assessed in light of the employer's circumstances and, in particular whether its liabilities will be subsumed (i.e. another employer or group will be responsible for the future funding of those liabilities) or will become orphan (where the Fund has no access to any future funding for those liabilities).

For most purposes, such as for the purpose of calculating an exit valuation or calculations under FRS102/IAS19, each employer in a group is assumed to have the same funding level as the group as a whole, based on the value of benefits accrued to date for the group as a whole and notional assets held in respect of the group. The funding level of the group is expressed as a percentage and calculated as:

notional assets held in respect of the group divided by value of benefits accrued to date for the group as a whole.

However, where circumstances dictate otherwise (e.g. to protect the remaining employers in a group), and it is necessary to allocate a notional value of assets to an employer in a group, this may be calculated as the value of the liabilities less the present value of the employer's stream of deficiency contributions.

Further aspects of funding strategy that may be relevant from time to time are

described below:

Notional sub-funds

In order to establish contribution rates for individual employers or groups of employers it is convenient to subdivide the Fund notionally between the employers, as if each employer had its own notional sub-fund.

This subdivision is for funding purposes only. It is purely notional and does not imply any formal subdivision of assets, nor ownership of any particular assets or groups of assets by any individual employer or group.

Roll forward of sub-funds

The notional sub-fund allocated to each employer or group will be updated allowing for all cashflows associated with that employer's or group's membership, including contribution income, benefits paid, transfers in and out and investment income allocated as set out below.

In some cases there is insufficient information to complete these calculations. In these circumstances:

- Where, in the opinion of the Fund's Actuary, the unavailable cashflow data is of low materiality, estimated cashflows will be used.
- Where, in the opinion of the Fund's Actuary, the unavailable cashflow data is material, the Fund's Actuary will use an analysis of gains and losses to update the notional sub-fund. This method is less precise than using cashflows, and involves calculating gains and losses to the surplus or deficiency shown at the previous valuation to determine an expected surplus or deficiency at this valuation. This is compared with the liabilities evaluated at this valuation to calculate an implied notional asset holding.

Attribution of investment income

Where the Administering Authority has agreed with a scheme employer that the scheme employer will have a tailored asset portfolio notionally allocated to it, the assets notionally allocated to that employer will be credited with a rate of return appropriate to the agreed allocation.

Where the employer has not been allocated a tailored notional portfolio of assets, the assets notionally allocated to that employer will be credited with the rate of return earned by the Fund assets as a whole, adjusted for any return credited to those employers for whom a tailored notional asset portfolio exists.

Phasing in of new contribution rates

At each actuarial valuation, the Administering Authority will consider whether changes to employers' contribution rates should be payable immediately, or be phased in. The Administering Authority discusses with the Fund's actuary the risks of adopting such an approach. The current policy is to phase in changes to the primary rate of employers' contributions over a maximum of four steps. However, phasing in of increases to deficit recovery contributions may be permitted if unusual and difficult budgetary constraints make this necessary, or if other changes, such as changes to the funding target, justify this approach.

Whenever contribution changes are being phased in, this can only be achieved if the regulatory requirements of setting employer contributions to ensure the solvency and long-term cost efficiency of the Fund would still be met.

Fund maturity

To protect the Fund, and individual employers, from the risk of increasing maturity producing unacceptably volatile contribution adjustments as a percentage of pay the administering authority will normally require defined capital streams from employers in respect of any disclosed funding surplus or deficiency.

Identification of risks and counter measures

The administering authority recognises that future events and investment income cannot be predicted with certainty. Instead, there is a range of possible outcomes, and different assumed outcomes will lie at different places within that range.

The more optimistic the assumptions made, the more that outcome will sit towards the 'favourable' end of the range of possible outcomes, the lower will be the probability of events actually matching or being more favourable than the assumed events, and the lower will be the Funding Target calculated using those assumptions.

The administering authority's overall policy on risk is to identify all risks to the Fund and to consider the position both in aggregate and at individual risk level. Risks to the Fund will be monitored and action taken to limit them as soon as possible. The main risks are as follows:

Investment risk

The risk of investments not performing (income) or increasing in value (growth) as forecast. Examples of specific risks would be:

- assets not delivering the required return (for whatever reason, including manager underperformance)
- systemic risk with the possibility of interlinked and simultaneous financial market volatility
- insufficient funds to meet liabilities as they fall due
- inadequate, inappropriate or incomplete investment and actuarial advice is taken and acted upon
- counterparty failure

The specific risks associated with assets and asset classes are:

- equities – industry, country, size and stock risks
- fixed income - yield curve, credit risks, duration risks and market risks
- alternative assets – liquidity risks, property risk, alpha risk
- money market – credit risk and liquidity risk

- currency risk
- macroeconomic risks

The administering authority reviews each investment manager's performance quarterly and annually considers the asset allocation of the Fund by carrying out an annual review meeting with its Investment Advisers, Fund Managers and Fund's Actuary. The administering authority also annually reviews the effect of market movements on the Fund's overall funding position.

DRAFT

Employer risk

Those risks that arise from the ever-changing mix of employers, from short-term and ceasing employers, and the potential for a shortfall in payments and/or orphaned liabilities.

The administering authority will put in place a FSS which contains sufficient detail on how funding risks are managed in respect of the main categories of employer (e.g. scheduled and admission bodies) and other pension fund stakeholders.

The administering authority maintains a knowledge base on their employers, their basis of participation and their legal status (e.g. charities, companies limited by guarantee, group/subsidiary arrangements) and uses this information to inform the Funding Strategy Statement.

Liquidity and maturity risk

The LGPS is going through a series of changes, each of which will impact upon the maturity profile of the LGPS and have potential cash flow implications:

- The increased emphasis on outsourcing and other alternative models for service delivery may result in active members leaving the LGPS,
- transfer of responsibility between different public sector bodies,
- scheme changes which might lead to increased opt-outs
- spending cuts and their implications

All of these may result in workforce reductions that would reduce membership, reduce contributions and prematurely increase retirements in ways that may not been taken into account in previous forecasts.

The administering authority's policy is to require regular communication between itself and employers and to ensure reviews of maturity at overall Fund and employer level where material issues are identified.

Liability risk

Inflation, life expectancy and other demographic changes, and interest rate and wage and salary inflation will all impact upon future liabilities.

The administering authority will make sure the Fund's Actuary investigates these matters at each valuation, or more often if necessary. The Fund's Actuary will report to the administering authority as appropriate. The administering authority will then agree with the Fund's actuary any necessary changes to the assumptions used in assessing solvency.

If significant liability changes become apparent between valuations, the administering authority will notify all participating employers of the likely effect on their contributions after the next full valuation, and consider whether any bonds that are in place for admission bodies require review.

Regulatory and Compliance risk

Occupational pensions in the UK are heavily regulated. Both general and LGPS-specific legislation must be complied with.

The administering authority will keep abreast of all proposed changes and, whenever possible, comment on the Fund's behalf during consultation periods. The administering authority will ask the Fund's Actuary to assess the effect of any changes on employers' contribution rates.

The administering authority will then notify employers of how these rule changes are likely to affect their contribution rates at the next valuation, if they are significant.

Governance risk

This covers the risk of unexpected structural changes in the Fund's membership (for example, if an employer closes their scheme to new entrants or if many members withdraw or groups of staff retire), and the related risk of an employer failing to notify the administering authority promptly.

To limit this risk, the administering authority requires the other participating employers to communicate regularly with it on such matters. The administering authority also undertakes to inform the Fund's Actuary promptly of any such matters.

Recovery period

Allowing surpluses or deficiencies to be eliminated over a recovery period of up to 19 years means there is a risk that too little will be done to restore solvency between successive actuarial valuations. The associated risk is reviewed with the Fund's actuary as part of the three-yearly valuation process, to ensure as far as possible that enough is done to restore solvency and that deficit contributions are compared to the amount of interest accruing on the deficit.

Stepping

Increasing employers' contribution rates in annual steps rather than immediately introduces a risk that too little will be done to restore solvency in the early years of the process or, in relation to the primary rates of contributions, that employers are not paying enough to meet the cost of benefits being accrued in future. The administering authority's policy is to limit the number of permitted steps to four. In addition, it accepts that a slightly higher final rate may be necessary at the end of the stepping process to help make up the shortfall.

Links to investment policy set out in the Fund's Investment Strategy Statement

The administering authority has produced this Funding Strategy Statement having taken an overall view of the level of risk in the investment policy set out in the Investment Strategy Statement (available from the Pension Fund's [website](#)).

Both documents are subject to regular review.

Future monitoring

The administering authority plans to review this FSS as part of the three-yearly actuarial valuation process unless circumstances arise that require earlier action.

The administering authority and the Fund's Actuary will monitor the Fund's solvency position at regular intervals between valuations. Discussions will be held with the Fund's Actuary to establish whether any changes are significant enough to require further action, such as informing employers of the need for different employers' contribution rates after the next valuation.

DRAFT

Hampshire Pension Fund – Employer Policy

Contents

1. Background	1
2. Aims.....	1
3. Principles	2
4. Responsibilities of employers in the Fund	3
5. Managing risk.....	3
6. New employers in the Hampshire Pension Fund.....	4
Admission bodies	4
All outsourcings.....	4
Paragraphs 5 & 6, Part 2, Schedule 2 bodies	5
Town and Parish Councils	7
Academies.....	7
7. Bonds and guarantors.....	8
Guarantor.....	8
Bond.....	9
8. Open or closed admission agreements.....	9
Open agreement	9
Closed agreement	10
Designating employers.....	10
9. Funding targets	10
Orphan (gilts) funding target	10
Scheduled Body Group funding target	11
Intermediate funding target	12
10. Pass-through	12
11. Fully funded or share of fund.....	12
Fully funded	12
Share of fund.....	13
12. Exit from the Fund (terminations)	13
Town and Parish Councils	14

1. Background

- 1.1. This policy explains the Fund's policies and procedures in the treatment of employers including the admission and exit of employers in the Hampshire Pension Fund. Hampshire Pension Fund is administered by Hampshire County Council.
- 1.2. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that, as the Administering Authority of the Hampshire Pension Fund, we will minimise the risk that any employer places on the Fund before agreeing to admit any new employers to the Fund. It is also intended to provide clarity on the decisions made by the Fund and provide consistency in the way types of employers are dealt with.
- 1.3. This policy should be read in conjunction with the Hampshire Pensions Funding Strategy Statement.
- 1.4. The policy will be reviewed from time to time and at least every three years in line with the Hampshire Pensions Funding Strategy. It will also be reviewed following changes in the regulations relating to employers in the Fund.
- 1.5. It should be noted that this statement is not exhaustive and individual circumstances may be taken into consideration where appropriate.
- 1.6. Where the information relates to a particular type of employer, this will be explained. If no type of employer is indicated the information relates to all employers in the Fund.

2. Aims

- 2.1. Our aim is to minimise risk to the Fund by ensuring that the employers participating in the Fund are managed in a way that ensures they are able to adequately fund the liabilities attributable to them and, in particular to pay any deficit due when leaving the Fund. In managing this risk we will have regard to the aims of Hampshire Pensions Funding Strategy:
 - to manage the employer's liabilities effectively and ensure that sufficient resources are available to meet all liabilities as they fall due,
 - to enable primary contribution rates to be kept as nearly constant as possible (subject to the administering authority not taking undue risk) at reasonable cost to the taxpayers, scheduled, resolution and admitted bodies
- 2.2. The Administering Authority has an obligation to pursue all liabilities owed so this deficit does not fall on other employers.

3. Principles

- 3.1. For funding purposes, the Administering Authority will treat employers in different ways depending on how they participate in the Fund and its views on their financial strength.
- 3.2. As set out in the Funding Strategy Statement Scheduled body employers under Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Regulations which are deemed to be secure public sector bodies and Town and Parish Councils under paragraph 2 or Part 2 of Schedule 2 will be part of the Scheduled body group. Decisions made by employers in the group must be in accordance with the group behaviours as set out in paragraph 4.1 below. Employers in the group will pay the same future service rate and share the funding risks of the group as set out in the Funding Strategy Statement.
- 3.3. Some existing Admitted bodies may be part of the Scheduled body group on the understanding that, where considered appropriate, a formal agreement will be put in place to protect the other grouped employers from the actions of the admission body and the effect of the admission agreement being closed to new entrants. The Administering Authority may remove those employers from the Group if satisfactory agreement cannot be reached or the terms of any agreement are not adhered to by the employers concerned.
- 3.4. Some existing Admitted body employers may be part of the Admitted body group.
- 3.5. Some employers will be in neither group and will be set an individual employer contribution.
- 3.6. Employers who are part of a group need to act in accordance with the group behaviours. The Fund will monitor the funding / membership experiences of the employers from time to time. If the Fund considers an employer is not acting in accordance with the group behaviours it will consider taking appropriate action which may include requiring the employer to pay additional contributions so the impacts of the decisions made by the employer do not adversely affect other employers in the group.
- 3.7. Regardless of whether they are grouped or ungrouped individual employers will pay for any legal and actuarial costs incurred on their behalf.

4. Responsibilities of employers in the Fund

- 4.1. We will expect all employers in the Fund to take into consideration the effect of their behaviours on the group, for example when considering;
- Discretions policies
 - Outsourcing decisions
 - Salary increases

Employers should have regard to the Hampshire Pension Fund administration strategy at all times.

Changes/mergers

- 4.2. All employers, whether Admission or Scheduled bodies, need to inform the Hampshire Pension Fund of any changes to the organisation that will impact on their participation in the Fund. This includes change of name or constitution or mergers with other organisations or other decision which will or may materially affect the employer's Fund membership.

Admission agreements

- 4.3. All employers must inform the Fund of any outsourcings and allow sufficient time for an admission agreement to be completed prior to the contract start date.

5. Managing risk

- 5.1. Our aim is to minimise employer related risk to the Fund across all the employers in the Fund.
- 5.2. There must be no significant additional risk to the Fund from any outsourcing by a scheme employer or admission of any other new body for which a scheme employer is guarantor. We would want to ensure that the decisions made by an employer when outsourcing services or providing a guarantee have no adverse impact on the Fund or on other employers in the Fund. We would look to protect both the Fund and other employers in these circumstances.
- 5.3. In particular, where Scheduled body employers under Part 1 of Schedule 2 outsource services, there will be a presumption that the Scheduled body has agreed to subsume any assets and liabilities attributable to the new admission on its exit from the Fund (excluding any assets and liabilities transferring to another employer in the Fund).
- 5.4. Scheme employers must be prepared to manage any pension risk of an outsourcing.

6. New employers in the Hampshire Pension Fund

Admission bodies

- 6.1. Each Admitted body will be a stand alone body in the Fund with its own contribution rate.
- 6.2. Employers considering outsourcing any services should have regard to and adhere to the requirements of the Fair Deal Policy/Best Value direction. They should also advise the Administering Authority at the earliest opportunity and before any transfer of staff so that the necessary paperwork and calculations can be completed in advance of the new body being admitted. More information on the process is available from the Fund.
- 6.3. The Administering Authority will have discretion to amend the contribution the scheme employer pays where they make decisions to outsource services if it is considered that there will be significant or material number of employee members moving from the scheme employer to a new employer, relative to the size of the scheme employer. The aim will be to ensure the transfer does not increase the risk to the Fund or the Scheduled body group.
- 6.4. The costs in terms of the contribution the new employer pays and the fees in relation to the solicitor and actuary costs will depend on the decisions made under this section. In particular, the funding target appropriate to the new employer will reflect the perceived strength of covenant of the scheme employer (including the existence or otherwise of a government guarantee) and whether or not the scheme employer has agreed to guarantee the new employer's participation and subsume its assets and liabilities in the Fund should that employer exit the Fund in future. The fees will depend on the information required from the actuary and solicitor but an estimate will be provided prior to work being commissioned.

All outsourcings

- 6.5. The Administering Authority will have discretion to amend the contribution the scheme employer pays where they make decisions to outsource services if it is considered that there will be significant or material number of employee members moving from the scheme employer to a new employer, relative to the size of the scheme employer. The aim will be to ensure the transfer does not increase the risk to the Fund or the Scheduled body group. Unless the circumstances dictate otherwise, the change in the scheme employer's contribution will generally be implemented as part of the next triennial valuation of the Fund when new contributions for all employers will be implemented.

Paragraphs 5 & 6, Part 2, Schedule 2 bodies

- 6.6. Unless any of the situations listed below apply, the default arrangement will be for the wholly owned company to be a stand alone employer subject to the ongoing orphan funding target. On exit, unless a subsumption commitment is in place, a low risk ("gilts") basis will be used to value the liabilities in accordance with the Funding Strategy Statement. In all cases any liabilities which the outgoing employer is unable to meet on exit will be assumed to pass to the related scheme employer, i.e. the scheme employer setting up the wholly owned company must provide a guarantee in relation to the liabilities of the wholly owned company.
- 6.7. If a wholly owned company is set up by a tax raising authority in the Scheduled Body Group, that employer can provide a subsumption commitment which will allow the company to be set up with the Scheduled Body Group funding target. The company will still be a stand alone employer with its own contribution rate.
- 6.8. If a wholly owned company is set up by an ungrouped Part 1 Schedule 2 employer the Fund will accept the scheme employer being pooled with its wholly owned company, provided the bodies share the same financial covenant and attributes, and the arrangement does not materially increase the risk to the Fund. This will allow the company to have the same funding target as the scheme employer. A parent company guarantee and subsumption agreement will need to be put in place for pooling to be acceptable to the Fund and the Administering Authority will reserve the right to review the contributions for the pool on the establishment of the wholly owned company.
- 6.9. If a scheme employer has a stronger financial covenant than the wholly owned company (i.e. a MAT/academy with a DfE guarantee that does not extend to the company) then the company will have to be a stand alone employer subject to the ongoing orphan funding target regardless of whether or not a subsumption commitment is in place.
- 6.10. Contribution rates for closed employers will be calculated using the attained age methodology (closed contribution rate) with a recovery period equal to future working life. This approach may also be taken for those employers where, in the opinion of the Administering Authority, access to the LGPS is being restricted. The Administering Authority will monitor the number of active members and in particular the number of new entrants in forming this opinion. If the scheme employer enters into a pooling arrangement with the wholly owned company under (3) above, but one of either the scheme employer or the wholly owned company is closed (or restricts access), the default position for the pool will be to use the attained age methodology with a recovery period equal to the future working lifetime. A period of transition or other easement may be agreed where the number of active members is expected to reduce only slowly over time and new entrants are still expected to be admitted to the group and, where in the Administering

Authority's view, such period of transition or easement does not constitute a material risk to the Fund/other employers.

- 6.11. The Administering Authority will reserve the right to amend the contribution paid by the scheme employer if it is considered that there will be significant or material number of employee members moving to the wholly owned company, relative to the size of the scheme employer. This assessment will take place as part of the triennial valuation.
- 6.12. Employers considering outsourcing any services to a wholly owned company should also advise the Administering Authority at the earliest opportunity and before any transfer of staff so that the necessary paperwork and calculations can be completed in advance of the new body being admitted. More information on the process is available from the Fund.
- 6.13. To be an employer under paragraph 5 of part 2 of Schedule 2, the new employer would be connected with scheme employer, where connected means:
- a) it is an entity other than the local authority; and .
 - b) according to proper practices in force at that time, financial information about the entity must be included in the local authority's statement of accounts for the financial year in which that time falls.
- 6.14. To be an employer under paragraph 6 of part 2 of Schedule 2, the new employer would be "under the control of" the scheme employer, where under the control of has the same meaning as in section 68 or, as the case may be, 73 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.
- 6.15. The Fund actuary will determine the employer contribution payable for such a body as an ungrouped employer (or for the group where the employer is grouped with the relevant Part 1 Schedule 2 body) and if necessary revise the contributions payable by the scheme employer outsourcing or otherwise transferring staff to a Part 2 Schedule 2 body with the aim of ensuring the transfer does not increase the risk to the Fund or the Scheduled body group. Unless the circumstances dictate otherwise, the change in the scheme employer's contribution will generally be implemented as part of the next triennial valuation of the Fund when new contributions for all employers will be implemented.
- 6.16. As with Admission bodies, the costs in terms of the contribution the new employer pays and the fees in relation to the solicitor and actuary will depend on the decisions made under this section. In particular, the funding target appropriate to the new employer will reflect the perceived strength of covenant of the scheme employer and whether or not the scheme employer has agreed to guarantee the new employer's participation and subsume its assets and liabilities in the Fund should that employer exit the Fund in future and, where relevant, whether the new employer has a government guarantee. The fees will depend on the information required from

the actuary and solicitor but an estimate will be provided prior to work being commissioned.

Town and Parish Councils

- 6.17. Town and Parish Councils joining the Fund will automatically join the Scheduled body group.
- 6.18. When a Town or Parish Council designates to join an employee to the Fund, they have no current active members and are not currently subject to a suspension notice (see section 12 below), a standard employer rate equal to the prevailing future service rate of the Scheduled body group (currently 14% of pay, increasing to 16.9% of pay with effect from 1 April 2017) will be payable until the contributions from the next triennial valuation come into force.

Academies

- 6.19. Schools and colleges converting to academy status will retain the position in the Fund held by the former establishment. This means that an academy created from the conversion of an LEA school will be part of the Scheduled body group. An academy created from a 6th form college, or where there is no former establishment, will be a standalone employer in the Fund. A new free school will also become a standalone employer in the Fund.
- 6.20. Similarly new multi academy trusts (MATs) will become standalone employers in the Fund unless at the point of creation they wholly consist of former LEA schools (in which case the MAT will stay in the Scheduled body group). Academies which join a MAT will become part of that MAT. An exception may be made for a former LEA school which joins a MAT which is a standalone employer. The MAT can choose for the LEA school to remain part of the Scheduled body group. This will mean that the school continues to share the experience of the Scheduled body group and may pay a different contribution rate to the rest of the MAT.
- 6.21. The DfE guarantee extends to all academies and free schools, including those created from 6th form colleges. While this guarantee is in force, contribution rates for all academies will be set using the same risk basis as for the Scheduled body group, even if the academy or MAT is a standalone employer.
- 6.22. A MAT which participates in the Scheduled Body Group will be treated as a single employer in the Group and will receive a single contribution rate and fixed contribution amount. A single report will be provided for IAS19 and will not be split between the academies which are part of the MAT.

- 6.23. New academies that are formed from an LEA school will also be asked to take responsibility for a portion of the local education authority's deficit contributions in line with the proportion of pensionable payroll which is transferring from the local education authority to the academy. If an academy moves to a MAT, the MAT will become responsible for those deficit contributions in addition to its own.
- 6.24. Where academies **outsource services or set up a wholly owned company** and the new admission body or **new Part 2 Schedule 2 body** is not backed by a guarantee from the Department for Education or the Local Education Authority, the new employer will be treated as an ungrouped employer subject to the ongoing orphan funding target as set out in the Funding Strategy Statement.

7. Bonds and guarantors

Guarantor

- 7.1. A guarantor takes responsibility for the assets and liabilities of the Fund which are attributable to the admission body **or wholly owned company**. In the event that liabilities of the admission body **or wholly owned company** remain unpaid, the Fund will seek payment from the guarantor.
- 7.2. Under The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013¹ every employer who outsources services becomes an ultimate guarantor for the pension liabilities of the new employer. **It is the Administering Authority's policy that all wholly owned companies which participate in the Fund as Part 2 Schedule 2 bodies are guaranteed by the Part 1 Schedule 2 employer to which they are related.**
- 7.3. In some circumstances, where the letting authority is not a tax raising authority the Fund will require a bond to be put in place to cover certain funding risks to the Fund on the advice of the Fund actuary.
- 7.4. The admission agreement ends if the new employer becomes an exiting employer². The Fund will arrange for a valuation of the assets and liabilities of the exiting employer and, where appropriate, a revised rates and adjustment certificate.
- 7.5. Payment of the outstanding liabilities must be made by the exiting scheme employer. If the exiting scheme employer fails to make this payment and if there is a bond in place we will call on this in the first instance.
- 7.6. If there is no bond in place and the scheme employer fails to pay the outstanding liability we will pursue payment from the guarantor. If there is no guarantor the liability will fall to the letting authority who arranged for admission body status for the exiting employer.

¹ Schedule 2, Part 3, 1(d)

² The Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 Part 2 , 64

- 7.7. Charitable bodies seeking admission to the Fund will need a tax raising authority to act as guarantor.
- 7.8. Any employer acting as guarantor will need to complete a guarantor agreement. The Fund will provide a template document for completion.

Bond

- 7.9. A bond is a way of insuring against the potential cost of the admission body failing by reason of insolvency, winding up or liquidation and being unable to meet its obligations to the Fund.
- 7.10. The Local Government Pension Scheme regulations provide that the risk assessment for bond cover must be carried out by the admission body. However, we will ask the Fund actuary to calculate the minimum risk to the Fund for any outsourcing. This information will be shared with the scheme employer but not with the admission body. However, it will not constitute advice for either the scheme employer or admission body, who should take their own actuarial advice as required.
- 7.11. Where there is a guarantor, the bond will be largely for that scheme employer's protection, in which case the scheme employer must decide if the admitted body will be required to provide a higher bond than that calculated by the Fund actuary.
- 7.12. The Administering Authority will require a bond or indemnity to be in place for any outsourcings that are arranged by scheme employers that do not have tax-raising powers. Where there is no bond the Fund will require the letting employer to sign a guarantee agreement.
- 7.13. The scheme employer needs to be aware of and manage the ongoing risks.
- 7.14. The scheme employer should review the bond cover annually.
- 7.15. In the event of an admitted body failing and there being insufficient bond cover, any outstanding liability will fall to the scheme employer.

8. Open or closed admission agreements

Open agreement

- 8.1. An open agreement allows any person employed in connection with the contract to join the LGPS.
- 8.2. The Fund will consider an open agreement for an outsourcing. It is for the scheme employer/admission body to ensure only those eligible are admitted to the Fund.

Closed agreement

- 8.3. A closed agreement relates to a fixed group of employees. Only the employees or roles that transfer to the admission body from the scheme employer can remain or be members of the Scheme.
- 8.4. Unless advised otherwise, we will assume the admission agreement is closed and there will be a default joining window of 6 months.
- 8.5. A scheme employer arranging an outsourcing may agree to vary from this position but they must be aware of their obligations under Best Value or recommendations of Fair Deal.

Designating employers

- 8.6. Part 2 Schedule 2 employers are "designating" employers in that they can designate which staff or posts are eligible for membership of the LGPS. Where a Part 1 Schedule 2 employer establishes a wholly owned company which participates in the Fund under Part 2 Schedule 2 employer, it must advise the Administering Authority of its intentions as regards the eligibility of the company's current and future employees. This will enable the Administering Authority to determine whether the wholly owned company should be treated as an open or closed employer.

9. Funding targets

- 9.1. The funding target relates to what happens to the liabilities for the members being outsourced at the end of the contract, on termination of the admission agreement or other exit of an employer, and may also take into account the administering authority's view on the strength of the scheme employer's covenant.
- 9.2. The presumption will be that the scheme employer will provide a "subsumption commitment" (i.e. be responsible for the future funding of the liabilities post-exit). This will automatically apply to the non-active liabilities of admission bodies in Part 3 paragraph 1(d)(9i) of Schedule 2 which commenced in the Fund after 15 December 2017, i.e. these liabilities and any associated assets will be subsumed by the relevant Scheme employer. This should be confirmed in all other cases.

Orphan (gilts) funding target

- 9.3. Outstanding liabilities of employers from whom no further funding can be obtained are known as orphan liabilities.
- 9.4. The Fund will seek to minimise the risk to other employers in the Fund of having to make good any deficiency arising on the orphan liabilities.

- 9.5. To achieve this, as set out in the Funding Strategy Statement, when an exiting employer would leave orphaned liabilities, the administering authority will seek sufficient funding from the outgoing employer to match the liabilities with low risk investments, generally Government fixed-interest and index-linked bonds.
- 9.6. Where an admission body is admitted and there is no subsumption commitment from a tax raising employer or the Administering Authority determines that the scheme employer which would subsume the assets and liabilities on the admission body's exit is not of sufficiently strong covenant, the new employer will be **set ongoing contributions calculated to meet the 'ongoing'** orphan funding target. This funding target takes account of the approach taken to value orphan liabilities on exit and will be reviewed at each triennial valuation on the advice of the actuary. Where **the 'ongoing'** orphan funding target applies the value of the transferring liabilities, and hence notional asset transfer sufficient (where a fully funded transfer applies) will be higher than using a subsumption basis. Similarly, the contribution rate payable by the admission body will be higher than payable by the scheme employer, potentially materially so. Whilst this approach does not guarantee that there will be no exit payment due, it should materially reduce this risk.
- 9.7. **The exit valuation for admission bodies under paragraph 1(d)(i) of Schedule 2 Part 3 which commenced in the Fund after 1 April 2018 and where the ongoing orphan funding target was used to determine the transferring assets on commencement, will be undertaken on the ongoing orphan funding target, notwithstanding the presumption that the scheme employer will subsume the non-active liabilities and associated assets on exit.**

Scheduled Body Group funding target

- 9.8. Where an employer is leaving the Fund another employer or group of employers may agree to provide future funding for any liability.
- 9.9. In that case, any funding deficit arising in future in relation to the exited employer's liabilities will be subsumed by the accepting employer or group.
- 9.10. Where the subsuming employer is a tax raising body or is deemed to be of similar covenant to a tax raising body the Administering Authority will assume that the investments held in respect of those liabilities will be the same as those held for the rest of the liabilities of the accepting employer or group. Generally this will mean assuming continued investment in more risky investments than Government bonds. In other cases a more prudent funding target will apply, for example in relation to admission bodies following an outsourcing by an academy or other educational establishment where the admission body is not subject to a guarantee from the Department for Education or Local Education Authority, as set out in paragraph 6.22 above.

Intermediate funding target

- 9.11. The actuary also has the option to place an employer on an intermediate funding target if they deem it appropriate. In the case of scheduled bodies without a government guarantee which are deemed to be of weaker covenant than the local authorities, the administering authority will normally adopt a funding target which produces a higher chance of achieving solvency/funding success through adoption of a lower discount rate than adopted for the local authorities.
- 9.12. Where an employer subject to the intermediate funding target outsources services under 1(d)(i) of Schedule 2 Part 3 or transfers employees to a wholly owned company with a commitment to subsume the liabilities of the company on exit, the funding target for the new employer will be the same as that applicable to the scheme employer, (i.e. will be the scheme employer's intermediate funding target) unless the ongoing orphan funding target is considered by the Administering Authority to be more appropriate to the circumstances.

10. Pass-through

- 10.1. A scheme employer may agree a pass-through arrangement with an admitted body. In this case the employer contribution is still calculated by the Fund actuary and the admitted body will be expected to pay this to the Fund. Any arrangement to share the cost of this rate will be between the scheme employer and the admitted body.
- 10.2. New Admitted bodies will not be included in the scheduled body or admitted body group even if there is a pass-through arrangement in place between the letting authority and the admitted body.

11. Fully funded or share of fund

Fully funded

- 11.1. When a new employer starts in the Fund, they will usually start as fully funded. This means that any past deficit for the members who are transferring to the new employer remains with the scheme employer and does not transfer to the new employer.
- 11.2. This applies even where there is an onward outsourcing from an existing body. The new employer will start fully funded and the existing admission body will pay any deficit (unless specified otherwise in their contract with the scheme employer).

- 11.3. Where the funding target for the new employer is higher than that for the scheme employer, the Fund actuary will revise the contributions for the scheme employer to take this into account. Unless the circumstances dictate otherwise, the change in the scheme employer's contribution will generally be implemented as part of the next triennial valuation of the Fund when new contributions for all employers will be implemented.

Share of fund

- 11.4. In exceptional circumstances and only where agreed between the employers the Fund may consider starting a new employer with a share of fund. The Fund will only agree to this where it doesn't increase the risk to the Fund.

12. Exit from the Fund (terminations)

- 12.1. If an exit is triggered, the employer will be responsible for all costs (including any deficit).
- 12.2. An exit valuation will be carried out when an employer becomes an "exiting employer", i.e. it :
- ceases to be a Scheme employer (including ceasing to be an admission body participating in the Scheme), or
 - no longer has an active member contributing towards the Fund
- 12.3. For admission bodies, this includes the following scenarios:
- an outsourcing contract ends or,
 - for a closed agreement, when the last member leaves if it is before the contract end date, or
 - the admission body becomes insolvent, is wound up or goes into liquidation.
- 12.4. For exits of a body admitted to the fund under Schedule 2 Part 3 paragraph 1(d) (or earlier regulations) or where a scheme employer is acting as guarantor, the scheme employer should notify the Administering Authority as soon as it knows the admission agreement is likely to be terminated.
- 12.5. The Fund will instruct the actuary to carry out an exit valuation. The costs of this will be added to the final exit valuation
- 12.6. The Administering Authority will pursue all liabilities owing to the Fund. We will support employers to develop a strategy to exit the Fund where required and it is in the interests of the Fund to do so

- 12.7. The Fund will pursue the body, any insurer providing a bond or any guarantor as appropriate but ultimately, if unsuccessful, the scheme employer will become liable for any outstanding costs. If there is no scheme employer (e.g. in relation to community admission bodies whose participation pre-dates the requirement for a guarantor), depending upon the circumstances the Scheduled Body Group may subsume the assets and liabilities, failing which they will fall to be funded by all employers in accordance with Regulation 64 (3)(b).

Town and Parish Councils

- 12.8. Under the Regulations an exit is triggered when the last active member leaves the Fund.
- 12.9. Given the unique nature of a Town or Parish Council, the Fund will not request an exit valuation immediately when the last member leaves as it may take some time to replace a member of staff and the Parish Council may wish to admit the new employers into the scheme. The Local Government Pension Scheme (Amendment) Regulations 2013 specifically introduced the power to suspend a demand for an exit payment for up to 3 years where the administering authority believes that the employer is likely to have one or more active members contributing to the fund within the period specified in the suspension notice. The Administering Authority considers that it would be appropriate to exercise that discretion in relation to Town and Parish Councils.
- 12.10. The Fund will issue written notice of the period of the suspension notice. The employer must continue to pay any deficit payments and the actuary will recalculate any deficit at the next valuation.

³ Provision 22

Recommendation

- 1. To receive, note the recommendations and accept the proposed changes in response to items raised.**

Introduction

The council's auditor visited the council on the 10th January 2018 and has made a series of recommendations. See the attached report that has been circulated on its receipt.

We need to respond to the issues and I would suggest as follows:

Standard Documents - The documents were reviewed but not minuted. They will be considered at the next meeting in March to meet the end of year deadline

Register of Members Interests - Despite previous requests to review and update forms this has not been done. Forms have been reissued and Members are asked to return them by Friday 16th February 2018. It is for members to ensure that the forms are complete and with the clerk. Both EBC and our own website will be updated.

Committees – Some Committees have not had full minutes kept. As more meetings take place this is creating a strain on resources. There is a request from the Personnel Committee elsewhere on the agenda to increase admin resources to help address this along with a number of other issues.

Payment Listing – we currently provide Members with a list of payments to be made. In the future we will also include a list of all payments made in the previous month including direct debts etc.

External Audit Report – the report was on the system but page 4 was missing and the original could not be found. The recommendation will be followed.

Budget monitoring – Noted

Earmarked reserves – Noted

Electronic banking – Members are asked to confirm compliance where they are an authorised signatory

Fixed asset register – Noted

Leases and rentals – Noted

Office filing and communication – Proposals to improve business continuity are subject to discussion with the Personnel Committee and on this agenda for consideration.

Do the Numbers Limited

37 Upper Brownhill Road
Southampton, SO16 5NG
023 8077 2341

10th January 2018

Amanda Jobling, Clerk
Hamble Le Rice Parish Council
Memorial Hall, 2 High Street
Hamble-le-Rice
Southampton, SO31 4JE

Dear Amanda,

Subject: Review of matters arising from interim Internal Audit for 31 March 2018

Please find below the final list of matters arising following my visit to the office today. The matters listed below should be addressed before the year end.

Control area	Issue	Recommended Action
Standard documents	The council has not reviewed, updated and approved the Standing Orders, Financial Regulations and Risk Assessment this financial year.	This is a requirement of the current audit regime. The reviews should be done and the outcomes clearly minuted.
Register of members interest.	Several members of the council have not included either their home address or their place of work on their members' interest forms. The forms are there to protect members from accusations of conflict of interest and should be filled out completely.	Every member has an interest in their home in the parish – no matter what terms they live there. Sources of income should clarify lack of bias. The parish website should include links to the up to date complete list at the Borough
Committees	The council appears to operate committees which do not properly publish their minutes. Members must attend meetings in person to ensure quorum.	It is a requirement of the Transparency Code and good practice that all minutes are published on the website within one month of any meeting.
Payment listing	The list of payments included in the minutes does not always include all entries and is not always signed.	The complete payment list for the whole month should always be signed into the minutes to comply with LGA 1972
External Audit Report	The original External Audit report for autumn 2017 was not to hand during the visit.	Such reports should be uploaded to the website on receipt (as per the Transparency Code)

eleanorgreene@thedunnefamily.co.uk

Registered in England No. 7871759


Director: Eleanor S Greene

Budget monitoring	The budget report from the Omega system had some anomalies in its projections due to automatic calculations. These have been rectified	Before presenting reports to members, officers should check that assumptions made by the system are reasonable.
Earmarked reserves	The council has identified several projects to be undertaken in the next 18 months that will be funded from reserves. This will bring the general reserve back to a more prudent level.	The earmarked amounts should be set up on the Accounts system so that the Balance Sheet becomes a more useful document and reserves monitoring undertaken quarterly.
Electronic banking	It is unclear from the office systems whether Barclays are operating proper MLR procedures to ensure that members cannot access the Parish Accounts from their personal bank and vice versa.	Any members who can see both personal accounts and parish accounts at the same time should cease using the system until Barclays put proper controls in place. (screenshots as evidence are useful)
Fixed Asset Register	The fixed asset register has not yet been updated for additions, disposals and obsolete items in 2017/18	Items should be added and removed from the register on the date of the transaction.
Leases and rentals	The council has numerous small / peppercorn leases and rentals.	When these are billed, the exact dates and terms should be specified and any uplifts correctly applied.
Office filing and communication	Hamble Parish council is unusual in the number of local stakeholder groups (relating to the river, the refinery, tourism, housing and infrastructure) with whom officers and members must engage on a regular basis.	The fact that some items of filing could not be located during the visit reflects on the complexity of the demands on the office and when staffing resource is being reviewed it would be prudent to take into account resilience of service delivery to electors.

I will return to the office on May 10th to complete the review of the systems and controls.

If either you or your councillors have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards



Eleanor S Greene

Recommendation

- 1. To note the RIDDOR report and the lessons identified in the report**
- 2. To agree to a day bespoke consultancy at the cost of £750 + VAT to identify and assess the risk of a range of work activities**
- 3. To advise on the use of CHAS approved contractors for future work.**

Introduction

- 1 On the 17th January a member of staff received a reportable injury while rehangng a gate at Hamble Lane recreational facilities.
- 2 The injury resulted in more than 5 days absence and as a result has been reported to the Health and Safety Executive. It is expected that there will be a follow up investigation to the report by EBC who act as agents for the HSE at a local level.
3. Following the accident statements were taken, the report written up, lessons identified and the Health and Safety Consultant was notified and his advice sought.
4. From the lessons learnt it is clear that mechanical lifting equipment should have been used. The Grounds Team has been told to ensure this happens in future.
5. Identifying and developing risk assessments for nonstandard work practices has also been recognized as a need going forward. A day's consultancy with the Head Groundsman is recommended to identify and plan for these types of events going forward. The cost of this is set out in the attached email.
6. In addition work has identified the need to improve our management of contractors and their H&S arrangements. Often we are unable to secure 3 competitive quotes for work and often are using small tradesman with less sophisticated health and safety regimes. It is recommended that we should consider a preferred contractor arrangement using contractors registered with CHAS <https://www.chas.co.uk/> which is a third party accreditation scheme. This would mean that there would be a greater certainty about the safe methods of working although the cost of using such contractors will inevitably be higher than non-accredited. Members are asked to consider this option.
7. The member of staff has returned to work but is on light duties.

Recommendation

- 1. To note the RIDDOR report and the lessons identified in the report**
 - 2. To agree to a day bespoke consultancy at the cost of £750 + VAT to identify and assess the risk of a range of work activities**
 - 3. To advise on the use of CHAS approved contractors for future work.**
-

Introduction

- 1 On the 17th January a member of staff received a reportable injury while rehangng a gate at Hamble Lane recreational facilities.
- 2 The injury resulted in more than 5 days absence and as a result has been reported to the Health and Safety Executive. It is expected that there will be a follow up investigation to the report by EBC who act as agents for the HSE at a local level.
3. Following the accident statements were taken, the report written up, lessons identified and the Health and Safety Consultant was notified and his advice sought.
4. From the lessons learnt it is clear that mechanical lifting equipment should have been used. The Grounds Team has been told to ensure this happens in future.
5. Identifying and developing risk assessments for nonstandard work practices has also been recognized as a need going forward. A day's consultancy with the Head Groundsman is recommended to identify and plan for these types of events going forward. The cost of this is set out in the attached email.
6. In addition work has identified the need to improve our management of contractors and their H&S arrangements. Often we are unable to secure 3 competitive quotes for work and often are using small tradesman with less sophisticated health and safety regimes. It is recommended that we should consider a preferred contractor arrangement using contractors registered with CHAS <https://www.chas.co.uk/> which is a third party accreditation scheme. This would mean that there would be a greater certainty about the safe methods of working although the cost of using such contractors will inevitably be higher than non-accredited. Members are asked to consider this option.
7. The member of staff has returned to work but is on light duties.

Recommendation

- 1. To note the RIDDOR report and the lessons identified in the report**
- 2. To agree to a day bespoke consultancy at the cost of £750 + VAT to identify and assess the risk of a range of work activities**
- 3. To advise on the use of CHAS approved contractors for future work.**

Introduction

- 1 On the 17th January a member of staff received a reportable injury while rehanging a gate at Hamble Lane recreational facilities.
- 2 The injury resulted in more than 5 days absence and as a result has been reported to the Health and Safety Executive. It is expected that there will be a follow up investigation to the report by EBC who act as agents for the HSE at a local level.
3. Following the accident statements were taken, the report written up, lessons identified and the Health and Safety Consultant was notified and his advice sought.
4. From the lessons learnt it is clear that mechanical lifting equipment should have been used. The Grounds Team has been told to ensure this happens in future.
5. Identifying and developing risk assessments for nonstandard work practices have also been recognised as a need going forward. A day's consultancy with the Head Groundsman is recommended to identify and plan for these types of events going forward. The cost of this is £750 + vat. Training will also be identified for all staff as part of this year's appraisals.
6. In addition work has identified the need to improve our management of contractors and their H&S arrangements. Often we are unable to secure 3 competitive quotes for work and often are using small tradesman with less sophisticated health and safety regimes. It is recommended that we should consider a preferred contractor arrangement using contractors registered with CHAS <https://www.chas.co.uk/> which is a third party accreditation scheme. This would mean that there would be a greater certainty about the safe methods of working although the cost of using such contractors will inevitably be higher than non-accredited. Members are asked to consider this option.
7. The member of staff has returned to work but is on light duties.

Recommendation

- 1 To progress items a-h by the Festive Lights Working Group and report back.**
 - 2. To enter into a supply agreement via LSI for electricity at Mount Pleasant as detailed in the attached quote.**
-

1. Community Governance Review – EBC have written asking that the Council meets with Hound Parish Council to discuss the proposed changes to the Hamble/Hound Boundary with a view to finding an agreeable way forward. EBC have a meeting scheduled for the 20th February 2018 with papers needing to go out by the 13th February 2018. A letter did go to the Clerk at Hound when our proposal was submitting asking for a meeting and this has now been chased.
2. Electricity contract - The electricity contract at Mount Pleasant is up for renewal a competitive quote has been received with reduces charges from £304.06 to £248.97 making a saving of £55.07 for electricity at Mount Pleasant. Members are asked to switch the supply agreement to LSI Independent Utility Brokers Ltd. Details are attached.
3. Update on the MDL proposals at Mercury Marina - Correspondence from MDL regarding their proposals at Mercury Marina have been received and circulated. Copies will be posted on the website with the agenda pack. MDL have been asked to note that the figures quoted for the We R Hamble Survey are incorrect. At this stage they have been told that the information is noted.
4. Charity Request - Red Rose, a local Southampton charity, has requested use of our pitches for a football tournament in May/June either free of charge or at a discounted rate. The Council is asked to consider this request. At the moment we don't have a tournament charge. Further information is attached.
5. Carols in the Square – St Andrews will be holding a meeting on February 22nd at 7.00pm in the HVMH to identify organisations prepared to take over the organization of the annual Carols in the Square event. Members are asked to nominate a representative to attend.
6. Also a copy of the Christmas Carol accounts for 2017 are attached.

The Priory Church of St. Andrew, the Apostle, Hamble le Rice



The Vicarage
High Street
Hamble
Southampton
SO31 4JF Tel: 023 8045 2148

29 JAN 2018

Carols in the square expenses for 2017

Dear Amanda,

January 29th 2018

In the Autumn Hamble Parish council kindly agree to give us a grant of £500 towards the expenses of running this important local event.

This letter is to give you a breakdown of what we spent the money on.

Professional amplification equipment for the event £360

Attendance of St John Ambulance £110

This comes to £460,

we also spent £60 on sweets from Veals that Father Christmas gave out to children in little bags at the end of the event.

These three items came to over £500. Is the council happy with the money going on these three items? I know there was concerns about the sweets, but I cannot remember if a definite decision was made not to spend council money on this item?

We also incurred expenses of £150 to pay for the Otterbourne brass band to support the event.


We have received other money to pay for these additional items.

Is the council happy with the items we have spent the money on, if there was a problem with the sweets we could refund you the balance of £30.

Yours Faithfully,

Rev Graham Whiting

Chairman of Carols in the Square organising committee.



Bursledon

Netley

Royal Victoria
Country Park

Hamble Cliff
Ho

EASTLEIGH
COUNCIL

Assistant Clerk - Hamble Parish Council

From: Barrie Jacobs <Barrie@lsienergy.com>
Sent: 05 February 2018 10:48
To: Assistant Clerk - Hamble Parish Council
Subject: LSI - Quote(s) for Humble-Le-Rice Parish Council (HAMBLE LANE) - SLCC Member Benefits 2 of 2
Attachments: T:_UD DOCSTORE_54343\LSIstandardLOA_54343_131842.doc; U:\UD File Folders\Templates\SME Services at a Glance.pdf; C:\Users\Barrie\AppData\Local\Temp\Your_Electric_contract_184505104521.pdf; C:\Users\Barrie\AppData\Local\Temp\Electric_cost_analysis_184505104526.pdf; SLCC Leaflet.pdf

Dear Jeanette Symes,

Further to our conversation thank you again for contacting LSI. As discussed please find attached a full cost analysis outlining all the rates LSI has achieved on your behalf.

LSI's Recommended Offers – (all relevant paperwork attached)

Supplier	Term	Day	Standing Charge p/day	Annual Cost	Diff
British Gas Trading Ltd (SME) (Current)	12 Mths	13.6040	31.31	£304.06	
Bristol Energy	24 Mths	13.3000	17.38	£248.97	£55.07

KEY CONTRACT TERMS

SUPPLIER: Bristol Energy

START DATE: 28 March 2018

CONTRACT LENGTH: 24

PAYMENT TERMS: Fixed Direct Debit Monthly

PRODUCT TYPE: Electricity

SUPPLIER TERMS: Supplier Terms and Conditions apply, please read carefully.

What to do next...

In order to proceed with our enclosed recommended offer, please kindly sign attached contract and return to me by e-mail at your very earliest convenience ensuring that the contract document is signed by an authorised signatory of the business, it will then be our pleasure to arrange for the transfer of your supply.

We wish to advise our clients that all offers are made subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Where applicable, prices are based on the information supplied by you and may be subject to change if this is inaccurate..
2. All prices are quoted for NON-AMR Meters unless you have advised us otherwise, please advise us immediately if you have a SMART Meter installed at your site.

3. Due to the volatility of the wholesale market energy offers can be withdrawn by the supplier at any time, should this occur we will endeavour to advise you as soon as possible and re-quote accordingly.
4. All offers are based on direct debit payment (unless other methods are specifically requested) and failure to set up a direct debit may result in an increase to your accepted price.
5. All offers are subject to the suppliers standard terms and conditions.
6. All offers are subject to a satisfactory credit check.
7. Please refer to our website for our Terms of Service <http://www.lsienergy.com/terms/>

In the meantime if you have any questions in regards to this offer or LSI's fully account managed service in general please do not hesitate to contact me on my direct line **01727 877 039**.

Useful links and information

[Who are LSI Energy?](#)

[Award Winning Service](#)

[What are F.I.T tariff charges?](#)

[What are the Micro Business Regulations?](#)

[Terms of Service](#)

[FAQ's?](#)

Kindest Regards,

Barrie Jacobs

Head of SME Sales

Direct: 01727 877039

Mobile: 07834 513490

Tel: 01727 877020

Email: Barrie@lsienergy.com

Web: lsienergy.com



LSI Energy is a trading name of LSI Independent Utility Brokers Ltd, Hastings House, 12 Park Industrial Estate, Park Street, St Albans, AL2 2DR
Telephone 01727 877020, Company Registration: 4072919

Humble-Le-Rice Parish Council

Client Letter of Authority

Date: 07 February 2018

Ref: LSI/SLCC

LSI Independent Utility Brokers Ltd

t/a LSI Energy

1st Floor, Hastings House

12 Park Industrial Estate

Park Street

Frogmore

St Albans

AL2 2DR

Dear Sirs,

Site Details: Humble-Le-Rice Parish Council HIGH STREET HAMBLE SOUTHAMPTON SO31 4JE
038011272000023672975

Please accept this letter as our authority for your company to: Humble-Le-Rice Parish Council

1. Act on my/our behalf in connection with the servicing and tendering of our gas/electricity/water/telecoms contracts. This includes; requesting and negotiating prices on my behalf.
2. Contact all the necessary companies concerned to obtain full details of the contracts with them to comply with this request. This includes; consumption history, supply numbers, pricing details, contract end dates & metering details.
3. Serve a termination notice where applicable and in accordance with the terms and conditions of our current utility supplier contracts.
4. To contact my current supplier to resolve any objections or rejections regarding my transfer. Request outstanding debt information (where applicable) including copies of any relevant invoices, debt information & payment term.
5. To authorise any adjustments, refunds or billing
6. To raise and deal with complaints on my behalf to a satisfactory resolution. **{Suppliers may notify customers if a complaint is raised on the account and confirm when this has been resolved}**

This letter of authority is valid with immediate effect until 30/09/2020

Signed:

Name:

Position:

Site Contact (if different to above):

Telephone (landline):

Mobile:

E-mail:

Date:

MERCURY FORWARD KEY FACTS DOCUMENT JANUARY 2018

MDL Marinas Group (MDL) have carefully reviewed the community's response to their consultation on Mercury Yacht Harbour (Mercury) and are pleased that so many people are interested in securing its future.

The majority of respondents support Mercury being reinvigorated, and value the non-revenue generating elements of the project, such as improved access and nature conservation.

Plans for a new outdoor activities centre are also extremely popular. MDL's draft masterplan carefully brings together certain aspirations of Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), Hamble and Hound Parish Councils, the local community and current users.

We believe that alternative options for the site would fail to deliver these shared aspirations. This document provides responses to the main issues that were raised during the consultation.



PLANNING POLICY

The Issue	MDL's Response
<p>1 Does the masterplan align with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)?</p>	<p>The masterplan directly reflects the aspirations of the NPPF in that; it encourages the effective use of land by reusing that which has been previously developed (brownfield), it promotes mixed use development, and encourages multiple benefits from the use of land in semi-urban / rural areas.</p>
<p>2 Does the masterplan align with EBC's Emerging Local Plan?</p>	<p>The masterplan directly reflects the majority of EBC's aspirations for the site as set out in Local Plan Policy HA2, and also in paragraphs 6.2.43 and 6.2.51. These aspirations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Exploiting the potential of the area's marine and aviation heritage; b) Retention of marina and related uses including sail and canoe training, facilities for watersports and visitor facilities; c) Provision of a public slipway; d) Retention and enhancement of the amount and mix of holiday accommodation; e) Retention, restoration and enhancement of the Northernmost shores of the site for Nature Conservation (i.e. Badnam Creek); f) Retention and management of The Bund / The Mound, including retention and enhancement of existing public access, subject to there being no adverse impact on nature conservation interests; g) A sequential approach to flood risk management; h) A comprehensive scheme, showing the whole site.
<p>3 EBC have not put Mercury forward as a potential site for new homes. On what basis should or could part of the site be allocated for residential development?</p>	<p>The enabling homes are essential to funding the many non-revenue generating elements of the scheme. EBC's Employment Land Review has given Mercury a low rating in terms of its potential as an employment site.</p> <p>National policy recommends that applications for alternative use should be treated on their merits, having regard to market signals, user demand, and the need for different land uses which support local communities.</p> <p>EBC already support the development of a hotel, recognising the poor quality of some of the buildings and their underutilisation. Given that this principle of development is accepted, then a simple shift in policy towards an element of enabling housing is all it would take to unlock the financial feasibility of the site, and deliver the range of community benefits on offer.</p>
<p>4 Isn't the site in the Countryside Gap?</p>	<p>The Donkey Field is the only part of the site which lies in the Countryside Gap. EBC's own documents (SLAA to Site Allocations July 2017) indicates this small (1.48ha) area could be removed from the Gap as it performs a limited role in separating Hamble, Burseldon and Netley.</p>
<p>5 If neighbouring applications for housing were refused, why is there merit in this site?</p>	<p>Neighbouring applications were refused on the basis of being genuine greenfield sites, or on the premise of a lack of 5-year housing land supply in Eastleigh. Our argument for brownfield regeneration stems from a serious need for regeneration at Mercury in order to secure its long term future.</p>

FINANCIALS

The Issue	MDL's Response
<p>1 Why can't you build a hotel?</p>	<p>The infrastructure and operating costs associated with a successful 4* hotel are significantly more than a hotel in this location can reasonably turn over. MDL are developing two hotels at other marina sites, neither would be possible without the construction of enabling homes.</p> <p>Our site has been allocated for a hotel development for four years, and in that time, not a single professional operator or developer has shown any interest in developing the site for hotel use.</p> <p>A new hotel is simply not a financially viable proposition without a significant capital injection.</p>
<p>2 You are a marina company, you should only promote marina and boatyard uses at Mercury.</p>	<p>The Hamble has six other marinas, thousands of river berths and three boat hoists. Three of the Hamble's Marinas belong to MDL. Regeneration of the marina and boatyard at Mercury are integral to the project but we are also seeking to diversify our offering with an enhanced 'family and child friendly leisure hub', where nature and the waterfront can be enjoyed by everyone, including non-sailors, without the need to join a club, or a formal yachting facility.</p>
<p>3 What evidence do you have that your yachting user base is experiencing a gentle decline?</p>	<p>The British Marine Federation (BMF) has produced an extensive 375 page report on the changing face of boat ownership and the marina user base. This BMF document sets the background for the fact that the current 'yacht owner demographic' is ageing, and the upcoming generation are neither as large in number, or as affluent as the current ownership base. This is further enhanced by evidence in a growing small watersports market which includes dinghies, canoes, kayaks, paddleboards, and the like. This matches MDL's experience across all of our marinas, and we aim to foster growth in the small craft market, rather than continue to manage the decline of Mercury.</p>
<p>4 How will you improve your employment facilities?</p>	<p>MDL have undertaken a specific consultation of our tenants at Mercury. Some of our tenants have expressed an interest in remaining at the new site, if offered space to grow. We aim to foster this growth through the construction of new employment space for existing and new small to medium sized marine based businesses. This new commercial space will be sustainable, fit for purpose and expansion ready for the next generation of start ups and small marine business owners.</p>
<p>5 How much will your masterplan cost?</p>	<p>The masterplan reflects the joint aspirations of EBC, MDL, community stakeholders and current users of Mercury. The total cost of implementing the development, (exclusive of any housebuilding) is currently estimated by our MRICS Quantities Surveyor at £12.675 million pounds.</p>
<p>6 Can't MDL pay for the regeneration from commercial revenue?</p>	<p>Commercial property revenue is not sufficient to support the non-revenue generating elements of the scheme, nor does a commercial led scheme deliver the relaxed feel and community access that MDL seeks to enhance and has been requested by many respondents to our consultation.</p>

ENABLING HOMES

The Issue	MDL's Response
<p>1 EBC have stated that there should be no more new homes on the Hamble Lane.</p>	<p>EBC have identified a need to meet significant housing requirements over the plan period to 2036. The emerging plan allocates many greenfield sites to meet this requirement. Housing as part of the regeneration of this brownfield site can make a small but important contribution to this housing requirement that might reduce the pressure to release more greenfield sites.</p> <p>Both the community gain (a hotel) as described in EBC's Local Plan Policy HA2 and the community preference (heritage and outdoor activities centre) proposed by MDL would require a capital injection.</p>
<p>2 New homes put too much pressure on local infrastructure (schools and doctors offices).</p>	<p>If permission is granted, EBC will determine the level of Section 106 contributions required to be made in terms of local infrastructure.</p>
<p>3 EBC already have a 5-year Housing Land Supply, and we don't need any more new homes.</p>	<p>This argument is yet to be tested via a formal process of appeal. Regardless of the existence of a 5-year housing land supply, the extensive amount of brownfield land at Mercury still requires restoration and repair.</p> <p>The core premise of our development proposals and our masterplan is to improve and enhance the existing features and uses within our brownfield site, and to deliver multiple benefits to the large and diverse community of users who currently enjoy Mercury's location, environment and siting.</p> <p>This is a genuine regeneration-led development, and all profits from the sale of new homes will be reinvested in the land and new facilities for the long term benefit of our existing and growing community of users.</p>
<p>4 Why can't you build fewer homes and smaller facilities?</p>	<p>MDL are happy to engage in this negotiation with EBC, however we have yet to achieve an acceptance from them that regardless of the site's use class allocation - whether we build a hotel or a heritage/outdoor activity centre - the cost of regeneration and construction is only viable through the development and sale of residential property on surplus land.</p>

TRANSPORT

The Issue	MDL's Response
<p>1 There is already too much traffic on the Hamble Lane.</p>	<p>Our transport consultants, Paul Basham Associates, have been working with the Hampshire Highways Authority in order to discuss how best to mitigate residents' concerns. It is unlikely HCC will object to this brownfield development on the basis of traffic concerns. The extent of additional car trips per hour in our proposed scheme would be limited, and similarly, the impact upon key junctions along the Hamble Land would also be limited. Evidence from EBC agrees that in transport sustainability terms, developing our site has an average impact when compared with developing other sites in the Borough.</p>
<p>2 What would MDL do to improve transport to and from the site?</p>	<p>MDL's proposals to enhance the sustainable transport features of the site include the following:</p> <p>Our land which fronts onto Satchell Lane would be used to facilitate pedestrian footpaths and cycleways which would make existing circulation safer.</p> <p>We would propose connections through to the Strawberry Trail and the footpath across the old airfield into Hamble village centre.</p> <p>MDL would consider implementing a local electric bus which would be used to shuttle residents in a circular route from the train station, to Coronation Parade, village centre, Port Hamble, Mercury, Blackthorn Health Centre and back to the train station. If sufficient take up is available, we would consider expanding route timetables or bus capacity.</p>
<p>3 Does the masterplan include enough parking?</p>	<p>Yes. The current site holds 275 car parking places, and the proposed development will have 287 car parking spaces. All parking will be designed to Hampshire Highways' and the Yacht Harbour Associations' standards.</p>
<p>4 Satchell Lane is already unsafe.</p>	<p>MDL will facilitate footpaths on its own land. Regardless of the site's end use - whether it be for housing, hotel, commercial or a mix of uses, MDL will be working with Hampshire Highways in order to facilitate and deliver better road safety on Satchell Lane.</p>

THE ENVIRONMENT

The Issue	MDL's Response
<p>1 Development of the site would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape and character of the area.</p>	<p>A carefully designed site, with replacement buildings of the same or similar size and location as existing buildings, and below the existing tree canopy would have a nominal impact upon the landscape and character of the immediate area. Enhanced landscaping would improve the character of the caravan park site.</p>
<p>2 Development of the site would harm the local biodiversity.</p>	<p>The land proposed for development is previously developed land. Much of the land is short sward grassland, which has been assessed by our ecologist as having a low ecological value. The most valuable area of land is the creekside saltmarsh where ecological enhancement is proposed.</p>
<p>3 Any development would put more pressure on the Coastal SPA (Special Protection Area).</p>	<p>The site has already been designated for marine and/or hotel use. These uses already have an impact upon the SPA, and have done for many years. This pressure is mitigated through levies payable to the SPA Authority (www.birdaware.co.uk). In addition our site could provide a valuable nature conservation / education function by providing a location where Coastal Rangers could choose to operate from.</p>
<p>4 Developing the site would have a negative impact upon the environment.</p>	<p>Buildings currently exist which are dangerous to the local environment in that their asbestos construction and poor state of repair requires ongoing monitoring and maintenance in order to control potential impact upon the Environment, and Health and Safety of current users. The proposed development would remove and improve these risks, and improve environmental conditions of the site for all users.</p>
<p>5 What does the local Wildlife Trust have to say about the development proposals?</p>	<p>Local Wildlife Trusts are consulted as part of any application for planning consent. In January 2018, Wildlife Trust UK called for any new housing to be restorative to nature. The proposals outlined by our sustainable housebuilder (HAB Housing) are specifically designed to do just that - to respond to the needs of local wildlife, and to enhance the environment for all users, creating a sustainable, long lasting investment in the land and local community.</p>
<p>6 The site has a number of different environmental character areas which need attention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land at Badnam Creek is a former derelict boatyard, and our proposed development would provide clear environmental enhancements to this and the local saltmarsh in the surrounding area. • The caravan park and car park site are both brownfield, with short sward grassland in areas. Our surveys reveal that no protected species of animal or bird have been found in these areas. • There is no specific development proposed within The Bund other than the provision of safe and managed footpaths as set out in EBC local policy aspirations. • There are no ecological or environmentally protected species present on the Donkey Field. Low-key park lodges and campsite provision would have limited impact on the landscape.

SITE USERS

The Issue

MDL's Response

<p>1 Mercury is a unique marina, with a relaxed feel and a non-commercial structure. We do not want this to change.</p>	<p>The marina market is changing. Demand for berths is slowing, and interest in small boating and watersports is growing. In addition, EBC have highlighted an interest in capitalising on the marine and aviation heritage within the Hamble, and the local SPA's "Bird Aware" website has highlighted an interest in allowing Coastal Rangers access to areas in which they may educate the public with regard to bird life active on our coasts. Our local sea scouts have cited a strong interest in occupying an improved watersports facility.</p> <p>It is MDL's aspiration to retain our user base, whilst expanding our offering to enhance all site facilities and to deliver the successful, sustainable 'leisure hub' that so many want to see.</p>
<p>2 Not all Hamble Residents are sailors, how will the development benefit these people?</p>	<p>MDL wishes to provide space for residents and visitors to the Hamble to access the waterfront. Instead of only providing private marina use, we would welcome a wide range of outdoor activity enthusiasts to our site, to enjoy the unique atmosphere, facilities and relaxation that comes with being near the water. Some of these user groups are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkers • Sailors • Cyclists • Birdwatchers • Canoeists and kayakers • Paddleboarders • Fishermen/women, subject to ecological constraints
<p>3 What specific facilities would the new Heritage and Outdoor Activities' Centre include?</p>	<p>The proposals for a new heritage and outdoor activities' centre would include the following key features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A display or displays of local Hamble maritime and aviation heritage, potentially including documents, artefacts and information from local historians and/or historical or archaeological groups. • Toilets, showers, lockers and changing facilities for watersports users. • Space, internal and/or external for boat storage and boat working, including space for education, talks, events and activities. • Noticeboard for all users showing activities and events planned. • Space for the site manager to monitor access to the land and to educate visitors as to specific navigational, environmental and ecological constraints in place on any given day (i.e. high tides, weather conditions, currents, locations to avoid, travelling birds, sensitive areas, access to the slipway and pontoon, etc.) • Meeting space or workspace for a range of uses. • Flexible external space for farmers' markets, marquees for regatta events, dinghy/small craft shows, and other such public activities.
<p>4 How many people currently use Mercury?</p>	<p>Mercury is a small, shallow water, leisure marina with a significant existing leisure user base, comprising the following user groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 360 Berth holders and their families • 240 Sea Scouts (and growing) • 480 Parents (and growing) • 40-50 Marina Employees and Small Business Owners • 420 Holiday makers per annum (25% caravan park occupancy) • Unknown numbers of walkers, cyclists, fisherman, canoeists, and visitors. <p>In total we believe over 2000 people have an ongoing interest in Mercury. Of those who have responded to our survey the majority support its regeneration.</p>

Statement of Community Involvement Draft 3.0 for Mercury Forward

Prepared by Stonyrock Limited on behalf of MDL Developments Ltd



NB: This draft Statement of Community Involvement has been produced to summarize the feedback received from the initial consultation phase so that it can be shared within the project team and with other statutory consultees only. It is not a formal planning application document.

23rd January 2018

Contents

1.0	Executive summary	3
2.0	Introduction	5
2.1	Purpose of the document	5
2.2	Development site	5
2.3	Proposed development	6
3.0	Policy context	8
3.1	Local consultation policy context	8
3.2	National consultation policy context	9
4.0	Consultation	11
4.1	Engagement plan	11
4.2	Consultation area	12
4.3	Stakeholder activity	13
4.4	Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council Survey	14
4.5	Exhibition	14
5.0	Feedback	16
5.1	Summary of responses	16
5.2	Responding to feedback	22
6.0	Conclusion and next steps	24
6.1	Consultation summary	24
6.2	Ongoing engagement	24

Annexe One: Consultation materials

Annexe Two: Feedback responses

Annexe Three: Press coverage

1.0 Executive Summary

This Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been prepared on behalf of MDL Developments Ltd (MDL) by Stonyrock Limited. The SCI supports the application to regenerate the Mercury Yacht Harbour (Mercury) site in Hamble-le-Rice.

In summary:

- During autumn 2017, MDL consulted with a wide range of stakeholders and the local community on proposals for Mercury. The feedback from this consultation will inform the planning application.
- The consultation strategy has been to involve a wide range of interested parties, including:
 - Current users of the marina;
 - Business tenants
 - Berth holders
 - MDL staff
 - Other leisure users such as Scouts
 - Parish and Borough Councillors and other community groups
 - Immediate neighbours of site
 - Wider Hamble-le-rice community both business and residential
 - Technical teams at relevant authorities including planning, highways and environment.
- Our consultation strategy has been fourfold:
 - Meetings with current users of the marina
 - Meetings with political stakeholders
 - A public exhibition, preview for neighbours, distribution of a newsletter and promotion of the project website
 - Meetings between specialist members of the project team, technical consultees and council officers.
- The feedback received via the website, FREEPOST forms and at the exhibitions demonstrated that only 46% of respondents opposed the Mercury Forward vision.
- Headline figures from the consultation response;
 - 292 people attended the exhibition and preview event.
 - The newsletter was delivered to 2500 addresses in Hamble.
 - The survey could be returned by Freepost, at the exhibition (66) or filled in on the project website (80).
 - In total 146 responses were received by the closing date of 16th November.

- Question One from the survey asked if the Mercury vision went ahead what would be respondents main reason for visiting Mercury. The top five answers were;
 - Eating and drinking – 44%
 - Land based leisure (eg. Walking and cycling) – 41%
 - Water based leisure (eg. Canoeing, SUP) – 39%
 - Marina – 35%
 - Other – 30% (mostly Scouts)

- Question Two asked which aspects of our vision are most important. The top six responses were;
 - Supporting wildlife – 53%
 - Restaurant, bar and coffee shop – 40%
 - Better access to The Bund and Badnam Creek – 39.5%
 - Landscaped spaces and pathways – 39%
 - Outdoor activities centre – 35%
 - Regeneration of Mercury site – 28%

- Whilst the consultation showed general support for regeneration of Mercury it also identified comments and questions from the local community on several issues. These comments are responded to in section 5.2.

- In their undertaking of consultation for the Mercury Yacht Harbour site, MDL Developments Limited have followed best practice, the guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Eastleigh Borough Council Statement of Community Involvement.



2.0 Introduction

Stonyrock were instructed by MDL Developments Ltd in July 2017 to undertake a community engagement programme about the Mercury Forward plans. The scope of the consultation exercise was to inform local residents and stakeholders about the development and to seek feedback on the plans. The exercise complemented the consultations undertaken by other members of the project team who continue to liaise with technical consultees.

2.1 Purpose of the document

This first draft SCI summarises consultation up to the closing date of 16th November 2017, the final version will accompany the planning application and will include any further consultation that takes place as the pre-application process continues.

This document provides analysis of all responses received in the consultation until the closing date of 16th November 2017. The full feedback responses are contained in Annexe Two and have been carefully considered by the project team, any resulting changes to the masterplan will be clearly outlined in the final version of this report as the application is submitted.

2.2 Development site

Mercury is a brownfield site in the north of Hamble village, where the waters of Badnam Creek join the river Hamble. The majority of the site is within Hamble-le-Rice Parish with a small section across the boundary into Hound Parish. The site plan below shows the outline of the area being proposed for regeneration divided into the five current distinctive uses.



2.3 Proposed development

MDL is keen to build on decades of operating on the Hamble Peninsula where around 400 local people are employed across three marinas. Mercury is in need of updating and there is an opportunity in doing so to provide more community facilities within the site.



Draft masterplan and key as presented during the autumn 2017 consultation

Eastleigh Borough Council have identified Mercury as a site that is suitable for redevelopment. MDL have also been considering how best to enable regeneration at the site, much of which is under-used brownfield space.

The Mercury Forward scheme would provide the following:

- Sustainable redevelopment of an under-used brownfield site
- Improved access to the site
- New recreational space, cycle paths and walkways
- Carefully planned and fit for purpose employment space
- Enabling homes including affordable housing
- High quality design and build principles to complement the setting
- Contemporary holiday lodges and campground
- A regenerated leisure hub for the Hamble community;
 - Outdoor activities centre
 - Function space
 - New restaurant, bar and coffee shop



MERCURY MARINA
forward
MDL MARINAS

Stonyrock

- Retained and enhanced facilities for dinghies, paddleboards, canoeists and public slipway
- Supporting a healthy wildlife infrastructure through restoration of northern shores of Badnam Creek and managed access to the Bund.
- Enhancement of the Old Bursledon Conservation area.

DRAFT

3.0 Policy Context


3.1 Local consultation policy context

The Eastleigh Borough Council Statement of Community Involvement adopted in November 2015 does not set direct guidelines for developers regarding pre-application consultation. Instead it directs developers to the national policy, see below.

Planning applications

- 2.8 The duty to consult on planning applications is set out in Part 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. There are separate arrangements for listed building and conservation area consent which are set out in The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990. These specify who applicants should notify, who the local planning authority should consult and how the local planning authority should advertise and make available applications for public scrutiny and comment. Section 7 below explains how the Council will involve the community in the consideration of planning applications.
- 2.9 The NPPF also encourages developers to engage with the community before they submit their planning applications [NPPF para. 189]. Further support and guidance is also offered in the 'Before submitting an application' chapter in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Eastleigh Borough Council have recently agreed a draft Local Plan to be taken through a consultation process in 2018. The Local Plan does not provide pre-application consultation guidance for developers.



3.2 National consultation policy context

A core part of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) which was published in March 2012 is to encourage community involvement in the planning process. It is expected to be reviewed in 2018. In the Ministerial Statement at the start of the document, the Minister for Planning specifically highlights the importance of public involvement:

In order to fulfil its purpose of helping achieve sustainable development, planning must not simply be about scrutiny. Planning must be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which we live our lives.

This should be a collective enterprise. Yet, in recent years, planning has tended to exclude, rather than to include, people and communities. In part, this has been a result of targets being imposed, and decisions taken, by bodies remote from them. Dismantling the unaccountable regional apparatus and introducing neighbourhood planning addresses this.

In part, people have been put off from getting involved because planning policy itself has become so elaborate and forbidding – the preserve of specialists, rather than people in communities.

This National Planning Policy Framework changes that. By replacing over a thousand pages of national policy with around fifty, written simply and clearly, we are allowing people and communities back into planning.

The NPPF encourages applicants to engage in pre-application consultation with the local community and is referenced in the EBC SCI section above. In paragraphs 188-191, the NPPF states:

“Early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community.

“Local planning authorities have a key role to play in encouraging other parties to take maximum advantage of the pre-application stage. They cannot require that a developer engages with them before submitting a planning application, but they should encourage take-up of any pre-application services they do offer. They should also, where they think this would be beneficial, encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community before submitting their applications.

“The more issues that can be resolved at pre-application stage, the greater the benefits. For their role in the planning system to be effective and positive, statutory planning consultees will need to take the same early, pro-active approach, and provide advice in a timely manner throughout the development process. This assists local planning authorities in issuing timely decisions, helping to ensure that applicants do not experience unnecessary delays and costs.”

“The participation of other consenting bodies in pre-application discussions should enable early consideration of all the fundamental issues relating to whether a particular development will be acceptable in principle, even where other consents relating to how a development is built or operated are needed at a later stage. Wherever possible, parallel processing of other consents should be encouraged to help speed up the process and resolve any issues as early as possible.”

Significantly, the NPPF also emphasises the need for planning to take into account the needs of business and calls on local planning authorities to *“work closely with the business community to understand their changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability.”* (para 160)

The DCLG Planning Practice Guidance, ‘Before submitting an application’, is also referenced in the EBC SCI. It was revised on 26th March 2015 and states.

The value of pre-application engagement

How can pre-application engagement improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system?

Pre-application engagement by prospective applicants offers significant potential to improve both the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system and improve the quality of planning applications and their likelihood of success. This can be achieved by:

- providing an understanding of the relevant planning policies and other material considerations associated with a proposed development
- working collaboratively and openly with interested parties at an early stage to identify, understand and seek to resolve issues associated with a proposed development
- discussing the possible mitigation of the impact of a proposed development, including any planning conditions
- identifying the information required to accompany a formal planning application, thus reducing the likelihood of delays at the validation stage. The information requested must be reasonable (more information can be found in [Making an application](#)).
- putting in place a Planning Performance Agreement where this would help with managing the process and agreeing any dedicated resources for progressing the application

The approach to pre-application engagement needs to be tailored to the nature of the proposed development and the issues to be addressed.

Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 20-001-20150326

Who can be involved at the pre-application stage?

Pre-application engagement is a collaborative process between a [prospective applicant](#) and other parties which may include:

- [the local planning authority](#)
- [statutory and non-statutory consultees](#)
- elected members
- [local people](#)

It is recognised that the parties involved at the pre-application stage will vary on a case by case basis, and the level of engagement needs to be proportionate to the nature and scale of a proposed development. Each party involved has an important role to play in ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of pre-application engagement.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 Engagement plan

The extensive, open and collaborative engagement programme was designed to:

- Identify different stakeholder groups
- Prepare current users for change
- Understand the community's aspirations for the future of Mercury
- Present the regeneration proposals
- Receive the community's feedback
- Respond to the issues raised.

Communications tools used to deliver the engagement plan included:

- A public exhibition
- Letter to attend private preview of exhibition posted to 200 nearest addresses
- A flyer and emails for current Mercury users and other stakeholders
- An advert for the public exhibition in the local media
- Posters announcing the public exhibition
- Newsletters with FREEPOST form
- A dedicated project website with online 'have your say' survey
- A dedicated email address for the project
- Emails providing updates
- Dedicated meetings with current users of Mercury and both Parish councils


See Annexe One for full details of the consultation materials.



Neighbours preview of public exhibition

4.2 Consultation area

MDL wished to ensure that the whole local community was informed of the proposals. Although letters, emails, flyers, posters, website and adverts were used to advertise the exhibition and invite people to have their say, a newsletter with FREEPOST feedback mechanism was also delivered to the community. The map below shows the agreed distribution area of approx.2500 residential and commercial addresses on the Hamble peninsula. The newsletter was delivered on 20th October 2017.



4.3 Stakeholder activity

One of the early priorities of the consultation was to open a dialogue with current users of Mercury. Their feedback has been essential in developing the detail of the plans.

Current site users include the following;

MDL Berth Holders	360 owners + families
Houseboat owners	6 boats
MDL Commercial Tenants	11 small businesses, 1 club + employees
MDL Staff	44 directly employed in Hamble
Mercury restaurant – Water's Edge	2 owners + staff and customers
Riverside Holidays	32 static caravan and campground
Sea Scouts (Amazon and Hamble)	Approx 240 members + parents and leaders.

A thorough and inclusive consultation programme ran throughout the autumn. Including the following;

Activity	Date
Hamble Parish Council meeting	6th September
<i>Flyer announcing consultation issued to current site users</i>	<i>September</i>
MDL staff meeting	7th and 11th September
Mercury Berth Holders, houseboats drop in	30th September
Mercury commercial tenants meeting	3rd October
Hound Parish Council meeting	16th October
<i>Website launch, press release, press advert</i>	<i>19th October</i>
<i>Invitations to key stakeholders inviting to preview event</i>	<i>19th October</i>
<i>Letters posted to nearest 200 neighbours of site</i>	<i>19th October</i>
Hamble Parish Council – site visit	19th October
<i>Posters up on Parish Council noticeboards</i>	<i>20th October</i>
<i>Newsletter delivered to 2500 addresses on peninsula</i>	<i>20th October</i>
Stakeholder and neighbours preview of exhibition	1st November
Public exhibition	2nd November
<i>Consultation closed</i>	<i>16th November</i>
<i>Update email to subscribers</i>	<i>4th December</i>

4.4 Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council Survey

In June 2017 the Parish Council published the results of their own community survey. The survey was undertaken to enable an update to the Parish Plan. The published feedback also helped inform the draft masterplan for Mercury in particular the plans for a community outdoor activities centre. Below is a summary of the most relevant responses:-

- 152 respondents, 54% were from 35-55 age group. 63% female
- Use of foreshore and dingy park popular
- 94% use waterfront at least weekly;
 - 88% go there to walk
 - 80% to go to pubs/cafes
 - 43% to use water based leisure
- 78% say Hamble should promote tourism/visitors
- 67% at least weekly use of village recreational/sports facilities.

4.5 Exhibition

The exhibition was held at Hamble Village Memorial Hall over two days;

- Wednesday 1st November 2017, 5-9pm (Preview event)
- Thursday 2nd November 2017, 4-9pm

292 people came along over the two days. Attendees were encouraged to provide feedback through the feedback form available at the exhibition, alternatively they were able to send their feedback in through the FREEPOST forms provided. Members of the project team and technical specialists were available to answer questions:

- MDL Developments Ltd
- Yattendon (owners of MDL)
- Turley – Planning
- Paul Basham Associates – Transport
- HAB – Sustainability and development
- ProVision – Environment and Ecology
- Stonyrock - Communications

Exhibition boards were on display, providing information on the mixed-use proposals (Annex one). The information provided was focused on:

- **Regeneration of the largely brownfield site:** providing the opportunity to reclaim the boat yard for ecological restoration and enhancement.
- **Improved access to Mercury:** by enhanced vehicular access from Satchell Lane, improving connectivity via the Bund, encouraging walking and cycling routes and including adequate parking provision.
- **MDL's commitment to the Hamble:** employment and training opportunities, charity and environmental commitments.
- **Attractive new restaurant, bar and coffee shop**
- **Relocated community building:** this would provide more convenient and improved facilities for users such as the Scouts.
- **Complementing and supporting the natural setting, wildlife and views:** reflecting the unique riverside location within the historic village of Hamble.
- **High quality design and build principles:** working with HAB on design concepts MDL expect the build quality and sustainable credentials to set a new standard locally.
- **Contemporary holiday lodges:** in essence the scheme provides a deconstructed hotel and best suits modern holiday accommodation market.
- **Open air function space:** offering the community an area to meet, hold events, small boat competitions, farmers markets etc.
- **More attractive flexible employment space:** the large boat sheds are no longer fit for purpose and much of the commercial tenancies are in temporary cabins. Existing commercial marina space will be replaced 1:1 in more efficiently designed buildings offering flexibility of uses.
- **Restoration of Badnam Creek and the Bund:** using the waterfront for walking and cycling is one of the most popular activities for local people. Restoring Badnam Creek and the Bund will enable further leisure activity around the Mercury site.

5.0 Feedback


5.1 Summary of responses

Feedback forms were available at the public exhibition, on the dedicated website and included in the newsletters posted to 2500 addresses on the Hamble peninsula. In total, 146 feedback forms were returned. All of the response detail is contained in Annex 2. Summaries of the responses received are listed below:

Question 1.

If our vision goes ahead what would be your main reason for visiting Mercury?


Answered: 140 Skipped: 6





Question 1. Other responses:

From the other section the most popular reason for visiting was Scouts as can be seen from the categorizing of the answers below.



Question 1 – Summary of responses.


The vast majority of respondents to question one see Mercury as a valuable water sports and outdoor leisure asset.



Question 2.

Which aspects of our vision are most important to you? (Please tick your top three only)

Answered: 134 Skipped: 12



Question 2 – Summary of responses.

The redevelopment of Mercury is very important to respondents - taking part in rejuvenated facilities dominates responses. The focus is clearly on the non-revenue generating community and wildlife benefits of the scheme.

Question 3. Is there anything else you would like to see provided at Mercury?

81 people gave responses to question three, their answers have been grouped into 25 categories and are included in Annex 2. The most popular suggestions were;

Category	Number of comments
Improved Scout/community facilities, with showers and storage	17
Other water based leisure such as paddleboarding, canoeing	12
Improved access both on and to the site	11
Maintaining and improving the public slipway	11
Small boat and yacht storage	9

Other suggestions included a children's play area, boat trips, ferry, spa, swimming pool, removal of overhead cables, boat hoist, lighting.


Question 3 – Summary of responses.

A significant number of respondents would welcome the new outdoor activity centre facility and value the benefits it would bring to the Hamble.

Question 4.

Do our plans for Mercury Forward match your own vision for the site?

Answered: 137 Skipped: 9



Question 4 – Summary of responses.

25% of respondents support the development. 29% of respondents "don't know" if they can support the development. If concerns related to traffic volume, road safety and pedestrian access can be dealt with it is expected that public support for the development would increase. Respondents may also benefit from more information on the commercial viability of the scheme in order to understand the necessity for the enabling homes.

Question 5. Do you have any other comments on our vision?

111 people responded to question five. Their answers have been grouped into 19 categories and are included in Annex 2. All the comments received have been reviewed, analysed and categorized. Below is a list of the most frequently mentioned categories.

Category	Number of comments
Traffic	34
Homes negative	24
Local infrastructure	20
Access	15
Road safety	14
Wildlife and setting	12
Marina use	12


Question 5 – Summary of responses.

Anti-housing comments are to be expected in any application which incorporates new housing. But even with this in mind, the numbers of plainly supportive comments were very high. MDL believe many of the concerns raised can be mitigated and have responded to them in more detail in section 5.2.

Question 6.

Do you wish to be kept updated about our proposal?

Answered: 145 Skipped: 1



Categories

The following is a list of the categories used to group responses in questions 1, 3 and 5.

Access	Boat storage	Building height
Business use	General concern	General object
General support	Greenfield	Homes positive
Homes negative	Local infrastructure	Marina use
Noise pollution	Parking	Road safety
Scouts/community use	Traffic	Wildlife/setting
Boat trips/ferry	Camping	Doctors on site
Fishing	Hoist	Hotel
Kids play area	Land based leisure	Restaurant/bar
Shop on site	Slipway	Sustainability
Water based leisure	To live	Uncategorised

DRAFT

5.2 Responding to the feedback

The project team have reviewed each individual comment received. Whilst the majority of comments supported regeneration of Mercury and improved community access and facilities, we have focused on responding to concerns raised. The responses are in conjunction with feedback received from Council officers and other statutory consultees.

Feedback	Response
<p>Traffic: Concern with Hamble Lane particularly but also M27, Satchell Lane junction and village more generally.</p>	<p>We recognise that local residents will have concerns about traffic. Our transport consultants Paul Basham Associates have been working with the Highways Authority to discuss how best to mitigate concerns.</p> <p>It is also noted that Hampshire County Council are currently running their own consultation on roads locally and have held events in Hamble specifically covering localised issues.</p> <p>Measures that we are considering to reduce car usage include a dedicated bus to the village and other marinas, improved access, footpaths and cycleways.</p> <p>Eastleigh Borough Council's own assessment of the site against NPPF shows a nominal impact on transport sustainability would arise as a result of developing the site.</p>
<p>Homes negative: either not wanting homes at all or would like fewer homes.</p>	<p>The scheme is not viable without the enabling homes.</p> <p>Guidance from the MHCLG expects that local authorities take a "brownfield first" approach to development.</p> <p>New homes are required for community gain as set out in EBC Policy HA2.</p>
<p>Local infrastructure: doctors and school places</p>	<p>If permission is granted the Council will determine the S106 contribution to be made in respect of local infrastructure.</p>
<p>Access: concerns regarding;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. entrance to site 2. public use 3. alternative routes 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. entrance to site – Paul Basham are discussing the access to the site (including widening the access road) and improvements to Satchell Lane with HCC. 2. A core goal of the vision is to provide better public use and access to Mercury including an improved public slipway. 3. Through improvements to pathways and the introduction of cycleways alternative linkages to the village are provided.



	<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. MDL could provide a mini-bus service to the other Hamble marinas, village shops and station.5. Improved train timetables for the Solent Metro train service are being discussed with Network Rail.6. Visibility displays on Satchell Lane can be improved.7. Footpaths will be possible on MDL land.
<p>Road safety: concerns regarding Satchell Lane; narrow, blind bends, no pavement, no cyclepaths.</p>	<p>MDL are discussing these issues with HCC, some of the proposed solutions are noted above.</p> <p>Encouraging sustainable transport and safe routes to school is a priority.</p>
<p>Wildlife/setting: mostly comments were positive. Ecological enhancement of the site is welcomed. The design and views of the site were also raised.</p>	<p>MDL have held sustainability and environmental rejuvenation at the centre of their plans for Mercury. This includes restoring the more sensitive northern shore of Badnam Creek and enhanced views from Old Bursledon Conservation Area.</p> <p>Elsewhere, the Bund which is private land will be opened for public access and properly managed so that the ecology is disturbed less than through current trespassing.</p> <p>The building design and layout will be sympathetic to all views, including from Satchell Lane and from the Hamble River itself.</p> <p>MDL are determined to maintain the relaxed feel of Mercury that is dependent on the unique setting.</p>
<p>Marina: comments referenced the historic use of Mercury as a marina and boat yard and wished to see this maintained and prioritised. Concerns were raised about boat storage and parking facilities.</p>	<p>MDL are currently making improvements to the hoist and boat storage facilities at Hamble Point which they expect will be welcomed by their customers at Mercury. There is an additional hoist at HYS in Port Hamble.</p> <p>The marina will have its own dedicated car park for berth holders.</p>

6.0 Conclusions and next steps

6.1 Consultation summary

- Key activities in the on-going consultation programme for Mercury have included stakeholder meetings, public exhibitions, newsletters, dedicated project website and online and freepost response functions.
- MDL have carefully reviewed the community's response to their consultation and are delighted that so many people are interested in securing its future.
- The majority of respondents support Mercury being reinvigorated and value the non-revenue generation elements of the project such as improved access and nature conservation.
- Plans for a new Outdoor Activities Centre are extremely popular.
- MDL's draft masterplan carefully brings together the aspirations of EBC, Hamble and Hound Parish Councils, the Hamble community and current users. We believe that alternative options for the site would fail to deliver these shared aspirations.

6.2 Ongoing engagement

Following the submission of the planning application MDL is committed to continuing dialogue with local residents and stakeholders.

MDL will maintain their dedicated website and email updates throughout the planning process and through construction if planning permission is granted.

MDL Developments Limited

24 January 2018

Hamble Parish Council
Hamble Parish Council Clerk
Hound Parish Council
Hound Parish Council Clerk

Re: Mercury Consultation Report

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Councillors;

Firstly, Happy New Year to you all. When we met to discuss our plans for Mercury Yacht Harbour in the autumn last year I promised to update you on our community consultation findings early in 2018.

The detailed consultation report (attached with annexes) is in the format of a **Statement of Community Involvement** so that it will sit in the suite of submission documents submitted to Eastleigh Borough Council as part of any potential planning application. Also enclosed is our **Key Facts** document for Mercury.

MDL are delighted that we had a similar number of responses (146) to that of the Hamble Parish Council Residents' Survey (159) undertaken in June of last year. We are also pleased that the overall message from the community was very much the same. It is clear that as a group, Hamble residents are reasonable, active and involved people. It is also clear that our plans for a 'leisure hub' and/or 'heritage and outdoor activities centre' were extremely popular, particularly with key representatives of the 750+ individuals involved in local scouting and canoeing groups from Hamble and outlying areas such as Hedge End. With these users in mind, our revised proposals are likely to suggest that any outdoor activities centre should provide more facilities than previously planned.

On the basis of this community-focused and collaborative approach, it is our experience that the majority of respondents absolutely understand the essential need to regenerate Mercury before it deteriorates further. They understand the need to 'promote growth rather than manage decline', and they understand the common sense behind MDL's offer to convert surplus brownfield land to form part of an 'outstanding, sustainable, mixed-use community' which would fund the non-revenue generating elements of the scheme which they value so highly.

MDL Developments Limited

Unfortunately for our extensive group of users, Eastleigh Borough Council do not share their enthusiasm, and appear to be in a non-collaborative mood. Council Leaders have dismissed any meeting which raises the issue of housing on any part of our brownfield land, and have discouraged the planning policy team from reviewing what our professional advisors suggest is very flawed logic behind preventing any new housing in the Hamble.

Whilst our users have voiced their strong disappointment that such a potential opportunity has been dismissed, MDL are a leisure provider, and we must continue to work toward what we see as the leisure focus of our scheme. With this in mind, we have prepared a **Key Facts** document to help better understand and unpick some of the barriers to our well-considered and well-researched regeneration plan.

We are adamant that our proposals represent the best possible, deliverable solution for the watersports community and the long-term future of the site. Our brownfield land is not only suitable for development, but is available, achievable (with an element of mixed-use residential allocation), and beneficial to the local community. Furthermore, we believe that alternative options such as a commercial scheme would fail to deliver the complex mix of uses required.

I hope that you feel free to discuss the above and enclosed with us at your convenience. I would welcome your feedback, and if appropriate, another collaborative meeting in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Kristi Roger RIBA AssocRICS

Head of Property Development, Yattendon Group

On behalf of MDL Developments Limited

Tel: 01635 203 929

Email: kristi.roger@yattendon.co.uk

Enc: Statement of Community Involvement
Key Facts Document

A landscape photograph of a mountain range with a large tree in the foreground, overlaid with a diagonal white-to-purple gradient. The mountains are rugged and layered, with a misty valley below. The tree is a large, dark, rounded tree in the lower right foreground.

SME Services

Why LSI?

Established in the utility industry since 1994, LSI provides its clients with the best possible solution for their utility tendering requirements and ongoing management of their contracts in a dynamic market. Many of our competitors promise cheap prices but we believe we are second to none when it comes to after-sales service.

- o Price advantage through LSI's buying strategies. This allows our clients to benefit from our economies of scale, which they would not be able to achieve in their own right
- o Live trading screens, which allow LSI to monitor the market constantly.
- o Experienced industry-trained staff.
- o Award Winning customer service and consultancy services.

SME Energy Services

LSI has an array of services that have been tailored and focused to the SME sector. Our years of experience in the market have helped us to understand the specific areas in which SME's can benefit and LSI will work with your business to help you not only reduce the cost of your energy but also reduce the amount of energy you consume.

Simple Price Comparisons

We cut through energy jargon and simply show you what you will be paying on a yearly basis for your gas and electricity.

Site Energy Audits

We will visit your site(s) and carry out full audits to help reduce your energy consumption.

Energy Reporting

You can't manage what you can't measure, we will report your usage and recommend efficiency upgrades.

Account Management

All customers receive a named Account Manager to assist with any queries.

Siteworks/Metering

Our dedicated site works team coordinate all functions required to install new metering systems.

Invoice Validation

Comprehensive reports detailing correct and incorrect invoices.



Village Hall



Saving of: **£880**

Parish Council



Saving of: **£1,021**

Textile Company



Saving of: **£2,572**

High Street Store



Saving of: **£118**

Butcher



Saving of: **£309**

Restaurant



Saving of: **£1,021**

What Do Our Customers Say About Our Service:

"The service LSI offer us is detailed, easy to understand and their cost analysis process was essential in helping us budget for the year ahead."

Mick Everett, Head of Operations, Charlton Athletic

"LSI and the team are professional and efficient and have worked extremely hard on our behalf to obtain the best prices and contracts that work for our business."

Tracey Storey, Managing Director, Happy Child Limited

"We anticipate making savings of up to £3,500 a year on our gas supplies. The LSI staff have been extremely helpful and efficient in their efforts to secure a good deal for the Council."

Reg Williams, City Clerk, Salisbury City Council

"On speaking with LSI they were helpful and very informed about the marketplace. We agreed upon a day that prices would be obtained, it was a straightforward and professional service."

Janet Stables, Business Manager, The Station

"Just a quick note of thanks in recognition of all the work that you and your team have undertaken in dealing with the enquiries that have come from NCVO member organisations ... I therefore have no hesitation in recommending your company to others."

Chris Taylor, Business Development Manager, National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO)

"I want to place on record my thanks and appreciation to LSI for securing significant savings on our gas and electricity contracts. I cannot speak highly enough of your company and would recommend LSI to every business."

Mike Kennedy, Town Clerk and Chief Executive, Henley-On-Thames Town Council

Contact Us

Telephone

01727 877 020

Email

enquiries@lsienergy.com

Website

www.lsienergy.com

Address

Hastings House,
12 Park Industrial Estate
Park Street,
Frogmore,
St Albans,
AL2 2DR

Parish Biodiversity Action Plan

Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council



Sarah Jackson
January 2018

Acknowledgements

Arcadian Ecology & Consulting Ltd were contracted by Jeanette Symes, Assistant Clerk, Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council, to deliver this work.

Publication Details

This document should be cited as: Jackson, S. (2018) *Parish Biodiversity Action Plan: Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council*. Arcadian Ecology & Consulting Ltd, Curdridge.

Arcadian Ecology & Consulting Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust.

Maps reproduced under Ordnance Survey licence no. 100015632 with the permission of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Crown Copyright 2018. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Front Cover: Hamble Green by Sarah Jackson

Published by:
Arcadian Ecology & Consulting Ltd.
Beechcroft House
Vicarage Lane
Curdridge
Hampshire
SO32 2DP

A company Ltd by guarantee & registered in England No. 10033962.

All assessments and recommendations provided are based on the information available to Arcadian Ecology & Consulting Ltd (Arcadian Ecology), and Arcadian Ecology endeavours to ensure all advice is accurate and appropriate at the time of publication. However, it is the sole responsibility of the recipient to ensure that any actions they take are both legally and contractually compliant, and Arcadian Ecology does not accept responsibility or liability for any losses incurred or arising from the advice we provide.

No part of this document may be reproduced without permission. Information contained in this report is intended for Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council. Records of protected and notable species may be forwarded to relevant recording organisations with site names removed. All other information in this report should not be passed on to any third party without the express permission of Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council and Arcadian Ecology. For information on how to obtain further copies of this document and accompanying data please contact Arcadian Ecology: arcadian@hiwwt.org.uk.

Document Control

Version	Author name	Date	Signed off by	Date
<i>Draft</i>	<i>Sarah Jackson</i>	<i>17.11.2017</i>	<i>Deborah Whitfield</i>	<i>22.11.2017</i>
<i>Draft V2</i>	<i>Sarah Jackson</i>	<i>24.11.2017</i>	<i>Deborah Whitfield</i>	<i>24.11.2017</i>
<i>Final</i>	<i>Sarah Jackson</i>	<i>19.01.2018</i>	<i>Deborah Whitfield</i>	

Executive Summary

Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council are keen to document, enhance and protect biodiversity within the Hamble-le-Rice parish. They intend to engage the local community, gather information on local wildlife and use this to produce a local biodiversity action plan. The council have sought advice from the Hampshire & Isle Wight Wildlife Trust's ecological consultancy Arcadian Ecology on how to achieve this and commissioned them to produce a Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).

The first step in assessment was an extended Phase 1 habitat survey, this was undertaken on 28th September 2017 and identifies the key habitat types, potential species they could support and informs actions for the BAP.

The survey sites were primarily amenity grassland, but did also include areas of woodland, scrub, and coastal habitats such as saltmarsh, coastal woodland and shingle.

The information gathered during surveys was used to create an action table for the parish, including both location specific and parish wide actions.

Some actions are enhancing features that have already been created to benefit biodiversity such as changing mowing regimes; while others are new ideas for example the creation of a wildlife pond in the cemetery.

By implementing the actions of the BAP the parish will enhance the biodiversity value of the parish, both for the benefit of wildlife and people.

Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1.	Background.....	1
1.2.	Site Description.....	1
1.3.	Remit and Scope of the Report	1
2.	BIODIVERSITY AND LEGISLATION.....	2
2.1.	Value of Biodiversity	2
2.2.	Planning & Biodiversity	4
2.2.1.	<i>Protecting Habitats and Species</i>	5
2.3.	Legal context for Protection of Biodiversity	5
2.3.1.	<i>European Directives</i>	5
2.3.2.	<i>UK Legislation</i>	6
3.	CURRENT STATUS OF BIODIVERSITY	7
3.1.	Background Data Search.....	7
3.2.	Phase 1 Habitat Survey Methodology	7
3.3.	Background Data Search Results	8
3.3.1.	<i>Protected and notable species</i>	8
3.3.2.	<i>Statutory and non-statutory designated sites</i>	8
3.4.	Phase 1 Habitat Survey Results.....	9
3.4.1.	<i>Summary</i>	9
3.4.2.	<i>Allotments</i>	9
3.4.3.	<i>Cemetery</i>	10
3.4.4.	<i>College playing field</i>	10
3.4.5.	<i>Donkey derby field</i>	10
3.4.6.	<i>Hamble green</i>	10
3.4.7.	<i>Heather gardens</i>	10
3.4.8.	<i>Mercury marshes</i>	11
3.4.9.	<i>Mount pleasant</i>	11
3.4.10.	<i>Westfield common</i>	11
4.	ACTION TABLE.....	12
4.1.	Hamble-le-Rice Action Table	13
5.	REFERENCES.....	24

MAPS

- Map 1: Parish Boundary
Map 2: Phase 1 Habitat Survey Locations

PHOTOGRAPHS

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Map showing extent of background data search area
- Appendix 2: Protected and notable species background data search results
- Appendix 3: Map showing location of statutory designated sites
- Appendix 4: Map showing location of non-statutory designated sites
- Appendix 5: Botanical species list compiled during Phase 1 habitat survey with a qualitative measure of abundance based on DAFOR scale
- Appendix 6: Bog garden creation
- Appendix 7: Natural England Technical Information Note TIN064: Sward enhancement

GLOSSARY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Hamble-le-Rice Parish Council are keen to document, enhance and protect biodiversity within the Hamble-le-Rice parish. They intend to engage the local community, gather information on local wildlife and use this to produce a local biodiversity action plan. The council have sought advice from the Hampshire & Isle Wight Wildlife Trust's ecological consultancy Arcadian Ecology on how to achieve this and commissioned them to produce a Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).

1.2. Site Description

The parish of Hamble-le-Rice (SU 473 067) covers an area of approximately 550 hectares (Map 1). The parish lies within Eastleigh District Council, and sits on a peninsula bounded by the River Hamble to the east and Southampton Water to the west, with the neighbouring settlements of Netley and Bursledon to the north.

The parish comprises the main settlement running across the centre of the parish, with areas of greenspace either side of an oil terminal to the south, and amenity areas and educational facilities bounding a disused airfield to the north. There are marinas along the eastern boundary of the parish, on the River Hamble.

The parish has a strong association with the water, but is also well connected by greenspaces to the neighbouring parishes, including Royal Victoria Country Park to the west, and other areas of amenity grassland, farmland, woodland and natural green spaces.

1.3. Remit and Scope of the Report

This report will assess the current ecological status of nine Hamble-le-Rice parish council sites and make recommendations on how to improve the biodiversity of the parish through a Biodiversity Action Plan.

2. BIODIVERSITY AND LEGISLATION

2.1. Value of Biodiversity

The State of Nature report 2013 identifies the biodiversity losses the UK has suffered, with over 60% of species having declined in the last 50 years (Burns *et al.* 2013). The latest State of Nature report, published in 2016, further highlights the declines with 56% of species having declined between 1970 and 2013; 40% of which demonstrated a strong or moderate decline (Hayhow *et al.* 2016). This is significant not just for the species and the functioning of the environment, but for the human health, well-being and the economic sustainability of the UK.

The economic value of biodiversity has been brought in to focus through ecosystem services. They identify the importance of biodiversity not only for the production of food, fuel etc., but also for the health and well-being of the population.

Ecosystem services are fundamental to understanding the value of ecosystems and their components: water, soil, nutrients and organisms; and how these natural resources are utilised and managed for sustainable development with long-term benefits.

They can be classified in to 4 key services (Ecosystem Services 2013):

Supporting services: Key services for the production of all our services such as photosynthesis, soil formation and water cycling


Provisioning services: Products sourced from ecosystems including fuel, food, fresh water and pharmaceuticals

Regulating services: Benefits gained from regulation of ecosystem processes such as climate regulation, disease regulation, pollination and water regulation

Cultural services: Non-material enhancements people gain from ecosystems which include recreational experiences, spiritual enrichment and cognitive development

www.ecosystems-services.org.uk

Biodiversity and the environment are underfunded, under-valued and not invested in. In the financial year 2015-16, the public sector spending on UK biodiversity was £453 million, equivalent to £2.40 in every £10,000 of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which is a decrease of 6% since 2014-15 (JNCC 2017). Whilst this is a short term decrease there has been an overall long-term (since 2000-01) increase in spending on biodiversity in the UK (Figure 1). However, this figure is not reflective of the economic importance of biodiversity.



Notes:

1. Deflated using UK Gross Domestic Product Deflator.
2. Non-governmental spend is net of government funding.
3. Small revisions to past data as a result of improved estimation methodology can mean this chart is not directly comparable to previously published versions.

Source: Defra, Her Majesty's Treasury.

Figure 1. Expenditure on biodiversity in the UK, 2000-01 to 2015-16 (<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4251>)

Green spaces and contact with nature also provide a number of health and well-being benefits. A study by the University of Essex of behalf of The Wildlife Trusts, identified that volunteering improved people’s mental wellbeing in 6 to 12 weeks. In addition to higher levels of mental wellbeing, the study also found a range of other benefits to nature volunteering, including increased feelings of positivity, levels of physical activity and contact with nature (Rogerson *et al.* 2017).

The Every Child Outdoors report identified the positive impacts that contact with nature has on young people’s education, health and well-being, and personal and social skills, creating more responsible citizens. Children who connected with nature were also more likely to be interested in the environment and take part in nature-based activities (RSPB 2010).

Citizen science plays a key role in the recording and understanding of UK wildlife. With over 70,000 species of plant, animal and fungi currently found in the UK, it is essential for monitoring how species are responding to the ecological pressures currently faced in the UK. There are currently over 200 voluntary wildlife recording initiatives in the UK, recording 4.5 million wildlife observations annually (Hayhow *et al.* 2016). In Hampshire there are a number of specialist recording groups such as Hampshire mammal group, Hampshire bat group and Hampshire fungus recording group, as well as opportunities to submit data particularly with the promotion of online recording systems such as Living Record.

2.2. Planning & Biodiversity

Biodiversity is a key consideration in local decision making. Any new build or renovation plans in the parish should take the following into consideration.

The **National Planning Policy Framework** (NPPF) sets out the Government's requirements for the planning system and the development of local and neighbourhood plans. It sets out the purpose of the planning system; to achieve sustainable development through 3 key areas; economic, social and environmental. The environmental strand includes the protection and enhancement of the natural environment and improving biodiversity.

The NPPF highlights key points for consideration in relation to green space and biodiversity:

- the *promotion of healthy communities* requiring access to high quality open spaces including the ability to designate land as Local Green Space;
- the *protection of green belt land* to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, prevent neighbouring towns merging, preserve the setting and character of historic towns, assist in urban regeneration and to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; and
- *conserving and enhancing the natural environment* through protection of valued landscapes, recognition of the benefits of ecosystem services, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible.

Natural Environment White Paper (The Natural Choice: Securing the value of nature) provides a 'clear framework for protecting and enhancing the things that nature gives us for free' (www.gov.uk). Published in 2011, it outlines the Government's vision for the natural environment over the next 50 years and links with the National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA 2011) and Making Space for Nature (Saltmarsh, N. 2011).

Key measures in the White paper include:

- **Reconnecting Nature**
 - Nature Improvement Areas
 - Biodiversity offsetting
 - New local nature partnerships
 - Phasing out use of natural peat
- **Connecting people and nature for better quality of life**
 - Green areas designation
 - Green spaces
 - More children experiencing nature by learning outdoors
 - Strengthening local public health activities
 - New environmental volunteering initiative "Muck in 4 life"
- **Capturing and improving the value of nature**
 - natural capital committee
 - an annual statement of green accounts for UK Plc
 - a business-led task force

Green Infrastructure is the planning and delivery of a network of high quality green spaces and other environmental spaces at the strategic level which support the well-being of local communities. The areas should be publicly accessible and multi-functional. Winchester undertook a Green Infrastructure (GI) Study in 2010 to identify local assets and provide a locally distinctive definition of Green Infrastructure in support of policies in the Local Plan. For the district, GI encompasses the natural and semi-natural areas within and between settlements which benefit health and well-being, support sustainable travel, green tourism and adaptation to climate change (Enfusion 2010).

Making Space for Nature (Lawton review) was a review of England's wildlife sites and ecological network submitted to DEFRA by Sir John Lawton in 2010. The review introduced the concept of "More, bigger, better and joined"

Two key elements to the review were rebuilding nature and establishing an ecological network, with key factors identified to achieving them.

Rebuilding nature

Five key approaches:

- Improve quality of current sites through better habitat management
- Increase the size of current wildlife sites
- Enhance connections between sites via corridors or stepping stones
- Create new sites
- Improve the wider environment to reduce pressure on wildlife, including the buffering of wildlife sites

Establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network

This should be underpinned by 3 key objectives:

- to restore appropriate species and habitats
- to restore and secure the long-term sustainability of ecological and physical processes (enhancing the ability to deliver ecosystem services)
- provide access natural environments rich in wildlife for all

(Lawton, J. 2010)

The **England Biodiversity Strategy 2020** identifies how international and EU commitments are being implemented, setting out the strategic direction for biodiversity policy on land and at sea. Its mission is 'to halt overall biodiversity loss, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people.' (DEFRA 2011c)

Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) are the regional priority areas of opportunity for restoration and creation of Biodiversity Action Plan habitats (SEB Strategy 2013), which is undertaken on a landscape-scale enabling the development of ecological networks. There are two partially within Hamble-le-Rice parish boundary: Hamble Valley and The Solent.

Living Landscapes is a Wildlife Trust initiative to restore, recreate and reconnect isolated habitats to make the whole landscape more wildlife-friendly. There is one partial living landscape area in the parish: East Solent Havens and Harbours.

2.2.1. Protecting Habitats and Species

The threat from development to protected habitats and species is on-going, resulting in habitat loss, reduction and fragmentation.

Obtaining protected species information to help support a case against inappropriate development and/or inappropriate mitigation is important. More information on how to comment on planning applications can be found on the Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust's website: <http://www.hiwwt.org.uk/we-influence-planning-systems>

In order to establish what species are present, a first step would be to request a background data for protected and notable species from Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC), the counties central repository for species records. Bat records are available separately from Hampshire Bat Group. This could then be supplemented by up-to-date surveys by local species groups, such as Hampshire bat group, volunteers and/or independent surveyors.

2.3. Legal context for Protection of Biodiversity

2.3.1. European Directives

The parish has three designated sites partially within its boundary; Solent and Southampton Water SPA, Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar and Solent Maritime SAC.

European designated sites are the Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection areas (SPA) and Ramsar sites (areas of international wetland importance). Together, these are known as 'Natura 2000' sites and are protected by European legislation. These directives all have implications

for local decision making and special care must be taken to ensure decisions and plans do not adversely impact on these European sites, the species or features for which they have been designated.

Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (the 'Habitats Directive') and **Directive 2009/147/EC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (the 'Birds Directive')**; These directives provide for the protection of European species and the habitats that support them including their habitats outside the designated areas.

Directive 92/43/EEC (the Water Framework Directive); This requires member states to achieve stated targets for the protection and improvement of inland and coastal waters. The directive identifies 30 measures to assess and classify waterbodies, which includes their ecological status.

(Note: Full information on these directives can be found on the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) website.)

The Hamble Estuary Partnership has guiding principles to ensure a collective approach. This includes one focusing on nature conservation, which at its broadest level is to encourage and enhance nature conservation interests of the Hamble in a sustainable manner (HCC 2015).

This legislation is translated into UK law by **The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010** (commonly known as 'The Habitats Regulations').

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

Where impacts cannot be avoided or satisfactorily reduced/mitigated, the competent authority will need to ascertain that the plan or project will not have a negative impact on the designated site populations, which would otherwise constitute an adverse effect on the integrity of the international site as a whole.

**Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (the 'Habitats Directive'); and Directive 2009/147/EC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (the 'Birds Directive').*

2.3.2. UK Legislation

The **Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006** requires every local authority to have regard to conserving biodiversity in the execution of their functions. Section 41 of the act lists 65 priority habitats and 1150 priority species, all of which are identified on the 'UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework' which succeeded the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, which should be taken into consideration by local authorities when implementing their duty under the NERC Act.

The **Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981** aimed to consolidate and amend national legislation to implement the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds (Birds Directive), which has since been replaced by Directive 2009/147/EC. This piece of legislation has been amended numerous times, and there is a statutory five year review of Schedules 5 and 8 (protected wild animals and plants) and period review of Schedule 9 (non-native species).

3. CURRENT STATUS OF BIODIVERSITY

The current status of biodiversity in the parish has been assessed through undertaking a series of botanical surveys at nine key sites identified by the parish council, to establish the habitats and potential species they can support, and are present in the parish.

Whilst these methods will not capture everything present, they will give an indication of current biodiversity interest and highlight areas for improvement for inclusion in the action plan.

3.1. Background Data Search

A data search of Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC) protected and notable species GIS layer was undertaken for records within 2km of the parish. Species included in the search parameters are:

- species that are protected by international law;
- species listed in European directives and legislation;
- nationally protected species under The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Badgers Act 1992 and The Deer Act 1991;
- all species listed as Red or Amber on the Birds of Conservation Concern 2002-2007;
- plant species that are Nationally Rare or Nationally Scarce; and
- species that have Action Plans under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) or are Priority Species under the Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan (HBAP).

A data search was made for statutory (those that are internationally and nationally important sites for ecology) and non-statutory (those that are important in a local context) sites designated for nature conservation within 1km of the site boundary. This search included Special Protection Area (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Ramsar, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).

A map indicating the extent of the data search areas is provided in Appendix 1.

3.2. Phase 1 Habitat Survey Methodology

An extended Phase 1 habitat survey was conducted on 28th September 2017 by Sarah Jackson (MCIEEM) and Deborah Whitfield of Arcadian Ecology & Consulting Ltd.

Nine key areas were identified by the parish council as priority for survey (Map 2). These were:

- Allotments
- Cemetery
- College playing field
- Donkey derby field
- Hamble green
- Heather gardens
- Mercury marshes
- Mount pleasant
- Westfield common

The Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) methodology for Phase 1 habitat survey was followed (Joint Nature Conservation Committee, 2010). A walkover survey of the site was undertaken, with areas classified and mapped using a standard set of colours on a Phase 1 Habitat Map to indicate the habitat types present. For each different habitat type a species list was compiled, with particular reference to protected, notable or BAP species; this list will not give every species found on the site, but will give a representation of the diversity, significance, and dominance of plant species found within each habitat type. The location of descriptions relating to specific areas and features of interest or note were annotated on the Phase 1 Habitat Map using Target Notes.

Plant nomenclature in this report follows Rose (1989; 2006) for native and naturalised species of vascular plant. Plant names in the text are given with the common names first, followed by the

scientific name in italics. Where there is a degree of doubt in the identification of a plant, 'cf.' precedes the specific epithet to signify the plant is very probably the species indicated, but it was not possible to distinguish it from similar members of the genus with certainty.

3.3. Background Data Search Results

3.3.1. Protected and notable species

The background data search returned 5767 records for 456 protected and/or notable species, within 2km of the parish boundary. Of these, there were 444 records of 154 species specified as being within the parish. A breakdown by group is given in Table 2. .

Table 2. Background data search results

Group	Number of Species	Number of Species Specified as in Parish
Amphibians & Reptiles	7	3
Birds	140	77
Higher Plants - Ferns	3	-
Higher Plants - Flowering Plants	126	34
Higher Plants – Horsetails	1	-
Invertebrates – Araneae (Spiders)	1	-
Invertebrates – Blattaria (Cockroaches)	3	3
Invertebrates – Coleoptera (Beetles)	41	9
Invertebrates – Dermaptera (Earwigs)	1	1
Invertebrates – Diptera (Flies)	5	2
Invertebrates – Hemiptera (True bugs)	9	1
Invertebrates –Hymenoptera (Bees)	13	1
Invertebrates – Lepidoptera (Butterflies & Moths)	71	9
Invertebrates – Mollusca	2	-
Invertebrates – Odonata (Dragonflies & Damselflies)	5	1
Invertebrates – Orthoptera (Grasshoppers & crickets)	2	1
Lichens	1	1
Lower Plants – Liverworts, Hornworts & Mosses	9	1
Mammals – Marine	2	1
Mammals - Terrestrial (bats)	9	8
Mammals - Terrestrial (non-bats)	5	1

Full results are provided in Appendix 2.

3.3.2. Statutory and non-statutory designated sites

There are four statutory designated sites at least partially within the parish boundary, Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen Estuary SSSI, Solent Maritime SAC, Solent & Southampton Water SPA and Solent & Southampton Water Ramsar. In addition, Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes, and Hythe to Calshot Marshes SSSI are within 2km of the parish boundary. As shown on the map in Appendix 3.

Seven non-statutory designated sites, SINCs, are found either entirely or partially within the parish boundary, as detailed in Table 4 and shown on the map in Appendix 4. In addition, there are a further 40 SINCs within 2km of the parish, which have been included on the map in Appendix 4.

Table 4. SINC's within Hamble Le Rice parish boundary

SINC Ref	SINC Name	Central Grid Ref.	SINC Criteria	Notables
EA0077	Hamble Common North	SU48200640	2A	
EA0083	Mercury Marsh South	SU48450745	4A	
EA0076	Hamble Common West	SU48200620	3A/3Bii	
EA0085	Mercury Marina Saltmarsh	SU48600800	4A/6A	Althaea officinalis (Marsh-Mallow) [NS]; Lotus glaber (Narrow-Lvd Bird's-Foot-Trefoil) [CS]; Oenanthe lachenalii (Parsley Water-Dropwort) [CS]; Polypogon monspeliensis (Annual Beard-Grass) [NS]; Puccinellia distans (Reflexed Saltmarsh-Grass) [CS]
EA0055	Petters Copse	SU47300670	1A	
EA0147	Netley to Hamble Shore	SU46470734	4A	
EA0047	West Wood (Royal Victoria Country Park)	SU47000750	1A/1Cii/5B	

3.4. Phase 1 Habitat Survey Results

A summary of the Phase 1 habitat survey, plus more detailed descriptions of each of the survey sites is provided below. A full species list is provided in Appendix 5.

3.4.1. Summary

Habitats

There are a range of habitats present across the parish, including amenity grassland, woodland, scrub, and coastal habitats such as saltmarsh, coastal woodland and shingle. The most dominant habitat, amenity grassland, is of limited ecological value, however the edge habitats which include hedgerows and trees create diversity, structure and cover, which is able to support a range of species.

Protected and Notable Species

No protected or notable species were recorded during the Phase 1 habitat survey. However, based on the habitat types and features identified around the parish, it is considered that the parish has the potential to support common amphibians, common and widespread reptiles, bats, birds including wader species, and common and widespread invertebrates.

Conclusion

Hamble-le-Rice has a range of habitats, with linked areas of green space within the parish and to the wider landscape offering opportunities for species to move around the landscape. Whilst many of the high ecological value habitats are not extensive, they offer important space for foraging and shelter, particularly for invertebrates, which in turn provides a food source for bats and birds.

Further enhancements to the parish could be made, and more detail is included in the biodiversity action tables.

3.4.2. Allotments

The allotments are an approximately 0.5 hectare area divided into plots, growing a variety of fruits, vegetables and flowers (Photograph 1). The area is bounded by grasses, forbs, ruderals and trees,

including cock's-foot *Dactylis glomerata*, false oat grass *Arrhenatherum elatius*, herb-robert *Geranium robertianum*, ivy *Hedera helix*, common nettle *Urtica dioica* and ash *Fraxinus excelsior*.

3.4.3. Cemetery

The cemetery to the south of St Andrews Church is mainly an area of rough grassland bounded by trees and hedgerows, over an area of 0.4 hectares. The grounds team have already reduced the mowing regime to create zones of longer grass which are already attracting wildlife, including an emperor dragonfly *Anax imperator* seen during the survey. The area to the north, around the headstones, is more frequently mown (Photograph 2).

There are a range of grasses and forbs, the most abundant being cock's-foot, common knapweed *Centaurea nigra*, lesser stitchwort *Stellaria graminea*, wood avens *Geum urbanum* and yarrow *Achillea millefolium*. The hedging and trees which bound the site are dominated by cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*, conifer *Cupressus sp.* and hornbeam *Carpinus betulus*.

3.4.4. College playing field

The college playing field is an approximately 3.2 hectare area of amenity grassland. It is dominated by short mown grasses, such as annual meadow grass *Poa annua*, cock's-foot and perennial rye grass *Lolium perenne*. It is bounded by fencing to the north and east, with shrubs and trees to the south and west, comprising species such as cherry *Prunus sp.*, field maple *Acer campestre*, lime *Tilia sp.* and rowan *Sorbus aucuparia*.

The area to the east of the playing field, where the community orchard is proposed, is distinguished by longer vegetation with grasses and forbs including creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, common mallow *Malva sylvestris*, redshank *Persicaria maculosa* and scarlet pimpernel *Anagallis arvensis*, and scattered trees including pear *Pyrus sp.* and hornbeam (Photograph 3).

3.4.5. Donkey derby field

Donkey derby field covers approximately 0.7 hectares. It is an area of amenity grassland but does not have a short mown sward allowing a more diverse mix of grass and forbs to develop (Photograph 4). The field is occasionally used as overflow parking for events. The field contains species typical of amenity grassland with grasses being dominant, including annual meadow grass, cock's-foot, common bent *Agrostis capillaris*, red fescue *Festuca rubra agg.* and Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus*, but interspersed with forbs and ruderals such as broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, dandelion *Taraxacum agg.* and ribwort plantain *Plantago lanceolata*.

The area is bounded by hedgerow, trees and fencing. The hedgerow includes a number of garden variants, due to the west of the site being adjacent to housing. This includes box *Buxus sp.*, cotoneaster *Cotoneaster sp.*, garden privet *Ligustrum ovalifolium* and a gorse species *Ulex sp.*

The presence of common bent, Sheep's sorrel *Rumex acetosella* and gorse species suggest slightly more acidic conditions within the grassland.

3.4.6. Hamble green

Hamble green is a small, 0.3 hectare, village green to the south east of the village. It comprises short mown amenity grassland including annual meadow grass, common bent, ribwort plantain, white clover *Trifolium repens* and yarrow, with scattered trees, namely copper beech *Fagus sylvatica f. purpurea*, pedunculate oak *Quercus robur*, small-leaved lime *Tilia cordata*, sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* and a hybrid lime species *Tilia sp.* (Photograph 5).

3.4.7. Heather gardens

Heather gardens is an area of historical garden which, through succession, has developed into a small woodland of 0.9 hectares (Photograph 6). The canopy is dominated by sycamore, with some very large specimens within the woodland. Other trees within the canopy include beech *Fagus sylvatica*, maple species *Acer sp.*, pedunculate oak, pine species *Pinus sp.* and silver birch *Betula pendula*. There are smaller trees scattered throughout the site, such as elder *Sambucus nigra*, elm *Ulmus sp.*, hazel *Corylus avellana* and yew *Taxus baccata*. The shrub and ground flora layers are less extensive, but include bracken *Pteridium sp.*, bramble *Rubus fruticosus*, Butcher's-broom *Ruscus*

aculeatus, ivy, male fern *Dryopteris filix-mas*, sweet flag *Acorus calamus* (county and south Hampshire scarce) and wood avens.

There is an area of bamboo *Bambusoideae sp.* to the south of site which is already subject to management to try and control its spread. Cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* and rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum* are also present, and their extent and spread should be monitored.

3.4.8. Mercury marshes

Mercury marshes is a 1.2 hectare area of scrub, woodland and reedbed with grass footpaths on the banks of the River Hamble (Photograph 7). It is adjacent to the more extensive Hampshire County Council Mercury Marshes Local Nature Reserve, and as such the reedbeds within the parish council's ownership are managed by the County Council, as part of their cutting regime.

The reedbed of common reed *Phragmites australis* dominates the eastern area of the site. Moving inland from the river and reedbed, there is a mix of smaller habitats including wet woodland dominated by willow species *Salix sp.*, scrub and trees over a ditch leading to the river which has both native and garden species including pendulous sedge *Carex pendula*, pampus grass *Cortaderia selloana*, rhododendron, cherry *Prunus sp.*, bamboo, fig *Ficus carica* and field maple; hedge planting comprising dogwood *Cornus sanguinea*, blackthorn *Prunus spinosa*, hazel and broom *Cytisus scoparius spp scoparius*; all habitats are interspersed with footpaths of short grass such as cock's-foot and creeping bent *Agrostis stolonifera*, with occasional forbs including red clover *Trifolium pratense*, cat's ear *Hypochaeris radicata* and redshank.

3.4.9. Mount pleasant

Mount pleasant is an amenity grassland, play area, car park and woodland covering 5.2 hectares (Photograph 8). The grassland is kept short, as it used for football at the weekends, with grasses such as annual meadow grass, cock's-foot and common bent most prolific in the sward. There is a small woodland to the west of the site, and scrub and trees to the south of the site. These areas include species such as apple *Malus pumila*, ash, bramble *Rubus fruticosus*, cherry, elder, elm, horse chestnut *Aesculus hippocastanum*, ivy, nettle, pedunculate oak and sycamore. The ground flora, comprising grasses, forbs and ruderals, is also longer in these areas.

3.4.10. Westfield common

Westfield common is on the shores of Southampton Water. It is an approximately 2.7 hectare of coastal woodland, coastal grassland and shingle (Photograph 9). It comprises a diverse mix of species including coastal, salt tolerant specialists such as sea beet *Beta vulgaris subsp. Maritime* and sea couch *Agropyron pungens*. The woodland and adjacent grassy footpaths include a range of trees, shrubs, scrub, ruderals, grasses and forbs, reflecting its coastal location, but also its close proximity to gardens and being used as an amenity space. Species found in the area include ash, blackthorn, bracken, Butcher's-broom, cock's-foot, ragwort *Senecio jacobea*, gorse, holly, ivy, pedunculate oak, sycamore, white clover and wood avens.

4. ACTION TABLE

Based on the results of the background data search, extended Phase 1 survey and discussions with the parish council, suitable actions have been developed that will improve the biodiversity interest of the parish. Actions are focussed on providing a connected space for wildlife across the parish.

Some of the actions listed are already underway; others are potential projects, while others are aspirational, they represent ideal actions given sufficient resources and time. The actions listed represent the current priorities. Priorities will, however, change for many reasons, hence the need for regular review of this BAP.

The action table has been divided into site specific actions for the sites surveyed and more generic actions that can be applied parish-wide.

Each action table is divided into 5 main columns; Objective, Action, Outcome, Targets and Reporting Method. Objectives are the overall aim of undertaking the action, actions are the key activities that need to be undertaken, outcomes are the benefits to biodiversity that will be achieved, the targets are the steps that need to be fulfilled by the end of the stated years, and the reporting method identifies how progress towards the final objective is going to be monitored. Some targets also include management suggestions on how best to achieve the target, these should be incorporated into the management plans for the sites.

4.1. Hamble-le-Rice Action Table

	OBJECTIVE	ACTION	OUTCOME	TARGET (YEARS)			REPORTING METHOD	
				1- 2	3 – 5	6 – 10		
Cemetery	More space for wildlife	Create a bog garden in suitable location not assigned to burial plots	<p>Increased habitat for amphibians, dragonflies and damselflies</p> <p>Peaceful place for visitors to sit</p>	<p>Bog garden created in suitable area.</p> <p><i>Management:</i> Dig out hole for bog garden, line and refill with soil. Plant with suitable native species.</p> <p>Further details in Appendix 6</p>	Bog garden with established vegetation.	Bog garden able to support a diversity of species including invertebrates, amphibians & plants.	Annual biodiversity check	Burial Comm to consider in conjunction with reps of St Andrews
Cemetery		Install a raised bird bath	<p>Fresh water for birds for drinking and bathing</p> <p>Close contact with nature for visitors</p>	Locate bird bath near to a hedge but far enough away so that it is in the open so birds are not vulnerable to predators e.g. cats, hiding in the hedge			Annual biodiversity check	Burial Comm to consider

Cemetery		Retain areas of longer grass for wildlife	Shelter and food source for invertebrates, birds and small mammals	<p>Reduce mowing frequency to allow wildflowers to grow and set-seed</p> <p>Areas retained for over-wintering invertebrates and seed source for birds</p> <p><i>Management:</i> Cut each autumn, but retaining an area of approximately 25% uncut</p>			Annual biodiversity check	Larger area of grass to be left uncut
----------	--	---	--	---	--	--	---------------------------	---------------------------------------

Donkey Derby Field		Acid grassland restoration	Species rich grassland	Test soil for current pH and suitability for restoration	Allow taller sward height around edges (ecotones)	Maintain grassland through mowing regime	Annual biodiversity check	RC to test soil
		HBIC habitat opportunity mapping identifies the area as suitable for acid grassland		Depending on soil pH will need to modify mowing regime and/or strip and re-seed to introduce species (See advice in Appendix 7)	Mow circular path into grassland to manage access Periodic creation of areas of bare ground Appropriate mowing regime as sward develops	<i>Management:</i> Mow 80% of sward on rotation (uncut area changed each time) in May and September		Bottom right corner close to Heather Gardens to be left uncut
College playing field		Install bee hives in new orchard	Community engagement Encouraging natural pollination			Install bee hives when orchard trees have become established		Annual biodiversity check
Heather gardens		Increased standing dead wood	Retention of trees as habitat for invertebrates, birds and bats		Any trees identified as hazardous retained as monoliths if safe to do so <i>Management:</i> Additional holes drilled to create cavities and stimulate rotting		Annual biodiversity check	

Mount Pleasant		Create a bog garden in suitable wet location	Increased habitat for amphibians, dragonflies and damselflies	Bog garden created in suitable wet area. <i>Management:</i> Dig out hole for bog garden, line and refill with soil. Plant with suitable native species. Further details in Appendix 6	Bog garden with established vegetation.	Bog garden able to support a diversity of species including invertebrates, amphibians & plants.	Annual biodiversity check	Consider suitable locations. Work with school? And/ or volunteer groups. Eg Scouts, corporate community days
Parish-wide		Installation of bat boxes	Increased roosting provision for bats	Install 5 bat boxes across the parish	If bat boxes not being used by year 5, site in a different location		Bat box check	Hampshire Bat Group contacted – no response so far Conservation volunteers
Parish-wide		Installation of bird boxes	Increased nesting provision for birds	Erection of at least 4 boxes across the parish			Bird box check	Contact Hamble Conservation Volunteers?

Parish-wide		Create holes in garden fences for hedgehogs	<p>Hedgehogs able to move around the landscape</p> <p>Part of a national scheme 'Hedgehog Street' www.hedgehogstreet.org</p> <p>Opportunity for engagement with neighbours and local community</p>	Cut 13cm x 13cm holes at base of fence, at approximately 20 metre intervals.			Annual biodiversity check	<p>Raise awareness through magazine.</p> <p>Include in planning responses or Village Design Plan?</p>
Parish-wide		Develop ecotones (transitional habitats) along boundaries of amenity spaces	<p>Increased cover for invertebrates and small mammals</p> <p>Food source for invertebrates, birds and small mammals</p>	Reduce mowing frequency along base of hedge extending up to 1 metre into field to develop gradient in vegetation from hedge into tall ruderals, herbs, long grass and amenity grassland.			Annual biodiversity check	<p>Barnaby's Field</p> <p>Rail Trail both sides</p> <p>Woodpecker Walk Strip by privet /edge of Spitfire Way</p> <p>College Playing Fields Orchard area</p> <p>Mount Pleasant Bank GE side</p>

Parish-wide		Provision of log piles in rough grassland area	More shelter and space for amphibians, reptiles and invertebrates		Installation of at 3 log piles		Annual biodiversity check	Log piles : Heather Gardens Village Green (5/02/2018) Photos for website and explanation in V Mag Barnaby's Field Rail Trail Woodpecker Walk
Parish-wide	Provision of food sources for wildlife	Appropriate species planting to habitats and landscape	Connected habitats to aid movement of wildlife through the landscape	Only use locally sourced, native species for new and replacement planting			Annual biodiversity check	Publish details of native species on Parish Council website Landscaping plans for new developments request native species
Heather gardens	Create a woodland management plan	Write a woodland management plan Once plan is written, can potentially apply for funding through countryside stewardship	Woodland designed and managed for the benefit of people and wildlife Glade and ride creation allowing more light for understorey plants and attracting invertebrates Formal access paths to manage access and protect ground flora from trampling and reduce disturbance to breeding birds.	Produce a woodland management plan	Explore funding opportunities if required e.g. countryside stewardship Implement woodland management plan		Approved woodland management plan Annual biodiversity check	Richard to investigate

Heather gardens		Prune trees to allow more light to reach ground and understorey to develop and/or consider planting native species (with deer guards)	Increased diversity of habitats		Trees pruned to create some lighter areas	Understorey developing. Planting may be required if not occurring naturally e.g. honeysuckle, holly, hazel 'Layers' within woodland	Annual biodiversity check Detailed in woodland management plan	Agree programme of work with other organisations to remove the non - native species and clear the undergrowth
Heather gardens		Undertake a tree inventory, logging and assessing mature trees for veteran tree status. Share with HBIC and assign TPO (where appropriate)	Protection of important trees in the parish	Produce an inventory of mature trees within Heather Gardens			Tree Inventory Detailed in woodland management plan	Volunteer Tree Warden or Work with Hamble Conservation Volunteers
Heather gardens		Introduce coppicing regime	Increased diversity of habitats	Introduce 8-10 year coppicing regime for existing hazel Create mosaic of coups for coppice rotation	Plant additional species suitable for coppicing e.g. sweet chestnut, hazel and willow, if required		Annual biodiversity check Detailed in woodland management plan	

Parish-wide	Create ecotones	Reduce management around hedge bases to soften edges and vary structure	Increased cover for invertebrates and small mammals Food source for invertebrates, birds and small mammals	Reduce mowing frequency along hedges to develop gradient in vegetation from shrubs to tall ruderals, herbs, long grass and amenity grassland			Annual biodiversity check	
College playing field	Community engagement	Plant a community orchard	Increased engagement and sense of ownership of green spaces Additional food source for birds and invertebrates	Saplings planted		Productive fruit trees	Annual biodiversity check	First phase complete Second phase autumn 2018
Parish-wide		Create a volunteer work party to undertake clean-ups of the beach and village	Increased engagement and sense of ownership of green spaces	Hold first beach clean-up linked with Marine Conservation Society's 'Great British Beach Clean'	Organise twice annual clean-ups		Volunteer records	Regular beach cleans already organised by conservation volunteers. Consider reporting results ie how many sacks, unusual finds etc in V Mag and website

Parish-wide		Information exchange – contact local Wildlife Trust for press releases and suitable news articles that cover topics such as disposal of garden waste	Awareness of wildlife issues e.g. effects of non-native species on local wildlife, value of wildlife gardening etc.	Regular articles in parish magazine and on website on relevant topics e.g. encouraging appropriate disposal of garden waste			Publications in magazine and webpage	Jeanette & Jack Initially report outcome of survey and planned actions.
Parish-wide		Create page on parish website for recording species and links to useful information and websites	Increased engagement and sense of ownership of green spaces	Develop page to allow submission of records and photos. Link to online recording system – Living Record	Update with articles or links to local/national projects and sightings of interest		Webpage counter	Investigate examples already in place. Set up separate page for each specific area
Parish-wide		Invest in trail cameras and set-up loan scheme for local residents	Increased engagement with local community Generate more species records for the parish				Number of species records for parish	
Parish-wide		Invite specialist groups to survey a site e.g. Hampshire bat group, Hampshire fungus recording group	Generate more species records for the parish	Invite Hampshire bat group to undertake a walk around heather gardens and Hamble green			Number of species records for parish	Hampshire Bat Group contacted but no response to date Butterfly Conservation Blue Marine RSPB

Parish-wide		Hold a BioBlitz to increase knowledge of species found in the parish	Increased awareness of natural environment Engagement with local community		Organise day to hold BioBlitz, contacting local experts and organizations to help with species ID Recruit volunteers to assist on day	Hold BioBlitz Disseminate results to participants	Count of attendees	
Parish-wide		Traditional woodland crafts event	Learn new skills Engagement with local community		Hold event using coppiced material from Heather Gardens to make crafts		Count of attendees	
Cemetery	Encouraging recycling of natural waste	Build compost bin	Encourage appropriate disposal of garden waste Additional habitat for wildlife Source of compost for future planting	Build compost bin in suitable location within cemetery			Annual biodiversity check	Burial Ground Comm Already committed to install compost bins. Design shortlisted Discuss with reps of St Andrews Order or commission bins
Heather gardens	Remove garden variants and non-native species	Continue to tackle bamboo until permanently removed from site Remove Rhododendron and cherry laurel	Invasive, non-native species removed	Remove non-native species before they spread	Monitor for recurrence, and remove/treat as necessary		Annual biodiversity check	

Parish-wide		Remove non-native species: bamboo, cherry laurel, pampas grass and Rhododendron	Invasive, non-native species removed from parish	Remove non-native species before they spread	Monitor for recurrence, and remove/treat as necessary		Annual biodiversity check	
Parish-wide		Use native species only for hedgerow planting Encourage local residents to use native species in their own gardens	Increased food sources for invertebrates and birds More native species, diverse hedgerows	Any new or replacement hedgerow planting should be with native species only. Use variety of species to create diversity of seed and fruit producing species		More species diverse hedges	Annual biodiversity check	

5. REFERENCES

- **Burns, F., Eaton, M.A., Gregory, R.D. et al. (2013).** *State of Nature report.* The State of Nature Partnership http://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/stateofnature_tcm9-345839.pdf
- **CIEEM. (2013).** Code of Professional Conduct. CIEEM.
- **DEFRA (2007).** *An Introductory Guide to Valuing Ecosystem Services PB12852*
- **DEFRA (2012).** *Public sector expenditure on UK biodiversity 2000-01 to 2010-11*
- **Department for Communities and Local Government (2012).** *National Planning Policy Framework*
- **Ecosystem services** <http://www.ecosystems-services.org.uk/ecoserv.htm> [accessed 21st September 2016]
- **Hayhow DB, Burns F, Eaton MA, Al Fulaij N, August TA, Babey L, Bacon L, Bingham, C, Boswell J, Boughey KL, Brereton T, Brookman E, Brooks DR, Bullock DJ, Burke, O, Collis M, Corbet L, Cornish N, De Massimi S, Densham J, Dunn E, Elliott S, Gent, T, Godber J, Hamilton S, Havery S, Hawkins S, Henney J, Holmes K, Hutchinson N,, Isaac NJB, Johns D, Macadam CR, Matthews F, Nicolet P, Noble DG, Outhwaite CL, Powney GD, Richardson P, Roy DB, Sims D, Smart S, Stevenson K, Stroud RA,, Walker KJ, Webb JR, Webb TJ, Wynde R and Gregory RD (2016).** *State of Nature 2016.* The State of Nature partnership.
- **HCC (2015).** **Guiding Principles Hamble Estuary Partnership** <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/hambleestuarypartnership/hep-principles.htm> [accessed 17th November 2017]
- **Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2010).** *Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: a technique for environmental audit.* Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.
- **Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2017).** *E2. Expenditure on UK and international biodiversity* <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4251> [accessed 17th November 2017]
- **Lawton, J [chair] (2010)** *Making Space for Nature: A review of England's Wildlife Sites and Ecological Network*
- **Rogerson, M., Barton, J., Bragg, R. & Pretty, J. (2017).** *The health and wellbeing impacts of volunteering with The Wildlife Trusts.* University of Essex, Colchester
- **Rose, F. (1989).** *Colour identification guide to the grasses, sedges, rushes and ferns of the British Isles and north-western Europe.* Viking, London.
- **Rose, F. (2006).** *The wildflower key: how to identify wild flowers, trees and shrubs in Britain and Ireland (revised edition).* Fredrick Warne, London.
- **RSPB (2010).** *Every Child Outdoors: summary report* https://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/everychildoutdoors_tcm9-259689.pdf
- **Saltmarsh, N. (2011).** *The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature* <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140827110041/http://sd.defra.gov.uk/2011/06/the-natural-choice-securing-the-value-of-nature> [accessed 21st September 2016]
- **UK National Ecosystem Assessment (2011).** *The UK National Ecosystem Assessment: Synthesis of the Key Findings.* UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge

MAPS

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photograph 1: Plots in allotment



Photograph 2: Different mowing regimes in cemetery



Photograph 3: Area for proposed orchard on college playing field



Photograph 4: Donkey derby field



Photograph 5: Hamble green



Photograph 6: Heather gardens



Photograph 7: Mercury marshes



Photograph 8: Mount pleasant recreation ground



Photograph 9: Westfield common

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:
Map showing extent of background data search area

Appendix 2:
Protected and notable species background data search results

Appendix 2. Protected and notable species background data search results

Search Area: Within 2km of Hamble-le-Rice parish boundary

Date: 14/11/2017

Group Name	Taxon Name	Common Name	Status	First Year Recorded	Last Year Recorded	Number of Records
Amphibians & Reptiles	<i>Anguis fragilis</i>	Slow-worm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2002	2016	295
	<i>Bufo bufo</i>	Common Toad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2003	2007	3
	<i>Natrix natrix</i>	Grass Snake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2005	2009	17
	<i>Rana temporaria</i>	Common Frog	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex V Habitats Directive 	2005	2016	11
	<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	Great Crested Newt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Annex V Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	2005	2013	27
	<i>Vipera berus</i>	Adder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2003	2013	6
	<i>Zootoca vivipara</i>	Common Lizard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2002	2015	31
Birds	<i>Acanthis cabaret</i>	Lesser Redpoll	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	1997	2016	70
	<i>Acanthis flammea</i>	Common (Mealy) Redpoll	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Interest 	2006	2013	2
	<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	Goshawk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Rare 	2016	2016	1
	<i>Acrocephalus scirpaceus</i>	Reed Warbler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	208

	<i>Alauda arvensis</i>	Skylark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	1996	2016	94
	<i>Alcedo atthis</i>	Kingfisher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1994	2016	820
	<i>Anas clypeata</i>	Shoveler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	1993	2016	505
	<i>Anas querquedula</i>	Garganey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1994	2016	51
	<i>Anas strepera</i>	Gadwall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	537
	<i>Anser albifrons</i>	White-fronted Goose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP 	2007	2015	3
	<i>Anser erythropus</i>	Lesser White-fronted Goose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2002	2002	1
	<i>Anthus petrosus</i>	Rock Pipit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	1993	2016	600
	<i>Anthus petrosus subsp. littoralis</i>	Scandinavian Rock Pipit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	2003	2003	1
	<i>Anthus spinoletta</i>	Water Pipit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	2003	2016	12
	<i>Anthus trivialis</i>	Tree Pipit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	1993	2016	91
	<i>Ardea cinerea</i>	Grey Heron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	1993	2016	332
	<i>Arenaria interpres</i>	Turnstone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	540
	<i>Asio flammeus</i>	Short-eared Owl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	1994	2015	50
	<i>Asio otus</i>	Long-eared Owl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	2010	2010	1
	<i>Aythya ferina</i>	Pochard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1993	2016	117
	<i>Aythya marila</i>	Scaup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1994	2010	19

<i>Botaurus stellaris</i>	Bittern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	2005	2015	23
<i>Branta bernicla</i>	Brent Goose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	649
<i>Branta leucopsis</i>	Barnacle Goose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2002	2016	17
<i>Calidris alba</i>	Sanderling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	124
<i>Calidris alpina</i>	Dunlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	651
<i>Calidris canutus</i>	Knot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	384
<i>Calidris maritima</i>	Purple Sandpiper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2008	2016	2
<i>Calidris pugnax</i>	Ruff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1993	2016	28
<i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i>	Nightjar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	2007	2016	5
<i>Cettia cetti</i>	Cetti's Warbler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1993	2016	119 8
<i>Charadrius dubius</i>	Little Ringed Plover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Scarce 	1994	2016	129
<i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>	Ringed Plover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List 	1993	2016	508
<i>Chlidonias niger</i>	Black Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1995	2016	34
<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>	Black-headed Gull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare 	2001	2016	202

	<i>Circus aeruginosus</i>	Marsh Harrier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Rare 	2000	2016	85
	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	Hen Harrier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	2003	2013	3
	<i>Circus pygargus</i>	Montagu's Harrier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	2002	2002	2
	<i>Clangula hyemalis</i>	Long-tailed Duck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2009	2014	16
	<i>Coccothraustes coccothraustes</i>	Hawfinch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	2005	2013	8
	<i>Crex crex</i>	Corncrake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2013	2013	1
	<i>Cuculus canorus</i>	Cuckoo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	1993	2016	161
	<i>Dendrocopos minor</i>	Lesser Spotted Woodpecker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP 	1993	2013	52
	<i>Egretta garzetta</i>	Little Egret	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1993	2016	818

<i>Emberiza citrinella</i>	Yellowhammer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	1997	2007	3
<i>Emberiza schoeniclus</i>	Reed Bunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	2001	2016	578
<i>Falco columbarius</i>	Merlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	1996	2016	37
<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	Peregrine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Rare 	1993	2016	441
<i>Falco subbuteo</i>	Hobby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	1993	2016	136
<i>Ficedula hypoleuca</i>	Pied Flycatcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List County Rare 	2002	2014	5
<i>Fringilla montifringilla</i>	Brambling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1994	2015	30
<i>Gallinago gallinago</i>	Snipe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1994	2016	466
<i>Gavia</i>	Indet. Diver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1995	2006	2
<i>Gavia arctica</i>	Black-throated Diver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2007	2015	10
<i>Gavia immer</i>	Great Northern Diver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1993	2016	266
<i>Gavia stellata</i>	Red-throated Diver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1994	2016	61
<i>Haematopus ostralegus</i>	Oystercatcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	1993	2016	664
<i>Hydrocoloeus minutus</i>	Little Gull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1994	2016	73
<i>Hydroprogne caspia</i>	Caspian Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2005	2005	1

	<i>Ixobrychus minutus</i>	Little Bittern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1997	2010	44
	<i>Jynx torquilla</i>	Wryneck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2009	2016	45
	<i>Larus argentatus</i>	Herring Gull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List County Rare 	1994	2016	181
	<i>Larus fuscus</i>	Lesser Black-backed Gull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List County Rare 	1993	2016	69
	<i>Larus marinus</i>	Great Black-backed Gull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare 	1994	2016	137
	<i>Larus melanocephalus</i>	Mediterranean Gull	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1994	2016	674
	<i>Limosa lapponica</i>	Bar-tailed Godwit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	210
	<i>Limosa limosa</i>	Black-tailed Godwit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	1993	2016	105 1
	<i>Linaria cannabina</i>	Linnet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	107
	<i>Locustella naevia</i>	Grasshopper Warbler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1996	2015	18
	<i>Loxia curvirostra</i>	Common Crossbill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Scarce 	2002	2016	22
	<i>Lullula arborea</i>	Woodlark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex I of the Birds Directive Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	2002	2014	20

	<i>Luscinia megarhynchos</i>	Nightingale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1993	2016	222
	<i>Luscinia svecica</i>	Bluethroat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2002	2002	1
	<i>Melanitta fusca</i>	Velvet Scoter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2009	2016	9
	<i>Melanitta nigra</i>	Common Scoter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	1994	2016	119
	<i>Mergellus albellus</i>	Smew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	1994	2015	17
	<i>Mergus merganser</i>	Goosander	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1993	2016	102
	<i>Mergus serrator</i>	Red-breasted Merganser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP 	1994	2016	207
	<i>Milvus migrans</i>	Black Kite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2010	2010	2
	<i>Milvus milvus</i>	Red Kite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1998	2016	54
	<i>Motacilla cinerea</i>	Grey Wagtail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List 	1994	2016	218
	<i>Motacilla flava</i>	Yellow Wagtail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1993	2016	670
	<i>Muscicapa striata</i>	Spotted Flycatcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	189
	<i>Numenius arquata</i>	Curlew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	1993	2016	601

<i>Numenius phaeopus</i>	Whimbrel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1993	2016	448
<i>Oceanodroma leucorhoa</i>	Leach's Petrel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2009	2012	3
<i>Oenanthe oenanthe</i>	Wheatear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	1993	2016	139 4
<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	Osprey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1997	2016	61
<i>Panurus biarmicus</i>	Bearded Tit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	1993	2016	190
<i>Passer domesticus</i>	House Sparrow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2008	2016	21
<i>Passer montanus</i>	Tree Sparrow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	2005	2011	2
<i>Pernis apivorus</i>	Honey-buzzard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	2010	2010	2
<i>Phalacrocorax aristotelis</i>	Shag	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List 	2009	2016	13
<i>Phoenicurus ochruros</i>	Black Redstart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Rare 	1994	2016	160
<i>Phoenicurus phoenicurus</i>	Redstart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Interest 	1993	2016	208
<i>Platalea leucorodia</i>	Spoonbill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1996	2015	32
<i>Plectrophenax nivalis</i>	Snow Bunting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1996	2014	20
<i>Plegadis falcinellus</i>	Glossy Ibis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2012	2012	1

<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>	Golden Plover	• Annex I of the Birds Directive Hampshire BAP	1993	2016	476
<i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>	Grey Plover	• Hampshire BAP County Interest	1993	2016	459
<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian Grebe	• Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP	1994	2016	37
<i>Podiceps cristatus</i>	Great Crested Grebe	• County Interest	1993	2016	288
<i>Podiceps grisegena</i>	Red-necked Grebe	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	2012	2016	3
<i>Podiceps nigricollis</i>	Black-necked Grebe	• Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP	2001	2016	42
<i>Poecile montana</i>	Willow Tit	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	2004	2004	1
<i>Poecile palustris</i>	Marsh Tit	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	1998	2016	27
<i>Porzana porzana</i>	Spotted Crake	• Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	2003	2005	3
<i>Pyrrhula pyrrhula</i>	Bullfinch	• Hampshire BAP	2009	2016	84
<i>Rallus aquaticus</i>	Water Rail	• County Scarce	1993	2016	681
<i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i>	Avocet	• Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 County Rare	1993	2016	315
<i>Regulus ignicapilla</i>	Firecrest	• Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Scarce	1994	2016	466
<i>Riparia riparia</i>	Sand Martin	• County Scarce	1994	2016	45
<i>Rissa tridactyla</i>	Kittiwake	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	1998	2015	42
<i>Saxicola rubetra</i>	Whinchat	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP County Rare	1993	2016	670
<i>Scolopax rusticola</i>	Woodcock	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	1995	2016	15
<i>Spinus spinus</i>	Siskin	• County Interest	1993	2016	113
<i>Stercorarius parasiticus</i>	Arctic Skua	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	2002	2015	12

	<i>Sterna dougallii</i>	Roseate Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	2002	2007	2
	<i>Sterna hirundo</i>	Common Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive County Rare 	1994	2016	124
	<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>	Arctic Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2004	2016	35
	<i>Sterna sandvicensis</i>	Sandwich Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive County Rare 	1994	2016	227
	<i>Sternula albifrons</i>	Little Tern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare 	2001	2016	22
	<i>Streptopelia turtur</i>	Turtle Dove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	1995	2015	17
	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	Starling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds of Conservation Concern Red List 	2002	2016	50
	<i>Sylvia undata</i>	Dartford Warbler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	1993	2016	127 0
	<i>Tadorna ferruginea</i>	Ruddy Shelduck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive 	2010	2016	5
	<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>	Shelduck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Interest 	1993	2016	510
	<i>Tringa glareola</i>	Wood Sandpiper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I of the Birds Directive Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2004	2015	24
	<i>Tringa nebularia</i>	Greenshank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1993	2016	116 0
	<i>Tringa ochropus</i>	Green Sandpiper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1993	2016	295
	<i>Tringa totanus</i>	Redshank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP 	1993	2016	596

	<i>Turdus iliacus</i>	Redwing	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	1994	2016	80
	<i>Turdus philomelos</i>	Song Thrush	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Hampshire BAP	2003	2015	39
	<i>Turdus pilaris</i>	Fieldfare	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	1993	2016	57
	<i>Turdus torquatus</i>	Ring Ouzel	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2007	2016	16
	<i>Turdus viscivorus</i>	Mistle Thrush	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List	1995	2016	31
	<i>Tyto alba</i>	Barn Owl	• Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	1993	2015	65
	<i>Upupa epops</i>	Hoopoe	• Schedule 1 Part 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	2006	2007	4
	<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>	Lapwing	• Birds of Conservation Concern Red List Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP	1993	2016	609
Higher plants - Ferns	<i>Dryopteris filix-mas x affinis = D. x complexa</i>	Buckler-Fern	• County Rare South Hampshire Rare	2011	2011	1
	<i>Pilularia globulifera</i>	Pillwort	• IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:VU Nationally Scarce Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP	2006	2006	1
	<i>Polypodium cambricum</i>	Southern Polypody	• County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce	1993	2003	2
Higher plants - Flowering Plants	<i>Acorus calamus</i>	Sweet-flag	• County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare	2008	2008	1

<i>Althaea officinalis</i>	Marsh-mallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT Nationally Scarce North Hampshire Rare South Hampshire Scarce Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	2010	2010	1
<i>Anacamptis morio</i>	Green-winged Orchid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:NT Hampshire BAP 	1989	2006	5
<i>Anthemis cotula</i>	Stinking Chamomile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU County Interest 	1994	1994	2
<i>Anthriscus caucalis</i>	Bur Chervil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare 	2004	2004	1
<i>Apium graveolens</i>	Wild Celery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1993	2013	4
<i>Artemisia absinthium</i>	Wormwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare 	1997	1997	1
<i>Atriplex prostrata x longipes = A. x gustafssoniana</i>	Kattegat Orache	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare South Hampshire Rare 	2009	2009	2
<i>Briza media</i>	Quaking-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2002	2011	4
<i>Bupleurum tenuissimum</i>	Slender Hare's-ear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU Nationally Scarce Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1982	2015	13
<i>Buxus sempervirens</i>	Box	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:DD, IUCN_GB_2001:DD Nationally Rare 	2011	2011	1
<i>Cakile maritima</i>	Sea Rocket	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1997	2004	8
<i>Calluna vulgaris</i>	Heather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1987	2014	26
<i>Carduus tenuiflorus</i>	Slender Thistle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1997	2011	5

	<i>Carex acuta</i>	Slender Tufted-sedge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:EX County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Scarce 	2001	2001	1
	<i>Carex divisa</i>	Divided Sedge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:VU Nationally Scarce Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	1999	2014	12
	<i>Carex echinata</i>	Star Sedge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2004	2004	1
	<i>Carex extensa</i>	Long-bracted Sedge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	2002	2013	4
	<i>Catabrosa aquatica</i>	Whorl-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU County Scarce 	1999	2004	2
	<i>Centaurea cyanus</i>	Cornflower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP 	2000	2000	1
	<i>Cerastium arvense</i>	Field Mouse-ear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2003	2003	1
	<i>Ceratocarpus claviculata</i>	Climbing Corydalis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	1987	2015	21
	<i>Cichorium intybus</i>	Chicory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	1994	1994	1
	<i>Cochlearia anglica</i>	English Scurvygrass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1988	1998	7
	<i>Crataegus laevigata</i>	Midland Hawthorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	2011	2011	2
	<i>Cruciata laevipes</i>	Crosswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1997	2016	5
	<i>Cuscuta epithimum</i>	Dodder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	2011	2011	1

	<i>Dianthus armeria</i>	Deptford Pink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:EN, IUCN_GB_2001:EN Nationally Scarce Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 8 Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Rare South Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Rare 	2011	2011	1
	<i>Eleocharis uniglumis</i>	Slender Spike-rush	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare 	2009	2009	1
	<i>Elytrigia juncea</i>	Sand Couch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1988	2004	2
	<i>Erica cinerea</i>	Bell Heather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2002	2014	5
	<i>Erica tetralix</i>	Cross-leaved Heath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1985	2013	11
	<i>Erysimum cheiranthoides</i>	Treacle-mustard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT County Scarce 	1992	1992	1
	<i>Euphrasia nemorosa</i>	Eyebright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2014	2014	1
	<i>Festuca ovina subsp. hirtula</i>	Sheep's Fescue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare South Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Rare 	1992	1992	1
	<i>Festuca rubra subsp. juncea</i>	Red Fescue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1999	1999	1
	<i>Festuca rubra subsp. litoralis</i>	Red Fescue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	2006	2010	4
	<i>Filago minima</i>	Small Cudweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1987	1987	1
	<i>Filago vulgaris</i>	Common Cudweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2000	2000	2
	<i>Fragaria vesca</i>	Wild Strawberry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1990	2016	13
	<i>Fumaria muralis subsp. boraei</i>	Few-Flowered Fumitory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	1998	2010	3

<i>Geranium purpureum</i>	Little-robin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Rare Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP County Rare South Hampshire Rare 	1990	1990	1
<i>Geranium rotundifolium</i>	Round-leaved Crane's-bill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Scarce 	2012	2012	1
<i>Glaucium flavum</i>	Yellow Horned-poppay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT County Scarce 	1997	2014	10
<i>Glebionis segetum</i>	Corn Marigold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU County Interest 	1994	1994	1
<i>Hieracium calcaricola</i>	Hawkweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare South Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Rare 	2006	2006	1
<i>Hippophae rhamnoides</i>	Sea-buckthorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce County Interest 	2001	2001	1
<i>Honckenya peploides</i>	Sea Sandwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1997	2014	7
<i>Hottonia palustris</i>	Water-violet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU County Scarce South Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Rare 	2006	2006	1
<i>Hydrocotyle vulgaris</i>	Marsh Pennywort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1996	2011	12
<i>Hypericum elodes</i>	Marsh St John's-wort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1994	2006	2
<i>Juncus subnodulosus</i>	Blunt-flowered Rush	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Scarce 	1999	2012	2
<i>Knautia arvensis</i>	Field Scabious	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2000	2009	4
<i>Lactuca virosa</i>	Great Lettuce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce South Hampshire Rare 	1997	2010	2
<i>Lamium hybridum</i>	Cut-leaved Dead-nettle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Scarce 	1995	1995	2

<i>Lathyrus linifolius</i>	Bitter-vetch	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1997	1997	2
<i>Lepidium campestre</i>	Field Pepperwort	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1997	2011	3
<i>Limonium vulgare</i>	Common Sea-lavender	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1996	2014	23
<i>Lotus subbiflorus</i>	Hairy Bird's-foot-trefoil	• Nationally Scarce	2012	2012	1
<i>Lychnis flos-cuculi</i>	Ragged-Robin	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT	1990	2013	22
<i>Medicago polymorpha</i>	Toothed Medick	• Nationally Scarce County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare	2000	2012	2
<i>Melampyrum pratense</i>	Common Cow-wheat	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1987	2010	8
<i>Misopates orontium</i>	Weasel's-snout	• IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU	1997	2014	4
<i>Moenchia erecta</i>	Upright Chickweed	• IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU	2001	2008	3
<i>Montia fontana subsp. amporitana</i>	Blinks	• County Rare South Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Rare	1999	1999	1
<i>Myrica gale</i>	Bog-myrtle	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1994	2006	2
<i>Nardus stricta</i>	Mat-grass	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1996	1996	2
<i>Nymphoides peltata</i>	Fringed Water-lily	• Nationally Scarce County Interest	1996	2011	7
<i>Oenanthe fistulosa</i>	Tubular Water-dropwort	• IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	1998	1998	1
<i>Oenanthe lachenalii</i>	Parsley Water-dropwort	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT County Scarce	1996	2012	17
<i>Orobanche hederæ</i>	Ivy Broomrape	• County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare	1991	1991	2
<i>Oxalis acetosella</i>	Wood-sorrel	• IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT	1990	2014	13
<i>Papaver dubium subsp. dubium</i>	Long-headed Poppy	• County Interest	2000	2000	1

	<i>Parapholis incurva</i>	Curved Hard-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1996	1996	1
	<i>Persicaria bistorta</i>	Common Bistort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1993	1993	2
	<i>Poa bulbosa</i>	Bulbous Meadow-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	2015	2015	1
	<i>Polygala serpyllifolia</i>	Heath Milkwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2006	2011	3
	<i>Polygonum rurivagum</i>	Cornfield Knotgrass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Interest 	2000	2000	1
	<i>Polypogon monspeliensis</i>	Annual Beard-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	1991	2014	6
	<i>Potamogeton berchtoldii</i>	Small Pondweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Scarce 	2013	2013	1
	<i>Potamogeton pectinatus</i>	Fennel Pondweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	2013	2013	2
	<i>Potentilla erecta</i>	Tormentil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1994	2013	29
	<i>Potentilla erecta x reptans = P. x italica</i>	Cinquefoil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Rare South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare 	2014	2014	1
	<i>Puccinellia fasciculata</i>	Borrer's Saltmarsh-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:VU Nationally Scarce Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1999	2007	3

<i>Puccinellia rupestris</i>	Stiff Saltmarsh-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1999	2007	4
<i>Ranunculus baudotii</i>	Brackish Water-crowfoot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	2013	2013	3
<i>Ranunculus flammula</i>	Lesser Spearwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	1993	2014	39
<i>Ranunculus flammula subsp. flammula</i>	Lesser Spearwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	2000	2000	1
<i>Ranunculus hederaceus</i>	Ivy-leaved Crowfoot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	1999	2016	3
<i>Raphanus raphanistrum subsp. maritimus</i>	Sea Radish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2013	2013	1
<i>Rorippa austriaca</i>	Austrian Yellow-cress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Interest 	1995	2011	7
<i>Rosa spinosissima</i>	Burnet Rose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2006	2011	2
<i>Rumex crispus subsp. littoreus</i>	Curled Dock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1997	2014	10
<i>Ruppia maritima</i>	Beaked Tasselweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	2004	2004	1
<i>Ruscus aculeatus</i>	Butcher's-broom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex V Habitats Directive 	1987	2016	73
<i>Sagina maritima</i>	Sea Pearlwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1999	1999	1
<i>Salicornia dolichostachya</i>	Long-spiked Glasswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2000	2011	4
<i>Salicornia europaea</i>	Common Glasswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	2000	2009	4
<i>Salicornia fragilis</i>	Yellow Glasswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce County Scarce 	1998	2011	6
<i>Salicornia pusilla</i>	One-flowered Glasswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1998	2009	4
<i>Salicornia ramosissima</i>	Purple Glasswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1998	2014	14
<i>Salix repens</i>	Creeping Willow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1999	2008	2

<i>Samolus valerandi</i>	Brookweed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Rare 	2001	2001	1
<i>Sanicula europaea</i>	Sanicle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1990	2015	11
<i>Sarcocornia perennis</i>	Perennial Glasswort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce County Scarce 	1989	2014	9
<i>Schoenoplectus triquetus</i>	Triangular Club-rush	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:CR, IUCN_GB_2001:CR Nationally Rare Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 8 Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2006	2006	1
<i>Senecio aquaticus</i>	Marsh Ragwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1997	2013	6
<i>Seriphidium maritimum</i>	Sea Wormwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1988	2010	9
<i>Solidago virgaurea</i>	Goldenrod	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1994	2011	7
<i>Spartina maritima x alterniflora = S. x townsendii</i>	Townsend's Cord-grass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce 	1990	2009	2
<i>Spergula arvensis</i>	Corn Spurrey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	1994	2000	2
<i>Spiranthes spiralis</i>	Autumn Lady's-tresses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2000	2015	12
<i>Stachys arvensis</i>	Field Woundwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	2012	2012	1
<i>Stratiotes aloides</i>	Water-soldier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:NT Nationally Rare County Interest 	1999	1999	2
<i>Succisa pratensis</i>	Devil's-bit Scabious	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1996	2013	14
<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i>	Large-leaved Lime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce County Rare South Hampshire Rare 	2011	2013	2
<i>Trifolium fragiferum</i>	Strawberry Clover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	1996	2014	18
<i>Trifolium ornithopodioides</i>	Bird's-foot Clover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Hampshire Rare North Hampshire Scarce 	1997	2012	12

	<i>Trifolium suffocatum</i>	Suffocated Clover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce Hampshire BAP County Scarce 	1999	2000	3
	<i>Ulex gallii</i>	Western Gorse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare County South Hampshire Rare South Hampshire Scarce 	2006	2006	1
	<i>Umbilicus rupestris</i>	Navelwort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2013	2013	2
	<i>Valeriana dioica</i>	Marsh Valerian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1994	2015	5
	<i>Valeriana officinalis</i>	Common Valerian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1990	2014	18
	<i>Veronica officinalis</i>	Heath Speedwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT 	1990	2011	19
	<i>Viola canina</i>	Heath Dog-violet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:VU, IUCN_GB_2001:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:VU 	2002	2002	1
	<i>Viola tricolor</i>	Wild Pansy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_EN_2014:NT, IUCN_GB_2001:NT County Scarce South Hampshire Scarce North Hampshire Scarce 	2000	2000	1
Higher plants - Horsetails	<i>Equisetum sylvaticum</i>	Wood Horsetail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	1988	1989	4
Invertebrates - Araneae	<i>Sitticus caricis</i>	Sedge Jumper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2008	2008	1
Invertebrates - Blattaria	<i>Ectobius lapponicus</i>	Dusky Cockroach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2005	2013	5
	<i>Ectobius pallidus</i>	Tawny Cockroach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2002	2006	2
	<i>Ectobius panzeri</i>	Lesser Cockroach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2005	2013	3
Invertebrates - Coleoptera	<i>Agelastica alni</i>	Alder Leaf Beetle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:DD Nationally Rare 	2014	2014	2
	<i>Ampedus sanguinolentus</i>	Ampedus sanguinolentus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2013	2013	1
	<i>Apion rubiginosum</i>	Apion rubiginosum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_pre94:R 	2005	2005	1
	<i>Bruchus atomarius</i>	Bruchus atomarius	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2005	2005	1
	<i>Calomicrus circumfusus</i>	Calomicrus circumfusus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2003	2003	2
	<i>Cantharis fusca</i>	Cantharis fusca	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2004	2013	6
	<i>Cassida nobilis</i>	Cassida nobilis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2006	2006	1

<i>Cerapheles terminatus</i>	Cerapheles terminatus	• Nationally Rare	2004	2012	4
<i>Cordicollis instabilis</i>	Cordicollis instabilis	• Nationally Scarce	2003	2003	1
<i>Cryptocephalus aureolus</i>	Cryptocephalus aureolus	• Nationally Scarce	2010	2010	1
<i>Dasytes niger</i>	Dasytes niger	• Nationally Rare	2012	2012	1
<i>Demetrias (Risophilus) imperialis</i>	Demetrias (Risophilus) imperialis	• Nationally Scarce	1983	2004	3
<i>Dicheirotichus obsoletus</i>	Dicheirotichus obsoletus	• Nationally Scarce	2012	2012	1
<i>Donacia thalassina</i>	Donacia thalassina	• Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	1
<i>Helops caeruleus</i>	Helops caeruleus	• Nationally Scarce	1984	2004	5
<i>Hippodamia (Adonia) variegata</i>	Adonis' Ladybird	• Nationally Scarce	2003	2003	1
<i>Hypera (Hypera) fuscocinerea</i>	Hypera (Hypera) fuscocinerea	• Nationally Scarce	2005	2005	1
<i>Lixus (Eulixus) scabricollis</i>	Lixus (Eulixus) scabricollis	• IUCN_GB_pre94:IK	2002	2006	6
<i>Longitarsus dorsalis</i>	Longitarsus dorsalis	• Nationally Scarce	2002	2002	1
<i>Longitarsus parvulus</i>	Flax Flea Beetle	• Nationally Scarce	2006	2006	1
<i>Lucanus cervus</i>	Stag Beetle	• Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Nationally Scarce Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP	1998	2013	51
<i>Magdalis (Porrothus) cerasi</i>	Magdalis (Porrothus) cerasi	• Nationally Scarce	2012	2012	1
<i>Mecinus circulatus</i>	Mecinus circulatus	• Nationally Scarce	2015	2015	1
<i>Neliocarus faber</i>	Neliocarus faber	• Nationally Scarce	1973	2013	4
<i>Nicrophorus interruptus</i>	Nicrophorus interruptus	• Nationally Scarce	2015	2015	1
<i>Notaris scirpi</i>	Notaris scirpi	• Nationally Scarce	1977	2003	3
<i>Oedemera (Oncomera) femoralis</i>	Oedemera (Oncomera) femoralis	• Nationally Scarce	2002	2002	1
<i>Orsodacne cerasi</i>	Orsodacne cerasi	• Nationally Scarce	2011	2011	1
<i>Orsodacne humeralis</i>	Orsodacne humeralis	• Nationally Scarce	2006	2007	2

	<i>Paracorymbia fulva</i>	Paracorymbia fulva	• IUCN_GB_pre94:R	2011	2012	2
	<i>Phaleria cadaverina</i>	Phaleria cadaverina	• Nationally Scarce	2003	2003	3
	<i>Pilemostoma fastuosa</i>	Pilemostoma fastuosa	• IUCN_GB_2001:NT Nationally Rare Nationally Scarce	2012	2012	1
	<i>Polydrusus (Eurodrusus) confluens</i>	Polydrusus (Eurodrusus) confluens	• Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	1
	<i>Polydrusus (Neoeustolus) pulchellus</i>	Sea-Wormwood Weevil	• Nationally Scarce	2005	2005	1
	<i>Pselactus spadix</i>	Pselactus spadix	• Nationally Scarce	2004	2004	1
	<i>Pyrochroa coccinea</i>	Black-headed Cardinal Beetle	• Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	1
	<i>Silpha obscura</i>	Silpha obscura	• IUCN_GB_pre94:VU	2003	2003	1
	<i>Sitona waterhousei</i>	Sitona waterhousei	• Nationally Scarce	2006	2006	1
	<i>Tanymecus palliatus</i>	Tanymecus palliatus	• Nationally Scarce	2006	2006	1
	<i>Tetratoma desmarestii</i>	Tetratoma desmarestii	• Nationally Scarce	2002	2002	1
	<i>Thinobius bicolor</i>	Thinobius bicolor	• Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	1
Invertebrates - Dermaptera	<i>Forficula lesnei</i>	Lesne's Earwig	• Nationally Scarce	2005	2013	8
Invertebrates - Diptera	<i>Cistogaster globosa</i>	Cistogaster globosa	• IUCN_GB_pre94:EN	2012	2012	1
	<i>Leopoldius signatus</i>	Leopoldius signatus	• Nationally Notable	1992	2008	3
	<i>Melieria picta</i>	Melieria picta	• Nationally Notable	2003	2003	3
	<i>Myolepta dubia</i>	Myolepta dubia	• Nationally Notable Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	1
	<i>Opomyza punctata</i>	Opomyza punctata	• Nationally Notable	2003	2003	1
Invertebrates - Hemiptera	<i>Aquarius najas</i>	River Skater	• Nationally Scarce	2015	2015	1
	<i>Eurygaster maura</i>	Eurygaster maura	• Nationally Scarce	2007	2007	1
	<i>Gonocerus acuteangulatus</i>	Box Bug	• IUCN_GB_pre94:EN	2005	2007	4
	<i>Lygus pratensis</i>	Lygus pratensis	• IUCN_GB_pre94:R	2003	2006	5
	<i>Nysius graminicola</i>	Nysius graminicola	• IUCN_GB_pre94:R	2003	2006	3

	<i>Orthotylus (Melanotrichus) moncreaffi</i>	Orthotylus (Melanotrichus) moncreaffi	• IUCN_GB_pre94:R Hampshire BAP	2003	2006	2
	<i>Psallus (Psallus) albicinctus</i>	Psallus (Psallus) albicinctus	• Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	2
	<i>Saldula pilosella</i>	Saldula pilosella	• Nationally Scarce	2003	2003	1
	<i>Stictopleurus abutilon</i>	Stictopleurus abutilon	• IUCN_GB_pre94:EX	2010	2010	1
Invertebrates - Hymenoptera	<i>Andrena (Hoplandrena) trimmerana</i>	Trimmer's Mining Bee	• Nationally Scarce	2012	2013	2
	<i>Andrena (Poecilandrena) labiata</i>	Red-girdled Mining Bee	• Nationally Scarce	2003	2007	3
	<i>Aporus unicolor</i>	Aporus unicolor	• Nationally Scarce	2015	2015	1
	<i>Chrysis gracillima</i>	Chrysis gracillima	• IUCN_GB_pre94:VU	2003	2005	2
	<i>Crossocerus (Crossocerus) distinguendus</i>	Crossocerus (Crossocerus) distinguendus	• Nationally Scarce	2015	2015	2
	<i>Dolichovespula (Dolichovespula) media</i>	Dolichovespula (Dolichovespula) media	• Nationally Scarce	1994	2008	3
	<i>Formica rufa</i>	Red Wood Ant	• Hampshire BAP County Scarce	2003	2003	1
	<i>Hylaeus (Lamdopsis) annularis</i>	Hylaeus (Lamdopsis) annularis	• IUCN_GB_pre94:R	2005	2005	1
	<i>Lasioglossum (Evylaeus) malachurum</i>	Sharp-collared Furrow Bee	• Nationally Scarce	2002	2005	3
	<i>Mutilla europaea</i>	Large Velvet Ant	• Nationally Scarce	2010	2010	2
	<i>Nomada fucata</i>	Painted Nomad Bee	• Nationally Scarce	2012	2012	2
	<i>Philanthus triangulum</i>	Bee Wolf	• IUCN_GB_pre94:VU	2003	2013	3
	<i>Sphecodes crassus</i>	Swollen-thighed Blood Bee	• Nationally Scarce	2005	2013	3
Invertebrates - Lepidoptera	<i>Acronicta psi</i>	Grey Dagger	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2002	2015	4
	<i>Acronicta rumicis</i>	Knot Grass	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2004	2015	2
	<i>Adela cuprella</i>	Early Long-horn	• County Rare	2012	2015	3
	<i>Aethes williana</i>	Silver Carrot Conch	• County Rare	2006	2006	1
	<i>Agdistis bennetii</i>	Saltmarsh Plume	• County Rare	2014	2014	1

<i>Agriopsis aurantiaria</i>	Scarce Umber	• County Scarce	2013	2013	1
<i>Agrochola helvola</i>	Flounced Chestnut	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2004	2004	1
<i>Agrochola lychnidis</i>	Beaded Chestnut	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2003	2003	1
<i>Amphipoea oculea</i>	Ear Moth	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2003	2014	2
<i>Arctia caja</i>	Garden Tiger	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2005	2005	1
<i>Argynnis aglaja</i>	Dark Green Fritillary	• County Scarce	2005	2005	1
<i>Argynnis paphia</i>	Silver-washed Fritillary	• Hampshire BAP County Interest	2003	2016	46
<i>Aspitates ochrearia</i>	Yellow Belle	• County Scarce	1995	2015	5
<i>Caradrina morpheus</i>	Mottled Rustic	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2005	2014	3
<i>Chesias legatella</i>	Streak	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 County Scarce	2009	2009	1
<i>Chlorissa viridata</i>	Small Grass Emerald	• Hampshire BAP	2006	2006	1
<i>Cirrhia icteritia</i>	Sallow	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2013	2013	1
<i>Coenonympha pamphilus</i>	Small Heath	• IUCN_GB_2001:NT Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	1996	2015	15
<i>Coleophora limosipennella</i>	Dark Elm Case-bearer	• County Rare	2012	2012	2
<i>Coleophora maritimella</i>	Sea-rush Case-bearer	• County Rare	2012	2012	3
<i>Coleophora pyrrhulipennella</i>	Ling Case-bearer	• County Rare	2004	2005	2
<i>Coleophora salinella</i>	Sea-purslane Case-bearer	• County Rare	2003	2003	1
<i>Cosmopterix scribaiella</i>	New Marsh Cosmet	• County Scarce	2003	2011	3
<i>Cryphia algae</i>	Tree-lichen Beauty	• County Rare	2005	2005	1

<i>Cupido minimus</i>	Small Blue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IUCN_GB_2001:NT • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 • Hampshire BAP • County Scarce 	2010	2014	2
<i>Diarsia rubi</i>	Small Square-spot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2006	2008	5
<i>Dolicharthria punctalis</i>	Long-legged China-mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationally Scarce 	1994	2003	4
<i>Ecliptopera silaceata</i>	Small Phoenix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2002	2009	4
<i>Eilema sororcula</i>	Orange Footman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hampshire BAP 	2003	2011	4
<i>Ennomos fuscantaria</i>	Dusky Thorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2009	2009	1
<i>Ephestia parasitella</i>	False Cacao Moth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	2004	2004	1
<i>Epiblema sticticana</i>	Colt's-foot Bell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	2015	2015	1
<i>Eugnorisma glareosa</i>	Autumnal Rustic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 • County Scarce 	2013	2013	1
<i>Eupithecia simpliciata</i>	Plain Pug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	2003	2003	1
<i>Eupithecia subumbrata</i>	Shaded Pug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	2002	2002	2
<i>Euxoa tritici</i>	White-line Dart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 • County Scarce 	1998	2014	2
<i>Grapholita internana</i>	Dark Gorse Piercer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Rare 	2011	2013	2
<i>Hadena perplexa</i>	Tawny Shears	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	2002	2002	1
<i>Hipparchia semele</i>	Grayling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IUCN_GB_2001:VU • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2009	2010	2
<i>Hoplodrina blanda</i>	Rustic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2002	2014	4
<i>Lacanobia suasa</i>	Dog's Tooth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	2002	2002	1
<i>Larentia clavaria</i>	Mallow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Scarce 	2002	2005	3

<i>Lasiommata megera</i>	Wall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:NT Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 County Scarce	2005	2012	6
<i>Limenitis camilla</i>	White Admiral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:VU Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	1996	2012	20
<i>Lithophane semibrunnea</i>	Tawny Pinion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2007	2007	1
<i>Litologia literosa</i>	Rosy Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2005	2009	2
<i>Malacosoma neustria</i>	Lackey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2002	2012	8
<i>Melanthia procellata</i>	Pretty Chalk Carpet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2003	2003	1
<i>Oncocera semirubella</i>	Rosy-striped Knot-horn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nationally Scarce 	2014	2014	1
<i>Panemeria tenebrata</i>	Small Yellow Underwing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2006	2006	2
<i>Perizoma albulata</i>	Grass Rivulet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2011	2011	1
<i>Phyllonorycter salictella</i>	Willow Midget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare 	2003	2003	1
<i>Platytes cerussella</i>	Little Grass-veneer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Rare 	1994	2006	5
<i>Plebejus argus</i>	Silver-studded Blue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:VU Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Interest	1982	2013	6
<i>Polymixis lichenea</i>	Feathered Ranunculus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Scarce 	2000	2009	5
<i>Polyommatus bellargus</i>	Adonis Blue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:NT Hampshire BAP County Rare	2003	2003	1
<i>Pyrgus malvae</i>	Grizzled Skipper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IUCN_GB_2001:VU Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 County Interest	1996	2009	18
<i>Rhizodra lutosa</i>	Large Wainscot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment 	1995	2002	4

			and Rural Communities Act 2006			
	<i>Saturnia pavonia</i>	Emperor Moth	• County Scarce	2004	2004	1
	<i>Satyrrium w-album</i>	White-letter Hairstreak	• IUCN_GB_2001:EN Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP County Scarce	2001	2009	15
	<i>Scrobipalpa instabilella</i>	Saltern Groundling	• County Rare	2012	2012	2
	<i>Sitochroa palealis</i>	Sulphur Pearl	• Nationally Notable	1994	2010	4
	<i>Spilosoma lubricipeda</i>	White Ermine	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2003	2012	2
	<i>Spilosoma lutea</i>	Buff Ermine	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2005	2005	1
	<i>Stenoptilia zophodactylus</i>	Dowdy Plume	• County Rare	2014	2014	1
	<i>Stigmella aeneofasciella</i>	Brassy Pigmy	• County Rare	2008	2008	4
	<i>Synaphe punctalis</i>	Long-legged Tabby	• Nationally Scarce	1998	2014	4
	<i>Timandra comae</i>	Blood-Vein	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2006	2006	1
	<i>Tyria jacobaeae</i>	Cinnabar	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	1993	2014	30
	<i>Watsonalla binaria</i>	Oak Hook-tip	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	2004	2006	5
	<i>Zygaena trifolii</i>	Five-spot Burnet	• County Scarce	2011	2011	1
Invertebrates - Mollusca	<i>Arion (Arion) ater</i>	Large Black Slug	• IUCN_GB_2001:DD	1998	2010	8
	<i>Ashfordia granulata</i>	Silky Snail	• Hampshire BAP County Scarce	2007	2007	2
Invertebrates - Odonata	<i>Ceriagrion tenellum</i>	Small Red Damselfly	• Hampshire BAP	2013	2013	1
	<i>Cordulia aenea</i>	Downy Emerald	• Hampshire BAP	2002	2005	5
	<i>Ischnura pumilio</i>	Scarce Blue-tailed Damselfly	• IUCN_GB_2001:NT Hampshire BAP	2002	2002	5
	<i>Libellula fulva</i>	Scarce Chaser	• IUCN_GB_2001:NT Hampshire BAP	2013	2013	1

	<i>Orthetrum coerulescens</i>	Keeled Skimmer	• Hampshire BAP	2005	2013	3
Invertebrates - Orthoptera	<i>Nemobius sylvestris</i>	Wood Cricket	• Nationally Scarce	2006	2006	1
	<i>Omocestus rufipes</i>	Woodland Grasshopper	• Nationally Scarce	2008	2008	1
Lichens	<i>Cladonia coniocraea</i>	Cladonia coniocraea	• Annex V Habitats Directive	2002	2002	1
Lower plants - Liverworts, Hornworts & Mosses	<i>Leucobryum glaucum</i>	Large White-moss	• Annex V Habitats Directive	1999	2009	9
	<i>Pallavicinia lyellii</i>	Ribbonwort	• Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Hampshire BAP	2001	2006	4
	<i>Sphagnum</i>	Bog Moss	• Annex V Habitats Directive	1991	2015	7
	<i>Sphagnum denticulatum</i>	Sphagnum denticulatum	• Annex V Habitats Directive	1999	1999	1
	<i>Sphagnum fallax</i>	Flat-topped Bog-moss	• Annex V Habitats Directive	1999	1999	1
	<i>Sphagnum fimbriatum</i>	Fringed Bog-moss	• Annex V Habitats Directive	1999	1999	1
	<i>Sphagnum palustre</i>	Blunt-leaved Bog-moss	• Annex V Habitats Directive	2004	2015	2
	<i>Sphagnum recurvum</i>	Sphagnum recurvum	• Annex V Habitats Directive	2004	2004	2
	<i>Sphagnum squarrosum</i>	Spiky Bog-moss	• Annex V Habitats Directive	1999	2004	2
Mammals - Marine	<i>Halichoerus grypus</i>	Grey Seal	• Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Annex V Habitats Directive	2009	2010	4
	<i>Phoca vitulina</i>	Common Seal	• Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Annex V Habitats Directive	2008	2010	12
Mammals - Terrestrial (bats)	<i>Chiroptera</i>	Bats	• Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest	1988	2016	11

	<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>	Serotine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	1987	2016	19
	<i>Myotis</i>	Unidentified Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	2004	2016	6
	<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>	Daubenton's Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2001	2016	5
	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	Whiskered Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2011	2016	3
	<i>Myotis mystacinus/brandtii</i>	Whiskered/Brandt's Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2001	2016	4

	<i>Myotis nattereri</i>	Natterer's Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	2003	2016	34
	<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	Noctule Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1997	2016	28
	<i>Pipistrellus</i>	Pipistrelle Bat species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	1984	2015	63
	<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	Pipistrelle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	2000	2016	47
	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	Soprano Pipistrelle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	1999	2016	39

	<i>Plecotus</i>	Long-eared Bat species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	1997	2016	7
	<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	Brown Long-eared Bat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 	1986	2016	30
Mammals - Terrestrial (non-bats)	<i>Arvicola amphibius</i>	European Water Vole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP County Interest 	2002	2009	2
	<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>	West European Hedgehog	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 	2006	2013	24
	<i>Lutra lutra</i>	European Otter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annex II of the Habitats Directive (non-priority species) Annex IV Habitats Directive Schedule 2 of Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Schedule 5 Section 9 (4b); Schedule 5 Section 9 (4c) of Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 Hampshire BAP 	2006	2006	1
	<i>Meles meles</i>	Eurasian Badger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of Badgers Act 1992 	2008	2014	4

	<i>Neomys fodiens</i>	Eurasian Water Shrew	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hampshire BAPCounty Scarce	2009	2009	1
--	-----------------------	----------------------	---	------	------	---

Appendix 3:
Map showing location of statutory designated sites

Appendix 4:
Map showing location of non-statutory designated sites

Appendix 5:

Botanical species list compiled during Phase 1 habitat survey with a qualitative measure of abundance based on DAFOR scale

Appendix 5: Botanical species list compiled during Phase 1 habitat survey with a qualitative measure of abundance based on DAFOR scale.

The DAFOR scale provides an assessment of the abundance of particular species.

D = Dominant, A = Abundant, F = Frequent, O = Occasional, R = Rare. Species can also be Locally Dominant (LD) or Locally Abundant (LA) meaning there is a particularly dense patch but it does not extend to an entire area, for example a nettle bed.

English Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR								
		Donkey derby field	Heather gardens	Hamble green	Cemetery	Westfield common	Mercury marshes	Mount pleasant recreation ground	College playing fields	Allotments
Annual meadow grass	<i>Poa annua</i>	R		O		R		F	O	
Apple	<i>Malus sp.</i>						R			
Apple	<i>Malus pumila</i>							R		
Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	R	R			R	O	R	O	O
Azalea	<i>Rhododendron sp.</i>						R			
Bamboo	<i>Bambusoideae sp.</i>		LA				R			
Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>		R							
Black bryony	<i>Dioscorea communis</i>							R		
Black medick	<i>Medicago lupulina</i>	R								
Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>					R	R			
Box	<i>Buxus sp.</i>	LA								
Bracken	<i>Pteridium sp.</i>	LA	R			F	R			O
Bramble	<i>Rubus fruticosus</i>	LA	F		O	F	O	O	R	
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	O		R	O		R		R	O
Broom	<i>Cytisus scoparius spp scoparius</i>						R			
Butcher's-broom	<i>Ruscus aculeatus</i>		R			R				
Cat's-ear	<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>	R			O	R	R			

Iris	<i>Iris sp.</i>					R				R	
Ivy	<i>Hedera helix</i>	LA	A			LF	LA	O	LA	R	O
Knotgrass	<i>Polygonum aviculare</i>			O			R				
Lesser burdock	<i>Arctium minus</i>						R				
Lesser stitchwort	<i>Stellaria graminea</i>					F					
Lime sp.	<i>Tilia sp.</i>									R	
Lime sp. (hybrid)	<i>Tilia sp.</i>			O							
Male fern	<i>Dryopteris filix-mas</i>		R								
Maple sp.	<i>Acer sp.</i>		R								
Meadow buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>	R									
Musk-mallow	<i>Malva moschata</i>							R			
Nipplewort	<i>Lapsana communis</i>					R					
Norway maple	<i>Acer platanoides</i>								R		
Osier	<i>Salix viminalis</i>									R	
Pampas grass	<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>							R			
Pear	<i>Pyrus sp.</i>									R	
Pedunculate oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>	R	O	O			O	O	O	R	
Pendulous sedge	<i>Carex pendula</i>							R			
Perennial rye grass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>									O	
Pine	<i>Pinus sp.</i>		R							R	
Prickly sow-thistle	<i>Sonchus asper</i>			R		R					R
Privet	<i>Ligustrum sp.</i>							R		R	
Purple toadflax	<i>Linaria purpurea</i>										R
Red clover	<i>Trifolium pratense</i>	R				R		R			
Red dead nettle	<i>Lamium purpureum</i>			R			R				R
Red fescue	<i>Festuca rubra agg.</i>	O									
Redshank	<i>Persicaria maculosa</i>							R		R	
Rhododendron	<i>Rhododendron ponticum</i>		R					O			
Ribwort plantain	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	O		F			R	O	O	R	O

Rose	<i>Rosa sp.</i>					R	R	R	R	
Rough hawkbit	<i>Leontodon hispidus</i>	O		O						
Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>				O		R		R	
Scarlet pimpernel	<i>Anagallis arvensis</i>				R				R	
Scented mayweed	<i>Matricaria chamomilla</i>					R				
Scots pine	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>							R		
Sea beet	<i>Beta vulgaris subsp. maritima</i>					O				
Sea couch	<i>Agropyron pungens</i>					LA				
Sessile oak	<i>Quercus petraea</i>					R				
Sheeps sorrel	<i>Rumex acetosella</i>	R		O						
Silver birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>		R			R				
Small-leaved lime	<i>Tilia cordata</i>			R						
Smooth sow-thistle	<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>					R				
Snowberry	<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>						R			
Spear thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>								O	
Sweet chestnut	<i>Castanea sativa</i>	R				R			R	
Sweet flag	<i>Acorus calamus</i>		O							
Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	LA	A	R	R	O		O		
Variegated yellow archangel	<i>Lamiaeum galeobdolon subsp. argentatum</i>					R				
White clover	<i>Trifolium repens</i>	R		O	O	O	O	O	O	
White dead nettle	<i>Lamium album</i>							R		
Wild strawberry	<i>Fragaria vesca</i>						R			
Willow sp.	<i>Salix sp.</i>						O	F		
Wilson's honeysuckle	<i>Lonicera nitida</i>									LA
Wood avens	<i>Geum urbanum</i>		O		F	O	R	O		
Wood forget-me-not	<i>Myosotis sylvatica</i>				R					
Wood sage	<i>Teucrium scorodonia</i>					R				R
Wood speedwell	<i>Veronica montana</i>				R					

Wood spurge	<i>Euphorbia amygdaloides</i>				R	R				
Yarrow	<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	O		O	F	R		O	F	
Yew	<i>Taxus baccata</i>		O		R		R			
Yorkshire fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	R			O	R				

Ad-hoc species sightings:

Group	Species	Scientific Name
Lepidoptera (butterflies)	Small copper	<i>Lycaena phlaeas</i>
	Speckled wood	<i>Pararge aegeria</i>
Hymenoptera (bumblebees)	Carder bee	<i>Bombus pascuorum</i>
Odonata (Dragonflies & damselflies)	Emperor dragonfly	<i>Anax imperator</i>
Diptera (flies)	Cranefly	
	Hoverfly	
Birds	Great tit	<i>Parus major</i>
	Magpie	<i>Pica pica</i>
	Robin	<i>Erithacus rubecula</i>
	Wood pigeon	<i>Columba palumbus</i>
Mammals	Grey squirrel	<i>Sciurus carolinensis</i>

Appendix 6:
Bog garden creation

Appendix 6: Bog garden creation

Bog gardens are excellent habitats for wildlife, such as for young frogs, due to the dense, damp vegetation they support. They can be stand-alone features, or adjacent to a pond to create an extensive area of suitable wildlife habitat.

Bog gardens need to be permanently damp, so should be created in a naturally wet area or where run-off can collect e.g. in a natural depression. If the area for creation is not naturally wet/damp, this can be achieved by using a leaky hose pipe buried into the soil that is blocked at one end and connected to a tap or water butt (further details can be found on the RHS link below). Ideally bog gardens should be located in an area that receives full sunlight for at least part of the day.

Method

- Dig a hole approximately 30 to 45cm deep and to the desired width and length;
- Line the hole with butyl pond liner or polythene sheeting. The liner should extend at least 30cm beyond the edge of the hole to allow for settling;
- Weigh down the edge of the liner with bricks/large stones;
- Pierce the liner at 1 metre intervals using a garden fork. This means water will be retained but some drainage can occur to stop water pooling;
- Line the hole with gravel;
- Refill the newly lined hole with the extracted soil.

Native plants with attractive flowers:

- Bugle (*Ajuga reptans*)
- Common skullcap (*Scutellaria Galericulata*)
- Cowslip (*Primula veris*)
- Lady's smock (*Cardamine pratensis*)
- Lesser spearwort (*Ranunculus flammula*)
- Marsh woundwort (*Stachys palustris*)
- Meadowsweet (*Filipendula ulmaria*)
- Purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*)
- Ragged robin (*Lychnis flos-cuculi*)

The list above has avoided large, vigorous growing species, as unless the bog garden is very large they will dominate and out-compete other species.

Sources of information:

- Natural England – Garden ponds and boggy areas: havens for wildlife
[http://www.wlgf.org/ne27garden_ponds\[1\].pdf](http://www.wlgf.org/ne27garden_ponds[1].pdf)
- Royal Horticultural Society – Bog gardens
<https://www.rhs.org.uk/advice/profile?PID=356#section-3>

Appendix 7:
Natural England Technical Information Note TIN064: Sward Enhancement

GLOSSARY

Glossary of Biodiversity Terms and Acronyms

Biodiversity – the diversity of life in an area.

Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) – regional priority areas of opportunity for restoration and creation of Biodiversity Action Plan habitats.

Buffer zone - a strip that partially or fully encloses an area to protect the inner section from ecological disturbance by outside pressures.

Corridor - the principle of connections between wildlife habitats. Closely related to the theory of fragmentation, ecological corridors aim to provide a corridor for migration of all species between suitable habitat areas.

Ecosystem - the interactions of animals, plants, fungi, and micro-organisms with each other and the non-living world.

Ecosystem Services – the natural resources and processes supplied by the ecosystem.

Edge-effects – where much of the biodiversity in small or narrow sites is under the influence of factors from outside the site. Larger blocks of habitat have an inner core which is buffered from these influences.

Eutrophication – the enrichment by nutrients of waterbodies leading to algal blooms which disrupt the ecosystem.

Fragmentation - the disruption of large areas of habitat into smaller, separate units. Involves both a total loss of habitat area and the isolation of remaining habitat patches, which prevents interaction between some organisms located in the fragments, and renders them effectively separate populations.

Green Infrastructure – a term used to describe the accessible 'multi-functional' green space that should accompany housing developments for residents' quality of life. These areas provide potential direct and indirect benefits for biodiversity.

Habitat - a place where animals, plants, fungi, and micro-organisms live.

HLF – Heritage Lottery Fund

Improved land – land that has been improved for the purposes of agricultural production, usually through ploughing, sowing, drainage, and the application of fertilisers.

Invasive alien species - species from other countries not naturally found growing in Britain, with a tendency to dominate communities to the detriment of native species.

Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) – plans produced at county, district, parish or similar level to interpret the actions of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.

Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act (2006) – Legislation which places a duty upon local authorities to protect and enhance biodiversity through their activities.

NIA - Nature Improvement Area

Ramsar – The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, especially as Waterfowl Habitat, is an international treaty for the conservation and sustainable utilisation of wetlands.

Ride - open track-ways cut through woods originally for the extraction of timber. Now important conservation areas for butterflies, other invertebrates and wildflowers growing there due to the increased sunlight along the woodland edge.

Riparian – living or growing along the banks of a river.

Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) - A non-statutory designation of sites at the county/district level. Sites are generally assessed by either local authorities or county wildlife trusts, and adopted in local plans. For the criteria used for selecting SINC, see section 2.

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - an area of land notified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as being of special nature conservation interest. The SSSI designation applies in England, Wales and Scotland. Sites are notified by the appropriate country conservation agency, in England this is Natural England.

Special Area for Conservation (SAC) - a site designated by the UK Government under EC Directive 92/43 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.

Special Protection Area (SPA) - a site designated under Article 4 of EC Directive 79/409 on the conservation of wild birds. Together SACs and SPAs form a network of European sites known as Natura 2000.

Tree Preservation Order (TPO) – an Order which causes the prohibition of cutting down, topping, lopping or the wilful destruction of trees except with the consent from the Local Authority to ensure the preservation of trees, groups of trees and woodlands. Type “W” refers to TPOs for woodlands.

UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) - the UK's priorities in biodiversity conservation, formulate a series of focused action plans designed to achieve these objectives.

Items marked with a * are disputed invoices.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Invoice</u>	<u>Supplier</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Net Value</u>	<u>VAT</u>	<u>Invoice Total</u>	<u>Balance</u>
21/09/17	* 2356589	EBC	E02	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
14/12/17	2379598	EBC	E02	232.50	43.50	276.00	276.00
28/12/17	2382687	EBC	E02	33.84	6.77	40.61	40.61
31/12/17	17-18	PA BUSINESS SER	PA01	595.00	0.00	595.00	595.00
02/01/18	2635	ENGRAVING	E020	29.95	5.99	35.94	35.94
02/01/18	7558	VISION ICT	V010	475.00	95.00	570.00	570.00
04/01/18	V01441634367	TMOBILE	T06	33.61	6.72	40.33	40.33
05/01/18	2389363	EBC	E02	828.86	0.00	828.86	828.86
05/01/18	58065807	HCC	H04	1.52	0.30	1.82	1.82
09/01/18	130853	CALE BRIPARC	C04	80.00	16.00	96.00	96.00
10/01/18	10675	P&R ELECTRICAL	P010	1,833.69	366.74	2,200.43	2,200.43
15/01/18	128957	CARRERA	C010	127.00	25.40	152.40	152.40
15/01/18	129055	CARRERA	C010	205.32	41.06	246.38	246.38
18/01/18	156347	JEWSON	J03	47.70	9.54	57.24	57.24
18/01/18	1801/013	DESIGN & PRINT	D04	840.00	0.00	840.00	840.00
18/01/18	18/1	BARCLAYS BANK	BB01	38.16	0.00	38.16	38.16
18/01/18	156386	JEWSON	J03	47.70	9.54	57.24	57.24
23/01/18	2666	ENGRAVING	E020	150.14	30.03	180.17	180.17
23/01/18	2754099/2	BUSINESS STREAM	BS02	96.88	0.00	96.88	96.88
24/01/18	12-17/18	JACKIE PANAKIS	J02	105.00	0.00	105.00	105.00
25/01/18	2773148/3	BUSINESS STREAM	BS02	317.23	0.00	317.23	317.23
29/01/18	219	ARCADIAN	AE01	1,250.00	250.00	1,500.00	1,500.00
31/01/18	31/1	BRADBURY-KNIGHT	BK01	165.75	0.00	165.75	165.75
				17,534.85	909.59	18,444.44	18,444.44