

## Council Meeting 14 March 2022 7.00pm Roy Underdown Pavilion

1. Welcome:  
Apologies for absence  
Dispensations -  
Expressions of interest  
Approve the minutes of 14<sup>th</sup> February 2022

2. Public participation.

### Community Issues

3. Cemex Quarrying Application
  - a. Approve Hamble Parish Council's consultation response
  - b. Working Groups
  - c. Next Steps
4. Annual Parish Meeting – Date, location, and focus.
5. Hampshire County Council Voluntary Sector Funding – consultation
6. Project Update
7. Recommendations from Working Groups and Committees:
  - a. Asset Management Committee
  - b. Personnel Working Group
  - c. Communications Working Group
  - d. Community Safety Working Group
  - e. Delegated decisions from cancelled Planning Committee – 28.02.2022



## Financial, Risk and Governance

8. Year-end process 2021/22
9. Payments and Bank reconciliation for February 2022
10. Monthly accounting reports

### Exempt business

To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 in respect of the following item(s) of business on the grounds that it is/they are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act. The Schedule 12A categories have been amended and are now subject to the public interest test, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This came into effect on 1st March 2006. It is considered that the following items are exempt from disclosure and that the public interest in not disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Signed: *Amanda Jobling*  
Clerk and Proper Officer

Date: 08.03.2022



**Council Meeting 14 February 2022**

**Minutes**

Hamble Parish Council, Parish Office, 2 High Street, Hamble, Southampton SO31  
4JE

Meeting held at the Roy Underdown Pavilion, Baron Road, Hamble.

Minute reference is the date plus number 14022022+ item number.

**Present**

Members: Cllr Cohen, Cllr Cross, Cllr Dann, Cllr Hand (Chair), Cllr Lehneis, Cllr Nicholson (arrived late at 19.07), Cllr Palmer, Cllr Rolfe (arrived late at 19.23) Cllr Thompson and Cllr Underdown

Staff: Clerk, Planning Consultant and Communications Consultant

**1. Welcome:**

Apologies for absence: Cllrs Jones and Cllr Ryan.

Expressions of interest - None declared

Approve the Minutes of 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022

Proposed: Cllr Cohen

Seconded: Cllr Dann and the Minutes for 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022 were agreed. Cllr Underdown didn't vote as he was absent from the January meeting.

**2. Public participation – three members of the public attended.**

A resident that was previously involved in Residents Against Gravel Extraction (RAGE) came to talk to the Council about the aspects of the campaign that they ran last time that they believed worked well and could assist residents in making effective consultation comments. They were keen that the messages were clear and simple with advice on the sorts of comments that people should make in their responses. The council welcomed the comments and thanked the residents for coming along.

**Community Issues**

Signed

Date

### 3. Cemex

#### Technical Assessment report

Steve Tilbury outlined the work that the case officer would be working on ahead of making a recommendation to the Regulatory Committee. Currently there is not enough information for the Case Officer to assess but there is likely to be additional information and studies over the coming weeks.

Although it is important to encourage people to respond to the application it is equally important that people understand it is not a decision stage – this will come much later. Once there is an indication about the likely decision the campaign will move to a more active stage.

Our response will be made shortly after the 14th March 2022 but it will highlight our main concerns but with a reserved position to come back later as more evidence is shared.

#### Key points:

Highways is the most significant. The situation has already been assessed as severe, but works have not been carried out to address this - so adding to the volumes is a key issue. With traffic moving slowly there will be economic and social impacts, and these need proper assessment.

Long term management of the site is currently too short to enable the proper restoration of the site. A much longer term is needed to safeguard biodiversity and to minimise the risk of a residential application following on the back of the site restoration.

Other issues also exist such as air pollution, noise, biodiversity, and we will be securitising work in these areas to ensure the issues are addressed adequately. etc. A technical solution is likely for most of these issues and are likely to be resolved by the Cemex to the Planning Authority's satisfaction. A technical solution is less clear around the highway's issues hence the focus of work for us and EBC.

#### Feedback from Working Groups

Infrastructure Group - Appraisal of the impact of the traffic movements and cycleways along Hamble Lane. Also concerned about the impact of combination of young people and truck movements.

Community Impacts Group – Met with a resident who raised concerns about the condition of the railway bridge, hydrology, and flood risk. Also feedback from several other residents who have shared their responses via social media.

A meeting for next Tuesday has been arranged at Hamble Club to allow people to voice their issues.

Biodiversity and after use - Looked at historic documentation and now waiting for responses to come in from the relevant statutory authorities and interest groups. What is clear is that the area designated for open space in the after-use period is inadequate and should be challenged.

Communication and Engagement Group - Asked to consider the use of highly visible banners on FB/website posts. Use “trusted village influencers” to disseminate information.

Proposed: Cllr Underdown and Seconded: Cllr Cross and all agreed to the terms of reference for the working groups.

Proposed: Cllr Rolfe and Seconded: Cllr Underdown and all agreed extend the contract for Steve Tilbury past the first 10 days contract which includes the drafting and submission of Hamble Parish Council’s response. This will be subject to further negotiation.

#### 4. Grant Applications: Hamble Village Conservation Volunteers

Applying for £500 to purchase silki saws at £60 per saw to help with scrub clearance, new hi viz bibs and PPE. The volunteers have not met as often as before due to covid so they do have nearly £1000 in reserves, but they will need to refresh equipment, hence the grant. They have now got more volunteers and will do three Mondays a month - beach cleans on the first Monday; second Monday of each month will be working with the Parish team and the third Monday undertake the heavy shrub work.

Proposed: Cllr Underdown and Seconded: Cllr Lehneis and all agreed that the Council in accordance with its powers under section 137 and 139 of the Local Government Act 1972, should incur the following expenditure which, in the opinion of the Council, is in the interests of the area or its inhabitants and will benefit them in a manner commensurate with the expenditure to award a grant of £500 for the purchase of equipment to help maintain public spaces in the village.

#### 5. Platinum Jubilee Celebrations – Updates

Support others to do things. So far aware of the Hamble Pipe Band playing a riposte at the area outside the RSrNYC. (Cllr Hand left the meeting temporarily) Agreed to provide a Tool kit for having a street party (item for the April new letter) and also to seek a dedication at the completed Southern Foreshore to the Jubilee. More details of the dedication will follow.

#### 6. Project Update

Proposed: Cllr Hand and Seconded: Cllr Cohen the recommendations were all approved as follows:

To note the update with the current projects including those that have now been completed.

Approve expenditure from the EMR for the additional lap top and approve the replacement mobile phones. The cost of this will be reported to the next meeting and delegation is sought to approve it.

Approve the list of existing and new projects and the committee/group overseeing it.

#### 7. Projects list for 2022

The Pink Ferry lease should be added to the list but other agreed and PID requested for the next meeting for sign off.

#### 8. Eastleigh Borough Council Team Meeting Update

Audit has been carried out and a consultation will start in April with residents at Grantham Avenue (Cllr Rolfe left the room temporarily)  
Friday Market - survey to be run via the newsletter  
Items were only for noting

#### 9. Recommendations from Working Groups and Committees

Recommendation from Asset Management Committee

To establish a task and finish group to agree a programme of works for Heather Gardens following the recent survey. The group to comprise: Cllr A Thompson – Chair of AMC, Mark Cowley – Parish Warden, Mr P Nicholson – resident and a Volunteer from the Hamble Village Conservation Volunteers.

Proposed Cllr Hand and seconded Cllr Underdown and all approved the task and finish group.

#### Recommendations from Personnel Working Group

To approve the changes to the role profiles of the grounds team with immediate effect

To permanently appoint the Parish Warden from 01.03.2022

To extend the Project Managers contract for a further twelve months from 20.05.2022 based on 20 hours per week.

To note the transfer from Head of Assets and Facilities to the Team Leaders role from 01.04.2022

To agree the changes to role titles as follows:

Groundsman – Estate Team Assistant

Head of Assets and Facilities – Estate Team Leader

Parish Warden – Estate Ranger

Project Manager – Projects and Assets Manager

To approve the payment of the annual increment for staff where incremental progression exists from 1.04.2022 (see exempt paper in Jan 2022)

To review discretionary payment for staff where this is no further incremental progression when the national pay award is known (September 2022).

Proposed Cllr Cohen Seconded Cllr Underdown and all the recommendations were approved.

Communications Working Group

Signed

Date

## Newsletter Delivery costs

With the additional size and weight of the newsletter the Council have been asked to consider increasing the payment per month from £330 to £390 per month divided equally by the number of delivery agents and to backdate it to the February delivery.

Undertake a review of delivery options to secure a reliable, resilient, cost effective and time sensitive service.

Proposed: Cllr Underdown and Seconded: Cllr Nicholson and all agreed to the new rate for deliveries and back date to February.

## Community Safety and Crime Reduction WG

(Cllr Lehneis left room temporarily)

Cllr Palmer requested that the name of the group be changed to the Crime Watch Group. This was agreed.

## Financial, Risk and Governance

### 10. Audit report

Proposed: Cllr Nicholson and Seconded: Cllr Rolfe and all agreed the recommendations listed in the report and management response.

### 11. Financial Risk Assessment

Proposed: Cllr Underdown and Seconded: Cllr Hand and all agreed the new financial risk assessment.

### 12. Payments and Bank reconciliation for November 2021

This was circulated after the last meeting and Members were asked to confirm their approval of them and the associated financial reports.

Proposed: Cllr Cohen and Seconded: Cllr Nicholson and all approved the December 2021 and January 2022 Bank Reconciliation and payments list.

### 13. Monthly accounting reports

Noted.

### 14. Accidents and incidents

Council noted the latest accidents and stressed the importance of maintaining a focus on safe working practices.

Proposed: Cllr Hand and Seconded: Cllr Nicholson and all agreed that up to £3,000 should be set aside in reserves for the purchase of two defibrillators for Rpy Underdown Pavilion and Mount Pleasant.

Exempt business: To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 in respect of the following item(s) of business on the

Signed

Date

grounds that it is/they are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act. The Schedule 12A categories have been amended and are now subject to the public interest test, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This came into effect on 1st March 2006. It is considered that the following items are exempt from disclosure and that the public interest in not disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Proposed: Cllr Underdown

Seconded: Cllr Hand

And all agreed to move into exempt business.

15. Staffing Pay for 2022/23 (part of item 9)

Claire Price left the meeting

Proposed: Cllr Hand and Seconded: Cllr Nicholson and all agreed the pay proposals as set out in the report from April 2022.

Meeting ended at 9.30pm

Signed

Date

Approve the Minutes of 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022

Proposed: Cllr

Seconded: Cllr and the Minutes for 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022 were agreed unanimously.

## 2. Public participation

A resident that was previously involved in Residents Against Gravel Extraction (RAGE) came to talk to the Council about the aspects of the campaign that they ran last time that they believed worked well and could assist residents in making effective consultation comments. They were keen that the messages were clear and simple with advice on the sorts of comments that people should make in their responses. The council welcomed the comments and thanked the residents for coming along.

The Chair agreed to change the order of the agenda to deal with the Grant Application first.

## Community Issues

### 3. Grant Applications: Hamble Village Conservation Volunteers

Proposed: Cllr    Seconded: Cllr    and all agreed that the Council in accordance with its powers under section 137 and 139 of the Local Government Act 1972, should incur the following expenditure which, in the opinion of the Council, is in the interests of the area or its inhabitants and will benefit them in a manner commensurate with the expenditure to award a grant of £500 for the purchase of equipment to help maintain public spaces in the village.

Cemex

Technical Assessment report

Feedback from Working Groups

Communication and Engagement

Draft ToR

Agenda and format for the meeting 28<sup>th</sup> Feb 2022

Site visit

Next steps

4.

### 5. Platinum Jubilee Celebrations Cemex – Updates

Signed

Date

Proposed: Cllr  
Seconded: Cllr

## 6. Project Update

Proposed: Cllr

Seconded: Cllr and the following expenditure was approved

## 7. Projects list for 2022

The Pink Ferry lease should be added to the list but other agreed and PID requested for the next meeting for sign off.

## 8. Eastleigh Borough Council Team Meeting Update

For noting

## 9. Recommendations from Working Groups and Committees

### Recommendation from Asset Management Committee

With that in mind it is recommended that a short task and finish group is agreed with the following representatives: Cllr A Thompson – Chair of AMC Mark Cowley – Parish Warden, Mr P Nicholson – resident and a Volunteer from the Hamble Village Conservation Volunteers.

### Recommendations from Personnel Working Group

To approve the changes to the role profiles of the grounds team with immediate effect

To permanently appoint the Parish Warden from 01.03.2022

To extend the Project Managers contract for a further twelve months from 20.05.2022 based on 20 hours per week.

To note the transfer from Head of Assets and Facilities to the Team Leaders role from 01.04.2022

To agree the changes to role titles as follows:

Groundsman – Estate Team Assistant

Head of Assets and Facilities – Estate Team Leader

Parish Warden – Estate Ranger

Project Manager – Projects and Assets Manager

Signed

Date

To approve the payment of the annual increment for staff where incremental progression exists from 1.04.2022 (see exempt paper in Jan 2022)

To review discretionary payment for staff where this is no further incremental progression when the national pay award is known (September 2022)

Communications Working Group

Newsletter Delivery costs

With the additional size and weight of the newsletter to increase the payment from £330 per month to £390 per month divided equally by the number of delivery agents. To consider whether this payment can be back dated for the February edition at the request of one of the delivery agents.

Undertake a review of delivery options to secure a reliable, resilient, cost effective and time sensitive service.

Community Safety and Crime Reduction WG

Cllr Palmer to ask Clerk to formally change Working Group name to Crime Watch Group if this name is supported by other members of the Working Group

## **Financial, Risk and Governance**

10. Audit report

Proposed: Cllr

Seconded: Cllr

And all agreed the recommendations listed above.

11. Financial Risk Assessment

Proposed: Cllr

Seconded: Cllr

And all agreed the recommendations listed above.

12. Payments and Bank reconciliation for November 2021

This was circulated after the last meeting and Members were asked to confirm their approval of them and the associated financial reports.

Proposed: Cllr

Seconded: Cllr

And all approved the December 2021 and January 2022 Bank Reconciliation and payments list.

Propose Cllr

Seconded Cllr

And all agreed.

Signed

Date

13. Monthly accounting reports

As above.

14. Accidents and incidents

Council noted the latest accidents and stressed the importance of maintaining a focus on safe working practices.

Propose Cllr

Seconded Cllr

And all agreed

Exempt business To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 in respect of the following item(s) of business on the grounds that it is/they are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act. The Schedule 12A categories have been amended and are now subject to the public interest test, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. This came into effect on 1st March 2006. It is considered that the following items are exempt from disclosure and that the public interest in not disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Proposed: Cllr

Seconded: Cllr

And all agreed to move into exempt business.

15. Staffing Pay for 2022/23 (part of item 9)

Claire Price left the meeting

Meeting ended at

## Council

14<sup>th</sup> March 2022

### Future of Hamble Airfield – Cemex Quarrying planning application HCC/2021/0787

#### Background

The application consultation closed for Hamble Airfield on the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The consultation exercise generated 1050 responses. Over the coming weeks the Case Officer will read and collate the responses as part of his assessment of the case. In addition, he will also be chasing for Statutory Consultation responses that remain outstanding. At the time of writing, they are indicated in red in appendix i. Most significantly is the absence of HCC Highway Authority which will comment on the capacity of the road network and will also have consulted Network Rail as part of the response.

Several the responses so far have requested further information and data from Cemex in order to confirm their position. These include:

Flood Authority

Natural England

EBC – Pollution, ecology, and trees.

EBC will also be submitting their own response from a policy perspective at the end of the month.

#### Hamble Parish Council's response

Following on from the public meeting held on the 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022 Hamble Parish Councils Planning Consultant Steve Tilbury has drafted our initial response. It is important to stress that this is our **first and initial comments not a definitive position**. We will reserve the right to continue to comment and engage as more information is provided. The paper also focuses on the main areas of concern; **it is not a definitive list of all the issues raised by residents** – but a focus on those grounds where there is a clear planning issue. It is important that we do not focus on these issues to the exclusion of all others but for the moment they are the most pressing. Other agencies will also be focused on issues such as public health and pollution and we will work with them to ensure these issues are addressed.

Summary of the grounds for objection and conclusion

Reason for Objection 1 - Traffic Impact

The Cemex application would create a severe impact on the local road network which is unacceptable and contrary to policies in the HMWP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Reason for Objection 2 – Proposals for Restoration and Management

Reason for Objection 3 – Environmental Impacts

- Flood Risk
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Dust
- Site Layout and Management

**Conclusion**

The Parish Council asks the local planning authority to note its **OBJECTION** to the Cemex application above and consider all of the points raised in this and any subsequent correspondence to ensure that they properly inform the planning judgement that may be reached in due course.

The Parish Council reserves the right to submit further detailed comments on consultation responses and additional material or evidence submitted by the applicant prior to the application being determined. The Parish Council also places on record its readiness to participate constructively in discussions to address the concerns that it has raised.

**Next steps**

The work so far has highlighted the need for some additional work. This includes:

Traffic survey work on Hamble Lane at the morning peak period logging the movements of vehicles and children during this peak period

Survey of recreational disturbance and its impact on other locations and habitats

The economic impacts of the application – follow up to the business briefing with local companies (identified at the EBC Planning Meeting).

Convene a meeting with Paul Holmes and Cllr Humby to discuss the status of the Hamble Lane Improvement Scheme (subject to Highways Authority response).

These pieces of work could be organised locally using Councillors or volunteers. Members are asked to confirm how they would like to proceed with this.

In addition there are some further policy issues which the Clerk will explore with HCC over the coming weeks. They would not form part of our consultation response but they could help with later stages of the application process.

### **Community engagement and the role of the working groups**

The consultation process has generated a good response from the community and there is a wish for people to continue to be engaged ahead of the more active campaign stage as we move towards the decision.

The challenge for the Council is to find ways to harness this enthusiasm and share information and knowledge in a way that helps build confidence in what we are doing. Issues that have recently come up on FB include:

Crowd funding for further legal/technical advice

Investigating other campaigns where applications have been refused

Briefing/informal meetings

Subsidence and compensation

Purchase of the Airfield and planning protections for the future

Rail bridge

Is there a way of the working groups being a focus for the community – working through issues or referring them back to the office in a structured way? If not is there another way to bridge the gap to the community?

## Recommendation

The submit the Hamble Airfield Planning Consultation as set out in the attached paper

To note the next steps

To provide advice on future engagement with the wider community.

Dear Peter

**Planning Application Reference HCC/2021/0787 Proposed Extraction of Sand and Gravel at Hamble Airfield**

Hamble Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the granting of planning permission for the extraction of sand and gravel from the Hamble Airfield site as proposed by Cemex UK Ltd in their application HCC/2021/7087 – hereafter referred to as ‘the Cemex application’.

Our reasons for this objection are set out below and we expect these to be taken fully into account, specifically and in detail, by the County Council in reaching its regulatory decision.

**Background Point - Policy Position**

The site at Hamble Airfield was allocated for the extraction of sand and gravel by the adoption of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) in 2013. The County Council provided itself with advice and reports upon which it based that decision and upon which the Inspector who examined the plan had to rely. The allocation was highly contested by the Parish Council, Eastleigh Borough Council and the local community in evidence at every stage of the plan process. The impact of the application on the local highway network was a major issue for consideration.

It is now clear that the highways evidence before the County Council and the Inspector for the purposes of the plan examination and adoption was significantly flawed.

The details contained in Cemex application demonstrate that quarrying of the site could never have taken place on the basis of the 60 HGV movements per day required to service the site that were considered in evidence by the HMWP process. The Cemex application seeks permission based on 144 HGV movements (during the years of greatest activity) plus an unspecified number of movements of cars and other site vehicles - over 2.5 times the figure assumed by the HMWP. Nothing about the site or the proposed circumstances of operation have changed in the intervening period to explain this very significant increase in numbers.

The figure of 60 HGV movements per day derives from the Strategic Transport and Traffic Assessment commissioned in evidence for the HMWP and was confirmed as accurate by Cemex UK via the evidence report submitted on its behalf by Mayer Brown Ltd in 2012<sup>1</sup>. The Cemex application contains no explanation as to why the information it supplied to the HMWP process was so different to that which it now provides. Had a more accurate figure been available to the County Council, to the Inspector and to interested parties at the time it is entirely possible that they would have taken a different view about the relative merits of this site when contrasted with other options which were then available.

Although we accept that it is too late to challenge the existence of the allocation in the HMWP, in accordance with Para 3.5 of the supporting text to Policy 1 of the HMWP we consider that the weight given to that policy when making a planning judgement about the Cemex application should be significantly reduced because the evidence on which it was based was incorrect to a material degree.

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Proposed Mineral Extraction at Hamble Airfield Access Review’ Mayer Brown May 2012

## **Reason for Objection 1 - Traffic Impact**

**The Cemex application would create a severe impact on the local road network which is unacceptable and contrary to policies in the HMWP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).**

The application proposes that between Yr3 and Yr7 (5 years in total) at least 144 HGV movements will be required every day to remove extracted material and deliver in-fill material for restoration processes. Based on information contained in the Transport Assessment (TA) at least 43% of these movements will take place during the period between 7.00am and 10.00am when Hamble Lane is at its busiest, including the AM Peak Period. Cemex have told the Parish Council that this is unavoidable due to the demands of the market for 'just in time' delivery to local sites. It has proposed no controls on these numbers or the way they are spread out and made clear that it is necessary to the commercial viability of the operation that they will be focussed on this short morning period.

In addition, the TA acknowledges that there will be vehicle movements relating to site staff, managerial visits, regulatory activity and maintenance but does not account for them anywhere in its TA. 20 car parking spaces are proposed on the site but no movements to and from those spaces appear in the TA.

The local planning authority has received over 1000 objections (so far) from residents, businesses and local service providers, a high percentage of which raise the issue of traffic congestion and concerns about the impact of a new junction on Hamble Lane. The number of objections alone is not of course a material consideration, but the inconvenience, delay and business interruption attested by these objections is a material consideration. Objectors include the Hampshire Constabulary and Police Commissioner, Hamble College (secondary school), Hamble Primary School and Blackthorne GP surgery. These objections are founded in the experience of local people in making use of the only road which gives them access to and from the Hamble peninsula. These concerns about the impact of development on Hamble Lane are of a fundamentally different type to those of road users who can choose between routes and may suffer minor inconvenience from additional development. Inevitably, HGVs accessing the proposed site will themselves become caught up in the very traffic congestion to which they contribute, further compounding the problem, and causing peak spreading.

The Parish Council expects these well-founded local concerns to be taken fully into account, but its own highways objection focuses on the shortcomings of the applicant's TA and the pre-existing condition of the local road network.

### **Current Position on Hamble Lane**

Hampshire County Council, in its capacity as highway authority ('the highway authority') has taken a series of decisions which confirm the experience of residents and businesses that Hamble Lane is already a severely congested route with insufficient capacity on several key junctions. In response to this the highway authority has designed and consulted upon a Hamble Lane Improvement Scheme (HLIS) which it considers necessary to implement in order to maintain reasonable access to and from the Hamble Peninsula.

In a report to the Executive Member for Environment and Economy on 14 November 2017 seeking permission to advance the HLIS, officers said at Para 3.4 of the report (emphasis added):

*“Development sites that have recently been permitted in the local area, including along or in the vicinity of Hamble Lane, reinforce the need for additional capacity so as to accommodate both existing and forecast future traffic along Hamble Lane. Given that Hamble Lane is **already largely operating at or above capacity in the peak hours**, further traffic demand would be likely to contribute to additional congestion and peak spreading, whereby the congestion is experienced for a longer period of time in both the morning and evening peak periods.”*

In its second public consultation information pack published on 3 September 2018 on the proposed HLIS the highway authority described the situation on Hamble Lane as follows (emphasis added and please note the use of the term ‘severe’ to describe the current situation):

*“At peak times, **junctions on Hamble Lane are at maximum capacity**, which can cause **severe journey time delays** for residents and commuters.”*

In a further report to the Executive Member on 12 March 2019 following public consultation on the HLIS proposals the officers report said at Para 3.1 (emphasis added):

*“**Hamble Lane is heavily congested throughout much of the day but particularly during peak periods**, with the potential to improve the situation being limited by the geographical constraints associated with the peninsula location.”*

It went on to say at Para 3.2:

*“There is a clear need to for (sic) an improvement to help address existing traffic problems and to help manage future demand associated with background growth. It is considered that additional development along the corridor would compound the existing problems and would negate the benefits of the Scheme, with very limited opportunity to make further improvements to the corridor in future. Therefore until at least the preferred Scheme for the northern section has been implemented, it is considered inappropriate from a traffic perspective for further development to be allocated or permitted along Hamble Lane.”*

The prior position of the highway authority is therefore unequivocally that it considers Hamble Lane to be heavily congested; that several of the key junctions operate over capacity; and that an extensive scheme of improvements is required before any further additional traffic from development can be acceptable. This analysis is fully supported by the Inspector’s report from the most recent and significant appeal decision relating to Hamble Lane, GE Aviation (APP/W1715/W/20/3255559). In dismissing the appeal in early 2021, the Inspector reported his view that Hamble Lane was already congested, noting that it was ‘common ground’ that four of the junctions on Hamble Lane operated above capacity (in the technical sense) even before the impact of traffic from the proposed development was introduced into the relevant modelling. He concluded that the current state of traffic on Hamble Lane is such that even with the level of mitigation proposed for the GE Aviation development the cumulative impact of additional development traffic would be unacceptable.

In determining this application the local planning authority will apply the policies of the NPPF which states that:

*110. In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code; and*
- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.*

*111. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*

It is the settled interpretation of the NPPF that the responsibility for demonstrating to the local planning authority that a proposal satisfies these requirements lies with the applicant through the submission of evidence in the form of a TA, in this case as part of the Environmental Statement.

**The TA provided with the Cemex application does not demonstrate that the application will not have a severe impact on the road network; in fact it does not even attempt to do so.**

The TA provides some data on traffic flows on Hamble Lane and provides a good deal of boiler plate discussion of relevant policies and background considerations. However, this should not distract from the simple underlying assumption which the TA is asking the local planning authority to accept. The applicant's case is no more sophisticated than to assert that because 144 additional HGV movements on Hamble Lane will be a small percentage addition to the existing total volume of traffic, the applicant does not need to carry out any actual analysis of the impact of its proposal on the local road network. Effectively the purpose of the TA is seek to persuade the local planning authority that no proper assessment the impact of development is required.

Specifically, the TA contains no modelling of the impact on any of the junctions north of the proposed development access except that at Hound Road/Hamble Lane. It makes no assessment of the way in which HGV movements will impact on the operation of junctions already described by the highway authority and the GE Inspector as operating over capacity. This means that the TA clearly and unequivocally fails to assess the impact of the proposed development on the local road network. To be credible as an evidential document the TA should have examined the operating capacity of all of the junctions north of the proposed new access up to and including the Windhover roundabout which will bear the full load of additional vehicle movements (according to the TA itself). It is not necessary for us to speculate on why such analysis was not carried out or what pre-application advice might have led to the conclusion that it was not required. The fact is that it was not, and this is a fundamental flaw in the TA.

The local planning authority should not give credence to the applicant's argument that the impact of the additional traffic is, in effect, 'de minimus' and that it cannot therefore be 'severe'. As the Inspector hearing the GE Aviation appeal made clear in his report there is no definition in the NPPF or Planning Practice Guidance of the term 'severe'. It is intended that it be considered in the circumstances of each application. It is wrong, as the applicant does, to suggest that Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment categorisation has any relevance to determining whether the impact of the application can be determined as 'severe'. Neither the NPPF nor Planning Practice Guidance recognises any such categorisation.

It is also incorrect to suggest that a small change in circumstances cannot be considered a severe impact for the purposes of the NPPF test in Para 111. The NPPF is explicit that consideration should

be given to 'cumulative residual impacts' and logically there cannot be any minimum cumulative unit which has to be exceeded before its impact needs to be considered.

Where the existing road network has been objectively determined to be 'heavily congested' and under pressure sufficient to warrant major investment, any impact must be given proper consideration in the light of the local situation and excluded by way of evidence that it is in fact not significant, or by way of mitigation if it is. This is indeed the highway authority's own current policy position as set out in the March 2019 Executive Member report. Despite copious evidence that the TA must assess all of the junctions on Hamble Lane to test the impact of HGV movements Cemex has chosen not to do so. The only reasonable explanation is that the applicant does not wish to put the results of such an analysis before the local planning authority. It cannot, however, make its escape by this route because this absence of evidence is a fundamental flaw in the TA which must lead you to refuse the application.

**Without evidence that the impact of 144 daily HGV movements through those junctions will not add further harm to an already heavily congested local road network, the local planning authority cannot conclude that the application should be permitted.**

Turning to the question of whether the application could proceed by way of mitigation, the highway authority has advised the Parish Council that the HLIS will cost in excess of £15million to implement and that it holds funds of £2million. A financial contribution which would meet the test required for planning obligations cannot be sufficient to enable the HLIS to proceed, and on that basis the application is simply incapable of meeting the requirement of the NPPF in Paragraph 110 (d).

This position is exactly that considered by the inspector in the GE Aviation appeal, where he dismissed the highway authority's (then) support for the application subject to a financial contribution to the HLIS, suggesting that even with such a contribution there was no prospect of the HLIS actually coming forward. He concluded that a financial contribution cannot represent NPPF compliant mitigation of the impact of development if that contribution will not be, indeed cannot be, processed into works on the ground on a reasonable timetable.

In summary, given the stated position of the highway authority that Hamble Lane is 'heavily congested' the approach taken in the TA is fundamentally flawed. It simply assumes what it purports to demonstrate and thereby provides no information whatsoever to satisfy the local planning authority as required by the NPPF at Para 111 that the impact of additional traffic on a road will not be 'severe'.

The Parish Council also draws attention to the fact that the design proposals for the new priority junction do not take account of the new requirements of the Highway Code and the principle that the road user with most potential to cause harm must do most to reduce risk. The proposals have not considered the implications of giving crossing priority to pedestrians and requiring HGVs to 'give way' on both access and egress turns, nor of providing crossing safety to those pedestrians.

### **Reason for Objection 2 – Proposals for Restoration and Management**

Consultation responses from Natural England, Eastleigh Borough Council and the County Council's own ecology team have identified deficiencies in the surveys and baseline data for habitats and biodiversity provided in support of the application. The Parish Council aligns itself with the comments of these consultees and draws the attention of the local planning authority to the significance of their representations. Based on those considerations alone the local planning authority may have grounds to refuse the application outright. It certainly has grounds to do so when considering the general policy requirements of the HMWP.

The Parish Council specifically objects to the proposals for restoration and management of the site on the basis that, inter alia, these fail to satisfy the requirements of Policy 3 of the HMWP which states that:

*Minerals and waste development should not have a significant adverse effect on, and where possible, should enhance, restore or create designated or important habitats and species.*

*The following sites, habitats and species will be protected in accordance with the level of their relative importance:*

*a. internationally designated sites including Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsar sites, any sites identified to counteract adverse effects on internationally designated sites, and European Protected Species;*

*b. nationally designated sites including Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves, nationally protected species and Ancient Woodland;*

*c. local interest sites including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, and Local Nature Reserves;*

*d. habitats and species of principal importance in England;*

*e. habitats and species identified in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan or Hampshire Authorities' Biodiversity Action Plans.*

*Development which is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon such sites, habitats and species will only be permitted where it is judged, in proportion to their relative importance, that the merits of the development outweigh any likely environmental damage. Appropriate mitigation and compensation measures will be required where development would cause harm to biodiversity interests.*

The quarrying of Hamble Airfield will affect every part of the landscape and habitat of the site. The fact that it will be destroyed in phases does not alter the fact that on completion of gravel extraction the whole of the site as it exists today will have been lost. The consultation response from Natural England raises the prospect that Hamble Airfield must be assessed as being within the most sensitive of the categories identified by HMWP Policy 3 given its proximity to SPA and Ramsar sites on the Hamble Peninsula. As with the evidence on highway impacts, the Parish Council reminds the local planning authority that it is the applicant who must provide evidence that their application meets all relevant requirements and in the absence of such evidence permission should be refused.

The Cemex application does not meet the requirements of this policy or relevant policies of the HMWP and NPPF, in that it proposes only a five-year post completion management programme with inadequate detail about who will be responsible for its implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The local planning authority cannot be satisfied by the proposals submitted that restoration compliant with relevant policies can or will take place.

The principle of 'biodiversity net gain' (BNG) established in the Environment Act 2021 will apply as a matter of law to all planning applications from late in 2023. It is acknowledged that the legal requirement does not apply to the Cemex application. However, the proposed operation of BNG sets a clear precedent of how the government considers restoration of habitat should take place and we consider that this has substantial weight as a planning consideration even before the legal position changes in addition to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to promote biodiversity objectives more broadly. Environment Act 2021 compliant BNG will require a minimum of 30 years retention and active management. The suggestion of a five-year post completion programme with no guarantee of retention beyond this date is therefore completely inadequate. In their generic proposals document Cemex have provided no local details of whom, how, or using

what regime the restoration of the site will take place or how it will be secured, evidence of their lack of attention to the detail of the site.

This should be of particular concern to the local planning authority given that the site is owned by Persimmon Homes who have previously sought the allocation of part of the site for residential development in the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan. Whilst the site is safeguarded for mineral extraction residential development is unlikely to be allocated or development permitted. However, it will be apparent that the restoration proposals submitted by Cemex are carefully differentiated into a more complex northern section with drainage and water management features, and an uncomplicated flat southern portion. Previous development proposals from Persimmon have focussed on this southern area.

We acknowledge that the local planning authority can only consider the application before it today. However, unless the restoration proposals are secured through legal agreement in such a way as to secure their intended outcome in both geographic and temporal extent then they cannot meet the HMWP or NPPF policy requirements. The Cemex application will not ensure that restoration works are properly managed or secured long term. On this basis that are not consistent with the policy requirements of the HMWP or NPPF and cannot be considered acceptable.

To be clear, that the Parish Council is not arguing that it would be appropriate for the local planning authority to seek to directly thwart future development proposals by the imposition of conditions or planning obligations. It is arguing that unless the local planning authority can impose conditions and/or planning obligations which ensure that the requirements for mitigation and compensation are maintained in their entirety for at least 30 years and not 'overwritten' by subsequent planning decisions, then it will have failed to secure the mitigation or compensation necessary to render this application acceptable and therefore the application must be refused.

The Parish Council also draws attention to the widespread and routine recreational use of the site by the local community, particularly for dog walking. Although the applicant correctly states that this use is unauthorised, it is incorrect to then argue, as it does, that this ensures it is irrelevant for planning purposes. Removing access to an existing site of 60 hectares will inevitably displace most of the existing recreation use to other sites including those within the Solent SPA. The practical effect is therefore the same as additional residential development on a site which lies within the scope of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy (SRMS) adopted by the Partnership for South Hampshire (including Hampshire County Council) in 2017. The effect of the SRMS is to establish that development which creates an additional recreational impact on the Solent SPA is unacceptable in planning terms unless adequately mitigated. Cemex have made no proposals for such mitigation and on this represent an additional basis on which the application should be refused.

### **Reason for Objection 3 – Environmental Impacts**

The Parish Council notes the concerns raised by other consultees thus far regarding the proposals to ensure that there are no impacts on local residents which go beyond those which would be acceptable in accordance with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. The Parish Council defers to the technical expertise of those organisations and makes its concerns known in the following terms:

#### **Flood Risk**

The flood risk assessment submitted with the application does not provide sufficient reassurance that the gravel extraction process and restoration proposals will not increase the risk of flooding to roads and property in the vicinity of the site. In particular the introduction of large volumes of

compact and impermeable material as in-fill, replacing free draining sand and gravel, must lead to a profound change in the way in which the site responds to surface water. The applicant has provided no material evidence in support of the assumptions made in its flood risk assessment regarding infiltration rates and invites the local planning authority to simply accept that the measures proposed will provide sufficient assurance of no damaging impacts. We note that the lead local flood authority considers that the information submitted with the application is inadequate and has requested further details from the applicant.

Flooding has a devastating impact on homes and the well-being of those affected by it and the duty at Para 167(d) of the NPPF to ensure that residual flood risks are properly managed. The fact that Hamble Airfield is currently located in an area of low flood risk is not the primary concern with this application – the primary concern is to ensure that it remains that way.

### **Air Quality**

A formal Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been declared for the area of the Hamble Lane corridor between the Portsmouth Road junction and the Windhover Roundabout. Eastleigh Borough Council has already identified concerns regarding the assessment of air quality impacts and requested that further details be obtained from the applicant. The Parish Council notes that the application provides no details of the type or nature of the HGVs that Cemex will permit to access the site and thus no location specific controls (just bare legal requirements) on their emissions.

The local planning authority must be satisfied that there will be no further detriment to air quality as a result of the proposed development and the information submitted so far is clearly insufficient to provide any reassurance that this will be the case.

### **Noise**

The local planning authority has the benefit of advice from its own experts, as well as from Eastleigh Borough Council and a number of local residents with knowledge of noise assessment methodology. All of the informed consultation responses on this topic have pointed out deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the methodology and findings of the noise assessment provided by Cemex. Unless Cemex can address all of the issues raised it will not be possible to conclude that noise impacts from the site, including those affecting sensitive receptors such as the secondary school and protect habitat will not be subject to unacceptable increase in noise level.

The Parish Council draws attention (as others have done) to the fact that the application fails to make any assessment of the noise level associated with HGV's as they enter and exit the site, and it is not clear from the applicants Environmental Statement what assumptions have been made regarding the assessment of vehicle noise during on site activities.

### **Dust**

Dust management is essential to minimise the possible impact on human health of dust particles arising from the extraction, processing and transportation of sand and gravel, as well less serious nuisance caused by dust blowing into roads and sensitive receptors. The Parish Council acknowledges that relatively simple dust management techniques may be capable of managing the on-going risk associated with dust but is not satisfied that this has yet been adequately assessed and any abnormal risks taken into account.

In particular we note that the 'wind rose' used to plot potential dust spread from the site is based on wind pattern evidence from Southampton Airport. Whilst this might be acceptable for some purposes where site conditions are unlikely to have their own impact, it is clearly not acceptable for a site as large as Hamble Airfield which has sufficient scale to produce unique local conditions.

### **Site Layout and Management**

The Parish Council does not consider that the approach taken to the provision of buffer zones between sites operations and neighbouring properties, including the provision of bunds where proposed, is acceptable.

The applicant's general approach has been to draw buffer zones to the narrowest possible margins so as to maximise the area from which extraction can take place without providing evidence of why that particular distance is acceptable. The Parish Council notes Para 5.5 of the supporting text to Policy 10 of the HMWP which says:

*"It is standard practice in Hampshire for operational mineral extraction and inert waste recycling sites to have a minimum buffer zone of 100 metres, where appropriate, from the nearest sensitive human receptors, such as homes and schools, though this distance will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis."*

Whilst we acknowledge that the distance required for a buffer zone must be related to that which is necessary for its effectiveness, we look to the local planning authority to ensure that the precautionary approach which is described in the HMWP is adopted in practice to assessing the adequacy of the Cemex application.

### **Conclusion**

The Parish Council asks the local planning authority to note its **OBJECTION** to the Cemex application above and consider all of the points raised in this and any subsequent correspondence to ensure that they properly inform the planning judgement that may be reached in due course.

The Parish Council reserves the right to submit further detailed comments on consultation responses and additional material or evidence submitted by the applicant prior to the application being determined. The Parish Council also places on record its readiness to participate constructively in discussions to address the concerns that it has raised.

Yours etc

## **Future of Hamble Airfield**

Organisations, groups and people consulted on the Cemex Sand and Gravel Planning Application

Flood and Water Management – Lead Local Flood Authority – Hampshire County Council. Responsible for developing, maintaining and applying a strategy for local flood risk management and for maintaining a register of flood risk assets. They also have lead responsibility for managing the risk of flooding from surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses.

Planning Policy – Hampshire County Council.

Public Health - Hampshire County Council

Arboriculture – Hampshire County Council

Hampshire Wildlife Trust – Part of a national charitable organisation which seeks to, to advance, promote and further the conservation, maintenance and protection of the environment.

Rights of Way Manager – Hampshire County Council

National Highways - A government company which plans, designs, builds, operates and maintains England's motorways and major A roads, known as the strategic road network

Environment Agency – executive non-departmental public body. They look after

- regulating major industry and waste
- treatment of contaminated land
- water quality and resources
- fisheries
- inland river, estuary and harbour navigations
- conservation and ecology

Natural England - Provide advice for the natural environment in England. We help to protect and restore our natural world. Natural England is an executive non-departmental public body

Network Rail - Network Rail owns, operates and develops Britain's railway infrastructure

Safeguarding Department – Défense Infrastructure organisation - The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) is the estate expert for defence, supporting the armed forces to enable military capability by planning, building, maintaining, and servicing infrastructure. DIO is part of the [Ministry of Defence](#).

Southampton Airport

Local Highway Authority – Hampshire County Council

County Ecologist – Hampshire County Council

County Landscape architect – Hampshire County Council

Environmental Health – Eastleigh Borough Council

Hamble Parish Council

Hound Parish Council

Netley Marsh Parish Council

Burseldon Parish Council

National Highways - We're the government company which plans, designs, builds, operates and maintains England's motorways and major A roads, known as the strategic road network

Cllr House – Hampshire County Councillor

Paul Holmes MP

## **Hamble Parish Annual Meeting/Assembly**

### **Guest**

All members of Parish Council

Paul Holmes MP

Rob Humby – Deputy Leader of Hampshire County Council Keith House  
Leader of Eastleigh Borough Council and County Councillor for Hamble

Marcus Cator – Chief Inspector Hampshire Police

Donna Jones – Hampshire Police Commissioner

Cllr Adam Manning - Mayor of Eastleigh

Mr Govan Head - The Hamble School

Mrs Hewitt – Acting Head of Hamble Primary School

Father Graham of St Andrews Church Commodores of Royal Southern,

Members of Local Area Committee

River Hamble Sailing Club and RAF YC

Mercury Residents Assoc

Hamble Village Memorial hall

Chair of the Community Hub

Hamble Conservation Volunteers

Hamble Good Neighbours

Hamble Players

Harbour Master

Hamble Lifeboat Trust

Hamble Warsash Ferry

MDL Marinas

Hamble Aerospace

Coopervision

## **MEETINGS OF PARISH MEETINGS**

### **Introduction**

1. The law in respect of parish meetings is set out in sections 9 and 13 and Part 3 of Schedule 12 to the Local Government Act 1972.
2. A parish meeting consists of the local government electors of a parish and the purpose of the meeting is to discuss parish affairs. There is no statutory definition or caselaw to determine what constitutes a “parish affair”. NALC is of the view that a parish affair could be any local issue, activity, subject matter which specifically affects a particular parish and which a parish meeting may wish to discuss, debate and potentially influence. It would exclude matters which affect all parishes in the country equally. Please also see the NALC Legal Briefing issued in 2009 for further guidance on the procedure for convening a meeting (or assembly) of a parish meeting, the powers of a parish meeting and the scope of matters which may be the subject of a consequent poll.
3. Meetings of a parish meeting are an effective forum for parish and town councils to engage with the local electorate. Even if the parish or town council disagrees with the issues raised, or related arguments, the council members’ attendance and involvement in the parish meeting would demonstrate that the council is prepared to take account of local residents’ views, which they must hold strongly if they have gone to the trouble to convene and attend a meeting of a parish meeting in the first place.

### **Convening a meeting**

4. A meeting of a parish meeting may be convened by any of the following:
  - the chairman of the parish council;
  - any two parish councillors for the parish;
  - where there is no parish council, the chairman of the parish meeting or any

- person representing the parish on the district council;
  - any six local government electors of the parish.
5. Public notice of the meeting must be given at least 7 clear days beforehand (subject to paragraph 6 below). The notice must:
- specify the time and place of the intended meeting;
  - specify the business to be transacted at the meeting; and
  - be signed by the person or persons convening the meeting.
6. Notice of the meeting is to be given by:
- posting a notice of the meeting in some conspicuous place or places in the parish, and
  - in such other manner, if any, as appears to the person or persons convening the meeting to be desirable for giving publicity to the meeting.
7. Where the meeting is convened to discuss the specific issues set out below, public notice of it must be given of it at least 14 clear days beforehand. The specific issues are as follows:
- the establishment or dissolution of a parish council, or
  - the grouping of the parish with another parish or parishes under a common parish council.

### **Times and Number of Meetings**

8. The parish meeting of a parish must assemble annually on some day between 1st March and 1st June, both inclusive, in every year. In a parish which does not have a separate parish council, the parish meeting shall, subject to any provision made by a grouping order, assemble at least on one other occasion in the year. In other cases, subject to the aforementioned requirements, meetings of parish meetings shall be held on such days and at such times as may be fixed by the parish council or, if there is no parish council, by the chairman of the parish meeting.
9. The proceedings at a parish meeting shall not commence earlier than 6 o'clock in the evening and may not be held in premises which are used for the supply of alcohol unless no other room is available free or at a reasonable cost.

## **Attendance of the Chairman of the Parish Council**

10. The chairman of a parish council shall be entitled to attend a parish meeting for the parish whether or not he is a local government elector for the parish, but if he is not an elector for the parish he shall not be entitled to give any vote at the meeting other than any casting vote which he may have (see paragraph 12 below).

## **Presiding at the Meeting**

11. In a parish having a separate parish council the chairman of the parish council, if present, must preside at a parish meeting and if he is absent the vice-chairman (if any) must, if present, preside. In a parish which does not have a separate parish council, the chairman of the meeting, if present, shall preside.
12. If the chairman and the vice-chairman of the parish council or the chairman of the parish meeting, as the case may be, is absent from an assembly of the parish meeting, the parish meeting may appoint a person to take the chair, and that person shall have, for the purposes of that meeting, the powers and authority of the chairman.

## **Attendance, Voting and Polls**

13. Only local government electors for the parish are qualified to attend a parish meeting or a poll consequent thereon. Each elector can give one vote on any question and no more. A question to be decided by a parish meeting shall, in the first instance, be decided by the majority of those present at the meeting and voting thereon, and the decision of the person presiding the meeting as to the result of the voting shall be final unless a poll is demanded. In the case of an equality of votes, the person presiding at the meeting shall have a casting vote, in addition to any other vote he may have.
14. A poll may be demanded before the conclusion of a parish meeting on any question arising at the meeting; but no poll shall be taken unless either the person presiding at the meeting consents or the poll is demanded by not less than ten, or one-third of the local government electors present at the meeting, whichever is the fewer.

15. A poll consequent on a parish meeting shall be a poll of those entitled to attend the meeting as local government electors, and shall be taken by ballot in accordance with the Parish and Community Meetings (Polls) Rules 1987 as amended. The rules provide that if a poll is demanded, the chairman of the parish meeting shall notify the district council in which the parish is situated and the council shall appoint an officer to be a returning officer. Essentially, the procedure is similar to that of electing a local councillor.

### **Expenses of Parish Meetings**

16. In a parish having a separate parish council whether separate or common, the expenses of the parish meeting (including the expenses of a poll) shall be paid by the parish (section 150 of the Local Government Act 1972).

### **Parish Meeting Resolutions**

17. A parish meeting's resolutions will not be binding on the parish council save in exceptional circumstances (e.g. a resolution for a parish council to provide allotment gardens will trigger a parish council's duty under s. 23 Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908 to consider if their provision of allotment gardens is sufficient to meet demand). Unless one of the exceptions apply, the parish meeting's resolutions will be persuasive only and the council will need to decide if it wishes to disregard them. The council may wish to consider the consequences of boycotting the parish meeting or ignoring any resolutions made by the meeting in terms of the unpopularity that this may ultimately cause.

### **Other Legal Topic Notes (LTNs) relevant to this subject:**

<b>LTN</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
3	The Powers of a Parish Meeting in Parish without a separate Parish Council.	Sets out the statutory functions of parish meetings.

© NALC 2009

# Adults' Health and Care

## Consultation on proposals to:

- stop the funding for three Adult Social Care grant schemes which support voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations.
- to reduce funding for Hampshire County Council funded Homelessness Support Services.

7 February 2022 – 21 March 2022

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
Responding to this consultation	3
Hampshire County Council's consultation policy	3
Why your views are important	4
<b>How to have your say</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Consultation One</b>	<b>5</b>
Context: About the Adult Social Care grant programme	5
Context: About the grants included in this consultation	6
What is being proposed?	7
Why is this being proposed?	7
How would this be implemented?	7
What would the impact be?	8
What alternatives have been considered?	10
<b>Consultation Two: To reduce funding for Hampshire County Council funded Homelessness Support Services</b>	<b>11</b>
Summary	11
Context: About Hampshire County Council Homelessness Support Services (also known as the Social Inclusion programme)	11
What is being proposed?	13
Why is this being proposed?	13
How would this be implemented?	14
What would the impact be?	15
What alternatives have been considered?	16
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>18</b>

## Introduction

This document outlines proposals which affect the funding of non-statutory Adult Social Care grants and Homelessness Support Services.

In Summer 2021 Hampshire County Council consulted the public on how it could balance its budget ([www.hants.gov.uk/aboutthecouncil/haveyoursay/consultations/balancing-the-budget](http://www.hants.gov.uk/aboutthecouncil/haveyoursay/consultations/balancing-the-budget)). Subsequently, the savings programme to 2023 (SP23) was agreed by the Council's Cabinet in October 2021. It requires the Council to save at least £80 million by April 2023, of which £40.6 million is expected to come from the Adults' Health and Care budget.

The proposed changes in this consultation could contribute £320,000 towards this target by stopping:

- the Neighbourhood Care and Support grant scheme;
- the Community Based Support grant scheme; and
- the Rural Connections grant scheme.

which directly fund grants to voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations.

Additionally, a further £360,000 could be contributed by reducing funding for commissioned non-statutory services that support people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Hampshire County Council is seeking the views of residents and stakeholders to help understand the potential impacts of the proposed options and alternative suggestions about how these savings could be made.

The consultation is open from midday on Monday 7 February 2022 and closes at 11:59pm on Monday 21 March 2022.

## Responding to this consultation

### **Hampshire County Council's consultation policy**

The County Council is committed to five principles of consultation:

- to consult on key issues and proposals;
- to consult in good time;
- to be inclusive but with clear and appropriate limits;
- to consult using clear, simple information;
- to ensure that responses are taken into account when decisions are made.

## Why your views are important

It is important to the County Council that the views of people and organisations who may be affected by the proposals are carefully considered, as well as feedback from Hampshire residents and other interested stakeholders.

The findings from this consultation will be published and presented to the Executive Member for Adult Services and Public Health in early-summer 2022.

Feedback will help to inform any decision by the County Council on the proposals set out in this document.

## How to have your say

### Open public consultation

You are invited to give your views on the following proposals.

- **Consultation One:** To stop the funding for three Adult Social Care grant schemes which support voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations.
- **Consultation Two:** To reduce funding for Hampshire County Council funded Homelessness Support Services.

You may respond to the proposals on either or both of the areas under consultation. You can do this by using the online Response Form at:

[www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation](http://www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation)

The Information Pack and Response Form, along with Easy Read versions of both documents, are available to download and print from the consultation webpage.

[www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation](http://www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation)

If you require a paper copy of the Information Pack or the Response Form, a copy in another language or format (such as audio, large print or Braille), or if you have any queries about the consultation, please contact:

[as.consultation@hants.gov.uk](mailto:as.consultation@hants.gov.uk), or call: 0370 779 8102\*

You can also email your response directly to Hampshire County Council using the email address: [as.consultation@hants.gov.uk](mailto:as.consultation@hants.gov.uk) or write to Freepost HAMPSHIRE. (Please also write AHC SP23 Consultation FM06 on the back of the envelope).

You can view the Privacy Notice for this consultation, which explains how we will use your information, how this will be stored, and for how long we will keep it, on the consultation web page at [www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation](http://www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation).

The consultation is open from midday Monday 7 February 2022 and closes at 11:59pm on Monday 21 March 2022. Please note that responses received after this date will not be included in the findings report.

*\* 03 calls are usually included in most landline and mobile call packages and if not, are charged at no more than calls to normal home or business landlines.*

**Consultation One:** To stop the funding for three Adult Social Care grant schemes which support voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations.

### **Context: About the Adult Social Care grant programme**

As set out in the Care Act 2014, Hampshire County Council has a responsibility to prevent or delay people developing care and support needs. The Adult Social Care grant programme is one of the ways that the County Council currently meets these responsibilities.

The ongoing grants budget is currently comprised of three grant schemes:

- The Neighbourhood Care and Support grant.
- The Community Based Support grant.
- The Rural Connections grant.

Voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations which deliver services in Hampshire are able to apply for a grant to support adults across Hampshire to continue to live independently in the community and delay, or prevent, the deterioration of their health and wellbeing. Currently, the grants are offered on a one-to-two-year cycle, with no guarantee that the organisations currently holding the grants would be awarded them again in subsequent cycles.

Other ways that the County Council meets the Care Act 2014 responsibilities include:

- Connect to Support Hampshire (the County Council's online information and advice service);
- supporting unpaid carers;
- supporting the Hampshire Social Prescriber Network; and
- working with partners to increase volunteering capacity in voluntary preventative services.

These are not affected by this proposal.

## **Context: About the grants included in this consultation**

*Neighbourhood Care and Support grant scheme: total awarded in 2021/22: £60,000*

This grant scheme funds support and advice for neighbourhood-level organisations which focus on meeting the needs of socially isolated and / or frail adults, to help them live healthily and independently in their own homes.

In 2020, the current grant holder supported 118 community groups which, in turn, supported 25,835 individuals. This was slightly lower than usual due to Covid. In 2019, 27,444 individuals were supported.

Service users are predominantly older people and include those:

- needing transport to attend health appointments (e.g. at a hospital or GP). (This is a key 'ask' for many community groups);
- using befriending services or attending the groups' social clubs;
- seeking transport for social reasons;
- seeking shopping support and prescription collection (particularly during Covid); and
- wanting assistance with DIY and other practical tasks.

*Community Based Support grant scheme: total awarded in 2021/22: £240,000*

This grant scheme supports people aged 65 or over who are at risk of social isolation and diminished independence, by supporting them to live healthily and independently in their own homes. This is primarily achieved through organising opportunities to meet with others socially and / or take part in group physical exercise.

Between December 2020 and November 2021, the current grant holder supported 2,365 people aged 65 and over. An average of 2,119 individuals were supported each month.

Service users were predominantly people aged 65 and over, particularly those at risk of loneliness and reduced independence, including;

- older people with long term conditions (over 1,200);
- older people with mental health needs (over 600);
- older people with sensory impairment/loss (over 400);
- older people who are unpaid carers (approximately 200).

Opportunities available include exercise classes, group walks, social clubs, befriending and group lunches, with transport arranged where necessary. Where additional user needs are identified, they are supported to access other services as required.

*Rural Connections grant scheme: total awarded in 2021/22: £20,000*

This grant scheme provides information and support for adults at risk of experiencing loneliness and social isolation in rural and semi-rural settings, connecting them to services, help and support needed, to enable them to live healthily and independently.

Between April 2021– December 2021, the current grant holder supported 297 people. Service users are typically older people:

- requiring support to complete benefit and concession forms, such as Attendance Allowance and Blue Badge applications;
- seeking community activities, groups and support, which promote wellbeing and reduce social isolation and loneliness;
- needing assistance with finding services, trades, help and support to remain independent, safe, well and healthy at home;

### **What is being proposed?**

The County Council is proposing to stop the funding for three Adult Social Care grant schemes which support voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations:

- Neighbourhood Care and Support grant scheme;
- Community Based Support grant scheme; and
- Rural Connections grant scheme.

### **Why is this being proposed?**

Stopping these grant schemes would allow the County Council to reduce its grant budget by £320,000, which would be a contribution to the savings required by the County Council's Savings Programme to 2023.

### **How would this be implemented?**

If this proposal is agreed, the funding for the Adult Social Care grants in question would not be available beyond March 2023.

In these circumstances, the County Council would actively work with the current grant holders and other voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations which provide similar services, to support them to make the services sustainable, for example by:

- providing fundraising support such as:
  - identifying and sharing suitable external funding opportunities;
  - helping to write funding applications;
  - the County Council applying for external funding which can be distributed to voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations.
- working with voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations to increase the number of volunteers in Hampshire through research, marketing and the sharing of ideas. This would increase capacity for the sector to

provide services which support people to live healthily and independently at home.

- promoting use of potential funding from other parts of the County Council e.g., Members' grants and Leader's grants for short-term project related costs.
- working with organisations that fund voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations in Hampshire (including the NHS, District and Borough Councils and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner) to maximise and coordinate funding across the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector.

### **What would the impact be?**

This proposal could impact:

1. voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations;
2. people receiving support from the organisations currently in receipt of the grants;
3. other services and organisations that fund or provide voluntary, community and social enterprise sector provision in Hampshire (e.g. the NHS, District and Borough Councils and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner).

#### *1. Voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations*

The services that could be affected by this proposal are not provided directly by Hampshire County Council and so any service decisions would be taken by the organisations currently in receipt of the grants.

Should these organisations wish to continue their services, then they would need to consider alternative options to meet the funding shortfall, such as:

- securing alternative funding from a different grant or organisation;
- asking service users to pay towards the service(s) they receive;
- adjusting the service so it is less costly to provide.

Should the decision be made to withdraw the grants, the County Council would continue to actively work with the current grant holders to explore ways that the services could continue to be sustained. However, if alternative options are not feasible, then the service(s) may be reduced or stopped at the end of the organisations' current grant agreement.

The County Council will continue to fund Infrastructure grants. These provide funding for the Council for Voluntary Services and Citizens Advice services in Hampshire to support the community, voluntary and social enterprise organisations working in Hampshire, e.g. with fundraising, training, support of volunteers and ensuring policies are appropriate.

## *2. People receiving support from the organisations currently in receipt of the grants*

Older people are the main recipients of current services. They may have long-term health conditions, be lonely, frail and/or need support to access health services, community resources and financial benefits. Some will also be acting as unpaid carers for others.

Additionally, the proposal could particularly impact rural areas where service users often live further away from each other and service venues, so more transport is needed and areas of higher deprivation where service users are less able to make a contribution towards service costs.

This proposal could mean that:

- their support could be withdrawn;
- they may be asked to contribute towards the support;
- the support is delivered by a different provider;
- support is available in a different location, format or frequency.

The services that could be affected by this proposal are not provided directly by Hampshire County Council and so any service decisions would be taken by the organisations currently in receipt of the grants.

If the proposal to stop awarding the grants were to be agreed, potential negative impacts on service users could be limited by:

- Signposting users to alternative provision where possible. For example, if any social groups stop, it may be possible to redirect users to an alternative social group. Where volunteer drivers are required, alternative options could include any existing Community and Voluntary Sector (CVS) volunteer driver services. The County Council also have a cohort of volunteer drivers that are used for Adult Social Care activity.
- Supporting people to successfully carry out tasks online and to use online options, such as Connect to Support Hampshire, to find out about alternative local services, including community support, social groups and group exercise opportunities.
- Running training to increase understanding of the support provided by the voluntary sector, how and when it is appropriate to access Adults' Health and Care support and services, supporting mental health concerns, demonstrating how technology can enable people to live safely at home for longer and how to access it and how to access equipment that supports health and wellbeing at home.

*3. Other services and organisations that fund or provide voluntary, community and social enterprise sector provision in Hampshire (e.g. the NHS, District and Borough Councils and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)*

Should the proposal be approved, this may increase demand on grants available from other parts of the County Council (e.g. Members' and Leaders' grants) or other funding agencies (e.g. the NHS, District and Borough Councils and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner) as organisations seek alternative sources of funding. The County Council would continue to work with partner agencies to maximise and coordinate funding across the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector.

A potential reduction or withdrawal of services over time could lead to an increased demand for Adult Social Care services and other services and organisations that work with older or vulnerable people. This is because the services currently funded support the County Council's prevention work and frequently address known health and wellbeing risk factors, such as loneliness.

**What alternatives have been considered?**

The savings target of £40.6million by April 2023 is challenging. We need to review all possible ways to meet this target to ensure we can continue to meet our statutory responsibilities. As an alternative to the proposal, we have considered:

- reducing the value of the budget for Adult Social Care grants;
- removing one or two of the grants;
- continuing the budget for the Adult Social Care grant schemes.

However, none of these options would contribute sufficient savings toward the overall target and would therefore result in savings needing to be met elsewhere in the Adults' Health and Care budget.

We have also considered reducing the number of permanent staff employed directly by Adults' Health and Care. However, meeting the savings this proposal is looking to make would mean terminating the contracts of a significant number of staff. This would limit Adults' Health and Care's ability to meet its responsibilities set out in the Care Act 2014.

## **Consultation Two: To reduce funding for Hampshire County Council funded Homelessness Support Services.**

### **Summary**

While supporting people who are homeless, or are at risk of becoming homeless, is not the responsibility of the County Council, Hampshire currently spend £2.4m on services in this area. This discretionary funding assists in the support for people over the age of 18, helping with things such as understanding and managing tenancies, facilitating access to substance misuse services, and helping to improve physical or mental health and wellbeing.

The County Council is proposing to reduce the contribution toward the annual budget for Homelessness Support Services by £360,000. It proposes that this is accomplished by:

- prioritising support in accommodation-based settings, and into those services that help the most vulnerable; and,
- delivering outreach and community-based support in those areas where accommodation-based settings may not be available.

### **Context: About Hampshire County Council Homelessness Support Services (also known as the Social Inclusion programme)**

Responsibilities for local government services in Hampshire are divided between the County Council and the eleven District, Borough and City councils.

- District, Borough and City Councils are responsible for housing and homelessness provision.
- The County Council is responsible for ensuring eligible people's adult social care needs can be met.

The services within the Social Inclusion programme deliver housing-related support for people over the age of 18 who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Housing-related support helps develop or sustain a person's ability to live independently. This can include:

- support to understand and manage the rights and responsibilities of their tenancy;
- support to manage debt and budget effectively;
- facilitating access to work, education or training;
- facilitating access to support someone to manage substance misuse;
- building social networks and positive relationships;
- reducing offending behaviour; and
- improving physical and mental health and wellbeing.

The services are funded through the County Council's Adult's Health and Care budget along with District, Borough and City Council contributions in some areas. The annual budget for the Social Inclusion programme from Hampshire County Council was just under £2.4m in 2021/22.

While most services included within the programme are commissioned by Hampshire County Council, services in Basingstoke and Deane are commissioned and managed by the Borough Council by way of a grant from Hampshire County Council.

The County Council currently funds housing-related support through two main types of service:

## **1. Accommodation based support<sup>1</sup>:**

### Stage One supported accommodation:

This supported accommodation is for individuals who are homeless and have high support needs. People using these services may have mental health or substance misuse issues and be referred into the service through their Local Housing Authority following an assessment. These services have staff on site 24 hours a day and provide crisis accommodation services for rough sleepers and people most at risk of rough sleeping.

A significant proportion of people who use this service face multiple challenges, including needing support to engage with mental health services, and substance misuse services.

### Stage Two supported accommodation:

This supported accommodation is for individuals who are homeless and have lower support needs or are ready to move on from a Stage One service. These services do not usually have support staff on-site and most are supported by visiting specialist staff.

During the financial year 2020-21 approximately 343 people were supported in Stage One accommodation and 117 people were supported in Stage Two accommodation-based services.

## **2. Outreach- and community-based support:**

Outreach and community-based support provides housing-related support services as detailed above for rough sleepers and individuals living in the community within a local area. These services supplement and support the local District, Borough or City Council responsibilities, the 'No Second Night Out' initiative, and look to improve outcomes for individuals. These services are also available where an individual or

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note, the County Council funds the support element within accommodation-based settings and is not responsible for any housing management or security costs.

family is homeless or at risk of homelessness and has additional needs that are exacerbating or preventing them from addressing their housing situation without support, regardless of tenure.

These services support rough sleepers and other homeless people to access accommodation and the other services that they may need. These other services may include GPs for health issues, the Department of Work and Pensions for benefits claims and specialist mental health and substance misuse services, such as assisting with completing applications, helping support attendance of meetings, or other types of support that the individual might require.

Services work on the basis of an individual support worker holding a caseload of individuals, who they will work with on a 121 basis for up to approximately 10 hours a week dependent on individual need.

During the financial year 2020-21 approximately 734 people were supported through a community support or outreach service.

### **What is being proposed?**

The County Council is proposing to reduce the annual budget for Homelessness Support Services by £360,000 whilst ensuring the strategic objectives of the programme are maintained.

It proposes that this is accomplished by:

- prioritising Stage One and Stage Two accommodation-based support, to target remaining funding into those areas where it is most needed, and into those services that help the most vulnerable; and,
- delivering outreach and community-based support in those areas where Stage One accommodation-based support is not available.

### **Why is this being proposed?**

Reducing the available budget for Hampshire County Council funded homelessness services would be a contribution to the savings required by the County Council's Savings Programme to 2023.

Public sector partners across Hampshire, including the County Council, District, Borough and City Councils, Public Health services, Hampshire Constabulary, and the Hampshire, Southampton and Isle of Wight Clinical Commissioning Group have been working together to explore new ways to tackle homelessness and make best use of wider collective resources to reshape services. They have considered different models for Homelessness Support Services, against the following overarching service-design principles.

1. Investment should focus on prioritising meeting the needs of the **most vulnerable service users** who find it difficult to engage with more

mainstream services without additional support, are most at risk of sleeping rough and **have no alternative support options**.

2. We would prioritise support service for **accommodation-based services**.
3. We would balance local need against available resources, ensuring services are **delivered within budget**.
4. The design of services should recognise the changes brought about by the Homeless Reduction Act (HRA) 2017 and align services more closely to the **statutory responsibilities of the district housing authorities** under this new legislation.
5. Support funding attached to accommodation-based services should be **used to fund support** not to fund housing management or security services.
6. **Meeting eligible-care needs and safeguarding individuals** is the statutory responsibility of Hampshire County Council and it is expected that County Council budgets are utilised in a way which **best meets the need of people with eligible care needs**; who should be prioritised within services.
7. Services that are funded by Hampshire County Council must ensure **county-wide access**
8. Any options explored could be awarded through a grant to a local housing authority or through a County Council procured contract

This proposal would allow the County Council to deliver cost savings of £360,000 in line with the above principles, while maintaining its statutory services and continuing to ensure Homelessness Support Services are available county-wide.

### **How would this be implemented?**

If approved, the budget for Homelessness Support Services would be reduced from April 2023 in all areas of Hampshire.

The proposed approach would protect accommodation-based support as a priority. However, it would mean that some outreach and community-based support is potentially removed or reduced in some areas.

- Some districts and boroughs would see a greater percentage reduction than others, as outlined in the table below. This relates to the location of accommodation-based support, but it would continue to be the case that all local authorities within Hampshire can refer to any Stage One service. Please note, the figures in the table below are approximate and exemplary as the current contracts are not divided on a district/ borough basis.

District	Current County Council Spend	Proposed services to be delivered	Percentage Reduction	Proposed Future funding*	Percentage Reduction
Basingstoke and Deane	£428,509	Maintain Stage One and funding towards maintaining Stage Two accommodation	£52,509	£376,000	12.25
Eastleigh Borough Council	£50,923	Funding towards maintaining Stage Two accommodation	£14,923	£36,000	29.3
Fareham and Gosport Borough Councils	£436,651	Maintain Stage One accommodation and some outreach/ community support	£66,031	£370,620	15.12
Havant Borough and East Hants District Councils	£285,427	Funding towards maintaining Stage Two accommodation in each area and reduced community support in each area	£82,443	£202,984	28.88
Hart District Council and Rushmoor Borough Council	£355,285	Maintain Stage One accommodation	£20,665	£334,620	5.81
New Forest District Council	£46,167	Reduced Community support provision	£10,167	£36,000	22.02
Test Valley Borough Council	£374,610	Funding towards maintaining Stage One accommodation	£39,990	£334,620	10.68
Winchester City council	£410,483	Maintain Stage One accommodation and reduce funding for Winchester Beacon	£73,272	£337,211	17.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>£2,388,055</b>		<b>360,000</b>	<b>£2,028,055</b>	

\*based on 2021/22 funding levels, subject to any future inflationary uplifts

If the proposal was approved, the County Council would actively work with partners to identify and apply for new sources of funding, deliver efficiencies through joint working with other services that support people who are homeless, or at risk of homelessness, (particularly Mental Health services, wellbeing hubs, substance misuse services and Housing Associations), and renegotiate contracts to be more cost-effective.

### What would the impact be?

It is anticipated that around 350 people would be impacted by this proposed change. The greatest impact would be felt by those who use outreach and community-based support, as these services would see the greatest reductions. Additionally, some Stage Two supported accommodation services may need to adapt where close links with current community support arrangements may change.

Users of these services tend to have complex and multiple needs, which can include physical and mental health issues, substance abuse issues, learning difficulties, a history of offending, and poor access to employment. The reduction in community-based support may mean that these groups may find it more challenging to access and maintain accommodation, because they may be less able to access benefits to which they are entitled or may find it harder to engage with the welfare system. However, the County Council would continue to work with partners to ensure that service users are directed to the most appropriate alternative services for their needs by improving connections and improving signposting between services.

Whilst alternative services are available for many, clients with complex needs often need support to engage with more mainstream service offers or are excluded from these services due to behaviour or substance misuse. The proposal to protect Stage One accommodation-based services which would help to ensure the continuation of support for individuals who have the most complex needs.

All District, Borough and City Council partners would continue to receive some level of funding towards services in their area.

### **What alternatives have been considered?**

The following options were produced and considered in partnership with District, Borough and City Councils, Public Health, Health and Police representatives but are not being proposed for the reasons outlined below.

#### 1: Withdrawing funding for community support services

Focusing Hampshire County Council funding only into accommodation-based support and withdrawing all funding for those services currently delivered in the wider community was considered as an alternative option.

However, it was considered that this option could both impact on a greater number of people, and disproportionately affect some areas such as the New Forest, which only receives community support services. Havant and East Hampshire would also be disproportionately affected due to the large number of people who access their community support services.

On that basis, it was considered that this option did not fully meet, or did not meet as well as the selected option, the following strategic priorities.

- Investment should focus on prioritising meeting the needs of the most vulnerable service users who find it difficult to engage with more mainstream services without additional support, are most at risk of sleeping rough and have no alternative support options.
- Meeting eligible-care needs and safeguarding individuals is the statutory responsibility of Hampshire County Council and it is expected that County Council budgets are utilised in a way which best meets the needs of people with eligible care needs; who should be prioritised within services.
- Services that are funded by Hampshire County Council must ensure county-wide access.

#### 2: Reducing funding in each District and Borough area by 15%

A 15% reduction in funding for services, tailored to suit the specific requirements of in District and Borough area was considered as an alternative option.

Upon review, it was felt that a 15% reduction in budget for each geographical area may have resulted in a number of accommodation-based services becoming unsustainable, and therefore that this option did not fully meet, or did not meet as well as the selected option, the following strategic priorities.

- Investment should focus on prioritising meeting the needs of the most vulnerable service users who find it difficult to engage with more mainstream services without additional support, are most at risk of sleeping rough and have no alternative support options.
- We would prioritise support service for accommodation-based services.

### 3: Distributing available resources as a grant to District, Borough and City Councils in order for them to commission services for themselves

Despite the success of this model in Basingstoke, discussions with partner organisations showed that this would not be a favourable option due to many local authorities not having the resources available to commission services for themselves.

Additionally, it was felt this may lead to an inconsistency in services, referral routes and eligibility criteria across the county including the potential to have a greater impact in some areas over others.

Traditionally access to Stage One hostels has been possible regardless of local connection, however it was felt this may cease should District and Borough partners commission services for themselves leading to some areas not having access to a full range of services.

On that basis, it was considered that this option did not fully meet, or did not meet as well as the selected option, the following strategic priorities.

- We would prioritise support service for accommodation-based services.
- Services that are funded by Hampshire County Council must ensure county-wide access.

### 4: Maintain the current level of spend and service.

This option is not being proposed because of the pressures on the County Council's budgets and the fact that the Authority is required by law to deliver a balanced budget. If the County Council decided to maintain the current level of spend on these services, this would put increased pressure on other service areas to meet higher savings targets and would risk the Council being unable to deliver a balanced budget.

### 5: Withdraw all the funding for this type of service

There is an option for the County Council to withdraw all funding for these services as it is not a service that we have a legal responsibility to provide. This option is not being proposed because the County Council wants to work in partnership with the district and borough councils to support homeless people and ensure that specialist services are available for vulnerable people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and may have eligible care and support needs either now or in the future.

## Conclusion

**Thank you** for reading through this Information Pack.  
You are invited to give your views on the following proposals.

- **Consultation One:** To stop the funding for three Adult Social Care grant schemes which support voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations.
- **Consultation Two:** To reduce funding for Hampshire County Council funded Homelessness Support Services.

You may respond to the proposals on either or both of the areas under consultation. You can do this by using the online Response Form at:

[www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation](http://www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation)

The Information Pack and Response Form, along with Easy Read versions of both documents, are available to download and print from the consultation webpage.

[www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation](http://www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation)

If you require a paper copy of the Information Pack or the Response Form, a copy in another language or format (such as audio, large print or Braille), or if you have any queries about the consultation, please contact:

[as.consultation@hants.gov.uk](mailto:as.consultation@hants.gov.uk), or call: 0370 779 8102\*

You can also email your response directly to Hampshire County Council using the email address: [as.consultation@hants.gov.uk](mailto:as.consultation@hants.gov.uk) or write to Freepost HAMPSHIRE. (Please also write AHC SP23 Consultation FM06 on the back of the envelope).

You can view the Privacy Notice for this consultation, which explains how we will use your information, how this will be stored, and for how long we will keep it, on the consultation web page at [www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation](http://www.hants.gov.uk/AHC-consultation).

The consultation is open from midday Monday 7 February 2022 and closes at 11:59pm on Monday 21 March 2022. Please note that responses received after this date will not be included in the findings report.

*\* 03 calls are usually included in most landline and mobile call packages and if not, are charged at no more than calls to normal home or business landlines.*

If you need this information in another language or format, please email **insight@hants.gov.uk** or call **0300 555 1384**

如果您希望以其他语言或格式接收本信息, 请发送电子邮件至 **insight@hants.gov.uk** 或致电 **0300 555 1384**

താങ്കൾക്കു ഈ പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്ന വിവരങ്ങൾ മറ്റു ഭാഷയിൽ ലഭിക്കുവാൻ ദയവായി താഴെ കാണുന്ന ഈമെയിലിലോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ഫോണിലോ ബന്ധപ്പെടുക. ഇമെയിൽ **insight@hants.gov.uk** ഫോൺ **0300 555 1384**.

यदि तपाईंलाई यो जानकारी अर्को भाषा वा ढाँचामा चाहिन्छ भने, कृपया **insight@hants.gov.uk** इमेल गर्नुहोस् वा **0300 555 1384** मा कल गर्नुहोस्

Jeżeli potrzebują Państwo dostępu do tych informacji w innym języku lub formacie, prosimy o kontakt na adres email: **insight@hants.gov.uk** lub pod numerem telefonu: **0300 555 1384**

Daca doriti informatii intr-o alta limba sau intr-un alt format, va rugam sa trimiteti un mesaj la adresa de e-mail: **insight@hants.gov.uk** sau sa sunati la numarul de telefon: **0300 555 1384**

---

When you have finished with this document, please give it to someone else so they too can have their say.

**February 2022**

**Council 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022**

**Recommendation from the Personnel Working Group**

**Reward and recognition Policy**

The Personnel Working Group requested a policy be created to recognise the importance of loyalty and experience to the organisation. They wanted to formally mark long service key milestones at an organisational level.

Recognition will be shown through formally writing to the staff member to thank them, inviting them to apply for a gift and presenting it to them on their anniversary.

Due to tax and national insurance issues the recognition will be in the form of a gift rather than a cash payment or equivalent and it has to follow the suggested intervals.

Council are asked to comment on the policy, approve it and note the pending anniversary of a staff member.

## **Draft Recognition and Reward Policy**

### **1. Policy**

1.1 The Council wishes to recognise staff who have given long service to the Council and helped to achieve its goals and objectives.

1.2 Long Service will be that accrued with Hamble Parish Council.

### **2. Rationale for the policy**

The resilience survey carried out in November 2020 stressed the importance of having staff that were able and equipped to deal with change. Having experienced staff was seen as an important aspect of the Council's resilience and helped to reduce the costs related to high turnover and low motivation.

### **3. Who is covered by the Policy?**

2.1 All members of staff at Hamble Parish Council.

### **4. Definition**

4.1 Long Service Award - The Council recognises long service and to celebrate a member of staff's loyalty an award is payable for each of the milestones shown below.

4.2 If a cash award is made to an employee to mark long-service the employee is liable for the payment of both Income Tax and Class 1 National Insurance Contributions. Therefore, it is proposed that a gift only scheme be implemented.

Non cash awards given for less than 20 years service, or for over 20 years service where another award has been given in the previous 10 years, are likely to be liable for the payment of Class 1 National Insurance Contributions unless the employee is earning below £8.5k per annum. Given this staff will be rewarded through the purchase of a gift. Purchasing a gift limits the tax liability if set out over the timescales below.

4.3 Staff will be able to identify where (within reason) they would like the gift to come from and will be asked to complete the attached form.

#### **4.4 Value of the gift**

10 years service – gift value of £100

25 years service - gift value of £250

30 years service - gift value of £300

## **5. Procedure**

5.1 The procedure for applying for a Long Service Award is set out in Appendix A. The long service award claim form and instructions is set out in - Appendix B

5.2 Procedure for issuing a Long Service Retirement Award (Gift)  
Employees who have reached the milestones set out above will be entitled to identify a gift from a local or online store and select a gift of their choice. The Clerk will then purchase the gift for the employee. The employee can select a gift which costs more than the value of the award, as long as it does not exceed twice the value of the award. The excess amount will be deducted from their next salary payment. For example, if the award is to the value of £200 the total purchase price cannot be more than £400.

5.3 The Clerk will review those who are approaching a milestone date within the next financial year and ensure that budget provision is made for it. The Clerk or manager will complete the Long Service Award Claim form (Appendix B) which is given to the employee. When it is returned the gift will be purchased and a presentation will be made to the employee. The presentation will be made by the Chair or Vice Chair.

## **6. Organisational issues**

Reporting lines – the Personnel Working Group should be made aware of impending awards (within the next 12 months).

Finance - Taxation: the purchase of a gift should negate any taxation issues

Legal Implications including – The rationale for the scheme came from the resilience survey in 2021.

Equality, Diversity & Human Rights (including the outcome of the EA attached, if required). The policy does not seek to discriminate on the basis of age but to support and value experience and expertise.

## Appendix A

### Procedure

Step 1. Clerk to identify the number of employees entitled to receive long service awards during the next financial year.

Step 2. A month prior to the anniversary the employee will be contacted, and the manager/Clerk will confirm the eligibility for a gift and its value and invited them to complete the attached form.

- 10 years £100
- 25 years service £250
- 30 years service £300

Step 3. The gift will be purchased on the employee's behalf.

Step 4. A presentation and lunch will be arranged for the date of the anniversary (or nearest date if the staff member is off on leave) and the gift presented to them.

Step 5. The length of service will be fully recorded at the Council's next meeting.

## Appendix B

Name	
Team	
Length of service	
Value of award £	
Authorised by manager	
Store gift to be purchased from	
Product code	
Product cost £	
Product description	
Delivery Details	
I authorise any difference in the cost of the gift in excess of the award to be deducted from my pay	
Signed	
Date	