



Medstead Parish Council

Minutes of the Full Council Meeting – 8th May 2024, 7.30pm

Present: Cllrs. Deborah Jackson (Chair), Mark Brayford, Ken Kercher, Frank Maloney, Gordon Mitchell, Phil Quinlan & Mike Smith

Also in attendance: Ilena Allsopp (EHDC Councillor). Julie Russell (Parish Clerk).

ACTION

24.061 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Cllr. Mike Smith was elected Chairman
Proposed Cllr Bennell, seconded Cllr Kercher. All councillors agreed.

24.062 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Cllr. Mark Brayford was elected Vice Chair
Proposed Cllr Bennell, seconded Cllr Kercher. All councillors agreed.

24.063 OPEN SESSION

Cllr Smith raised the issue of the fete storage shed and said we need to give the builders instructions. **Clerk**

24.064 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Graham Bennell (approved)

24.065 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

None

24.066 COUNCILLOR VACANCIES

The clerk has the notification of two vacancies ready to be uploaded on the website and distributed to noticeboards following this meeting. It was agreed with EHDC Electoral Services that both vacancies will be advertised together. Councillors suggested advertising in Four Marks News. **Clerk**

24.067 MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES

- The minutes of the meeting held on 17th April 2024 were confirmed as a true record and were signed by the Chairman.
- Matters arising: The table below shows a summary of action points completed, ongoing or outstanding since the last meeting.

Minute #	Full Council Meeting Date	Action	Assigned to	Status	Comments
23.058	May-23	Clerk to contact Nat West to open a new current account for the Wake Trust	Clerk	Pending	This would be taken forward by the new Clerk in due course.
23.146 (v)	Nov-23	Full Council to consider 2024 bulb planting in August 24	Full Council	Pending	To be considered in August 2024
23.160 (ii)	Dec-23	Maintenance Committee to consider a suitable site for a mens shed	Mtce. Committee	Outstanding	on next Mtce meeting
23.169 (ii) b		Clerk to apply for generic S106 funds for the Pavilion solar panels etc.	Clerk	Pending	Waiting for the quotations to allow an application to proceed.
24.005(iii)c	Jan-24	F&GP Committee to consider Medstead SC Agreement revisions	F&GP Committee	Outstanding	
24.018 (ii)	Feb-24	Maintenance Committee to consider Churchyard kissing gate	Maintenance Committee	Completed	
24.028 (ii)		Cllr Kercher to address gas disconnection at Pavilion	Cllr Kercher	Pending	
24.028 (iv)		Maintenance Committee to consider additional play equipment purchase funded by S106	Maintenance Committee	Outstanding	
24.048(iii)	Apr-24	Planning Committee to write to Mark Kemp-Gee about flooding at Five Ash /Roe Downs	Planning Committee	Outstanding	Unclear who to do it but was offered to resident during the open session
24.051(i)	Apr-24	Cllr Maloney to update the clerk on point of contact regarding the churchyard	Cllr Maloney	Completed	
24.951(ii)	Apr-24	Clerk to inform Playdale of arrangements / timing for siting their equipment	Clerk	Completed	
24.052(ii)	Apr-24	Clerk to communicate with the Day Work contractor and complete follow up action	Clerk	Outstanding	
24.057(b)	Apr-24	Cllr Smith to ask Turnquay for door to eaves storage and outside tao	Cllr Smith	Completed	
24.059	Apr-24	Clerk to communicate info on the SCF grant to relevant parties	Clerk	Completed	

The following matters were raised with regard to these minutes:

- i. 24.028 (iii) The gas tap cannot be disconnected until the scaffolding has been removed.
- ii. 24.028 (iv) Additional play equipment purchases will be on the next Maintenance Committee meeting agenda.
- iii. 24.048 (iii) The Planning Committee thinks that drainage is a key element of the problems at the Five Ash / Roe Down crossroads and so it is both an environmental and highways issue. Patrick Blogg (Director of Universal Services) would be a better person to contact than Cllr Kemp-Gee. Cllr Bennell will supply evidence and Cllr Maloney will write a letter.

**Cllrs
Bennell
&
Maloney**

24.068 COMMITTEE MINUTES AND REPORTS

a. PLANNING COMMITTEE

i. Chairman’s Report. There is no report as there is currently no committee chairman and no meetings since the last full council meeting.

ii. Planning decisions

There was no discussion on EHDC planning decisions made since the last Planning Meeting.

iii. Planning Applications

Cllr Maloney noted that comments had been uploaded on the EHDC Portal from HCC Highways for the ongoing planning applications behind Friars Oak (25256/050 and the Redrow development near Lymington Barns.

The following planning applications were discussed and the MPC submissions for the EHDC Planning Portal agreed.

a.	60371	Change of use from agriculture to a mixed use in agriculture and as a hobby farm and leisure use (amended address). Land to the north of, Wield Road, Medstead.
<p>Medstead Parish Council object to this application and request that it is refused.</p> <p>MPC was originally confused by the address for this Application. The Planning Statement mentions the ‘Appellant’, and the PC enquires if both this and the adjacent appeal site are under the same ownership.</p> <p>The Planning Statement records that the applicant lives in Blackwater, some 25 miles to the northeast of Medstead adjacent to the border of the Royal County of Berkshire.</p> <p>With this information before us the PC believe that this Application is contrary to Core Policy CP2 Spatial Strategy.</p> <p><i>‘New development growth in the period up to 2028 will be directed to the most sustainable and accessible locations in the District ...’</i></p> <p>The PC would feel very honoured that the Parish of Medstead was the only area in Hampshire that could be used for this venture, but both it and the Officer must concede that there must be other suitable locations within a 25m radius of Blackwater, many of them much more sustainable as described in NPPF paragraph 8 and with the detail on mobility in the National Design Code- Part 2 as referenced in paragraph 134.</p> <p>The PC notes the wording of JCS Policy CP19 Development in the Countryside states</p> <p><i>‘The approach to sustainable development in the countryside, defined as the area outside settlement policy boundaries, is to operate a policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake. The only development allowed in the countryside will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location, such as that necessary for farming, forestry, or other rural enterprises (see Policy CP6). Within the South Downs National Park the pursuit of National Park purposes will be paramount</i></p>		

MPC note that the inspector for the Appeal against EHDC decision on Application 58482/004 - APP/M1710/W/23/3316603 referred to the supporting words to the Policy in his decision. Similarly, the PC wish to draw the Officer's attention to the supporting words for CP19

*7.6 It is therefore recognised that some development can take place which is beneficial to the countryside and **the people that live and work there**. The emphasis in the Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy is therefore to allow development in the countryside **where it can be demonstrated that a countryside location is both necessary and justified**. Such an approach will preclude development for which a rural location is not essential. Inappropriate types and scales of development will not be permitted in order to maintain the landscape character and quality of the countryside. The countryside will continue to be protected for its intrinsic value. Even so, it is possible to maximise opportunities to strengthen the rural economy by encouraging uses related to the land, including appropriate forms of agriculture, forestry and green tourism.*

It refers to Policy CP6 Rural Economy and Enterprise noting

'Development will be permitted:

a) For farm diversification schemes and enterprises that help maintain the viability of farm businesses engaged in sustainable land management, ...

... and/or providing local services for local people.'

Similarly, with regard to the drafter's meeting for CP6, in the supporting words the PC notes:

'5.28 The rural economy and enterprise strategy is to retain and enhance both established and new businesses and rural enterprises subject to their being consistent in scale and environmental impact with their location. As a part of this strategy priority will also be given to:

- working with others to retain, develop and promote rural enterprise, in particular that associated with agriculture, horticulture and forestry infrastructure **that can support local products and local markets**;*
- **developing markets for sustainably produced local, land-based products, including local foods sold through local outlets, and wood products**;*
- **developing initiatives that help nurture markets and business enterprise** in rural skills including traditional building skills; and*
- **promoting understanding by the local community** of the needs of rural enterprise; and*
- enabling residential development essential to maintain a rural workforce, including agricultural workers' dwellings and rural affordable housing where there is an established local need.'*

MPC considers that this development is contrary to the EHDC Local Plan JCS Policy CP19, particularly as it was written with EHDC residents in mind, as it does not support **'the people who live and work'** here. It has not been conclusively demonstrated that this activity is **'both necessary and justified'** to be carried out solely at this location.

It is also noncompliant to Policy CP6, as it is not a business or providing services for local people, particularly as it will not **'support local products and local markets'**; **'developing markets for sustainably produced local, land-based products, including local foods sold through local outlets'**; **'developing initiatives that help nurture markets and business enterprise'** nor **'promoting understanding by the local community'**.

With regard to Application, 56617/001, the PC would remind the Officer that this was an equine application; and they will be cognisant of the longstanding equine heritage and history of Medstead and the surrounding area.

In the light of its assertion that this site as intended is not sustainable, the PC has reviewed the NPPF and notes that is not compatible to paragraphs 7 or 8:

Paragraph 7

*'The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of **sustainable development**, including the provision of homes, commercial development, and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner.'*

Paragraph 8

*8. Achieving **sustainable development** means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways ...*

The intention of Paragraph 88 heads the section 'Supporting prosperous a rural economy', which does not include a 'hobby farm'.

The PC cannot discern the Applicants reliance on Paragraph 181, especially as the activity would disrupt the existing habitat, and Paragraph 182 refers to National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The PC believe that one of the major issues in determining this application is sustainability, particularly as the application is for a farm with the staff living some 25 miles distant.

With regards to Highway matters, the PC is becoming increasingly concerned with the increase of traffic by individual users of this and associated plots. The removal of the ancient hedgerow was not carried out until these plots of land were sold, and is both of recent date and did not have planning approval.

The access 'track, the ownership of which is unknown, appears to be less than 5m wide at its entrance. With the increase in use the PC is concerned that there could be traffic movements in opposite directions at the same time to access/egress the different sites. It is also apparent that due to the obscuration by the hedgerow and the tracking of vehicles on the track, drivers of vehicles on it may not have a clear view of approaching vehicles. The PC ask the Officer to particularly clarify this issue with the Highways Authority, particularly as the vehicles using the site could be towing a trailer.

For these reasons, the PC asks EHDC to refuse this Application.

As EHDC is currently having a difficulty in proving its land supply, the Parish Council has a natural concern regarding speculative applications outside the SPB. Should this application be granted, the PC would ask for a condition to be added to prevent any dwelling being built on the plot until either EHDC or the M&FMNP Steering Group determine that the current SPB be extended to include the plot.

Similarly, a condition should be considered regarding details of a scheme for the management of animal waste, and other wastes, generated on-site should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b.	57295/002	Outline application for 1no. custom/ self-build dwelling with all matters reserved except access. Land East of Paddock Grange, Homestead Road, Medstead.
<p>MPC strongly object to this speculative application. From the detail provided in the Planning statement, the site is being put forward for 'a proposed custom/ self-build residential development' forward to obtain planning permission <i>in principle</i> for the development of any dwelling, and as such all plan and elevation drawings submitted with this proposal are purely speculative, and carry no weight.</p> <p>The proposal has failed to demonstrate 'a genuine and proven need' for a new dwelling. There has been no evidence submitted regarding the successful marketing of the plot. It is contrary to CP19 and CP6; and also, Policy 1 of the M&FMNP, all of which seek to prevent unrequired development in the countryside.</p> <p>For the previous application 57295 that proceeded to appeal (Ref: APP/M1710/W/20/3247593), the inspector rejected the application, particularly noting:</p> <p><i>'4. I accept that there are some examples of dwellings along Homestead Road that are fairly closely spaced, however most are further apart, particularly those closest to the appeal site. ... removing the intervening gap and creating a more developed frontage that would be contrary to the largely undeveloped character of this central portion of the road. ... However, the dwellings would still be more closely spaced than most in the area, and the proposal would result in the loss of the undeveloped gap.</i></p> <p><i>'8. The appellant suggests that the appeal site is close to the settlement boundary and is part of an established rural community. Away from the site to the east and west, towards either end of Homestead Road, small numbers of dwellings are grouped together. However, the central portion of the road is sporadically developed and is dominated by undeveloped agricultural land. As such, the site is unrelated to the developed area of Medstead and is instead more closely associated with undeveloped agricultural land.</i></p> <p>9. The proposed dwelling would be located away from the services and facilities provided at Medstead. Homestead Road is a roughly surfaced bridleway, and South Town Road is without a dedicated footpath. Neither</p>		

road would provide a safe and convenient walking route into the village. Therefore, future occupiers of the proposed dwelling would be likely to rely on a private car to access local services and facilities.

13. In summary the Policy position is clear, and there are no material considerations before me that are of sufficient weight to cause me to conclude that the site is suitably located for the proposed development. The proposal is contrary to Policy C19 of the JCS, ... and Policy 1 of the NP, which together seek to restrict development in the countryside.

Similarly, application 57295/001 also proceeded to appeal (*Ref: APP/M1710/W/21/3274136*), when the inspector noted:

3. The appeal site is located outside of a settlement boundary and as a consequence, it is situated within the countryside. Policy CP19 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) (JCS) is a policy of general restraint in order to protect the countryside for its own sake. Accordingly, it confirms that the only development allowed in the countryside will be that with a genuine and proven need for a countryside location, such as that necessary for farming, forestry, or other rural enterprises.

The character of Homestead Road is an unmetalled BOAT with some 19 dwellings spaced along its 1km length. This proposal will be an infill development that will disrupt the pastoral feel of the road.

There is no footway on the BOAT, indeed there are no footways at the junctions of Hattingley Road or South Town Road, the latter being at a particularly difficult section for pedestrians to traverse, with two blind bends in 75m, before reaching the first footway some 100m further on at the football field. The distance by this route to the village shop is some 1.2km, when measured in accordance with NPPF paragraph 134. The walking distance across the fields by footpath (Green Infrastructure Network) is over a kilometre.

Paragraph 134 refers the Officer to the National Model Design Code, Part 2 of which states in *Check List Movement Local design codes should consider:*

M.1 Connected Places

- *The provision of public transport and the distance of all dwellings from a stop.*

The nearest daily bus service stop is some 2.75 km to the south of the site. The site is dependent on private vehicles.

This evidence is not compliant with the requirements of the sub paragraphs of NPPF paragraphs 8. Regarding the economic objective, the evidence shows that the land is wrongly placed to ensure the building of a strong, responsive and competitive economy, or to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and has not identified or coordinated the provision of infrastructure. Any offsite activity retail employment or educational must be carried out using a vehicle requiring additional expenditure by the resident. The location of the dwelling between large plots ensures that the social objective cannot be met and that any environmental objective contribution will be reduced to the need use vehicles to service the site

MPC believes that the development in this proposal is not suitable to comply with NPPF paragraphs:

- 60 – not a significant boost to housing supply.
- 63 – not applicable, as no evidence provided.
- 70 – the location is not a suitable site. The spirit of the paragraph does not apply single dwelling not compliant in support of sub paragraphs a, b, c, d (outside SPB) or e.
- 83 – location of the site does not enhance or maintain the vitality of a rural community.'
- 84 -this does not apply as it is not relevant. Although there is the demolition of 'existing buildings', the indicative drawings provide no evidence to enable the determination related to an exceptional design.
- 123 – It could be considered a Brownfield site, but apart from one house, no objectively assessed needs.
- 124 – the attachment to sub paragraph d) is extremely tenuous.
- 135 – the applicant has not offered any evidence to support Doubt if this really applies to a single dwelling no evidence.
- 139. No solid evidence has been offered by the Applicant to ensure that the proposal is compliant.

or EHDC JCS Policies: CP1, CP19, CP 24, CP25 CP 27 CP 29 and CP31.

Should this Application be approved the Parish Council ask that a condition be applied to provide funding for HCC to maintain the BOAT for perpetuity.

iv. Meeting with Four Marks Parish Councillors and EHDC, 30th April

Cllr Maloney reported back on this meeting, to which he was invited as a representative of Medstead Parish Council. Attendees were Adam Harvey, Kevin Thurlow, Jenny Edwards (all EHDC), Cllr Roland Richardson (EHDC), Cllr Reg Pullen (FMPC) and Paul McAllister (NPSG). Key points Cllr Maloney noted are:

- a. Settlement Policy Boundary Changes:** Concerns were discussed in detail with EHDC in the meeting over changes proposed in the Draft Local Plan. EHDC are still dealing with the large volume of consultation responses. The SPB is only agreed when the Local Plan is published or the Neighbourhood Plan is updated.
- b. Settlement Hierarchy:** Concerns were raised with EHDC over their methodology used in defining the Settlement Hierarchy
- c. Site Allocations:** The Gladman appeal has raised concerns over site allocations. The NPSG are considering site allocations with regard to the revision of the Neighbourhood Plan
- d. Design Codes:** The next version of the Neighbourhood Plan intends to include Design Codes..

v. Neighbourhood Plan

- a. Revisions to the plan:** The NPSG proposes to revise the NP now rather than wait for the Local Plan. It aims to incorporate Design Codes and include a referendum.
- b. CIL funding / Parish needs:** Work is needed on this

vi. Planning compliance

- a. Greendrift, Homestead Road** The clerk should contact EHDC over the destruction of woodland and request protection measures.

Clerk

b. MAINTENANCE COMMITTEE.

- i. Chairman's report** No meeting held since last full council

c. FINANCE & GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

i. Chairman's Report

No meeting held since the last Full Council meeting.

The audit scheduled for 1st May was postponed, and the proposed extraordinary meeting on staffing issues was not held due to concerns whether it would be quorate. Information relating to the topic to be discussed was circulated to all council members for discussion under agenda item 8cii.

ii. Staffing arrangements

This item was discussed in confidence. (No members of the press or public were present in the meeting at this point).

The council agreed to use Peter Baston as a locum clerk to support the audit process. Cllr Maloney proposed. Cllr Brayford seconded.

iii. Grant applications

- a. Speedwatch** The grant application for £143 for Speedwatch was approved. Cllr Kercher proposed, Cllr Maloney seconded, and all agreed.

24.069 MEDSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The outgoing chairman's report was circulated in advance. She reported that the final few weeks had been busy dealing with staffing issues and addressing a number of challenges whilst trying to balance work commitments. She offered to share any knowledge she had with councillors and the clerk after she left and wished the new chairman and the council the best for the future.

24.070 CLERK / RFO REPORT

The clerk's report was circulated in advance. The following points were covered:

- The internal audit process has been delayed to sort queries with the numbers, since questions arose that could not be answered by the locum. However everything is still on track to be completed by 30th June.
- The precept has been paid but we are waiting for the next tranche of funds from EHDC for the pavilion, due shortly.
- An advert has been placed on the website and noticeboards for the Day Work Contract with a 24th May deadline for responding.
- The Playdale equipment will be installed in w/c 20th May and all logistical arrangements are in hand.
- The clerk has applied to be a signatory on the Nat West accounts as agreed and is awaiting approval.
- The clerk has confirmed with Boundaries NHS surgery that they can use the Village Hall car park in May (subject to conditions) following consultation with councillors via email, but they have not yet proposed dates.

24.071 EAST HANTS DISTRICT COUNCILLORS' REPORT

East Hants District Councillors provided the following report in advance:

*In addition to responding to the news of the granting of planning permission for **46 Lymington Bottom**, as district councillors, we have been following up with the normal volume of correspondence from our residents and ongoing case work for our ward.*

Local Plan

Due to the volume of feedback to the Local plan, the initial feedback to councillors has been delayed to the middle of July 2024. We will keep you updated.

*The council agree that brownfield land should be the priority for development and are looking to identify brownfield land for development. However, we have not managed to identify sufficient brownfield land able to deliver the new homes we need. To make sure we have considered all possibilities, EHDC are launching a "**Call for Brownfield Sites**", running from 7 May to 7 June.*

We encourage all residents to let EHDC know about those brownfield sites that you think could deliver development in our planning area. If you know an area that might be suitable, please use the link on the EHDC website - <https://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-services/planning-policy/local-plan/emerging-local-plan/call-brownfield-sites>.

Case 56082/004

As you may be aware, on 10 April, we received an appeal decision regarding 60 dwellings at Mount Royal, 46 Lymington Bottom, Four Marks. Unfortunately, in addition to other matters, the inspector accepted the Appellants' arguments in relation to the Council's published housing land supply position, concluding that there was a 3.59 years supply, rather than the Council's position of 4.74 years supply (measured over 5 years). As local councillors, we have been in contact with both officers and senior councillors to find out how, what the council thought was a robust position could have been challenged and the planning inspector ruled for the appellant.

EHDC are seeking to restore the Housing Land Supply position as quickly as possible. We will keep the Parish Councils updated with new information on this as we receive it.

Four Marks Village Picnic.

EHDC is supporting the local picnic in Four Marks on the 23rd June 2024. We hope as many people as can, will attend.

The 2024/25 Councillor Grant Scheme will be available from June. Amounts are reduced from the previous year. However, a new community grant scheme will also be available and the total grants available will therefore be the similar to this of 2023/24

24.072 CORRESPONDENCE

The following correspondence was noted

- a. **Greendrift, Homestead Road** Residents correspondence
- b. **Hampshire & IoW Constabulary** Knapp Wood
- c. **Boundaries Surgery / Village Hall** Use of car park for Covid vaccinations
- d. **Hampshire & IoW Village of the Year 2024** Open for entries
- e. **Manor Colts** Football enquiry
- f. **Charlotte Reay, EHDC** Wild flower meadow budget
- g. **Chair of Village Hall Committee** Information regarding football grants
- h. **Supporting Communities Fund** Notification of grant applications open
- i. **Hampshire & IOW Constabulary, South East Cyber Policing Team**
- j. **PCSO, Alton Neighbourhood Policing Team**

Cllr Kercher gave an update on Manor Colt's use of Medstead Green. The U12s use it at the moment. They may want to use it for 11-a-side teams who will need a full size pitch with improvements to current arrangements. Opportunities to for them to use the pavilion will also be raised. Currently they just hire the pitch but older teams may want to use the pavilion. Prior to the pavilion project, it was normally shut down and drained down for the winter. Manor Colts rented for one winter season as a one-off but this was not repeated. The pavilion will no longer be closed for the winter so it could be made available. Cllr Kercher will arrange a meeting between himself, Manor Colts and the Clerk to discuss arrangements and future requirements with Manor Colts.

**Cllr
Kercher**

24.073 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

a. Planning Committee

The Planning Committee was appointed with Cllr Frank Maloney, Cllr Phil Quinlan, Cllr Gordon Mitchell and Cllr Mark Brayford. Graham, Bennell is the reserve member.

b. Maintenance Committee

The Maintenance Committee was appointed with Cllr Ken Kercher, Cllr Graham Bennell, Cllr Mark Brayford and Cllr Phil Quinlan.

c. F&GP Committee

F&GP membership was confirmed as Cllr Smith, Cllr Brayford and the chairs of Planning and Maintenance, yet to be decided.

24.074 APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES

The following people were appointed to committees

- a. **Medstead Village Hall Management Committee** Cllr Graham Bennell

- b. **Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** Cllr Frank Maloney
- c. **East Hampshire Association of Parish and Town Councils** Cllr Phil Quinlan
- d. **Medstead Sports Club Committee** Cllr Ken Kercher
- e. **Speedwatch** Cllr Mike Smith

24.075 FINANCIAL MATTERS

- a. **To receive and approve the Income and Expenditure report for March 2024**
Approved
- b. **To receive and approve the Bank Reconciliation as at 31st March 2024** Approved
- c. **Internal Audit**
The meeting with Tim Light has been delayed until 24th May whilst numbers are prepared for the balanced accounts for the year
- d. **To agree signatories on bank accounts**
Gordon Mitchell is to become a signatory, the clerk will him send details of how to do this
- e. **To agree temporary changes to standing orders rules on signing cheques during extenuating circumstances |** Clerk
Currently standing orders say cheques must be signed by the clerk and two other councillors. Until the clerk is approved by Nat West the council has agreed that cheques can be signed by three councillors.

24.076 S106 / CIL FUNDED PROJECTS

- a. **Medstead Village Green restoration**
Cllr Kercher informed council that Southern Ground Care have no remaining dates available to aerate and fertilise the green this spring and the ground will be too hard in summer, so it will be deferred until the autumn.
- b. **Medstead Parish Office / Pavilion / Community Room**
Work is running slightly behind schedule.
- c. **Wild flower Meadow**
Cllr Mitchell has agreed to contact neighbouring residents to the wild flower meadow to discuss options over its future. Cllr Mitchell

24.077 MEDSTEAD PONDS

Nothing to report

24.078 DATES FOR FUTURE COUNCIL MEETINGS

Additional dates for four months in 2025 to the end of April were circulated and agreed. Councillors agreed the January meeting could be slipped to the third Wednesday to avoid preparation of papers between Christmas and New Year.

There were no further matters to discuss and the meeting was closed at 9.15pm.

Signed Chairman

Date.....