

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL
HELD ON 18 DECEMBER 2013 AT 6pm**

Attendance:

The Mayor (Councillor Beavis) (P) (in the Chair);

The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Ronayne) (P);

Councillors Allen (P), Ms Ballard (P), Burgess (P), Carter CK (P), Carter CR (P), Chegwyn (P), Mrs Cully (P), Ms Diffey (P), Edgar (P), Farr (P) Forder (P), Foster-Reed (P), Geddes, Gill (P), Hazel (P), Henshaw (P), Mrs Hook (P), Hook (P), Hylands (P), Jacobs (P), Jessop (P), Kimber (P), Lane (P), Langdon (P), Mrs. Morgan, Murphy (P), Philpott (P), Ronayne (P), Scard (P), Mrs Searle (P), Mrs Wright (P) and Wright (P).

Also in Attendance:

Honorary Alderman O'Neill

APOLOGIES

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting were submitted on behalf of; Councillors Mrs. Morgan and Geddes, Honorary Aldermen Train, Bailey, Foster and Searle

MINUTES

COUNCIL RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 10 October 2013, be confirmed as a true and correct record and signed.

MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

(I) Presentation to the Mayor from the Federation of Small Business

Caroline Collins from the Federation of Small Business presented the Council with an award as Gosport Borough Council had been highly commended for 'all-round business friendliness' in the Federation of Small Business Local Authority Small Business Friendly Awards this September. Ms. Collins felt sure everyone was well aware of the importance of small businesses to the local economy; stating that around 90% of all businesses in the borough employ less than 10 people.

By recognising their importance, the Council had continued to provide support across a number of areas. These, she added, included a business focused website; 'www.investingosport.co.uk', which contains a host of information from grants to funding for vacant premises, and provides free one to one business support for anyone wishing to start a business and a regular business e-bulletin that reaches over 1000 businesses and stakeholders across the borough.

Ms. Collins continued to say that, working with the Town Team the retail officer had supported local high street businesses with the development of a new website and vinyl's to improve the look of the Post Office. She highlighted that there was an Empty Unit Grant Scheme running in the Town Centre the aim of which was to encourage new businesses to locate. The Members were advised that the Federation of Small Business runs an annual business and employment fair which had attracted over 600 residents;

whilst this was primarily a recruitment fair, it had also helped raise the profile of Gosport's companies. Ms. Collins ended her presentation by saying that it is hoped that local businesses will find contract and workforce development opportunities as the implementation of the planning policy, to secure employment and training plans through Section 106 agreements, goes forward.

The Mayor thanked Ms. Collins and accepted the award on behalf of The Council.

(II) ST VINCENT COLLEGE AND BAY HOUSE SCHOOL AND SIXTH FORM STRATEGIC ALLIANCE

The Mayor advised that the corporations of St Vincent College and Bay House School & Sixth Form were pleased to announce that they have agreed to form a strategic alliance. The aim of the alliance was to work towards achieving a very exciting educational development for the young people of Gosport.

The occasion of the retirement of St Vincent Principal, Di Lloyd, in April 2014 had provided the Boards of Governors of the two institutions with the opportunity to develop an historic partnership. Building on the respective strengths of the two mainstays of post-16 education in the Borough, it was advised that this will continue to be a long-term project to expand provision and choice for the learners of Gosport and further afield. As a consequence of this decision the St Vincent Corporation did not intend to recruit a new Principal to replace Di Lloyd but would instead establish a new joint executive team under the leadership of Ian Potter, Head Teacher of Bay House School and Sixth Form.

The Mayor advised that through collaborative working the two institutions would be looking forward to engaging with other schools in Gosport, as well as wider stakeholders to build high-quality academic, technical and vocational education and training pathways across the town for sixth formers and adult learners alike. In consequence the Corporation had advised it would anticipate the quality of education in the Borough continuing to strengthen as a result of the partnership working.

(III) RETIREMENT OF STAFF MEMBER

The final communication from the Mayor was to share that John Green, Mayors Officer, would be retiring from his duties on Thursday 19th December 2013. It was advised that John had asked that no special recognition be carried out on his departure. The Mayor along with Members and Officers wished John a long, happy and healthy retirement. A member expressed his thanks for John's commitment and said that without the efforts of John Green the Council would not be recognised as a shining example for Civic events to other Councils.

The Mayor advised that he was going to deal with item 5 of the Agenda before Item 4.

QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 3.4

Question No 1 standing in the name of Councillor Farr on the demolition of bungalows in St Vincent Road was answered by the Chairman of the Community Board.

Question No 2 standing in the name of Councillor Farr on quotes for demolition of bungalows was answered by the Chairman of the Community Board.

Question No 1 standing in the name of Councillor Chegwyn in respect of vandalism at

Anne's Hill Cemetery were answered by the Chairman of the Community Board

Question No 2 standing in the name of Councillor Chegwyn on hirers' payment of sports facilities and sports pitches in the Borough was answered by the Chairman of the Community Board.

Question 3 standing in the name of Councillor Chegwyn on use of Walpole Park by a previous Councillor, incurring additional costs, was answered by the Chairman of the Community Board.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 3.6

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 3.6 2 notices of public questions had been received by the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive from Mr Mawby and Mr Gallett.

Mr. Mawby's question on the financial quotation for the D-Day Memorial relocation was answered by the Chairman of the Community Board.

Mr. Gallett's question in respect of the Civic Ceremony planned for June 2014 was answered by the Leader of the Council.

DEPUTATIONS IN PURSUANT OF STANDING ORDER 3.5 – OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED RELOCATION OF THE CANADIAN STONE MEMORIAL

It was reported that in accordance with Standing Order 3.5 3 notices of Deputation had been received by the Borough Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive from Mr Mawby, Mr Gallett and Councillor Eddis.

Mr. Mawby, Chairman of Gosport Society (GS), was invited by the Mayor to present his deputation.

Mr. Mawby, in his deputation, stated that it is the understanding of the Gosport Society (GS) that it is planned to conduct a formal civic event to commemorate the 70th Anniversary of D Day in June next year. The difficulty the Society has is the failure of certain Councillors to work with Friends of Stokes Bay (FOSB) and the Gosport Society (GS) to obtain a consensus on the location and design of a D Day Memorial that is the proposed venue for this civic event.

Consultation on building a new D Day memorial began with an initial meeting held at 3 Crescent Road, on 30 March 2012. Attended by representatives from the Anglesey Conservation Group, later to become the D-Day Fellowship (DDF), the GS and the FOSB. Ideas were discussed and all agreed to keep in contact with proposals and ideas.

A series of meetings were held between the FOSB the GS and the DDF to try to arrive at a compromise in terms of location and design. After two initial meetings held in private homes meetings were held in the Town Hall attended by Councillor and officials.

At a meeting held on the 8th January it was agreed that the best site would be on the grass near the present site of the Mulberry Stone. However the design still lacked the support of the FOSB and the GS. It was agreed at this meeting to set up a working group consisting of a representative from the DDF and the Chairman of the FOSB, and the GS

to reach a compromise on the design of the memorial. The working party met in January 2013 and came up with a proposal that they felt might be agreeable with their relevant committees. Unfortunately the FOSB Committee unanimously agreed that they were too costly, and an unnecessary large incursion on the Bay. A further meeting was held in the Council Offices on the 6th February at which Councillor Kimber announced that due to the lack of support from GS and FOSB the DDF had decided to go ahead with the plan for the Memorial site, a decision agreed by Councillor Hook.

However on the 30th January, the Chairman of the FOSB received a note from the DDF stating that they had decided not to pursue the proposals any further, but were looking for an alternative site with GBC. As no further correspondence on the results of the search for an alternative site was received it was considered by the FOSB and the GS that the proposal to construct a new memorial had been scrapped. This was the last communication the FOSB and the GS had had on this subject until the FOSB and the GS were informed by E mail of the inclusion of an item on the D Day memorial on the Agenda of the Community Board meeting on the 25th November.

On receiving the notice of the Community Board meeting it became obvious that Councillors Kimber and Hook had decided to ignore the views of the FOSB and the GS and proceed to implement the design fully in the knowledge it to be unacceptable to the FOSB and the GS.

Dealing with issues relating to the design of the proposed memorial.

Moving the Canadian Memorial.

The current location of the memorial was picked after considerable research into where the Canadian Forces embarked for the Normandy Beaches and its location is recorded in the Imperial War Museums list of war memorials. Hence its current location is linked to a specific event in a specific location and moving it will break this historical linkage. The Imperial War Museum has said that any decision to relocate a memorial must be fully justified and agreed by them.

It is accepted that the DDF wrote to the Canadian High Commissioner for consent to move the memorial stone but the letter to the Commissioner said that patrons from the local cafe (Pebbles') balance their drinks and ice cream on it this left him with little choice but to agree to its re-location. However, the form of this memorial makes it impossible to see how it could practically be used to balance drinks and ice creams on. Anyone who is familiar with the memorial will know that this is not possible, thus moving cannot be justified for the reason stated by the DDF in the letter.

The GS has applied to English Heritage to list the remains of the concrete strips on which the caissons were constructed to protect them from damage and to protect them for later generations. These strips are clearly visible behind the Mulberry Stone during dry summers and reach right to the edge of the promenade, the proposed site of the new memorial. There is a significant risk that these strips will be badly damaged when the foundations are laid for the stone walls contained in the design of the proposed new memorial. It considered by the GS that the concrete strips may be listed by English Heritage and as such must not be put at risk of damage by constructing the new memorial until an English Heritage position on their listing is obtained.

Grouping War Memorials

The design proposal is to group the D Day Memorial and the Mulberry stone together with a new stone the details of which are unknown is wrong. These two existing Memorials are located to record a specific event in a specific location. The Mulberry stone is located at

the site caissons were constructed. The caissons were built in 1943 and hence have no time and little geographic relationship with the events recorded by the Canadian Stone.

Project Cost

The project is being funded from Council Tax revenue and in these times of stringent control of council expenditure the accuracy of the expected cost is essential prior to any commitment to allow the project to proceed. The accuracy of the costing was not discussed at the Community Board Meeting £25,000 was quoted as the cost of the project but this figure was not substantiated, considering what is involved the figure is likely to be a gross underestimate. It is considered essential that prior to a planning application being considered the project cost must be the subject of three competitive tenders to ensure that the cost of the project to be included in the 2014 budget is accurate and not likely to be the subject of a cost overrun.

The GS considers that an alternative venue for the planned Civic Ceremony be sought for the following reasons:-

1. The new memorial is a waste of Council Tax money
2. It is wrong to co-locate war memorials as it detracts the significance of each one.
3. Ignoring the views of the FOSB and the GS is not compliant with Government initiatives promoting Community Involvement

On conclusion, the Mayor thanked Mr. Mawby for his deputation.

Mr. Ian Gallet, Friends of Stokes Bay (FOSB), was invited to deliver his deputation by the Mayor.

Mr. Gallet, in his deputation, stated that the Friends of Stokes Bay (FOSB) have taken note of Item 28 of the Minutes of the Community Board meeting on 25 November 2013. We would like to put on record our support for the position enunciated by Mrs. Whitehead speaking against the movement of the Canadian Memorial. We feel its movement is inappropriate, not necessary, would not change the likelihood of its misuse and would be unnecessarily expensive.

However, the main object of this note is to correct the perception of the history of discussions concerning the D-Day Memorial proposed by the D-Day Fellowship in the fifth paragraph of Item 28 opening: 'It was clarified that...'. It is implied the Gosport Society (GS) and ourselves FOSB among others had been involved with discussions from the inception of the proposal in 2012 to the present day and were generally in favour. This is not the case. I therefore feel that FOSB's involvement leading up to the present should be clarified. The time line is as follows:

- An initial meeting was held at 3 Crescent Road on 30 March 2012. In attendance were three members from the Anglesey Conservation Group (later to become the D-Day Fellowship), Roger Mawby (RM) from GS and Ian Gallett (IG), Felicity Anderson (FA), Kevin Casey (KC) & Hazel Casey (HC) from FOSB. Ideas were discussed and all agreed to keep in contact with proposals and ideas.
- A further meeting was held on 30 August at the home of Malcolm Chapman for more informal discussions. Those in attendance were three members of the FOSB Committee and Peter Newell, Penny Harris, Tony Belben (D Day Fellowship).
- The Fellowship's plans which had been drawn up were considered by FOSB to be a major incursion on Stokes Bay and would not be acceptable. They would also be very expensive. However, the FOSB committee agreed to continue with their input

to the Fellowship.

- On 12 September another member of the FOSB committee, who had not previously attended the meetings, attended a meeting at the Council offices with RM (GS).
- A further three meetings up to 28 November were held at the Council offices which either or both KC & IG (FOSB) attended, although no agreed proposal was forthcoming.
- At the last meeting it was agreed to form a working party involving all three Chairmen. They met in January 2013 and came up with a proposal which they felt may be agreeable to their relevant committees. However, these plans were examined and debated by the FOSB committee which decided that they were still too costly and an unnecessarily large incursion on the Bay. However, before this could be communicated to the Fellowship, on 30 January, FOSB Chairman (IG) received a note stating that the Fellowship had decided not to pursue the proposals discussed any further, but was looking for an alternative site with GBC not in Stokes Bay. This was the last communication received on this subject until being informed of the Community Board meeting 10 months later.

During this time IG had sent an email on 14 May to all Councilors' and Samantha Voller inquiring as to the plans for any D-Day Memorial. Having not received a reply from anyone, it was re-sent on 12 June. Again no response was forthcoming. It was assumed from this that whatever plans that the Council had no longer involved Stokes Bay, as it had been made clear that FOSB would be involved in any activity which involved the Bay. It therefore came as a considerable surprise when it was learned of the D-Day Memorial proposal in the Community Board minutes.

During the period of negotiation with the D-Day Fellowship they had written to the Canadian High Commissioner for consent to move the Canadian Memorial stone. In this it was stated that patrons from the local cafe (Pebbles) balanced their drinks and ice cream on it. Anyone who is familiar with the Memorial will know that this is not possible as it has a very uneven upper surface. We believe therefore that the High Commissioner was misled into giving his permission.

Following the recommendation of the proposals by the Community Board, FOSB members were contacted for their views so that the majority view could be represented. Two members were partially in favour, but were disappointed in regard to the treatment of FOSB, while many other members felt that:

- All present memorials were placed in their positions for a reason and should be left
- A large development on the Bay was not acceptable
- The cost of the proposals was grossly under- estimated
- The money could be better spent
- The memorial area would be very liable to vandalism, especially with the seats provided, and in light of experience with the existing shelters and the seats along the promenade
- Members were not against a memorial, but would favour information boards or a simple stone with a plaque in an area representative of the whole of the D-Day events in Stokes Bay.

These bullet points represent the democratic views of our members, who strive, with the Council, to maintain Stokes Bay as a clean, attractive and unspoiled amenity, allowing for the variety of needs of our local population and of its many visitors.

On conclusion, the Mayor thanked Mr. Gallet for his deputation.

Councillor Eddis, Chairperson of Portsmouth City Council Overview and Scrutiny Panel, was invited to deliver his deputation by the Mayor.

Councillor Eddis provided a brief history of the proposal to move Vascular Surgery from Queen Alexandra Hospital to Southampton. He highlighted that two years ago the Scrutiny Committee responded to the same proposal providing clear reasoning for vascular surgery to remain at Portsmouth. He advised that this proposal had been put forward again by the Senate. Having looked at the proposal the Scrutiny Committee had been unable to see any changes of note in support. Councillor Eddis continued to say that QA hospital had continued to provide an excellent service and this is recognized with their Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm (AAA) procedures being conducted without a single death, he further informed members that national statistics currently showed a 2.2 mortality rate; QA is the top hospital in the UK and a viable centre of excellence.

He continued to state that QA had been rebuilt in 2009, within the design and build was the recognition that new technology would be essential for a large hospital with specialist tertiary services. QA have two purpose built vascular interventional radiology facilities which are used to combine both interventional radiology and surgical vascular procedures. Feedback from QA consultants in areas such as; diabetes, renal, stroke, cancer, trauma, venous disease and renal cases said that vascular surgeons were specialists and these conditions need access to vascular support; Councillor Eddis said that if the proposal were to go ahead there was potential for QA to lose its excellence status and become a training hospital.

Councillor Eddis ended his deputation by sharing the view that the way forward would be for both hospitals to work together for the future.

Further to a question from a member Councillor Eddis responded by saying his interpretation is that the proposal is to move all vascular surgery to Southampton, but it is not absolutely clear.

Councillor Edgar asked it be noted in the interest of transparency, that he holds the health portfolio and has been appointed to sit on the board of Governors of QA Hospital.

Members voiced their support in keeping vascular surgery at QA hospital.

NOTICE OF MOTION

The Mayor reported that he had a Notice of Motion under Standing Order 3.3.5 (Notice to Suspend Standing Orders) proposed by Councillor Forder and seconded by Councillor Hook to suspend Standing Order 3.3.2 (Eight days' Notice of Motion) so that the Council could consider the Motion in respect of the proposal to move vascular surgery From QA Hospital to Southampton.

COUNCIL RESOLVED: That Standing Order 3.3.2 be suspended so that the Council could consider the Motion in respect of the proposal to move vascular surgery to from QA Hospital to Southampton

The Mayor further reported that included in the above Notice of Motion was the suspension of Standing Order 4.6 (Procedure for Motions following Notice) so that this

Council meeting could consider the Motion in respect of the proposal to move vascular surgery from QA Hospital to Southampton.

COUNCIL RESOLVED; That Standing Order 4.6 be suspended so that this Council meeting may consider the Motion in respect of the proposal to move Vascular Surgery from QA Hospital to Southampton Councillor Forder accordingly moved, seconded by Councillor Hook the following Motion;-

That, the Council notes with concern the report of the Wessex Clinical Senate, which calls for vascular surgery to be focused in Southampton. The Council vigorously opposes any such move. The Council is troubled that the composition of the Senate fails to adequately represent the residents of South East Hampshire who have clearly expressed their opposition through the News 'Keep it at Q A' petition.

Following research undertaken by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee the Council is gravely concerned that the loss of vascular surgery services at QA will undermine the viability of other important hospital services and degrade the Hospital.

Upon the Motion being put to the meeting the following Amendment was received by the Mayor from Councillor Wright seconded by Councillor Mrs. Cully

AMENDMENT; That the following be added to the end of the Motion 'That this Council calls for a Vascular Surgery Centre to be retained at the Queen Alexandra Hospital in the interests of Gosport and South East Hampshire residents.'

COUNCIL RESOLVED: To approve the Amendment
The Motion as amended was then put to the Council.

COUNCIL RESOLVED: To approve and adopt the Motion as amended.

PART II MINUTES

COUNCIL RESOLVED: That the following Part II Minutes be received

Community Board: 25 November (Minute No. 28 - 31)

Economic Development Board: 27 November (Minute No. 28 - 32)

LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME FOR GOSPORT

Consideration was given to a report of the Borough Treasurer which informed Members of the proposal not to change the Local Council Tax Support scheme (LCTS) for Gosport for the forthcoming 2014-2015 financial year.

COUNCIL RESOLVED: That approval be given for the Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTS) for Gosport referred to in Sections 1.1 and 2.5 of the Borough Treasurers report and noted the statutory scheme for Pension Age customers

The meeting ended at 19:25