

Sleepers Hill Association

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of The Association held at the Conference Room at Highcroft, Sleepers Hill Sunday 6th February 2000 at 11.30 am.

Present:

Captain C.J.L.Croft (Chairman), Mr S.J.Osborne (Secretary), Mrs T.I.Barlow, Mrs S.J.Buchanan, Mr & Mrs R.Cherrett, Mrs J.Crabtree, Mrs E.N.Davies, Mr S.Dugdale, Mrs C.A.Ellison, Miss J.M.Elliott, Mr I.E.J.Ferguson, Mr I.J.Fleming, Mr & Mrs E.P.Gilliat, Ms P.Goodall, Mr H.M.Harker, Mr & Mrs S.D.Harte, Mrs G.M.Heneghan, Mr C.G.Johnson, Mr & Mrs I.W.L.Jones, Mr J.V.Martin, Mr D.E.Midgely, Mrs E.Osborne, Mr & Mrs J.P.A.Ouvry, Mr S.Patterson, Mr & Mrs J.Pattinson, Mr B.Royston-Smith, Mr & Mrs B.H.Sharpe, Mr D.M.J.Smith, Mr M.C.Sollom, Mr & Mrs J.H.Stanning, Judge H.J.M.Tucker, Dr & Dr W.D.White, Mr D. Wilmshurst.

Apologies:

Mr & Mrs P.Bateson, Mr P.J.Barlow, Mr A.A.Bath, Dr N.M.M.Buchanan, Dr & Mrs A.G.Bolwell, Mr & Mrs P.M.Greene, Mr & Mrs H.N.Jeffery, Mr M.A.Hughes, Mr & Mrs E.C.Law, Mr & Mrs D.B.Mathews, Mr & Mrs R.Stahel, Mr R.G.N.Pryor, Mr & Mrs J.H.Richardson, Mrs K.M.Underwood, Mr G.M.Zerbi.

1. Welcome to new members

The Chairman welcomed the following new residents to Sleepers Hill:

Ceri Park & Stephen Barber	Little Robertson
Tim & Christina Stanley	The Laurels
Nick & Allison Kelly	Hilbury (G.E.D.)
Ian & Claire Lamb	Beech Lodge
Maurice & Linda Harker	Springdale
Tom & Jackie Milne	Pilgrims House

2. Minutes of the 1998 AGM.

There was unanimous agreement that the Minutes were a fair record of that Meeting.

3. Matters arising.

The Chairman explained that matters arising from the previous AGM, which had not been covered in Committee, would be dealt with during the course of the meeting. Mrs Crabtree added that Cable & Wireless had no plans to install cable TV on Sleepers Hill in the foreseeable future.

4. Election of Officers

Captain Croft said he was reluctant to continue as Chairman, but would be willing to stand for a final year if no names were put forward as his successor. As no names were forthcoming, Captain Croft was elected Chairman for the current year. As there were no proposals for Secretary, Mr Osborne was confirmed in office for the current year.

The Chairman explained that the Committee had decided that Committee members should be elected as from this year rather than to continue with the previous informal arrangement. Joan Elliott and Stephen Harte had decided to stand down to make way for new elected members. Captain Croft thanked Miss Elliott for her hard work and support over many years. He also thanked Mr Harte and hoped he would act as architectural advisor to the Association in future. Mr Ouvry and Mr Stanning thanked the Committee for their endeavours.

Three new Committee members were elected for a 2 year term:

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Seconded</u>
Iain Fleming	C.J.L.Croft	P.E.Jones
Bob Jones	W.D.White	P.S.Goodall
Matt Johnson	S.J.Osborne	J.M.Elliott

5. Financial Report.

The Secretary gave a brief statement of the current financial situation. There was currently £2350 in the bank after the Patterson Reeves account had been settled. After the current subscriptions had been collected, there would be a balance of some £5700 on deposit. The Association would be in a position to resurface the road in 2002 barring any unforeseen large items of expenditure.

The Meeting was asked to adopt the Financial Report. There being no comments, it was adopted. The Secretary thanked Carol Ellison for once again acting as Hon. Auditor to The Association.

5. Voting Procedure to be adopted for Implementation of Major Works

The Chairman invited proposals as to what majority would be required to implement major works on Sleepers Hill, in the event of a postal ballot. A lively debate followed which included the following contributions:

Mr Jones – 51% for all works in addition to regular maintenance.

Judge Tucker – who would be entitled to vote, individuals or households ?

Mr Zerbi – there should be unanimous agreement (comment by proxy).

Mr Ferguson – the figure adopted in company law for items of major additional expenditure, is normally 75%.

Mr Fleming – a need to distinguish between day to day expenditure and non budgeted capital expenditure.

Mrs Jones – concern over the wording of the question on any ballot paper.

Mr Patterson – the majority should be two thirds, supported by Mrs Crabtree.

It was agreed that since the term 'major works' was not defined, the meeting should confine the discussions of majorities to the traffic calming scheme only. It was suggested that the Committee should look into the procedure to be adopted in future as part of the research and possible adoption of a formal constitution for the Association. It was also agreed that there should be 1 vote per household on the List of Members.

The chairman then invited a show of hands to indicate members' views in response to the question 'In a postal ballot, what majority of votes should be required to justify proceeding with the traffic calming scheme - 51%, two thirds or 75%?'. Before the show of hands, it was agreed that there should be only one hand per household. There was a clear majority in favour of 75%, the figures being as follows:

51%	4	
2/3	12	
75%	17	(75% carried)

7. The Traffic Calming Scheme

The Secretary gave a presentation of the scheme as prepared by Patterson Reeve, Chartered Civil Engineers. He described the background to the current situation and the reasons the proposed speed tables were in the suggested positions. Owing to the profile of the hill and the number of driveways, there was very little chance of them being re-located without a major increase in cost. The original plans had incorporated a level table from verge to verge which would have necessitated drainage gullies and soakaways which would have added some £3000 to £4000 to the cost of each table. As this was thought to be unacceptable, the engineers were asked to suggest a cheaper option. The proposed tables with tapering falls on each side were the result of this discussion.

There would need to be an illuminated warning sign at either end of the scheme and because the existing lamp standards were so far apart, two extra street lights would need to be installed, to comply with regulations.

The four contractors' estimates varied from £9400 to over £20,000. Patterson Reeves had checked the figures for the cheapest quotation, found them to be realistic and recommended the Association to accept the price tendered by Swanwick Construction Ltd. The Association had been assured that they were a reputable company.

Difficulties with establishing the lighting requirements had meant that written quotations for installation had not been forthcoming, but the Association had been given a range of verbal estimates. A major cost would be the installation of electrical junction boxes to enable the extra lighting to be wired into the street lighting circuit. Winchester City Council had agreed verbally to pay for the energy cost of the lighting but not for any maintenance of signs or lights.

The probable cost of the construction would be:

Construction of speed tables	£9400
Signs & Lighting	£5000
Total (incl. VAT)	£14400
Divided between say 50 members	£300 per household (approx.)

The Chairman thanked Mr Osborne for his presentation and invited questions and comments from the members. There followed a thorough and at times heated debate which included the following contributions:

Mrs Jones - £300 was remarkably good value

Mr Jones - could not the scheme be introduced incrementally?

Mrs Crabtree - concern for the frontagers who would have tables outside their properties.

Mrs Jones - could the tables be provided with drainage channels covered by a cast iron grating rather than sloping sides which could be a hazard.

Judge Tucker - would the tables actually reduce speeds? In his experience they would not.

Mr Ferguson - what would be the effect on the Associations' insurance policy.

Mr Ouvry - The lack of traffic calming on the lower half of the hill would encourage drivers to speed up again. Could any measures be installed further down the hill?

Mr Cherrett - Have all the frontagers who would be most affected by tables been approached and what was their view?

Ms Goodall - since the traffic speeds would be reduced so would the noise level.

Mrs Osborne - in her experience of meeting householders in Stanmore Lane during her canvassing for local elections, she had found those with humps outside their houses were unanimous in their opposition to them.

Mr Jones - accused members of pettifogging.

Mr Fleming - Members were perhaps losing sight of the fact that the scheme was being introduced to improve safety and that personal inconvenience was of secondary importance.

Mr Sharpe - thought the scheme was flawed and would rather see restrictions to the entry to and exit from Sleepers Hill at the junction with Romsey Road.

Mr Patterson - pedestrians were in danger not from traffic speeds but by virtue of having to walk in the road since the verges were muddy and slippery. If the verges were more satisfactory for pedestrians safety would be much improved.

Mrs Jones - safety was paramount.

Mr Stanning - objected to the approach and arguments used by Mrs Jones.

After the debate, it was agreed that the Committee would draft a ballot paper to be sent to all members, inviting them to approve and pay for the scheme as it stood. The minutes of the AGM would be delivered at the same time.

8. Any Other Business

Judge Tucker reported that the Planning Committee of Winchester Council had approved the change of use of Enniskerry to a residential home. They had deferred the decision to allow the extension until revised plans had been submitted.

There being no other business, the Meeting closed at 13.15 pm.