

Notes from Inform Fareham YouTube Videos of FBC Council meeting 28/7/16

FVS, 5/8/16

Points in the debate where there was political bias, and subjective views shown - rather than relying on objective evidence

1. EL's Intro ([video #7](#))

The EL gives some 'precept' examples from the Officer's report Appendix, however figures have clearly been 'cherry-picked,' and their careful selection whilst rejecting other much lower local examples misleads the other councillors.

The EL gives low attendance at the Funtley CAT meeting as proof of "waning support" in the campaign, however that is a subjective view, as no inference can be read into numbers attending – the meeting was just a number of different ways for residents to make up their mind, so his statement to the Council on this is misleading - it could be rationally argued that the numbers were low because FVS had already given residents all the information they needed.

The EL gives detail of only 30 people responding to say they disagreed with the Officer's report (5%) as evidence of "waning support." Firstly, he doesn't mention why they were forced to re-open the process (Council Officers had mishandled the consultation dates), so omitting that is information misleading to other councillors. Also saying that this 5% response, (and the EL repeated this more than once) is evidence of "waning support," is again misleading, as it is a subjective view, all it shows is 5% wanted to express a view on the negative report conclusion *at that stage* - after the Officers had been forced to re-open the process.

The EL sums up by saying he is not convinced of "overwhelming support" - that "only a small part of Funtley supported this". Bearing in mind that the objective evidence is that 74.5% of Funtley residents expressed their support for a parish council in the CGR survey and >50% had signed a petition in favour (which the EL also omits to mention), and then the EL is clearly expressing a subjective view, and misleading the Council.

2. Cllr Price ([video #8](#))

Asks for clarity on addressing of envelopes for the CAT invite, whether that was a contributing factor to low CAT meeting attendance, which is answered by Council Officer Leigh Usher, who despite several attempts gives ambiguous answers, and it takes several attempts for her to admit that they were addressed only to the property, (so could have been discarded as junk mail) - however her words are accepted by the Mayor without further questions being allowed on this subject, which is inappropriate to the Mayor's position - she shows bias by shutting down the debate on this important point.

3. Cllr Bryant ([video #9](#))

Cllr Bryant does ask for the Mayor's "indulgence" to speak over the allotted 5 minutes, however she then speaks for 8 minutes (3 minutes over time!) without being warned or challenged by the Mayor, which is in contrast to treatment of a Councillor in favour of a Parish Council who speaks later in the debate. This shows bias on the Mayor's part.

Cllr Bryant says it is clear the decision should represent the “whole community” – which is untrue as that is not what the Government Act or guidance says, so clearly that statement is clearly misleading.

Cllr Bryant says (more than once) that Funtley would be a “very small Parish” – which she uses as a reason to reject the proposal (viability) – however that is a subjective view - it can be objectively evidenced that there are very successful Parishes locally with less residents than Funtley that work very effectively, and nationally Parishes of less than 100 people that are also successful, so by giving her subjective view she misleads the other members.

Cllr Bryant gives the two competing Combined Authority plans as a reason to reject the proposals (uncertainty), but that is a subjective view, not based on the Officer’s report findings - it can equally be argued that these plans should be irrelevant to this decision about local democracy at the lowest tier of government, her subjective views mislead the other Councillors.

Cllr Bryant says “no natural leaders have come forward” which is clearly a slight against FVS members, but more importantly “that we had indicated to her that we wouldn’t have time to do this” which is simply not true, as the elected parish councillors would not be exclusively FVS members so this is irrelevant and to give that as a reason for rejecting, is misleading the others.

4. Cllr Keeble ([video #11](#))

Asks for advice on legal criteria, gets a response from the solicitor that doesn’t mention why Council Officers had to reopen the consultation process – that they made an error with the consultation dates, so her response is misleading as it gives Councillors the false impression this has been handled impeccably by Officers, when the objective evidence shows the opposite.

5. Cllr Bayford ([video #13](#))

Says he is voting against as we hadn’t shown “unequivocal support”- which is highly subjective, it could easily be argued that the objective evidence of 75% in favour and more than 50% of signatures shows this support, also he is misleading the others as there is no requirement to be “unequivocal” in the Government Act or guidance.

Cllr Bayford says FVS literature is “misleading and in some cases just plain wrong” and as an example says we’d said that a portion of the Welborne infrastructure money should be “automatically available” to us, which we have never said, so for him to say that as a reason for rejecting the Parish Council plans is misleading the others.

6. Cllr Fazackarley ([video #15](#))

Speaks of his membership of the “Fareham and Eastleigh bus drivers Association” – however no trace of that organisation can be found. He speaks of it having “a few members in Funtley” which again, after making enquiries, we can find no evidence of.

Cllr Fazackarley says (quote) “All said exactly the same, in their opinion... had been bullied” – but he doesn’t present any evidence of that, and also that residents were “apprehensive of giving response” and “frightened” but again no evidence is presented to back this up, so to

make these quite serious accusations, without presenting any evidence, is very poor conduct by a serving councillor, and could easily be construed as slander.

Also Cllr Fazackerley is Deputy Mayor, so his role on the Council is to support the Mayor in ensuring that debates are fair and balanced, so he should not have been allowed to use his position express a view like this to the debate anyhow.

7. Cllr Birkett ([video #17](#))

Makes a point about democracy, says as there was no committee in Funtley saying they didn't want a Parish Council, which makes our consultation invalid, however the stated Governance process does not require an organised opposition, so to discount our vote on this highly subjective basis is both bizarre, and misleading the other Councillors.

8. Cllr Cunningham ([video #18](#))

Speaks for only 5 minutes and 8 seconds before the Mayor interrupts him, she then warns him again, then tells him to sit down and cuts him off after only 5 minutes 26 seconds. This contrasts with the more than 8 minutes allowed for Councillor Bryant without even a warning, and clearly shows bias by the Mayor.

9. Cllr Pankhurst ([video #19](#))

Twice raises the point of unfairness of people having to pay "a precept for the same services," however as stated in the report, any precept raised by the Parish Council would be for additional services, so by stating this view she clearly misleads the other Councillors.

10. Cllr Ellis ([video #21](#))

Speaks to say that 32 respondents to the Officer's report at that stage (when consultation had to be reopened), plus low CAT meeting attendance is not evidence of "sustained support" – however as stated previously, the objective evidence says otherwise, so to present in this subjective way is misleading the Council. She also gives a precept figure of £94 – when we have clearly stated in our literature that our proposed precept would be £40 per annum, then raises a point on collection of non-payment - that the Parish Council would have to enforce collection, which is misleading the Council, as Council Tax is not collected directly by the Parish Council.

11. Cllr Bell ([video #22](#))

Congratulates Officers on their report (no mention of date issue that meant consultation had to be re-opened), castigates the audience for disrespecting the report and authors, but there was no disrespect or interruption during the meeting, so to raise that is misleading the other Councillors.

Says support is waning, which again is subjective not objective evidence, based again on CAT meeting turnout and 30 responses to the Officer's report at that late stage, so is clearly misleading the other Councillors.

Says 79p per week not enough to pay for a Clerk, which is incorrect as we have costed out the services of a part time clerk based on information given to us by the parish clerk of Wickham & Whiteley Parish and Town Councils and the Hampshire Association of Local Councils (HALC). She also neglects to mention to grants and other funding that would be open as options to the Parish Council, so misleading the Council.

12. Cllr Butts ([video #23](#))

Says “the Consultation is not a democratic exercise” which is simply not true, it **IS** a democratic exercise within the Governance Review, as set out in the Government Act and guidance, so to present it in that way is misleading the Council. He says, “people have not voted for a Parish Council”, and the vote had “no democratic basis,” which is again not supported by objective evidence and misleads the other councillors.

13. Cllr Cartwright ([video #24](#))

Says we should take the views of everyone not just the “few who went through consultation” which is a highly subjective statement to make, particularly considering the objective evidence on the numbers who took part and voted in favour, so clearly he has misled here.

Says the 5% who contacted the Council over the Officer’s report conclusion is evidence of waning support, but it isn’t, it’s a subjective view, so once again is misleading the Council. Says the suggested precept is “ad hoc” – but this is not as it has been clearly costed as mentioned previously, so to point that out, as a reason for refusing the application, is misleading.

Raises the Whitely Town Council precept figure as a “cherry-picked” example, which is not a fair and balanced thing to do, and designed again to mislead Councillors.

14. The EL Winding-Up ([video #25](#))

The EL justifies the No decision on purely subjective evidence - low consultation turnout numbers (they were actually comparable with Council election turnouts), and low CATs meeting turnout (which could easily be explained by poor advertising by the Officers), and also low support within the community – (subjective again) giving only 30 people showing support at the late consultation stage as justification for refusal.

In presenting his case in this way we ascertain that the ELs summing up is not based on the objective evidence in the report, and is misleading the other Councillors.

Finally, the EL says he believed a Yes decision would put up “social barriers” between Funtley and other areas, but again that is a highly subjective view, and he makes no attempt to present objective evidence to explain this, which is again clearly misleading the other Councillors before the vote.

15. Post-debate ([video #26](#))

Cllr Price raises a Point of order that the Amendment as put is not valid (as there were 3 options on the vote, but the EL had rejected one of them), legal advice is taken which is not clear, however the Mayor then stops Cllr Price continuing to question this, saying she had closed the debate, and that is a final example of abuse of power by the Mayor.