

Item 6 – Public Question Received under Standing Order 27.5 (Councillor Pike)

	Question From	Question to	Question
1	Mrs Buckley	Councillor Pike	<p>The committee report seems to lack detail on Item 7. Surrender of the lease on the HBC owned Land at Southmoor Lane, Havant. Until recently this was Havant Lorry Park and has now been vacated.</p> <p>Why does the committee report not give details of what Suez Recycling and Reclamation South East Ltd were doing with the site, the planning history and restrictions on the lease?</p>
Reply			
2	Mrs Buckley	Councillor Pike	<p>The rent review was not completed by HBC in 2019 resulting in four years of the rent increase of £15, 000 not being paid to HBC a total of £60, 000. This seems to be poor property management. Why are HBC now proposing the Council pay Suez £400, 000 to surrender the lease on a site they are not currently using?</p>
Reply			
3	Mrs Buckley	Councillor Pike	<p>This 2.2 acre HBC site in Southmoor Lane is adjacent to Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works and could be a very convenient site for Southern Water to have a Water Recycling Plant an important part of their proposal to recycle effluent to Havant Thicket Reservoir as a source of drinking water. Havant BC recent response to Defra made it clear that the Council do not support the Water Recycling proposal. Have there been discussions with Southern Water regarding the use of this 2.2 acre Southmoor site ?</p>
Reply			
4	Mr Owens	Councillor Pike	<p>1. Has there been ANY contact with Southern Water whatsoever in the 5 years prior to this meeting (22 March 2023) regarding any potential arrangement for Southern Water or any of it's representatives or any of it's contractors to acquire, purchase, lease or otherwise contractually conduct its business on any site within 1.5 kilometre of the Budds</p>

	Question From	Question to	Question
			Farm boundary (please indicate the site) specifically related to the recycling of sewage effluent for drinking water?
Reply			
5	Mr Owens	Councillor Pike	When the plan is to remove a massive £400k from the HBC corporate reserves it seems to me that ALL FIVE risks in para 9.0 should be properly determined and stated using appropriate and unambiguous nomenclature - this is not the case. Currently only one fits the accepted practice of using low/medium/high risk language (ie para 9.4). I note that Para 9.1 says the risk is "limited" which appears to be contextually ambiguous. Risk assessments usually consist of risks plus risk mitigation; the latter is clearly absent in this motion and mitigation is clearly a significant material consideration when such a large sum of taxpayers cash is potentially at risk. What are the specific levels of risk (low/medium/high) for each risk and what are the mitigations for each risk?
Reply			
6	Mr Owens	Councillor Pike	It seems very curious to me that the urgency of vacating the site has literally been stated as being in the next 2 days (24/3/23). With such urgency it seems somewhat absurd that the two reasons cited in para 3.8 could both be true. So, is the council planning to use the land for "operational use" (if so what will the use be?) or is an opportunity for generating additional revenue already on the table and in progress (if so what is the nature of the opportunity?) or do both reasons apply, please explain?
Reply			