

# BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting 10 October 2022 at 7.30pm

### **Present**

Cllr Dugmore (Chairman)    Cllr Christian-Carter    Cllr Kettle  
Cllr Thomas                    Cllr Tressler

### **Absent**

4 Vacant seats

### **In Attendance**

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

### **Public**

2 – Mr Austin and Mr Knight

### **22/158 Apologies**

Cllr Gates - out of the country

It was **RESOLVED** to accept Councillor Gates apologies. (Proposed Cllr Tressler, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

### **22/159 Declarations of Interest**

None

### **22/160 Dispensations**

None.

### **22/161 Minutes**

Minute 22/157 is incorrect as Cllr Tressler was at the meeting and therefore his apology needed to be deleted. It was also noted that there was a 'typo' in minute 22/153 (2.) as Michael Weller should read Michael Wellock .

It was **RESOLVED** to, with the above amendments, approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council held on 11 July 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Tressler, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

### **22/162 Public Forum**

Mr Austin and Mr Knight are in attendance to speak to item 6. ii. 22/02494, Garage Blocks, Starbold Road – Construction of 2 no. 4 bedroom houses. Both residents have submitted formal objections to the planning application and hope that the parish council will support them in their objection.

Mr Austin commented:

- The proposed development is at the rear of his and Mr Knight's houses,
- Planned properties are very large and are therefore disproportionate to the size of the site,
- The amount of light they currently experience will be massively reduced,
- The new properties would be intrusive and result in their privacy being invaded,
- It is 'infilling'.
- This site was previously garages. There is a serious lack of parking spaces in the vicinity, and this will be exasperated by yet more large houses, each with multiple cars,
- Do not feel there is a local need for houses of the proposed type and size – if they were bungalows he may well have viewed the application differently.

Mr Knight commented that:

- Because of the way they have been designed, the side elevation is going to be right behind their properties and will block most of the light out of their properties,
- Parking is limited and these additional properties will make it worse,
- The proposed properties will be 2.5 storey's high and will be exactly the same size as the estate behind and therefore they will be overbearing,
- Windows will be overlooking their properties and will therefore invade their privacy.

## **22/163 Planning Matters**

1. To review and consider any amendments to the responses made using delegated powers for the following:

- i. **22/02442/FUL**

Land between Bishop's Itchington and Gaydon Knightcote – Construction of a solar farm (82.5ha) together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.

Delegated response of 'Holding Objection'.

This is a re-submission of their previous application and includes a few minor amendments but nothing substantial. Councillors were asked for their comments:

- Happy to re-submit objections excluding the part about 'a variable number of major objections' as this has not happened yet regarding this particular application,
- Object and re-send the material planning considerations verses core strategy planning policies, sustainable developments, sustainable energy particularly the Wright survey of the Feldon Vale and the size of it being totally unacceptable, the part about solar energy and SDC's renewable energy landscape etc,

- It was commented that following the original submission, the world energy/economic climate has changed and there is now a different approach hence the re-submission. There will be a call for far more solar farms and wind farms due to the way the world is currently changing,
- There will become a point where the balance of the committee will possibly swing in favour of allowing this to happen,
- The argument about solar can actually be strengthened because the amount of renewable energy produced by solar panels is quite minimal compared to other renewable sources,
- Arguments put forward last time are still relevant today and still stand,
- No public consultation with regards to this application has been made and this point should be made. This application has already been in front of committee and has been refused which adds weight to the argument we put forward last time as it demonstrates that SDC, planning committee, did object,
- Government is proposing to re-categorise farm land that can have solar farm development upon it. They are looking at amending the definition so that category 3b farm land is not classed as suitable for solar farms. This proposed development would be on category 3b farm land,
- In a quandary over this now as there is a competition between food production and energy. There is no easy answer to this contest and therefore it would be difficult to decide whether to support or object to the proposal,
- The energy landscape has changed literally and although solar is not as large a contributor to the grid as others forms – currently wind power peaked at just under 20 giga watts, solar just under 10 gigawatts so therefore it is not insignificant amount. At times, the 20 gigawatts of wind power is generating 45-50% of the UK energy supply,
- Need a source of energy or we need to start turning the lights off a little bit more. If we are not prepared to consume less then we are going to have to source more. We have already tested this site 9 approximately) with the proposition of a wind farm and there was out-cry although a wind farm can generate at night and a solar farm cannot. Also, land within a wind farm can still be farmed but this is impossible with a solar farm. Having considered the alternative and declined it, this is the next best option,

It was **RESOLVED** to carry forward the objections already placed subject to the removals raised by Cllr Christian-Carter. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter – 4 in favour, one against (Cllr Dugmore))

It was suggested that one of the councillors who have objected to this, and the previous planning application attend the planning appeal as outline later in the agenda. Following discussion, it was suggested that Cllr Chrisitan-Carter would

be the most appropriate representative. Cllr Tressler attended the last appeal and was extremely disillusioned with Stratford DC and planning committee.

**ii. 22/02494/FUL**

Garage Blocks, Starbold Road, Bishop's Itchington – Construction of 2 no 4 bedroom houses.

Delegated response of 'Holding Objection' submitted.

- The land was sold by Orbit Group as development land
- Down to what is permitted
- Contrary to policy CS9 Design and Distinctiveness
- Contrary to policy CS15, distribution of development also supported by our NDP (BINDP2 – any development within the BUAB has to be supported by the community).
- Contrary to CS16 Housing Development. We do not need two more market value houses of 4 bedroom x 2,5 storeys,
- Contrary to Policy AS10 Countryside and Villages. There is no scope for it within the BUAB as needs to be supported by the community and this is not,
- Contrary to CS26 Transport and Communications because although Highways authority said no problem, from an internal point of view there would be a problem as it would be exasperating the use of narrow roads etc
- Contrary to SPD Part F Residential Amenity (F4 Separation Distances). The plans show a measurement of 13 meters from the new side wall to pavements edge. This should be 16 meters from the side wall to back of garden/building line,
- Contrary to SPD Part 0 Parking and Travel (02 Tandem Parking) - the house nearest the exit will have to have three parking spaces down the side of the house,
- The Lakin Drive estate has a specific design and these properties will be incongruous with that design and would not fall in with SDC supplementary planning documents on design guides,
- SDC, as of this week, has a 10 year housing land supply and therefore there is no pressure on the District to deliver houses unless they strictly meet other policy reasons within the core strategy,
- Clearly, these two houses will be out of character and it would be better to see affordable housing rather than more executive homes,
- At face value, it is on the south side therefore generating the greatest shading issues,
- Having looked at the plans for them, at least one side window is in a bathroom so should be obscure glass from a privacy point of view but on the other side there is a landing window which will be overlooking,
- References from the BINDP – it was suggested that it be looked at carefully before using as the reference in BINDPi actually says infill development inside the BUAB is supported in principle rather than needing public support

- BINDP12 should be cited as there is no comment as to whether they have a charging infrastructure and this would be expected especially as plot 2 parking spaces are away from the property
- The site was parking for the properties that exist and it was a mistake to allow the site to be sold separately by Orbit,
- The 'high' number properties in Starbold Road are prone to flooding. The garages have been flooded numerous times with up to six inches of water so if they were to go ahead with building on the site they would have to address drainage problems,
- A normal two storey building would mitigate some of the concerns regarding the height of the proposed houses
- BINDP Local Distinctiveness - reinforce local distinctiveness by demonstrating appropriate account has been taken of existing village street layouts, blocks and plots, building forms and styles,
- Over development,

It was **RESOLVED** to object to Planning Application 22/02494/FUL Garage Blocks on the policy-based objections given above. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, four in favour, one abstention (Cllr Kettle))

2. To consider Planning Appeal for the following:

**20/02839/FUL**

Land between Bishop's Itchington and Gaydon Knightcote – Construction of a solar farm (82.5ha) together with all associated works, equipment, and necessary infrastructure.

It was **RESOLVED** to stand by the comments already submitted on the original planning application rather than including any additional material. (Proposed by Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, four in favour, one abstention (Cllr Kettle))

3. To consider the following application:

**22/01572/FUL**

Waterside Barn, Mill Pit Farm, Hambridge Road, Bishop's Itchington – Two-storey extension to existing annex.

- Cllr Thomas – no reps
- Cllr Tressler asked for clarification of what we have previously signed off after the gentleman concerned attended a parish council meeting regarding the annex to this property. It was confirmed that he was requesting a change of use application from a holiday let to a permanent residence let and this was conditioned as domestic use
- What is being proposed is totally contrary to CS20 about annexes and the user guide for household development December 2018 contains a section regarding annexes where it says quite categorically that an

annexe must be subservient in both scale and size to main host dwelling which on this occasion is Waterside Barn. Looking at the plans, the annex is going to be infinitely bigger than the existing Waterside Barn,

- We can summarise that he wants it as an annex then after two to three years, would want it as a separate dwelling in the countryside,
- Originally this was a conversion of a garage to put a holiday let flat on top. It was a holiday let flat because holiday lets were a way of circumventing AS10. If it was not a holiday let it would have been refused as an isolated dwelling. By making it a holiday let, it had economic value and therefore there was a separate policy that supported it. They then attended parish council to say it was not commercially viable they wanted to make it a permanent residential let. In the process of doing so, he confessed to being in breach of planning conditions for at least 12 months possibly 2 years. He got the approval to convert it from a short-term holiday let to residential long term as he told us it was to house his daughter, her husband and child. This is separate from the main building of Waterside Barn and proposes to extend it further. It is not subservient to the main house and is not an annex as it is a self-contained unit of accommodation, and this extends it to be a very viable four-bedroomed house – it will be described as three-bedroomed as the downstairs room is described as a study but is only a bed away from being a bedroom.
- It is an annex to the main dwelling and there are conditions attached so that it can only be used as that. It cannot be lived in separately in its own right. It is an annex to the main dwelling and can have a kitchen, bathroom and facilities and it has to be within the same curtilage. All the criteria are within the user's household design guide and are quite carefully spelt out and so what he got was okay but now what he wants to do is anything but okay
- In its own right, as an extension to something not withstanding the point about annexes, as an extension to something it is far enough away from anyone else to not make a significant difference. There are no immediate neighbours, it is not immediately overlooked however the process that this has gone through to get to this point is not the correct way to go about it and is quite 'fishy'. On that basis, under AS10, they would not have had a hope of starting from that basis.
- If it was just a mere householders extension, he does not have to have client statements but this is a full planning application a planning statement should be submitted/included to justify why this is required,

It was **RESOLVED** to object to planning application 22/01572/FUL Waterside Barn, Mill Pit Lane, due to scale and size contrary to CS20 and the User Guide for Household Development 2018 appendix 2 Annexes and page 13 entitled 'Additional Living Accommodation/Dependent Relatives Accommodation'. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Tressler, three in favour and two

abstentions (Cllr Kettle (interest declared as he knows the family) and Cllr Thomas)).

4. To respond to the request for formal scoping opinion for Land South of Junction 12, M40 near Gaydon, Warwickshire – Proposed Erection of up to approximately 96,000 sqm for Flexible B2, B\* and Class E(g)(ii&iii) floor space.
- This would be an industrial park stretching from the M40 to Gaydon along the link road
  - What are we being asked to provide here? The response was what we want to see going into a scoping request from Stratford
  - In-depth environmental ecological impact assessment,
  - soil to be properly tested (soil grading) as it is agricultural land,
  - archaeological survey,
  - flooding,
  - noise,
  - lighting,
  - smell,
  - proper traffic survey,
  - why do they want an industrial business site in this location.

It was RESOLVED that this list of items be forwarded to Stratford DC. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, four in favour, one abstention (Cllr Kettle))

5. To note the following decisions:

i. **22/02375/FUL**

12 Fisher Road, Bishop's Itchington, CV47 2RE – Demolition of double integral garage and replace with single storey extension. **Permission with Conditions.**

ii. **22/01699/FUL**

Land Off, Ladbroke Road, Bishop's Itchington – Alterations to external materials and fenestration of Building 1, the installation of replacement gates and a sewage treatment facility. **Permission with Conditions.**

iii. **22/01639/FUL**

Holmes House, Hambridge, Road Bishops Itchington, CV47 2SB – Change of use of 180m<sup>2</sup> of paddock into residential garden for the purpose of constructing a 50m<sup>2</sup> pool and surrounding paved area surrounded by 1.2m wall. **Refusal.**

iv. **21/03378/FUL**

Nemo Racing, Knightcote Bottom, Knightcote, CV47 2 QX – Regularisation of site layout, including structures, and proposed Grass Road of internal access route. **Permission with Conditions.**

**v. 21/03162/VARY**

Nemo Racing, Knightcote Bottom, Knightcote, CV47 2 QX – Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 09/00675/FUL dated 17 June 2009 to allow a camping and caravan use associated with existing Radio-Controlled Model Car facility. Original description of development: Permanent use of land forming part of field as radio-controlled model car racing hobby club. (Upgrade of temporary to permanent permission).  
**Permission.**

Cllr Kettle advised that he did write to the Chief Executive regarding the Nemo Racing applications to raise a number of issues that he considered to be fundamental to the planning process whereby the planning officer informed the Highways Team there would be no intensification and on the basis of that they did not submit an objection. That information was not put before the planning committee. The planning officer also wrote to say the objection from Highways on the other application had been removed on 6 June 2022 and this was not the case as it was removed by email on the evening of the planning committee meeting which was not recorded on the e-planning site until the following morning. The planning officer stated in the event of caravanning not being allowed, there was a ‘fall back’ position that they could park on the neighbouring field but in fact, planning enforcement had already identified that they could not do that so planning committee was again presented with inaccurate information believing the ‘fall back’ position was real and felt therefore that they had no choice but to allow the caravans as it would happen anyway that. He had raised other points as well.

Nemo Racing have now changed the colour of the track to bright red despite there being a requirement from ecology that on non-race days it should be used to encourage biodiversity.

**22/164 County, District & Parish Liaison**

**SDC/WCC**

Cllr Kettle had circulated notes appertaining to the District and County Council prior to the meeting. Cllr Dugmore thanked Cllr Kettle for his reports that were very

- Cllr Kettle advised that he has authorised payment for the painting of white lines in Chapel Street and the re-painting of all the lines outside the primary school to enhance their visibility,
- The Fosse Way traffic lights – there is going to be an open evening, lead by Highways officers, in Harbury later this month to explain what is going to happen with the traffic lights. The contractor is signed up after the developer approved them. The utilities companies are already working on diverting the current utilities that are there and when this design work is completed then they will commence work. It is not the intention to close the road whilst works are undertaken. Temporary lights will be installed whilst work is undertaken



## **22/165 Finance**

### **1 Monthly Financial Report for September:**

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the Monthly Finance Report ending 30 September 2022 (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

### **2 Bank Reconciliation Report September 2022:**

The bank reconciliation report for September 2022 had been completed by the Clerk. Cllr Kettle had been unable to check the reconciliation as yet.

### **3 Accounts for payment on 10 October 2022**

It was **RESOLVED** that the Accounts Payable on 10 October 2022 be authorised for payment by Cllr Thomas and Cllr Christian-Carter (Appendix B). (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

### **4. Notice of Conclusion of Audit for Annual Governance & Accountability Return for the year ended 31 March 2022**

It was noted that the external audit for year ending 31 March 2022 has now been concluded and the auditors had not raised any concerns.

## **22/166 RoSPA Safety Inspection Reports**

- i. Bishop's Itchington Playground – Playing Field,
- ii. Bishop's Itchington Playground – Hard Court Area,
- iii. Bishop's Itchington Playground - Playground

As we are in the process of replacing the playground, it was suggested that the best way forward would be to deal with the high-risk issues and monitor the medium risk issues. The red item in the playground refers to the agility trail. There are some high medium risks, one being repairs to the fence/stiles at the bottom of the playing field – quotes to repair it to be obtained by the clerk. A lot of the timber around the hardcourt area and the timber of the fence is looking tired and would the addition of some form of preservative coating enhance its longevity. It has previously been discussed that once the new playground is installed the issue of fencing/timber needs to be addressed and therefore it was suggested that we wait until we get to that point to discuss further.

There is a consistent comment throughout the report about the number of items of equipment whose wear was accelerated by strimmer damage.

It was **RESOLVED** to seek immediate remedy of the issues marked red. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

## **22/167 Civility & Respect Pledge**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt and sign up to the Civility & Respect Pledge. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).

### **22/168 Community Grant Application**

- i. The application form from Bishop's Itchington Primary School for football nets has not been received.
- ii. Bishop's Itchington Football Club – Goal Fencing. The football club are requesting funds to replace the current net behind the goal posts nearest to properties. They want to have a fence installed professionally to ensure its longevity. The proposal is to remove the current netting and replace it with the installation of 22.50 meters of 5-meter-high Zaun Duo 6 sports fencing (metal). Given the sum of money involved £5,909.84 plus VAT, it was requested that two more quotes be obtained. Due to the height and length of the proposed metal fence it is likely that they would need to obtain planning permission and undertake consultation with the neighbours regarding the visual impact of such a large fence. Also, the land does not belong to BIFC therefore they would need to obtain permission for the fence. The suitability of the fence on the playing field was questioned. The fact that something needs to be done about the current net is highlighted by the RoSPA report but this does not seem to be the right answer to the problem. It cannot be justified to spend £7,000 to change the existing netting into something that is completely out of context with the rural nature of the pitch. A new net, properly installed would be more appropriate and in keeping with the surroundings. It was suggested that BIFC should re-think this and come back with a more suitable option. The accounts submitted are a bit 'wonky' and we would need to see these again.

The parish council understands that a replacement to the current net is needed but the proposal is not acceptable either visually or price wise. It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council understands the need for a replacement for the current ball stop netting but cannot support the current application on the grounds that it is expensive, it is a very narrow focused application and would need significant consultation with the neighbours given something of that proportion/height. The parish council would welcome a follow up application for something more modest, a like for like replacement that is more appropriate for the rural setting (google ball stop netting). (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).

### **22/169 Memorial Hall**

Cllr Tressler advised that there will be a sustainability problem at the Memorial Hall unless they gain charitable status, so he has asked them to do is request an agenda point at the next parish council meeting and for them to write a letter to challenge how far we have got towards them obtaining charitable status. It was suggested that this goes on the agenda for the November meeting. It was agreed that the Clerk write to The Memorial Hall to advise them of the current status of the land registry application.

### **22/170 Crime Prevention Toolbox Event**

The event was postponed and will now be held on 19 October 2022 at the Community Centre between 09:00 and 12:00 hours.

### **22/171 Community Support within Bishop's Itchington during the winter months**

This item was prompted by a conversation with Martin Green, taking into account the current financial climate whereby some residents will have to make decisions about heating or eating this winter and the consequences of this. Martin is proposing to have the church hall open and heated with the Wi-Fi available so if people who may like to drop in or people who normally work from home but want to work in the warmth, is social and other people are around. He is proposing to also use the screen and projector in the church if there are sporting events etc whereby people could congregate during the day in the warmth to watch the events i.e. World Cup matches. Also, this tackles the issue of loneliness for those who are on their own especially over the winter months. There are a number of these activities/community buildings opening and these can be viewed on a map at [warmspaces.org.uk](http://warmspaces.org.uk). The question is how we can work together and help share the burden rather than it falling to one organisation . Suggestions include:

- supporting the cost of room hire at various village facilities,
- community contribution towards for instance soup and rolls once per week at a facility. If it was coordinated, it could be moved around facilities to spread the burden,
- 'Events that hide events' whereby something is set up so people are going out to it a specific event i.e. games afternoon, coffee morning etc so they are going to an event that is positive rather than 'I'm just getting out of my house because it is cold' hence removing any stigma. This also has a positive mental side effect.

Thoughts and suggestions were sought as to how the parish council can contribute to this, what role the parish council would like to play in such a thing.

- District, Council and WALC are all looking at ways they can support schemes,
- Providing a warm space in the village through November to February,
- Partnering up with other local groups/organisations
- Possibility of providing snacks one day at the pub, or soup at café, etc,
- Martin is intending to set up a meeting with some more community organisations,
- Drop ideas in an email to the Chair and he can then share them at future meetings,
- Needs to be regular so people know when events are happening
- Possibility of some pump-priming monies from the community grants budget,
- If it is lunchtime or early evening it is all about food,
- Early evening is dark and therefore elderly people will not want to come out
- Bishop's big lunch,
- One member of the parish council to attend village meetings, with the idea of finding out, for example, if it was food provision, opening up a building for 3 to 4 hours, drop in and dine, a seat at the table (sometimes a person is cooking

for four people and if there is a lonely person close by, cooking for an extra person and offering them a seat at the dining table (subject to safeguarding))

- Difficult to know the need and take up without trying

It was agreed that Cllr Dugmore would get back to Martin and advise him that we have discussed it and would like to participate in some way and have some ideas for instance covering the cost of hiring one of the venues so that it does not fall all on one location, possibly contributing to providing food at one event. To find out the scope and scale of the project and ensure it is on the November's agenda.

## **22/172 Bishop's Itchington Parish Council Policies**

### **Complaints Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Complaints Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

### **Data Protection Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Data Protection Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

### **Discipline and Grievance Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Discipline and Grievance Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Kettle, all in favour).

### **Equality Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Equality Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

### **Publication Scheme:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Publication Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

### **Reserve Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Reserve Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Kettle, all in favour).

### **Statement of Controls:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Statement of Controls as presented. (Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

### **Training Policy:**

The proposed policy includes the wording:

“Chair of the council and all committee chairs will attend the Chairman's training at the WALC.

All councillors to attend courses available depending on what committee they are on via the WALC.

Any changes in legislation councillors will seek advice from the Clerk regarding further training courses”.

It was proposed that the lines above be amended to read:

“Chair of the council and all committee chairs will attend the Chairman’s training at the WALC when appropriate or required.

All councillors to attend courses available depending on what committee they are on via the WALC when appropriate or required.

Training will be reviewed with any change in relevant legislation and/or new software systems for which staff/councillors may need training.”

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Training Policy amended as per above. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

**Health and Safety Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Health and Safety Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

**Social Media Policy:**

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Social Media Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

It was suggested that the parish councils website is checked to ensure it does not for contain any images or material that we do not have ownership, license or permission to use.

**Lone Working Policy:**

The principle of this is fine but the practice is something we need to look at very carefully to see if they are implementable or can be appropriately explained around and a risk assessment should be undertaken before the clerk returns to the office in the new year.

It was **RESOLVED** to adopt the Lone Working Policy as presented. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

**22/173 Environment & Properties**

**1. Children’s Playground:**

Working Group Update:

- The Tender is open
- The Tender closing date has been extended to 31 October due to proposed Royal Mail strike days
- Cllr Thomas has shown a couple of companies around the playground whilst Cllr Christian-Carter has shown another the current facilities
- The Working Group will hire the Community Centre and review the proposals with a view to making a recommendation that they will present to the parish council at its November meeting
- The Working Group has already started a GoFundMe appeal. This needs to be aligned with a bank account. It was agreed that the Instant Access Account details should be used.

- The question of where the GoFundMe Pavilion Appeal money has gone was raised as if it is still there, it could be moved to the playground page. It was agreed to ask Mr Cooper to see if he could clarify this.
- Also, the possibility of a Landfill Tax grant is being looked at but an application cannot be made until we have got the tenders in.

## 2. BINDP:

- We have a referendum ready NDP document,
- We have been requested by SDC to delay the referendum to coincide with the council elections in May 2023 rather than have a standalone referendum as soon as it can be arranged. Following discussion it was agreed that the Parish Council would like the referendum to proceed as soon as possible

## 3. Tree Works:

- i. Work to Horse Chestnut by the entrance to the playing fields:
  - The residents in the adjoining property have requested that work is undertaken on the tree.
  - The tree surgeon has looked at the tree and has suggested “the crown lift to approximately 3.5 meters, thin out by approximately 20% and prune back from neighbouring property by 2 meters but leaving it in a balanced condition. They would not advise reducing the height of the tree as this would have a detrimental effect on the trees lifespan”.
  - The consequence of doing nothing would be complaints. We are not responsible for the tree, but in the interests of public safety we will however deal with it if there are health and safety issues.
  - If it is not our tree then who is going to maintain it because if it is not ours it has to belong to someone else.
  - It was suggested that we make a public announcement that the parish council would like the owner of the tree to come forward. That way we are demonstrating that we have tried to identify the owner and in the event of the owner not coming forward, in the public interest we had no option but to undertake the required work. Advertise it on website, Facebook page and parish noticeboard giving a four-week period for the owner to come forward and if nobody claims it we then have to take responsibility for the tree and therefore, then decide as to whether to spend £480 to get it sorted. We are then seen as taking a responsible approach as we have identified a risk, we have tried to find the owner, we have failed to find the owner, and therefore in the interest of public safety/well-being of the tree we have acted.

It was **RESOLVED** to advertise the works required to the tree for a four-week period to allow the owner of the tree to come forward and if no one comes forward within this period, the clerk to authorise works to the tree as per the quote for £480.00 plus VAT. (Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

- ii. Clarification of Trees within the responsibility of the Parish Council: The clerk advise that she cannot find a definitive list of the trees that the parish council are responsible for. The last tree survey undertaken covered the Cemetery, St

Michaels, and the village green, Rupert Kettle Drive, Ladbroke Road, The Yellow Land and Scowcroft/Parrish/Mandale. It was confirmed that those trees in the tree survey are the responsibility of the parish council but then WCC came along and planted some trees, but they have confirmed their responsibility for these

**4. The Yellow Land**

- i. Fencing – there are some gaps in the fence/missing pieces that need to be repaired/replaced. It was agreed to obtain quotes to undertake this work.
  
- ii. No Motorcycle signs – it was agreed to just remove the remains of the sign. It was suggested we need either a new Yellow Land legend sign or the existing one cleaned up as it is disgusting.

**22/174 Reports and Questions**

- ‘Roots to the Future’ are planning another wilderness weekend in Warwickshire (22 to 23 October). Karl Curtis and the police have been informed. The Community Safety Team at SDC have also been informed,
- It was requested that we keep advertising on Facebook/Website/Noticeboards/The Scene the need for new councillors,
- The Leamington Courier want to do an article regarding the playground and the GoFundMe page

**22/175 Date of Next Meeting**

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Monday 14 November 2022 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

**Meeting closed at 22:17**

Signed.....Chairman Date.....

## APPENDIX A

### Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/22 and 30/09/22 inclusive. Includes due and unpaid transactions.

Excludes transactions with an invoice date prior to 01/04/22

	Budget 2022/2023	Reserve Movements	Actual Net	Balance	
<b>INCOME</b>					
<b>Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>					
10	Precept	£0.00	£0.00	£104,500.00	£104,500.00
20	Council Tax Support Grant	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
30	Burials	£0.00	£0.00	£1,499.00	£1,499.00
40	Sec 136 & Other Reimbursements	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
50	Playing Field	£0.00	£0.00	£192.94	£192.94
60	Interest - Current	£0.00	£0.00	£159.94	£159.94
61	Interest - Pavilion Fund	£0.00	£0.00	£243.37	£243.37
70	Grants	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
80	Misc	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
90	VAT Refund	£0.00	£0.00	£9,120.91	£9,120.91
100	Pavilion Fund	£0.00	£0.00	£2.84	£2.84
<b>Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>		£0.00	£0.00	£115,719.00	£115,719.00
<b>Total Income</b>		£0.00	£0.00	£115,719.00	£115,719.00
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>					
<b>Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>					
200	Salaries & Expenses	£0.00	£0.00	£14,775.41	-£14,775.41
210	Councillor Allowances	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
220	Administration	£0.00	£0.00	£7,102.64	-£7,102.64
230	Grounds Maintenance	£0.00	£0.00	£12,879.87	-£12,879.87
240	Cemetery & Churchyard	£0.00	£0.00	£1,538.82	-£1,538.82
250	Playing Field	£0.00	£0.00	£12,661.76	-£12,661.76
260	Grants	£0.00	£0.00	£204.32	-£204.32
270	Neighbourhood Plan	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
280	Other Expenditure	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
290	VAT	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
300	Contingency	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
310	Parish Office	£0.00	£0.00	£2,555.01	-£2,555.01
320	Pavilion Project	£0.00	£0.00	£4,780.64	-£4,780.64
<b>Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>		£0.00	£0.00	£56,498.47	-£56,498.47
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		£0.00	£0.00	£56,498.47	-£56,498.47
Total Income		£0.00	£0.00	£115,719.00	£115,719.00
Total Expenditure		£0.00	£0.00	£56,498.47	-£56,498.47
<b>Total Net Balance</b>		<b>£0.00</b>		<b>£59,220.53</b>	



## APPENDIX B

<b>Bishop's Itchington Parish Council</b>					
<b>Accounts Payable 10 October 2022</b>					
<b>To Whom Payable</b>	<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Ex Vat</b>	<b>Vat Payable</b>	<b>Totals</b>	
<i>Urgent accounts paid since last meeting requiring the formal approval of the council</i>					
E Biddle (office rent 01/10/22)	s/order	£ 440.00	£ -	£ 440.00	
Onecom (phone & b/band 30/09/22)	d/debit	£ 69.66	£ 13.93	£ 83.59	
Three Business (mobile sim 22/09/22)	d/debit	£ 4.17	£ 0.83	£ 5.00	
E.ON Next (pavilion electricity 21/09/22)	d/debit	£ 68.30	£ 3.42	£ 71.72	
Bishop's Short Mat Bowls Club (Community Grant payment)	221000	£ 1,274.00	£ -	£ 1,274.00	
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 1,856.13</b>	<b>£ 18.18</b>	<b>£ 1,874.31</b>	
<i>Accounts for payment on 10 October 2022</i>					
J Kirton (Salary)	221001	£ 48.88	£ -	£ 48.88	
V Powell (Salary)	221002	£ 117.63	£ -	£ 117.63	
K Stevens (Salary)	221003	£ 1,405.53	£ -	£ 1,405.53	
HRMC (PAYE)	221004	£ 383.18		£ 383.18	
WWC Pension Fund (August)	221005	£ 458.28	£ -	£ 458.28	
Expenses (K Stevens - Mobile Sim (Sept/Oct))	221006	£ 16.00		£ 16.00	
Edge (Microsoft 365 Fee)	221007	£ 585.60	£ 117.12	£ 702.72	
Edge (Antivirus fee)	221008	£ 72.24	£ 14.45	£ 86.69	
Hawkesford (Warwickshire) Ltd (Insurance Valuations)	221009	£ 416.67	£ 83.33	£ 500.00	
Kirkwells Ltd (BINDP Examinations and final changes to plan)	221010	£ 490.00	£ 98.00	£ 588.00	
Light Media (Hosting of Web Site period 4/9/22 to 3/12/22)	221011	£ 90.00	£ 18.00	£ 108.00	
Memorial Hall (Room rental for Crafty Cuppa)	221012	£ 72.00		£ 72.00	
PKF (External Audit)	221013	£ 600.00	£ 120.00	£ 720.00	
PWC (Bus Shelter)	221014	£ 45.00		£ 45.00	
ROSPA (Annual Playground Inspections)	221015	£ 210.00	£ 42.00	£ 252.00	
SLCC (Training Seminar)	221016	£ 85.00	£ 17.00	£ 102.00	
Thomas Fox Landscaping (Mowing)	221017	£ 1,412.26	£ 282.46	£ 1,694.72	
WALC (Training - Recruiting and Retaining Councillors)	221018	£ 30.00	£ 6.00	£ 36.00	
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 6,538.27</b>	<b>£ 798.36</b>	<b>£ 7,336.63</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£ 8,394.40</b>	<b>£ 816.54</b>	<b>£ 9,210.94</b>	