

BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting 11 July 2022 at 7.30pm

Present

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

Absent

4 Vacant seats

In Attendance

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

Public

1

22/126 Apologies

Cllr Gates and Cllr Tressler.

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the apologies received from Cllr's Gates and Tressler.
(Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carte, all in favour).

22/127 Declarations of Interest

None

22/128 Dispensations

None.

22/129 Minutes

- i. It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council held on 13 June 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr N Thomas, seconded Cllr Kettle, all in favour).
- ii. It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the extraordinary parish council meeting held on 27 June 2022 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

22/130 Public Forum

The member of the public in attendance did not wish to speak.

22/131 Planning Matters

i. 22/01779/FUL:

4 Gaydon Road, Bishop's Itchington, CV47 2QN – Dropped kerb to be added to the front of the property.

- The application form is incorrectly completed and is not accurate in that they claim that there will be no disturbance to existing. To extend the drive down, they will have to remove the hedge although they have said in the application that there will be no removal of hedge.
- That it will exit into a layby that is an enforced parking space for three cars. If they are granted permission to turn their garden into a driveway, and then have a dropped kerb, then that part of the layby will become non-existent
- The block plan is drawn in a misleading fashion as the block plan does not show the lay-by at all. It is a section of parking space off the public highway that has been deliberately put there and would be rendered unusable by anybody. At least 5 meters of lay-by would disappear.
- It is not a proper location plan as although it is to scale but does not show North, therefore how did it get validated
- Application form not correctly completed
- Block Plan and Location Plan are not fit for purpose
- The layby is a section of the public highway specifically created for the purpose of parking and by approving this application it would deny the public use of the layby area and therefore a loss of public amenity,
- Object to application based on observations

It was **RESOLVED** to object to planning application 22/01779/FUL as part of the layby would be lost and therefore part of a public amenity would also be lost. In our opinion the application form is incorrectly filled out because it asks 'will any trees or hedges need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out your proposal' to which the answer is 'no'. This is blatantly untrue as a hedge will need to be removed to complete the proposed plans/works. The parish council also questions the validity of both the location and block site plan as no North is shown on them and the layby is missing from the plans. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, three in favour, one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

ii. 22/01699/FUL

Land off Ladbrook Road, Bishop's Itchington – Internal and external alterations to Building 1, the installation of replacement gates and a sewage treatment facility

It was **RESOLVED** to respond to planning application 22/01699/FUL as no representations. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Dugmore, three in favour, one abstention (Cllr Kettle)).

22/132 County, District & Parish Liaison

SDC/WCC

Cllr Kettle had circulated notes appertaining to the District and County Council prior to the meeting.

The question was asked as to whether SDC are all or most of the employees back working in the office again. The answer to this was no. There has been a concerted effort to get people back in the office and a scheme is being developed to try and encourage people back. The council offices are still shutting a 2.00pm but it is hoped to extend the opening times from September.

There has been an election this week and there has been a lot of press commentary and a strong message coming out is that the non- merger of SDC and WDC has cost SDC £320,000 for no benefit. The £320,000 was the total cost across both authorities and the savings as a result of being able to bid on the waste contract and for us to develop our own legal service over 5 years in £1,200,000 and the immediate savings that have come through for both authorities in year one is approximately £150,000.

Therefore, there is a £170,000 immediate cost to both authorities, but this will turn into a net gain going forward. The white lines by the entrance to the playing field will be painted when there is a team in the locality (up to 6 months).

22/133 Finance

1 Monthly Financial Report

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the Monthly Finance Report ending 30 June 2022 (Appendix A). (Proposed Cllr Kettler, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

2 Bank Reconciliation Report for June 2022

The bank reconciliation report for June 2022 had been completed by the Clerk. Cllr Kettle has checked it and is happy with it.

3 Accounts for Payment

It was **RESOLVED** that the Accounts Payable on 11 July 2022 be authorised for payment by Cllr Christian-Carter and Cllr Dugmore (Appendix B). (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

22/134 Community Grant Application

It was **RESOLVED** to award a community grant application of £200.00 to The Hidden Green Community Growing Space for the Improvement and Increase of the Growing Space Project. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

An application has also been received from the Bishop's Itchington Make, Bake and Grow Show to provide a prize for the 2022 Village Produce Show. Due to the time scales involved and the amount (£10.00) it was agreed to treat it as an expense rather than a grant.

22/135 Environment & Properties

1. Children's Playground:

i. Working Group Update:

- The new Zip-wire is installed and working. A lot of positive comments were received but there proved to be an issue with the height of the seat (this was also picked up from the health and safety inspection that had taken place). RPM had returned and made some minor adjustments to the platform, seat, and cable. Thanks were given to Cllr Thomas and the rest of the group for making this happen. The dead turf has been removed by RPM and has been replaced by topsoil and grass seed – due to the weather conditions, this may have to be re-seeded in the autumn.
- A Working Group meeting was recently held, and the main objective is to produce the tender documents so there is now a splinter group now looking at producing the paperwork. This group comprises of Cllr Thomas, Cllr Gates, Jules Kirton and Tom Cooper. As there are no parish council meetings scheduled until September, Cllr Thomas suggested that when the group is happy with the document, that it be circulated to parish councillors to get everyone's approval before posting on the Find a Tender portal. The group is working on a budget of £155,000 with installation early spring 2023.
- The question was asked that in the terms of tendering are they putting together a specification with the equipment required and the intended location. In response, it was said that based on the results of the surveys, we are not specifying actual pieces of equipment but types of equipment i.e., sliding, swinging, climbing thereby leaving the specification/offer up to the contractor. The question of how we are to compare like with like to determine what's an appropriate value if there is not a definite answer was then raised. There will be a points scoring system based on elements including playground, usage value etc so the idea is that when the tenders are in, the play group working group will review the tenders and award the points and the highest scoring one is the scheme that we go with.
- Concern was raised that we are going to try to decide on a qualitative assessment when it needs to be made on an objective comparison. Concern is that we will get back three quotes for three different jobs, and they are not comparable. There needs to be three quotes for the same job so that a decision can be made.
- It was suggested that we do this in two steps. Step One – we go to various playground suppliers and ask what they can provide for the budget that fulfils the wants of the community so that they come back with proposals. Step Two – use this information to conclude that is what we want, we do not like a, b and c then using this information come up with a specification that says this piece of equipment or its equivalent in that location, that piece of equipment or its equivalent in that location etc

to form a plan that says this is our playground, how much can you build it for? Therefore, the first round is to seek information and proposals then use those proposals develop specifications for the final job then ask each one of them that or its closest equivalent. There is then a direct comparison

- The members of the playground working group present wish to follow the path they were advised to take were we basically we are saying we are looking for a playground overhaul suitable for toddlers to mid-teens, it should incorporate the following activities of swinging, climbing, and sliding as well as a cantilever swing and obstacle course. The playground should have a centrepiece item and are suggesting that some of the smaller items that are in a good condition or nearly new, should be retained if possible or give us a good reason as to why you do not want to retain them. The community survey will be included in the papers.

ii. Replacement Rubbish Bins:

Two are required on the playing fields – one by the pavilion and one by the hardcourts. Another needs to be replaced adjacent to The Village Store.

It was RESOLVED to replace the three broken/missing litter bins in the village. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

Currently the clerk has had no feedback as to whether Biffa would empty 'child friendly' bins if they were installed in the playground.

2. BINDP:

- Correspondence has been exchanged between our examiner, Andrew Matheson and Cllr Thomas. The last communication on 7 July stated that he hoped to finalise his report within 7 to 10 days. Michael Wellock has been extremely helpful in providing help with responses. This is the final report and may suggest minor modifications. Cllr Dugmore thanked Cllr Thomas for his work on this.

3. Cemetery:

i. Working Group Update:

Replacement water tank. The group went and measured the dimensions of the proposed plastic tank against the Chapel, and it would cover windows and would require new guttering/downpipes to fill it from rainwater. Cliff Young found a traditional rectangular galvanised steel tank that would be in keeping with the removed tank that would hold more water than the original tank. This would cost considerably more than a plastic tank but would be more in keeping. If a plastic tank was used, it would require screening and there are graves very close to where screening would need to be erected. Cliff and Steve have said they will clear the area and put down a base for the tank to stand on. The tank

will be very traditional, it will have a divided lid to allow easy cleaning, the tap will be better located, and the tank will blend into the surroundings.

It was **RESOLVED** to purchase a galvanised steel tank at a cost of £1,517.00 plus VAT. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

Use of the Reflective Area. We feel the area would be most suitable for the interment of ashes rather than graves due to the size and shape of the space. We are currently researching a semi-circular tree bench to go around the tree in the middle and are looking at getting the hedge behind the tree cut back. Costs are being obtained to open up the entrance to the area (remove two meters of hedge either side of the current entrance) so, as you walk up through the avenue of limes, the reflective area can be seen it can be seen and be an area you might want to walk into instead of it being a redundant space.

- iii. Flooding at entrance to the Cemetery. Cllr Kettle advised that he had written to Jeffrey Hobday regarding this, but he wants to see what it looks like and where the water flows. He was advised that it is obvious even in the dry and what is required is a drain at the entrance to the cemetery.

22/136 Reports and Questions

- Mobile phone for Cemetery Manager – We have changed Val's phone over from pay-as-you-go to a monthly contract arrangement (£8.00 per month). Unfortunately, the way it had to be set up means that the clerk will have to put in monthly expenses claim to meet the cost of the bill.
- Central Drive – There was a complaint raised by a resident regarding the allegedly poor work at clearing the footways along Central Drive. Having visited, there were a few small areas where it could have been strimmed better on the highway side, but the main issue was the overgrowth from private gardens. It was agreed that the clerk would write to the offending properties asking them to cut back the overgrowth.
- Horse chestnut tree by entrance to the playing fields (tree that has always been in debate as to who owns it and therefore is responsible for the tree) – We have been contacted by a resident as to whether this could be cut back. We have responded to the resident advising that we have previously paid for a tree surgeon to tackle it from a health and safety viewpoint, but this was without prejudice and liability on our part. The parish council will await the residents reply.
- Areas of vegetation within the village – The Spinney car park (legacy land that has never been transferred from the original developer). The vegetation is unsightly, and the residents want someone to address cutting back the vegetation/shrubs/trees. Unfortunately, it does not come under the remit of the district council or parish council. The land is not registered but originally it would have been the developer who bought the estate so technically belongs to them (Persimmon). The vegetation appears to be boundary treatments originally that has grown out of control. Residents may need to check their title deeds to establish if the red line incorporates the amenity land thereby making them are responsible. There is need to establish where the red lines are positioned for each of the properties. If it is a public car park, the parish council

would not be responsible for it – it does not look like adopted highway therefore it is not county council responsibility either. It was suggested that the residents of the properties backing on the car park should get together and form a resident's association to tackle the maintenance of it. If it is something that needs doing on a regular basis, the parish council may be able to help them out with an element of support.

Cllr Kettle has written to Folletts and has received a response regarding two issues:

- i. Complaint regarding vegetation behind the Butchers Close (Carla Phase 2 land), Savilles have been instructed to look at it
 - ii. Grounds surrounding the community centre and boundary vegetation obscuring school sign. The path in question was never transferred to the parish council and is the responsibility of the Marlow Green Management Company.
- The matter of camping, swimming etc on the Nature Reserve is being dealt with by Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (WWLT) and they are keeping us updated. All information is being shared with WLT and we have advised them that we will support them in getting the message across to residents that the land is a nature reserve.

22/137 Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Monday 11 July 2022 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre. Cllr Tressler advised that he will be unable to attend this meeting and therefore tenders his apologies.

Meeting closed at 21:01

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

APPENDIX A

Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/22 and 30/06/22 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	
INCOME					
Bishops Itchington Parish Council					
10	Precept	£0.00	£0.00	£52,250.00	£52,250.00
20	Council Tax Support Grant	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
30	Burials	£0.00	£0.00	£1,165.00	£1,165.00
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	£0.00	£0.00	£59.24	£59.24
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
Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council		£0.00	£0.00	£62,790.93	£62,790.93
Total Income		£0.00	£0.00	£62,790.93	£62,790.93
EXPENDITURE					
Bishops Itchington Parish Council					
200	Salaries & Expenses	£0.00	£0.00	£7,504.50	-£7,504.50
210	Councillor Allowances	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
220	Administration	£0.00	£0.00	£5,136.69	-£5,136.69
230	Grounds Maintenance	£0.00	£0.00	£5,457.48	-£5,457.48
240	Cemetery & Churchyard	£0.00	£0.00	£1,248.53	-£1,248.53
250	Playing Field	£0.00	£0.00	£5,774.66	-£5,774.66
260	Grants	£0.00	£0.00	£4.32	-£4.32
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	£1,235.01	-£1,235.01
320	Pavilion Project	£0.00	£0.00	£4,780.64	-£4,780.64
Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council		£0.00	£0.00	£31,141.83	-£31,141.83
Total Expenditure		£0.00	£0.00	£31,141.83	-£31,141.83
Total Income		£0.00	£0.00	£62,790.93	£62,790.93
Total Expenditure		£0.00	£0.00	£31,141.83	-£31,141.83
Total Net Balance		£0.00	£0.00	£31,649.10	

