

Minutes of a Parish Council meeting
held in the Village Hall, Glebe Avenue, Orton Waterville on
Wednesday, 19 April 2006.

Present:- Mrs G Thornley (in the Chair) Mrs A Beeton Mrs J Farnham Mrs D Harkness
Mr E Howlett Cllr Mrs D Lamb Mr C Long Mr M Smith

Members of the Public – one Press – none Ward Councillors – as above

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were received from Councillor J Crane, Councillor A Kempself, Mr M Chambers, Mrs K Whitworth and Mr C Whitworth.

5. LOCAL POLICING MATTERS – PCSO Gordon Scott attended the meeting. He reported on some of the crime taking place in the Parish and said that the motorbike nuisance offenders had been caught. However, it was very difficult to catch the graffiti artists. All crime needs to be reported - including youth hanging around cars - and ecops has been set up on the Cambridgeshire Police website to make the reporting of crime better.

6. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS – The following members declared interests:

Mrs Ann Thornley – item 5a – trustee of the United Charities Fund.
Mr Ted Howlett – item 5b – a member of the Village Hall Committee.
Mr Cyril Long – item 5b – a member of the Village Hall Committee.
Mrs Jenny Farnham – item 6e – Governor of Bushfield School.

7. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 MARCH 2006 – Mrs Harkness proposed and Mr Howlett seconded that the minutes be signed as a true and correct record. This was carried.

8. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(a) Tree and Hedgerow Management (Minute 5a).

A letter of appreciation was received from Mrs Stuttard who had requested the tree work to be done. This was circulated with the agenda and noted.

Also circulated with the agenda was a letter regarding the tree adjacent to the war memorial in the churchyard. It stated that all trees within the churchyard are afforded a degree of protection by virtue of their position within a Conservation Area. If pruning is necessary, a six week notice of intention to carry out tree works must be submitted to the Local Authority. In order to ascertain if pruning was necessary, a site meeting was arranged with the Landscape Officer. His advice was that the crown could be lifted to 2.5 metres, to laterally reduce branches from the memorial to provide 1.5 metres clearance and clean out crown. Mr Howlett proposed and Mr Long seconded that the Local Authority be so notified. This was carried. The Clerk was instructed to obtain 3 quotes.

(b) Village Hall Graffiti (Minute 5b).

On receipt of the invoice, the Clerk contacted the City Council about the faint outline remaining on the external wall. The explanation was that the outline had originally been painted with dark/black paint which was absorbed deeply into the porous material of the brickwork. The contractors made numerous attempts to remove it, using every conceivable chemical, but could not better it. In the end they were afraid that any further attempts with their high pressure hoses would result in damage to the structure. The only possible alternative to consider is to paint the wall with external brick emulsion which will not only result in covering the graffiti but will be more easily removed if the artists return. It was agreed to pass this information to the Village Hall Committee. In the meantime, Mr Smith proposed and Mrs Harkness seconded that the invoice for £111.63 should be paid.

It was also reported that the Graffiti Removing Kit, held by the Clerk, had already been used on the Matley Notice Board.

(c) Vacancy in Orton Goldhay East (Minute 5c)

No requests for an election were received so, as instructed, articles were sent to the Evening Telegraph and the Orton Oracle. A very good article appeared in the Evening Telegraph two weeks running but the deadline was missed for the April issue of Orton Oracle. It may appear in the May issue. It was agreed to defer this matter to the next meeting.

(d) Ways to Improve the Engagement of the Parish (Minute 12)

A discussion took place on ways to improve the engagement of the Parish. A suggestion put forward was to print a News Sheet reporting all the work done by the Parish Council for the community. Mrs Harkness proposed and Mr Howlett seconded that a working group was set up to look into this. This was carried. It was agreed that the working group should consist of Diana Harkness, Malcolm Smith and Cyril Long. Members were asked to think about ways of distributing this News Sheet around the Parish.

6. NEW CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED

(a) Street Lighting – A letter was received from the street lighting manager informing the Parish Council that as Mill Crescent is unadopted as highway, according to his records, he has passed on our request for improved lighting to someone who deals with lighting in landscape areas at Contract Services to see if he has responsibility for it. It was agreed to allow another month for them to look into this further.

(b) Roller Hockey Club – An acknowledgement and letter of appreciation was received for the grant under section 137 of £100. This was noted.

(c) Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act – A letter was received from DEFRA regarding the new powers allotted to Parish Councils by this Act. Mrs Harkness proposed and Mr Howlett seconded that this Parish Council will not take up the powers of Fixed Penalty Notices. This was carried.

(d) Community Safety Forum – The agenda for this meeting was circulated to every member in case anyone wished to attend. This was noted.

(e) Orton Counselling Service for Young People – A letter was received requesting a donation towards this cause as in previous years. Mr Howlett proposed and Mr Long seconded that £500 be granted under section 137 LGA. This was carried.

7. BURIAL GROUND

The notices were duly posted, following which a request was received from DEFRA asking of confirmation that the Open Spaces Society had received a copy of the application. They were referred to the Legal Department acting for the Parish Council.

A phone call was received from the Planning Department reminding the Parish Council that all the conditions had to be complied with before starting work on the construction of a road or otherwise the permission becomes null and void.

Another letter from DEFRA via the Legal Department was received asking for clarification about the rights under the Allotments Act. A copy of the permission given to the Parish Council in 2004 by the Secretary of State was forwarded to them.

Another letter from the Legal Department was received regarding the date the land was made Common Land. The enclosed letter from DEFRA stated that if it was after 1926 no permission is required and asking whether the Parish Council wanted to continue with the application.

Finally, copies of the objections that went to DEFRA were received together with a petition against the proposed roadway. An emergency subcommittee was called to look at these objections since DEFRA required a reply by 21 April 2006.

Submission by Mr Bridgeman

1. He was concerned that approval may not be given and that the burial ground may then be used as housing rather than as an open space for the community. This cannot happen as a condition was imposed when the ground was handed over to the Parish Council that it could never be used for housing.

2. He disputes the accuracy of the plan of the Burial Ground and asks if planning permission exists. The planning permission was given before subsequent negotiations with the developers and the section 106 agreement. The Parish Council will in due course be submitting a revised planning application for a smaller Burial Ground and there will be no building work before this revision is approved.
3. His third statement refers to the allotment area as a Play Area. The Allotment area is not a Play Area and is separated from the Play Area by an earth bank.
4. He refers to a footpath in his second statement. There is no official footpath where Mr Bridgeman suggests. In recent years a track has been worn between the entrances in Wyman Way and The Gannocks. A tarmac alternative exists at the west end of the allotments. There would be no danger to children, particularly as the vehicular entrance would be locked and funerals infrequent.

Submission by Mr & Mrs Hammerton and Mr & Mrs Rollings

The submission was lengthy and a brief summary is outlined below:

In parts of the submission there seems to be criticism or implied criticism of the competence or integrity of the Council or its officers. For example, the statement that the Council was incorrect to say that the Play Area “adjoined” the Allotment Land over which the road was to pass, and that it was all one piece of common land called Pegan Place. (This can be shown to be wrong.) The submission suggested that the Council was failing to inform the Open Spaces Society. (This is also incorrect.) There was ignorance of the fact that permission to use allotment land (as opposed to Common Land) had already been obtained.

It was argued that the application merited greater publicity than the statutory notices issued and that most people contacted were unaware of the proposal to have access to the Burial Ground across the allotments. (This was of course part of the Planning Application approved by the Planning Authority with the usual notification to directly affected persons, and when objections were considered. The notification to DEFRA was the natural next step, which was delayed for reasons beyond the Council’s control.)

It was argued that the almost unanimous consent of the Parish Council meeting (actually, the Annual Parish Meeting) in 1997 for a cemetery on the present site was no longer relevant. It was questioned whether access through the allotments was raised at this meeting. (Certainly people likely to be affected in Wyman Way were informed of the subject of the meeting.)

The fundamental objection is the complete disagreement with the Parish Council statement that “the proposed road across the adjacent common land is the only available access to the site.” It is alleged that alternatives were not properly and fully considered.

It was suggested that vehicular access was not necessary – even for a hearse. (It has now been learned that coffins could not be carried this distance because of Health & Safety regulations.) It was stated that “if it was considered necessary to provide vehicular access ... there is a potential alternative achievable by upgrading the existing footpath. (This was an option that had been raised in Parish Council, but the Council was advised this was not a viable option.)

The submission listed the various organisations/individuals that had been consulted. It was stressed that the objectors did not object to the Burial Ground. They hoped for “**an outcome that would meet both the aspirations of the Parish Council and the approbation of residents**” to be achieved by dialogue between the Parish Council and the Community and obviate the need for a public local inquiry.

Mr Howlett proposed and Mrs Beeton seconded that the Parish Council should reply to DEFRA on the following lines and it was carried:

1. The proposal to have access to the Burial Ground was not something new. It was integral to the planning application submitted in 2002 and granted consent by the Planning Authority after due consideration of any objections. The Parish Council therefore considered that the statutory notices on this occasion were sufficient. A notice was displayed in a prominent position on the Common Land affected. The map clearly showed the route across the Common Land to the proposed Burial Ground. The fact that the map did not show housing nearing completion is irrelevant.

2. The Parish Council correctly described the Play Area as “adjoining” the largely unused allotment area over which the proposed access to the Burial Ground is to pass. The two areas were deliberately separated, when the play area was created by a bank of earth. Furthermore, in 1970, when the registration as Common Land was made, two separate areas were registered, namely: ref. CL 77 1.30 acres called Allotments and ref. CL 79 1.80 acres called Play Area. There was therefore no intention to give a false impression as appears implied.
3. In reply to comments disputing the statement that “The proposed road across the adjacent Common Land is the only available access to the site.” This decision was made by the Parish Council following advice received when the planning application for a Burial Ground was drawn up some years ago.

The Parish Council is quite willing to adopt a different option for access, if acceptable to the Planning Authority, when the council submits a revised Planning Application for the Burial Ground, which, as the objectors correctly state, will now be reduced in size from that originally given consent.

The Parish Council has no wish to spend money unnecessarily, if there is a satisfactory alternative, and shares with the objectors **the wish to keep intrusion on this area to the minimum practicable**, - but the Council will continue to seek access across the land the Council itself registered as Common Land, *if there is in fact no satisfactory alternative.*

4. The Parish Council will therefore ask DEFRA to **temporarily suspend consideration** of its current application to construct works on common land, in order that the Council may re-examine whether a different access is acceptable to the Planning Authority.

A letter was received quite late, just prior to the meeting, from Mr & Mrs Hammerton and Mr & Mrs Rollings requesting that this matter be discussed at the May meeting since they could not attend the April one. It was agreed to invite them to the May meeting despite the fact that DEFRA required a reply by 21 April 2006. This need not hold up the reply to DEFRA. It was also agreed to begin the investigation into alternative access by arranging a site meeting with the Planning Authority and Highways Departments.

8. ALLOTMENTS

Cherry Orton Road – Planning permission has been received with the condition that ‘no development shall commence until details of the precise line and colour of the fence and gate have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.’ Following this a letter was received from Mr Seymour, whose property backs on to the allotments, objecting mainly to the barbed wire proposed for the top of the fence. The police Architectural Liaison Officer, taking all these into account, considered that a 2m high, welded mesh fence of the style proposed, powder coated either green or black, securely fixed onto similarly coloured metal posts, would, in his opinion, be a sufficient barrier whilst being aesthetically acceptable. Councillor Mrs Lamb proposed and Mrs Farnham seconded that this advice be accepted. It was carried.

Gostwick – On turning the water back on in the spring, the Clerk discovered that at least 2 out of the 6 stand pipes had burst over the winter. A plumber had to be called out as an emergency and the repairs and replacements cost £300. It was agreed to ask the plumber to quote for coming out to turn off the water in the autumn, and on again in the spring, to make sure that the standpipes would be safe over winter in the hope that this will not happen again.

9. PLANNING MATTERS

(a) New applications since last month

05/01788/FUL	Dormer at 7-8 Everingham, Orton Brimbles	No objection
06/00279/FUL	Conservatory at 28 The Gannocks, Orton Waterville	No objection
06/00407/FUL	Front porch at 9 Charles Cope Road, Orton Waterville	No objection
06/00344/FUL	Dwelling at 1 Martins Way, Orton Waterville	No objection
06/00436/FUL	Extension at 16 Cherryfields, Ham Lane	No objection
06/00470/REM	Offices at Pegasus, Bakewell Road, Orton Southgate	No objection

(b) Decisions on previous applications

06/00001/FUL	Warehouse at Schmidt UK Ltd, Southgate Way	Approved
06/00103/ADV	Sign adjacent to 1 Bakewell Road, Orton Southgate	Approved
05/01702/FUL	Extensions at 8 Lady Lodge Drive, Orton Waterville	Withdrawn

05/01647/FUL	Dwelling at 1 Martins Way, Orton Waterville	Refused*
06/00007/FUL	Retention of temporary building at E of E Showground	Approved
06/00199/FUL	Conservatory at 21 Valence Road, Orton Waterville	Approved

Appeals

05/01871/FUL Extensions at 25 The Orchards, Orton Waterville.

* This application was refused on the grounds that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the amenity of the residents of neighbouring residential properties, in particular No. 1 and No. 3 Martins Way, Meadow Rise, Stonelea and 11 and 13 The Gannocks. It is also considered that the development would create an unacceptable form of backland development out of character with the area.

Two plans that were circulated in March in the Wistow Ward have not been returned. Annette had not seen them - she must have been on holiday. Malcolm said there were two that he had to take to Diane but he wasn't sure if he put them in the correct door. The Clerk agreed to ask Diane whether she had received them.

10. FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

(a) The following payments were authorised

Mr Russell (pond maintenance)	£40.00
Fox Murphy (Legal Notice)	£77.34
Aqua Main (plumber)	£300.00
Beebys Landscaping (churchyard maintenance)	£277.59
Peterborough Office Supplies (stationery)	£13.49
Peterborough City Council (graffiti clean up)	£111.63
CALC (Burial Authority subs)	£55.50
Peterborough Tree Services (hedge maintenance)	£235.00
Inland Revenue	£115.30
Clerk's Salary (for April)	£361.70
Clerk's Expenses (for April)	£37.66

(b) Income received to date

J Hopper – shed rent	£140.00
M Lodge – shed rent	£100.00
Bank Interest on Saver Plus Account (for March)	£130.42
Bank Interest on Treasurer's Account (for March)	£0.38

11. MAINTENANCE MATTERS

The following matters were raised:

- (a) The sign post to the church in Church Drive has been pulled out of the ground. The Clerk was asked to report it to the City Council.
- (b) The sign on Brimbles Way has been taken away but the posts have been left. The Clerk was asked to enquire whether the City Council was going to replace it.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Clerk was asked to write to Orton Longueville Parish Council to enquire whether they would like to reconvene the Annual Cricket Match which used to happen between the parishes every year.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 10.00 pm.