



Castlethorpe Parish Council

Parish Council General Meeting to be held
on Monday 5th June at 7.30 pm

AGENDA

Dear Parishioners

A General Meeting of Castlethorpe Parish Council will be held on the above date and time in the Village Hall, when the business set out below will be transacted.

Please do not attend if you are ill or have any Covid symptoms

Residents may ask questions in the Open Forum or by giving them to the Clerk or any Councillor by noon on the day of the meeting

Technology permitting, proceedings may be viewed on the 'Castlethorpe Parish Council' YouTube Channel, both as a live stream and as a recording which will be retained for at least a month. **There will be no stream to Facebook.**

Jacquie Ladyman
Clerk to the Parish Council
Phone: 07707 836973 or email: clerk@castlethorpe-pc.gov.uk

1		TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
2		TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST by Councillors in any of the agenda items below
3		TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING
	3.1 3.2	To agree the minutes of the previous annual meeting of the 15 th May as a true and accurate record. To agree the email sent to Councillors in relation to Part 2 of the annual meeting dated 19 th May as a true and accurate record.
4		TO RECEIVE REPORTS
	4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5	Clerks Report & Review of Actions (to be circulated prior to meeting) Ward Councillors Report (to be given at meeting) Report on meeting with MKCC Highways File note on double yellow lines Update on Sustrans initiative the cycle path (circulated prior to meeting)
5		TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS (previously viewed on line by Cllrs)
	5.1	23/00976 The Pavilion Thrupp Close Castlethorpe extension to existing Cricket Pavilion to include a mixed-use Cricket Pitch/Pavilion, Local Community Hall and ancillary Parish Office and associated interior improvements
6		TO RECEIVE REPORT BACK ON PREVIOUS PLANNING APPLICATION
	6.1 6.2 6.3 6.4 6.5 6.6	22/01156/FUL - Erection of Cafe building (Class E(b)) with ancillary shower facilities and cycle stands, in an area of existing an unused hardstanding. Lodge Farm Business Centre Wolverton Road Castlethorpe – Application Permitted WNS/2022/1741/EIA Application for full planning permission for the erection of 9 x employment units comprising circa 69,744sqm GIA. of floorspace within Class B2 or B8 Uses, with ancillary class E(g)(i) offices and E(g)(ii) research and development, together with country park, ground re-profiling in the country park, new vehicular access from the A508 and associated site infrastructure, including lorry parking – status pending – currently update not available as issue with website see: https://snc.planning-register.co.uk/Planning/Display/WNS/2022/1741/EIA 23/00565/FUL - The construction of four residential dwellings with associated access and parking The Old Rail Yard South Street Castlethorpe Application refused 23/00960/NMA – 21 Lodge Farm Court, Castlethorpe Non-material amendment to permission ref. 22/02702/HOU seeking changes to north (rear) and west (side) fenestration relating to the two storey rear extension to existing garage to provide gym and home office above for ancillary use to the main properties. Existing garage conversion at 21 to be converted back to garage - details previously circulated and no objections raised expiry date now exceeded - Application permitted 23/00881/FUL – Lodge Farm House Wolverton Road Castlethorpe -The erection of new agricultural building (comments to be submitted by 19/5/23) – No update 23/00763/CLUP – 18 Bullington End Road, Castlethorpe Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights – details previously circulated and no objections raised expiry date now exceeded – Application permitted

7		TO CONSIDER RESOLUTIONS (all supporting documentation to be circulated prior to meeting)
	7.1	To consider & agree to a public excluded part 2 of the meeting to discuss matters in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as defined in paragraphs 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act
	7.2	To receive an update on the clubhouse project and to consider issuing an ITT for its construction (Cllr Ayles)
	7.3	Consider moving to an online banking account which would require two digital signatures (Cllr Ayles)
	7.4	Consider actions arising from the tree survey carried out in Castle Field (Cllr Markham)
	7.5	Consider CIF projects for the 2024/25 allocation of funding – deadline for submission 31/8/23 (All)
	7.6	Consider response to CAMRA following their email about the pub (Cllr Forgham)
	7.7	To follow up the complaint to the CEO of Network Rail about vehicle engines still running and headlights still shining into residents' homes late at night despite assurances that this would cease (Cllr Forgham)
8		TO CONSIDER FINANCIAL MATTERS (circulated prior to meeting)
	8.1	To agree the RFO payment schedule
	8.2	To consider Internal Auditor's report
	8.3	To approve Annual Return
9		CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED (circulated prior to meeting)
	9.1	A resident has written to ask whether water bowls could be placed around the village for dogs, cats and wildlife to use as the warmer weather approaches
	9.2	A request has been received to consider providing a seat/bench outside the bus stop by the village hall so bus users can sit outside whilst waiting for their bus
	9.3	A resident contacted Cllr Hinds about a situation with damp in their council house. The proposed solution by MKCC was unsatisfactory and Ward Cllr Alison Andrews is following up.
10		ANY OTHER BUSINESS (for noting, or for inclusion on a future agenda)
11		TO AGREE DATE AND ATTENDANCE FOR FUTURE MEETINGS/EVENTS
	11.1	Next meeting will be held at 7.30 on Monday 3 rd July in the Village Hall
		PART 2
12		RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST by Councillors in any of the agenda items below
13		TO RECEIVE REPORTS
	13.1	None
14		TO CONSIDER RESOLUTIONS (all supporting documentation to be circulated prior to meeting)
	14.1	To consider quotes for Speed Indicator Devices
	14.2	To consider quote for repair of post and rail fencing between Castle Field and the church and around the village hall garden
	14.3	To consider quote to inspect all floodlights at the Sport Ground
	14.4	To consider quote to repair the unstable floodlight at the Sports Ground (if received)
	14.5	To consider quote to clear the footpath around the football pitch (if received)

Appendix A – Schedule of Reports & File Notes

1. Appendix A1 - Clerk's Report (item 4.1) - To be circulated prior to meeting
2. Appendix A2 - Highways report (item 4.3)
3. Appendix A3 - File note (item 4.4)

Appendix A2 – Highways Report (item 4.3) - email sent by Cllr Ayles to Graham Cox cc: Rachel Munday, Kay Petit, Jacquie Ladyman following meeting on Thursday 25th June in Castlethorpe Village Hall

Dear Graham,

Thank you for coming out to Castlethorpe on Thursday. It was a difficult meeting; on my side because of the issues over the past 6+ months and I cannot imagine it was pleasant for you to receive my email listing these. I would ask you to note that I sent this in order so we could try and resolve it outside the formal complaint procedure and I hope we can look forward to a good working relationship in the future.

Our understanding of the discussion points is:

1. Streetlights Project.

You will ensure that we receive a monthly update from now on. I have normally asked that these be timed for our monthly Council meeting and the next one is on Monday 5th (they are on the first Monday of each month unless there is a Bank Holiday). Councillors are regularly asked about the streetlights and our councillors need to be able to respond as it is a considerable sum we are spending on this project.

I would also like to know why Mark and Chris just stopped responding to me. If you don't want them responding to councillors directly, then the least they could have done was to re-direct me or forward my emails to Rachel.

I specifically raised the point about lights 9SR and 12SR where decisions were required about trenching across the road (3 day road closure), along the footway (5 day closure including driveway access) or a decorative bracket. Given that the lamp posts had already been erected (and have now been painted) and that 16SR had also been moved across the road to the same side, these decisions seem odd as we would not have expected you to install the new posts without access to power. We would appreciate knowing the background to this as we had an explicit discussion about this with Mark and Chris on their site visit.

Although not part of 'our' project, we would also appreciate knowing the timetable for converting the remainder of the existing heritage style lights to LED.

As I wrote, the project is over a year late, we had no communication between 1 Dec and 3 April (after chasing every month) and our response on 4 April has gone another 6 weeks without reply. The management, responsiveness and communication has been extremely poor to non-existent.

The cost of the heritage upgrade project to the Parish Council is approx £54k and I have asked you to consider a substantial rebate and I would suggest at the very least the 19% management fee.

2. Road Safety Process

You said that a process had been introduced a long time ago essentially being CSW -> TVP -> MKCC. I was unaware of this during the 15 months we have been talking to Keith Wheeler and I asked if Rachel could send me the original notification to parishes of this process.

I still disagree with it as the only metric for improvements. CSW is, by its nature, an hour's snapshot and affects driver behaviour on seeing people in hi-viz jackets pointing a speed gun at them but it does give immediate 'enforcement' through a warning letter. SIDs give an objective 24x7 recording and give V85 and speed distribution which is an evidence base for speed reduction measures on the highway (which is the advice Keith had said he was consulting his colleagues about) and possible police enforcement. However, I accept that CSW is the PCC's approach (though I will ask the PCC rep if this is their intent at the next SaferMK meeting) and one of our councillors is in any case trying to set up a CSW group.

3a. Lack of Response from Yourself

You apologised and I of course accept that. As the 'Together We can' document governing the relationship between MKCC and the parishes says "Respond to each other in a timely manner and work together to ensure a regular flow of information, particularly where issues remain outstanding or unresolved."

3b Allowing Local Councils to do Minor Works

You agreed that the statement following the Teams meeting held with our Clerk was incorrect (that it was statutory and would otherwise be illegal) and that the reason for discontinuing previous arrangements that allowed parishes, with MKCC consent, to do minor works is not statutory but to do with the exclusivity clause in your outsourcing contract.

I said that I had understood that and was asking that some provision be made in the new contract now being negotiated. You replied that:

(a) not providing exclusivity would mean MKCC would get a worse deal. I said that MKCC money would of course be exclusive if that is what you negotiated but that I was suggesting additional money from parish council budgets would be used ie money that your contractor would not expect to get. This should not worsen your negotiating position and would mean that extra work will be done that would otherwise be outside your budget / priorities.

(b) that the bulk of the MKCC Highways budget is for resurfacing and you wanted to get the cheapest cost for that and were prepared to accept higher costs on the smaller items. I have to say that this strikes me as an odd way to negotiate a contract but it is of course the smaller items that parishes are likely to want (posts, fences, 'white gates'). Parishes are under an obligation to ensure good value for their ratepayers. If you have negotiated higher prices, then this is not good value and parishes cannot proceed.

Going forward as part of the new contract you said you were negotiating added value bits which may take the form of 'local gangs' for instance and would provide ways in which parishes can procure minor services. It is unlikely that parishes would commit to a fixed annual levy as demand is intermittent and there is no mechanism that could oblige all councils to participate. Incidentally, model standing orders, which are used by most parishes, require that three bids are obtained for any procurement over a threshold, usually £2k, so parishes need that option.

I look forward to hearing your ideas and would perhaps suggest that you come to the Parishes Advisory Group at some point.

4. Streetnaming

You said this is in Planning not Highways and you would pass to Jon Palmer. You said it looked like a simple mistake. I agree but that it is not the mistake but the delay and apparently blaming the developer and withholding of material from an FoI request which is the subject of my complaint.

5. Highways Parishes Liaison

You agreed that the reason for not allowing councillors on the call was not because of 'politicising' but because you wanted to move to an officer to officer model and that I am the only councillor in all of MK who has complained.

I suspect that the other councillors are not aware that they may not attend and, in 9 cases out of 10, I would be happy for our clerk to attend on our behalf. Having had misunderstandings in the past (not necessarily with Highways), our protocol is that two parish representatives attend meetings. However, I will raise this at the next local association meeting and gauge the response of councillors.

I repeated the point that in smaller parishes, councillors do some of the tasks that clerks or other officers do in larger councils.

You have offered to allow me to attend for the next two months but, not only am I away, but this misses the point that there may be times when I need to attend rather than trying to brief our Clerk so she can report on it second hand. I would ask that you reconsider this position - perhaps that normally it is only the Clerk but the Clerk has the option to invite a single councillor for a specific topic.

The other problem is that we do not always get proper answers in the officer to clerk meetings. I mentioned the double depth granite sets (and you said a Highways officer would inspect) but, on reflection, the response suggesting 3-way lights to the other kerb damage at the triangle seems wrong. This is (as its name suggests) a triangle and traffic can be diverted around the triangle to create a safe working area without lights as it has been several times before. In fact,

a protective bollard would likely save MKCC money because it wouldn't have to keep repairing the kerb stones, never mind the aesthetic damage to the verge.

Rachel said that she has forwarded my comments (on streetlighting) to the relevant officers but had not had a reply. It is essential that your officers respond to Rachel in a timely manner otherwise she can't do her job and therefore we can't do ours.

I hope this is in line with your own recollections of our discussion and look forward to responses on the various issues we discussed and a better working relationship in future.

Regards,
Phil

Cllr Ayles asked Graham Cox his thoughts on double yellow lines due to our parking issues on the South Street/Maltings Field junction.

GC advised that the first step would be to get support from the residents in the vicinity. If this is positive then the request is passed to a Ward Councillor. The Ward Councillor requests that MKCC look at it and a decision is made. If it is felt that double yellow lines are the best course of action, the works go into a programme to be carried out.

Cllr Ayles asked how enforcement would be made should the lines go ahead. GC explained that they would be enforced by MKCC's contractor. He said that MKCC would not put yellow lines anywhere where they would not intend to enforce. Their contractors enforce all areas on a rota basis and whilst they would concentrate on areas of repeat offences, they would come out to Castlethorpe.

An emergency vehicle would need an access clearance of 2.6 m and are within their rights to push vehicles out the way, and in fact have, when causing an obstruction to them. They would climb a pavement or verge if able to get through without the need for moving vehicles.