

Mawsley Parish Council

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 10 January 2011

Present: Cllr Littler (Chair); Cllr Holland; Cllr. Cope; Cllr Moreton; Cllr Thomas; Cllr Barnwell; Cllr Redman; Diana MacCarthy (clerk);

Members of the public present: Tom Sanders; Tim Bellamy; Kelly Farden, Nicola Holton, Geoff Marston, Dave Cross, Sue Cross, Moira Cross, Pat Demetriou, Al McDoanld, Tony Bagshaw, Sue Rickman, Steven Farthing, Graham Leah, Simon Wisdom, Chris Winter, Stuart Clark, Andrea Walker, Vicki Farmer.

1.11.1 Apologies for Absence: None received

1.11.2 Declaration of Interests

Cllr. Littler declared his position as a Director of Mawsley Villagers Association Ltd. (MVA) and as a Director of The Centre at Mawsley CIC, and as a member of the Allotment Association.

1.11.3 Allotted time for members of the public

KF – Issue of bus route extension; General feeling was that it wasn't wanted at the bottom of the village. Has spoken to residents on affected route, has approx 27 names on petition.

Grounds;

1 Road configuration is poor especially Hawthorn Avenue.

2 Cost considerations due to required changes to the road

3 Drain would need to be altered or moved.

4 Impact on council tax – would it increase?

5 There have been a number of accidents at the junction of Rosehill Way, Sloe lane and Long Breech.

6 Children playing in the road.

7 Stage coach drivers are already unhappy with current extension to route.

It is approx 450 metres from Roman Settle to current stop, which is not far, residents, can get to doctors which are the same distance, and there have been no complaints regarding this. There is also the privacy issue of double decker buses and viewing in windows, and also the 11 police officers and nurses living in immediate vicinity who would have their sleep disrupted.

BL confirmed no decision had been made but if one were to be made it would be between stage coach and county council.

TS said we had asked for any concerns of residents to be raised in the newsletter.

VC asked how many of those residents were elderly or single mums, young mums without transport etc? SC added that she walks to top of village as bus does not always stop at the relevant stops and it takes 10 mins to get to the top of the village.

CM should we ask Stage coach whether they have any intention of extending the route and why the drivers do not always stop at the correct stops? TS said this had been done but no response.

GM – re planning issue (please see attached note); wanted to put fence on property and noted that planning permission was required. Obtained pre application advice and was told that hedging would not be classed as development and would be ok. Application was refused as it would technically be a material change of use of land, as George Wimpey had not gained reserved matters approval. Technically it would revert to original use – Agricultural. Then defined land as amenity land (for the enjoyment of others). Please see attached notes. KBC summed up by saying George Wimpey had failed in their duties as developer. Can MPC take this on and look in to it further?

BL confirmed that Cath Bicknell is looking in to it and will attend the next meeting. RB will bring this up at the peer review planning meeting on Wednesday 12 January 2011. ACTION 1.11.3.1 RB to report back to MPC.

SC suggested we confirm whether all planning conditions have been met and discharged. GW should write a letter to confirm all matters are discharged. GM said GW would only be in correspondence with KBC.

ACTION; Request Cath Bicknell's attendance at the next meeting to update us of the situation, along with the district councillors. 1.11.3.2 Clerk

NH – heard a report had been undertaken and it was being decided whether the parish council were going to increase the precept to support the Centre.

BL said that the funding of the Centre would be discussed shortly.

1.11.4 Minutes of the previous meeting

Cllr. Barnwell proposed the minutes of the meeting held 6 December 2010 and Cllr. Holland seconded these.

1.11.5 Matters arising from the previous meeting

03.09.07.1	BL	Determine costs of path to play area	Path now progressing
04.09.15	Cllr. Cope	Emergency planning	Ongoing
7.10.3.3	Clerk & VC	To investigate speed laws	Clerk to write to Jim Harker

			as to whether 20mph can be put in place
10.10.5.1	BL	Transfer back to KBC of pub land	Meeting expected before Xmas – legal advice required
10.10.13.1	Clerk	Clerk to speak to KBC re contribution to planning advice costs	Response awaited
11.10.3.1	TS	Speak to WI re trees	Await response
11.10.5.1	Clerk	Letter to KBC re adoption of open space	Response awaited
11.10.5.2	Clerk	Letter to Peter Chaplin re pond	Response awaited
12.10.5.1	RB	To investigate wording for signage	Ongoing
12.10.7.1	VC & BH	Obtaining quotes for drainage and resurfacing	

1.11.6 Mawsley Interface to Kettering Borough Council

PT raised point on application to appeal on pub site. Written submission being made. Jim Hakewill does not agree this is appropriate as the public should be allowed. Outcome is awaited.

JR confirmed she had prepared flyers against the appeal.

1.11.7 Taylor Wimpey

TS - Phase 2 under way, includes improved access particularly for the bus route.

Still awaiting approval from TW on land for bus shelter.

1.11.8 Mawsley Community Fund

No applications

1.11.9 The Centre at Mawsley

SW – he is here to speak on behalf of TCAM and MVA in respect of the centre. TCAM have requested additional funding from MPC to assist the running of the centre. His key questions were;

1 In respect of the report, are there any issues of clarification required?

- 2 Do the Parish Councillors accept the report?
- 3 Can they give their own view direct to TCAM

SW then read out a letter from TCAM regarding the funding and detailing the critical point which TCAM had arrived at (at the point of winding up)

BH – report arrived Christmas Eve, which left little opportunity to do anything prior to New Year. Hawsons were contacted on 4 January. BH said they were disappointed with report as it did not answer all question and that we all needed to talk. This is set up for tomorrow afternoon. No mention in report on how to save costs, so this also needs to be looked at.

PT said not all councillors were disappointed with the report. Suggestions have been made prior to the assessment as to how the centre could be run and these are briefly discussed in the report.

SW said TCAM are unprepared to continue anymore, it is an independent report, prepared at MPC request.

PT agrees that tax payers should be making a contribution as it is a community facility, for which funds are required.

BH clarified that we are being asked to raise a precept to support TCAM up to £30,0000 per year. BH then asked for clarification as to how the 30k figure was arrived at.

SW - figures were prepared by TCAM directors and Jane Twistleton (Centre Manager).

BH added that MPC were not aware from the beginning that they would be funding the Centre.

BL added that the report states the centre is well run and the bar is doing well.

NH added that TCAM directors are unpaid volunteers doing their best for the centre and that they ran the risk of losing their home or job or incur financial penalties. SW added that he would also lose his job as a director so it had added meaning.

CM thought there was limited liability as it was a charitable organisation.

CW confirmed that liabilities will not come back to the charity but as directors they could still be liable for wrongful trading. Veil of incorporation will be lifted if you have been wrongful trading – ie you know that you are still trading when you are not in a position to.

SW added that they were trading insolvently.

NH added that wrongful trading is continuing to trade when you know you can't meet bills and costs.

Personal comments were then made by members of TCAM and directed at the Parish Councillors in particular Cllr Cope and Moreton.

VC was visibly upset and left the meeting at 20.46

RB asked for clarification on a few points. BH confirmed the report was a draft report. RB went on to say he was aware we would have to fund the centre through the precept, he also thought that we should accept the findings of the report. It works out that it is only approx £40 per year, which he felt most people would not mind paying. He added that we should agree and make decision tonight.

JR added that it was a draft copy and we should wait until we have spoken to Hawsons, in the meeting tomorrow.

BL finished by adding he understood the concerns of the high-level commitment that is being asked. TCAM are more than happy to work with MPC or others within the village as to how losses can be reduced and profits improved. There is also an agreed attendance for any MPC councillors to attend the TCAM meetings but since John Hazell has left the council no one has done this.

CM clarified his issues were raising the precept when people were struggling.

Finally it was discussed that a member of MPC should attend the TCAM meetings from now on.

PT proposed that we agree to commit to raising the precept to an as yet determined figure to cover the shortfall of the community centre.

All members of the public then left the room, whilst the Councillors discussed the key points..

PT then proposed that we vote on diverting the precept that we would raise over the next 12 months that would have gone in to the maintenance fund, to be used as financial support for TCAM. This does not include any increase in precept at this stage but a decision on steps to be taken to meet any further shortfall can be taken after Horsons meeting tomorrow, and councillors are happy with the figures.

Seconded by RB

RB and PT for, JR abstained and CM and BH against.

BH had casting vote as chairman in BL absence.

BH suggested reconvening at end of the week

Meeting to be re-arranged for Friday at 9pm. ACTION 1.11.9.1 Clerk to arrange meeting

BL confirmed to public who had returned that a decision will be made on Friday at the meeting.

1.11.10 Bus Route and Shelter

Await approval on allocation of land, and approval of extended route. RB thought stagecoach should not be able to choose whether they do whole route or not. MPC should report this to Stage Coach. TS had already done this and Stage Coach is talking to the drivers. Concerns on cost of shelter against who uses it – TS has requested a survey. Stage coach said they can't give figure for individual stop just usage for the whole of Mawsley.

1.11.11 Police Matters

No official crime figures had been received.

1.11.12 Villager issues

None, save for those raised at start at meeting.

1.11.13 Accounts and Budgets

Top notch, TCAM (£42.00) and ACRE (£34.00) added

1.11.14 Correspondence and Clerks update

General Poppy appeal ACTION 1.11.14.1 PT to look in to this.

1.11.15 Planning matters

Pub site

1.11.16 Items for newsletter

PT has prepared Article for next newsletter

1.1.17 Any Other Business

None

ACTION POINTS

1.11.3.1	RB	To report to MPC on peer review planning meeting	
1.11.3.2	Clerk	Arrange for Cath Bicknell to attend February meeting	
1.11.9.1	Clerk	Arrange Extraordinary Meeting for Friday 14 January 2011	
1.11.14.1	PT	Look at Poppy week	

Dog Control Orders (Prescribed Offences and Penalties etc) Regulations 2006

Dog Control Order (Procedures) Regulations 2006

Kettering Borough Council is undertaking consultation, in accordance with the above legislation, with a view to the introduction of two Dog Control Orders for the Borough of Kettering. The first Order updates the current controls over dog fouling as previously contained in the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996; whilst the second Order provides new controls under which Officers of the Council can request that persons in control of dogs put them on a lead.

Proposed Dog Fouling Order

Under the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996, Kettering Borough Council designated some 60 public open spaces, in addition to highway verges where the speed limit is less than 40 miles per hour, as areas where dog fouling must be removed forthwith. The introduction of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, removed the ability for the Council to designate new spaces. This has left a number of public open spaces, including but not limited to areas around Mawsley, and The Grange, Desborough effectively unprotected by the dog fouling legislation.

Why tackle dog fouling?

Whilst the level of dog fouling has actually reduced over the last decade.

- In 2004/05 the average number of complaints to local authorities was 194 per authority (Keep Britain Tidy, Control of Dogs Survey, 2005/06). In 2009/10 Kettering Borough Council received 184 complaints of dog fouling.
- 95% of the British public are worried by the amount of dog fouling in public places (Local Government Association)
- Not only is dog fouling unpleasant, it's dangerous. You can contract Toxocariasis from dog mess, which can lead to blindness

What will the proposed Order do?

The proposed Dog Control Order – *The Fouling of Land by Dogs (Kettering Borough Council) Order 2011* – will create the offence of failing to remove dog faeces from any land within the Borough of Kettering, which is open to the air, and to which the public are entitled to have access with or without payment.

Please return the questionnaire, which can be downloaded from www.kettering.gov.uk along with any further comments you wish to make by **20th December 2010**.

12.10.12.1	Clerk	To arrange joint meeting with BPHA	
------------	-------	------------------------------------	--

The meeting ended at 10.00

Signed:

Date: