

Clerk report to Bourn parish Council 15 June 2016

Where I have information to support the agenda this is detailed below.

Public session

Anthony Taylor has indicated he may attend to explain

1. Apologies for absence – Angela Marcham
3. To approve the minutes of the meeting on 18 May 2016 (attached)
5. Matters arising
- 5.1 Funding for Broadway Public Open Space
Cllr Demetriou has written:
“Following on from the request for me to deal with Seeking funds for the above at the last PC meeting, I have made enquiries and most grant providers are more favourable towards Community Group Applications as opposed to Parish Council. With this in mind I have spoken to residents who are keen to set up a community Group to seek and raise funds for the POS. I have invited them to contact you and attend the next Parish Council meeting to discuss this with the PC and seek advice where necessary.
I also think that my hands are tied as I have an interest as a close neighbour and may purchase our property when legislation allows us to so. Therefore there is a conflict of interest. With this in mind I feel it is more appropriate for the POS working group to carry out this role. Therefore can you remove me from this responsibility.”
- 5.2 (8.2) Interactive signs – to consider report and recommendation
Cllr Bruce to report.
- 5.3 (12.4) Proposal, further to point 7.2 in the April minutes, that Frank Haxton should be notified of all new work scheduled and advised of the date(s) of the work being carried out so that he can inspect the work as it is in progress. Further, that all future work should entail a contracted notification to the supplier that work will be inspected *while it is in progress* and that the contractor must provide dates and times of scheduled work to enable this ^(SJa)
Deferred at the last meeting.
- 5.4 (12.5) Update regarding the current provision of an unsupervised meeting facility for young people in the village and to consider what, if anything, the Parish Council should do next ^(SJa)
Deferred at the last meeting.
- 5.5 (12.6) Proposal that the Council considers the condition of its notice boards
Deferred at the last meeting.
- 5.6 (12.8) Bourn Parish Council’s successes – to note
Deferred at the last meeting.
6. To consider reports on the progress of all ongoing projects and to see if any further action is required
7. To consider resolutions from the Annual Parish Meeting, including
- 7.1 To consider proposal for holding an informative meeting on Rights of Way, involving the County Council, Police and Landowners
Angela Marcham says “On the information I have heard, my views are:
1. Most of the time everything runs smoothly. Graham and I identify any problems and take appropriate action. If the landowner needs to be contacted we or CCC (or both) contact them to rectify the situation. On the whole, each issue is a different one. A general meeting of landowners wouldn't be an efficient way to address individual cases.

2. It is the general public using these rights of way who need more knowledge - especially dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists and - the latest fad - off road motorbikers. Though they are a small minority, it is significant in so far as the individual landowners and pedestrians are concerned. And that minority do usually know the rules, they just don't wish to abide by them. That's life. The minority always spoil it for the majority.

3. So for the above 2 reasons I don't think a meeting for landowners, even if new to the village, is warranted. And there is plenty of information on the internet re their obligations regarding the maintenance of rights of ways. “

- 7.2 To consider the area under the trees and whether it should be maintained for biodiversity
The Parish Council has many powers (thinks it can do) but only a few duties (thinks it must do). One of these duties is its biodiversity duty.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-duty-public-authority-duty-to-have-regard-to-conserving-biodiversity>

- 7.3 To consider pursuing the outstanding work on the ditch with SCDC
The Parish Council's January 2016 minutes record “RESOLVED to authorise Frank Haxton to liaise with SCDC regarding clearance of the ditch to an acceptable standard and to Mr Haxton's satisfaction.” SCDC and Mr Haxton were notified of this.

8. To consider planning, tree work applications and any planning related matters

8.1 Planning applications received since the last meeting

8.1.1 S/1081/16/LD – 45 High Street – Certificate of lawful development for the erection of a garden studio

8.1.2 S/1312/16/DC – Gills Hill Farm, Gills Hill – Discharge of condition 3 (Materials) of S/1500/15/FL

8.1.3 S/0427/16/FL Bourn Airfield - Proposed Storage Use on The Area to consider correspondence from the Planning Officer. Anthony Taylor has written to say he will attend the meeting to answer any questions that the Parish Council may have.

8.2 SCDC Decision notices

8.2.1 S/0499/15/FL – Bourn Airfield, St Neots Road – Part change of use of runway for external storage to include but not limited to the siting of plant, machinery, storage containers and vehicles – Permission granted.

8.2.2 S/1314/16/DC – Bourn Airfield, as above, discharge of conditions – Permission granted.

8.2.3 S/0595/16/FL – Lalbagh Restaurant, 49 Alms Hill – Single storey ground floor side extension to restaurant, relocation of extraction unit and oil tank – Permission granted.

8.3 Tree works applications – no notifications received at the time of writing.

9. Finance, procedure and risk assessment including to consider any urgent work required because of health and safety or risk

Frank Haxton has been asked if he could re-mortar the loose bricks on the emergency flight of stairs and he has kindly agreed.

9.1 To receive the financial report and approve the payment of bills – attached.

9.2 Play inspection report and to consider any works required

Frank Haxton's May report:

Jubilee Play Field

Repairs/Modifications Completed.

Gate to enclosed play area reduced in width to provide 15 mm gap on closing stile

Notes and Actions - Annual Safety Report

1. Picnic bench to be moved. This is the inspector's opinion only; we have found no problem with its location and it is fixed down.
2. Second gate recommended. This is to provide an escape in case of bullying. As we have no known problem with bullying this is not necessary.
3. Finger trap on the gate closing stile. Fixed.
4. Re location of signs. This is also the inspector's opinion but we do not find fault with the present location.
5. Wear on chains. All chains have now been measured for wear with a Vernier Slide Gauge and no wear exceeds 21%. The recommended wear point for replacement is 40%.
6. The Swing Bridge needs cleaning. I will undertake this task.
7. Ground erosion to the spring mobiles and rolling barrel. Safer surfacing has been laid (an expensive solution to this little problem!).
8. Moss build-up on play surfaces. This has been cleaned off and treated.
9. Cycle track has worn grass in some areas. This area is seldom used for other than children running about and the worn areas are very limited. No action recommended.
10. One of the roundabouts on the Multi-play reported as worn. It is in fact misaligned due to foundation movement. We have been aware of this for some time and are monitoring the situation.
11. Embankment Slide. We are aware that the concrete steps and the path up to the slide are less than satisfactory. I will propose a solution in due course. We have however improved the run-out which was the most pressing problem.
A safer surfacing is recommended beneath the slide. We should action this item and I will assess the requirement and report in due course.
12. Basket Swing. The finger entrapment on this item is a design fault. I shall investigate with the manufacturer and find a supplier of nut covers.

Hall Close Play Field

Ditch and Culvert. Culvert entrance and stream bed badly blocked with rubbish and posing a risk to children. Grass cuttings are being disposed of in the ditch either by the grass cutting contractor or residents **Risk M.**

Monkey Bars. Holes have appeared in the ground that are a serious trip hazard. It is not clear if these were dug by animals or people! I will fill them.

Notes and Actions - Annual Safety Report. Wear on bushes, chains and shackles has been measured and all are within safe tolerance

Frank Haxton
01954 718 321

25 May 2016

- 9.3 To consider any matter which is urgent because of risk or health and safety
None at the time of writing.
10. Members' items
- 10.1 Planning Working Group
- 10.2 Highways Report
- 10.3 Proposed interactive sign for Broadway, and suggestion for use of Energy Grant to fund this
Cllr Demetriou to report.

- 10.4 Report on CAPALC Pensions course and proposal that the Council sets up a working group to make a recommendation to the Council on a pension scheme and contributions from the PC^(NB)
- 10.5 Report on meeting with Wincanton regarding their operations at Bourn Airfield and proposal that a liaison group with Wincanton and representatives from the neighbouring parish councils (Bourn, Cambourne, Knapwell & Caldecote)
- Cllr Blair writes “Meeting with Wincanton to form a liaison group
- Steve Jones, Neil Blair and Les Rolfe met with Daniel Brown, Peter Gostling and Lukas Seruset to discuss the start of Wincanton operations at Bourn airfield and to set up a liaison group between Wincanton and representatives from the neighbouring parish councils (Bourn, Cambourne, Knapwell & Caldecote). Wincanton showed us the briefing sheet that they will be giving to all drivers and outlined how the operation will work. Initially there would be one lifter on site for unloading lorries and stacking. The site would hold about 1300 containers when full.
 - We arranged the next meeting with Wincanton on the site on Monday 18th July at 6 pm.”
- 10.6 Bourn Parish Council’s successes – to note

11. Correspondence

- 11.1 Angela Marcham – Hemlock and request that the Parish Council consider what action is necessary and also purchase 2 face visors

Angela Marcham writes:

The end nearest the brook FP10 (it runs in the 'ditch' along the perimeter fence up to Caxton Road) always has been a problem with nettles. We do have separate funding for additional cuts but Graham and I will always need to give this end of the footpath occasional strimming to keep the vegetation under control in this area. I recently tackled this section with my cordless hedge trimmer and was concerned to see an infestation of hemlock (check the internet if you don't know about this toxic plant). I inspected it 2 weeks later and it has already grown another 2 feet high again. The odd one or two are manageable but these are widespread and appear to be taking over from the nettles. They also extend on to the bank of the brook.

I am concerned about the risks both to Graham, myself and people using the path (the latter we need to undertake further investigation - I have contacted the Wildlife Trust). I have consulted Peter Gaskin who has taken advice and recommends full PPE protection for Graham and myself before we tackle hemlock.

So we have several options - either to just leave it to CCC contractors to do their usual cuts (twice yearly) + use some of our allocated additional funding for additional cuts (but this will still leave the FP10 obstructed with hemlock periodically), or get some PPE. Approximate costs for this are below. Or we could do both, as I'm sure hemlock is spreading.

I could do a risk assessment if someone can provide a template. I have relevant experience and training (though that was 10 years ago). Or I could accompany someone to assist them when they complete it. And if anyone has any relevant experience or thoughts on this issue I am very happy to receive it.

PPE

Visors about £12 each (need one each). In fact I think these would be useful regardless of hemlock. Following disposables come in multiple packs (e.g. 5, 10, 20) and we can split packs between us: Coveralls about £3 each (these are 'paper' and may not be robust enough, but worth a try). If not disposable, they should be washed after every use and I don't fancy doing that!)

Gloves about £1.50 a pair

FFP2 masks (not sure yet if need to be disposable) to prevent dust inhalation (May need FFP3 which

have better protection and cost twice as much - need to find out).

And we still need to find out if having hemlock on a Recreation Ground is OK, - it is likely kids make camps and play hide and seek in the trees alongside the footpath. I haven't inspected the rest of the boundary.”

Also

“I have just got this email (in italics at end of message).

Dear Parish Councillors, I now have a response from the Wildlife Trust - see below (permission granted). We basically have (1) risk to Graham and myself keeping the footpath unobstructed, which we can do if properly protected with PPE (even the CCC twice yearly contracted cuts only do the footpath, not the surrounding area), and (2) risk to the general public using the area especially as it is alongside the Recreation Ground (I expect children play there climbing trees, building camps, etc) before, during and after clearance. To be frank, I'm not sure of the best way forward. I'm not prepared to dig it out myself for six years (and I doubt Graham is either though I haven't asked him), and it is heavily nettled too, though it does appear at the moment to be in a cluster. As I've said before, there may be other areas around the Recreation Ground infested too - I haven't had the time to look. It will almost certainly spread - there are already some plants in the hedgerow on FPs 22 and 23 which border the Bourn Golf Course and along the Bourn Brook bank near what I call 'the lego bridge' exiting Camping Close Meadow.

My view is that you need to discuss what action, if necessary, should now be taken. But regardless of that, I would like the PC to fund the purchase of at least the 2 face visors, not especially for hemlock, but to protect the eyes (and glasses) during our routine general clearances.

I would appreciate being kept informed of any decisions or developments and if I can help further, I will.

Dear Angela

If you're planning to deal with hemlock (a good idea if children are making dens there) the best thing is to dig it out with ditching spades. It can be quite persistent and the seed bank can last 6 years, so it might be a bit of a struggle, but it does work. The obvious health and safety issues for a) are making sure no-one eats it (best to wear gloves, wash hands before eating etc), and physical injuries relating to hard work digging (so make sure everyone takes it easy and has regular breaks). With regard to b) the main risk is children getting sap on their hands and ingesting it, which is probably the main reason to clear hemlock in the first place. After clearance there will be uneven ground, and possibly compost heaps that should be out of bounds for children.”

11.2 Local Government Boundary Commission – electoral review of South Cambridgeshire consultation
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has published draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire District Council.

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE: DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has published draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for South Cambridgeshire District Council. Today is the start of an 8 week public consultation on the Commission's draft recommendations on new ward boundaries across South Cambridgeshire District Council. The consultation closes on 25 July 2016.

View the draft recommendations

You can view the Commission's draft recommendations at <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/6215> where you can find interactive maps, a report and guidance on how to have your say. The Commission has not finalised its conclusions and now invites representations on the draft recommendations.

An interactive map of the Commission's recommendations for South Cambridgeshire, a summary outlining the Commission's draft recommendations, electorate figures and guidance on how to propose new wards is available on the consultation area at: <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/6215>. Further information about the review is published on our website at: <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/south-cambridgeshire>.

Have your say

We encourage everyone who has a view on the draft recommendations to contact us whether you support them or whether you wish to propose alternative arrangements.

Before finalising the recommendations, the Commission will consider every representation received during consultation whether it is submitted by an individual, a local group or an organisation. We will weigh each submission against the criteria the Commission must follow when drawing up electoral arrangements:

- To deliver electoral equality where each district councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the district.
- That the pattern of wards should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities.
- That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.

It is important that you take account of the criteria if you are suggesting an alternative pattern of wards. You can find additional guidance and information about previous electoral reviews on our website to help you or your organisation make a submission.

Get in touch

The Commission welcomes comments on the recommendations report by 25 July 2016. Representations should be made:

- Through our interactive consultation portal where you can explore the maps of the recommendations, draw your own boundaries and supply comments at: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk.
- By email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk.
- Or in writing to:

Review Officer (South Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

The Commission aims to publish every response it receives during phases of consultation. If you do not want all or any part of your response or name to be made public, you must state this clearly in the response. Any such request should explain why confidentiality is necessary. All responses may be subject to publication or disclosure as required by law (in particular under the Freedom of Information Act 2000).

This is the last opportunity to influence the Commission's recommendations before they are finalised. We therefore encourage local people to get in touch with us and have their say.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Emily Starkie
Review Officer
reviews@lgbce.org.uk
0330 500 1280

11.3 Local Government Boundary Commission – electoral review of Cambridgeshire consultation
ELECTORAL REVIEW OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE: NEW DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England has published new draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Cambridgeshire County Council. Today is the start of a 6 week public consultation on the Commission's new draft recommendations on new electoral division boundaries across Cambridgeshire County Council. The consultation closes on 20 June 2016.

View the new draft recommendations

You can view the Commission's new draft recommendations at <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/4143> where you can find interactive maps, a report and guidance on how to have your say. The Commission has not finalised its conclusions and now invites representations on the new draft recommendations.

Enclosed with this letter is a summary outlining the Commission's new draft recommendations outlining the new draft recommendations. An interactive map of the Commission's recommendations for Cambridgeshire County Council, electorate figures and guidance on how to propose new divisions is available on the consultation area at: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk. Further information about the review and the Commission's work is also published on our website at: www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council.

An interactive map of the Commission's recommendations for Cambridgeshire summary outlining the Commission's draft recommendations, electorate figures and guidance on how to propose new wards is available on the consultation area at: <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/4143>. Further

information about the review is published on our website at: www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/eastern/cambridgeshire/cambridgeshire-county-council.

Have your say

We encourage everyone who has a view on the new draft recommendations to contact us whether you support them or whether you wish to propose alternative arrangements.

Before finalising the recommendations, the Commission will consider every representation received during consultation whether it is submitted by an individual, a local group or an organisation. We will weigh each submission against the criteria the Commission must follow when drawing up electoral arrangements:

- To deliver electoral equality where each county councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the county.
- That the pattern of divisions should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities.
- That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.

It is important that you take account of the criteria if you are suggesting an alternative pattern of divisions. You can find additional guidance and information about previous electoral reviews on our website to help you or your organisation make a submission.

Get in touch

The Commission welcomes comments on the recommendations report by 20 June 2016. Representations should be made:

- Through our interactive consultation portal where you can explore the maps of the recommendations, draw your own boundaries and supply comments at: www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk.
- By email to: reviews@lgbce.org.uk.
- Or in writing to:
Review Officer (Cambridgeshire)
Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

The Commission aims to publish every response it receives during phases of consultation. If you do not want all or any part of your response or name to be made public, you must state this clearly in the response. Any such request should explain why confidentiality is necessary. All responses may be subject to publication or disclosure as required by law (in particular under the Freedom of Information Act 2000).

This is the last opportunity to influence the Commission's recommendations before they are finalised. We therefore encourage local people to get in touch with us and have their say.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Alex Hinds

Review Officer

Reviews@lgbce.org.uk

11.4 Residents grass cutting of the memorial site

Following complaints from residents that the grass has not been cut at the memorial site I requested that the County Council did so as it is not part of the CGM contract.

CCC has replied "I have spoken with Dennis Vacher, who runs the grass cutting programme.

He is of the opinion that CCC have never cut the grass here, and that the Parish are responsible for its maintenance."

I am checking with Land Registry if it has information as to whose land it is.

12. Closure of meeting.