

BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting 13 December 2021 at 7.30pm

Present

Cllr Dugmore (Chairman)	Cllr Christian-Carter	Cllr Gates
Cllr M Mann	Cllr Thomas	Cllr Tressler

Absent

3 Vacant seats

In Attendance

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

Public

1

21/171 Apologies

Cllr Kettle for late attendance

21/172 Declarations of Interest

None

21/173 Dispensations

None.

21/174 Minutes

- i. Ordinary Parish Council meeting held on 8 November 2021.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council meeting held on 8 November 2021 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Tressler)).

- ii. Extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on 6 December 2021.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council meeting held on 6 December 2021 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Mann, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Tressler)).

21/175 Public Forum

- i. Nemo Raceway: Mr Kim Salmon, Lower Spring Farm advised that this is 'round two' of Nemo Racing and that he had attended the last meeting of the parish council to comment on Nemo Racing's planning application. He had objected to that planning application and saw that the parish council had responded accordingly.
- This is the second application. Nemo Racing should have submitted it by the end of June but did not, so they have now submitted it just before Christmas.
 - The approach is quite disingenuous in that as much as the planning application is to regularise the developments of the site: new track, the constructions that have taken place, facilities of the site, the engineering works associated with a pit track, but also to put up another construction on the north/west end which is described as a refreshment storage but as it is a huge container he thinks it will eventually be used as a café. They also want to construct a grass road (form of matting) that will go all along the east boundary to the north end so that they can use it for car parking at the top end where they normally erect a giant marquee for events, in order to undertake servicing and repairs as well as vendor stalls selling equipment. Also, at the north-end there is a convenient opening in the hedge that they can drive through to access the north field where they camp which is outside their boundary (so it will be interesting to see what SDC say regarding the camping planning application).
 - If you go back to the original planning application that was approved in 2009, the parish and ward both objected and everything that they objected to has now come to fruition.
 - This site is now attracting between 350 and 450 people on 3- and 4-day events, especially those held at bank holidays.
 - This is now a commercial entity, so it has gone from a bunch of volunteers, having relocated from Burton Dasset with about thirty participants meeting every alternate Sunday. They laid out a track and erected a small stand. This has all been demolished and there has been an expansive set of development there.
 - Mr Salmon thinks there are serious issues associated with flooding. They have dug a large pit to drain off the water off the track.
 - They use vegetable oil, which is not good for wildlife, particularly aquatic species as it takes the oxygen out of the water, and it is a tributary to the river Itchen that is remarkably close by.
 - Mr Salmon stated that if we have read their supporting document for planning it is based on fantasy and fiction, it is an awful document and it has taken him a considerable amount time to make his response as the document is that horrendous.
 - Mr Salmon concluded that if this were a green field site now and an application was being made for the level of intensity and the level of

engineered structures work on that site, he believes that the application would be refused.

- Mr Salmon is objecting to this latest planning application.

21/176 Planning Matters

i. 21/03540/FUL

A Cappella, Plough Lane, Bishop's Itchington – Two storey rear extension and new porch. No concerns were raised with the planning as it appears to be an improvement on the existing dwelling.

It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council's response to this planning application would be 'No Representations.' (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Tressler, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Mann)).

ii. 21/03378/FUL

Nemo Racing, Knightcote Bottom, Knightcote – Regularisation of site layout, including structures, and proposed GrassRoad of internal access route

This is a retrospective application for what is there.

Cllr Thomas raised the issue of access into the site from Knightcote Bottoms Road which is a narrow Lane.

Cllr Tressler stated that he thinks there is precedent here, in that people can not just do what they want to do and it appears they have just 'steam-rolled' it in by continuing to develop the site and at some stage people have to be put in their place and these 'guys' need putting in their place. Cllr Tressler understands that the parish council does have to tackle it on planning matters but he believes that they have written their own rules for what they have done so they have not had permission for what they have now.

Cllr Christian-Carter stated that we should object to this planning application on noise amenity and also visual amenity. In 2009, Bishop's Itchington parish council objected to the then proposal, so did both ward members and as a result, it went to the planning committee where the recommendation was to grant which they subsequently did. However, if you go back to this 2009 decision, you will see that there is not only a number of conditions, one of which is for landscaping, also for parking (parking provision for the parking of 30 cars within the site that should be permanently retained for use at all times). Because the planning statement, which she agrees is totally wholly inadequate yet again, does not actually mention parking but it does mention the 2009 planning permission, in which case we have to revert back to that and what was actually granted under conditions some of which not taken on board whilst some were. The other important thing is, not only the parking that should be 30 cars only (they want more), is the consistent use of the term "radio controlled model cars". Back in 2009, these were battery operated cars and were fairly quiet. We know now that this is not the case, they are nitro-fuelled cars and therefore the noise levels have shot up expodentially. Cllr Tressler stated that

he lives approximately 1.5 miles away and if the wind is in the right direction, he can hear it and therefore it will be awful for those living nearer. The cars operate at between 25 and 35 rpm and they are about 95 db and 15 go round the track each race.

Cllr Christian-Carter stated that regarding the noise amenity point of view this has not been addressed at all in the planning statement, therefore the parish council should object and also, going back to the 2009 application, there is the statement from SDC Landscape Advice which says "from further away, on high land of the Burton Dassett Hills Country Park, views from elevated vantage points look down on the agricultural mosaic below. This application site forms part of that mosaic. My concern would be impact of introducing 30 parked cars glinting in this empty agricultural landscape and the frequency of this event". The concluding comment was, "whilst I raise no objection to the proposal in principle, I would be slightly concerned by likely impact caused by the parking provision (30 cars) in this rural landscape. However, it would be possible to look at measures to mitigate this impact screening etc, etc. and this would need to be conditioned as part of any permission granted on this site". Cllr Christian-Carter stated that the visual impact was, whilst being clearly dismissed in the planning statement, an important aspect because, unless she is wrong, the site has not changed that much. Cllr Mann confirmed this and stated that you can actually look across when you go past Lower Farm you can visually see it from there so it is seen not just from the hills, it is seen from the Knightcote Road and it is quite clearly visible. Cllr Thomas raised the point that the M40 runs close by and there will be a lot of glinting windscreens from the site. Cllr Mann responded that in 2009 the issue was that it could be seen from Burton Dassett Country Park, with high attendances now, if you put 300 – 400 cars together it has quite a visual impact.

Cllr Christian-Carter concluded that we should object and that the reasons she has put forward are all material planning considerations and are extremely valid.

Cllr Mann reiterated the issues with the noise from the raceway citing that if you can imagine 15 chainsaws all going at the same time, the noise levels from these equates to the noise coming from the cars racing. The public address system adds to the noise levels and is very intrusive to anyone in the locality. Cllr Mann also expressed, along with other Councillors, a lack of faith in SDC Planning doing the right thing bearing in mind the original application back in 2009 should never have been granted. He stated that we have to be careful, object strongly on good grounds so at least they have to respond to the Planning Committee.

Cllr Gates questioned where does this end, is there an actual end to this or is it a case that the parish council puts an objection in, they put an appeal in, where does it stop as we have talked about this on a number of occasions?

Cllr Dugmore explained that the application we discussed last time was for a different proposal, in that they applied for a variation to the existing permission so that they could camp. This is a separate application which is retrospectively

seeking permission for the construction work they have done there: the development of the track, the original was for a grass track; the development of the container with podium and rostrum on there, the original permission was for a timber structure. From the point of view of the process thereafter, Cllr Christian-Carter advised that firstly it is retrospective because the planning that the site was granted in 2009 they have contravened and because enforcement did finally get involved, they have been told they have to put in a retrospective planning application although Nemo Racing do not use these words as they are trying to spin it that this is something new but we know it is not new. If we object and the ward member objects then if the planning officer wants to grant permission then it will have to go to planning committee when we have three minutes to say why the Planning Committee should refuse it and the ward member has five minutes to say why they should refuse it. If they are refused planning permission either by the planning officer under their delegated powers or by the Planning Committee, they can go to appeal which must be done within six months. Provided the reasons that SDC state for refusing it are watertight, comprehensive and expansive then no planning inspector would uphold their appeal so it would be dismissed. Once it is dismissed, the only alternative they have is to go to High Court which is very expensive. They can then of course submit another application by which point there is precedent set for that principle of development not to be approved.

Cllr Thomas stated that he was very concerned regarding road traffic safety as there are three or four completely blind bends coming off the main road and it is bad enough assuming that maybe one or two vehicles will come along every ten minutes but if this amount of traffic is going to be coming in and out of this site then it is impossible and will not work.

Cllr Dugmore advised that this is one of the points that he had spotted and a point in the planning statement which is actually spinning things a little bit, to do with basically the reference that has been used in each case. The planning consultant has written it in such a way as to refer this application to the current status verses what is currently permitted. Fundamentally she is making the statement in the planning statement that says it will be no material difference or no difference to the volume of traffic on the highway. The point is that the permitted development out there does not support that level of traffic so the delta from the permitted to the currently being sought permission for is huge (top of page 7). They have not mentioned the number of cars but this is critical. Cllr Dugmore therefore feels that this need to be highlighted as this is something in the planning statement that is being spun to try and create the belief that its not doing any harm as because it is no different. It is only no different because it has been 'shoved' in the back door. What it is different from from a correct permission for point of view is massively different.

Cllr Christian-Carter advised that the radio controlled cars was a concern to the parish council in 2009 but the parish council was assured that would be fairly 'noiseless' as they were battery operated but we now know this is totally untrue with the noise equating to 15 chainsaws and not only the numbers that were

originally allowed to race in 2009 we know that this has increased exponentially (100 fold).

Cllr Dugmore stated that we need to go with the extensive points raised during this discussion and suggested that we do highlight that the traffic issue is significantly different and it is not something to be dismissed the way they have dodged it in the planning statement because she is doing it relative to what there is today and not to what is permitted today.

It was **RESOLVED** to object based on the points raised above regarding noise amenity and visual amenity together with the comments about arguably misrepresented traffic issues. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).

iii **21/03467/FUL**

3 Butchers Close, Bishops Itchington – Single storey rear and side extension, new porch and alterations. Although the general consensus is ‘no representations’ it was pointed out that the deletion of the garage leaves a three bedroom house with only one parking space.

It was **RESOLVED** to respond ‘no representations’ with the comment that the parish council is concerned that following the removing of the garage, will there be two parking spaces left. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, five in favour and one abstention (Cllr Thomas)).

21/177 County, District & Parish Liaison

SDC/WCC

Cllr Kettle had circulated his reports prior to the meeting. Any questions regarding these to be raised when Cllr Kettle arrives.

21/178 Finance

1 Monthly Financial Report

Cllr Gates raised the issue that when we look at next year’s budget, we need to look at how we access reserves i.e., the monies for Shakespeare Martineau, where is this money coming from in terms of existing budget.

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the Monthly Finance Report ending 30 November 2021 (Appendix A). (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Thomas, five in favour, one abstention (Cllr Tressler)).

2 Bank Reconciliation Reports for November 2021

The bank reconciliation report for November 2021 had been completed by the Clerk. Cllr Gates has checked it and is happy with it.

3 Accounts for Payment

It was **RESOLVED** that the Accounts Payable on 13 November 2021 be authorised for payment by Cllrs Gates and Cllr Thomas (Appendix B). (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

21/179 Consideration of Grant Application

This is a follow up to Maddy Bailey's visit in respect of hanging litter pickers off the village notice boards to promote community participation in litter picking areas of the village. The grant request covers hi-vis vests, litter pickers, hoops, gloves, hooks and screws and hand sanitiser if necessary.

It was suggested, as it would be useful from a community point of view, for the parish council to buy them and lend them to the group – if the group folds, they can be returned to the parish council. The cost will be approximately £75.00 per unit.

Cllr Mann also suggested that as they will be attached to the noticeboards, and as the noticeboards have not been up long, there should be a maintenance budget identified and these litter picking units be included.

It was agreed to get four sets, one set per noticeboard using the entry level or mid-range litter pickers to see how it goes.

It was **RESOLVED** to take onboard observations made regarding quality of the items, that we go and source the equipment outlined in the grant application and help Maddy Bailey get them on the noticeboard. A budget of up to £300.00 be made available. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Mann, all in favour).

21/180 Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment – Draft Methodology Consultation

Following discussion, the council agreed to make no response to this.

21/181 Engagement of Shakespeare Martineau to Undertake Legal Work on Behalf of the Parish Council

To approve the engagement of Shakespeare Martineau to undertake legal work as follows:

Community Centre: Lease - £1,900.00,

Memorial Hall: Registration with Land Registry - £900.00,

Hidden Green: transfer of land from Orbit to the parish council - £1,900.00.

Although the parish council has not budgeted for these, it is work that needs to be undertaken

It was **RESOLVED** that we engage Shakespeare Martineau to undertake the three pieces of work at the prices stated. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

21/182 Queens Platinum Jubilee

i. Queen's Green Canopy (information received from Warwickshire Lieutenancy Lead)

Following discussion, it was agreed, that, as there is a lack of spaces to plant trees in the villages, that the parish council will not participate.

- ii. Establishing a Jubilee Fund (information received from WALC).
As the parish council already has a community grant fund it agreed to leave things as they stand.

21/183 Local Council Award Scheme

The parish council previously held the foundation level of the scheme, but it expired in February 2020.

It was **RESOLVED** to agree in principle that the parish council will apply for the foundation level in May 2022. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, all in favour).

21/184 Environment & Properties

1. Children's Playground:

- i. Working Group Update: The working group will now be working towards getting in formal quotes for the upgrading of the playground. One comprehensive report has been received from Proludic. It was suggested that two further quotes are obtained from local companies and that the Clerk and Tom Cooper would be able to supply company names. These companies can then be approached to produce an exciting plan within the budget confines. A brief based on the area we have got, the amount of money available, any core items of equipment that need to be included i.e., ariel cableway and advising what item(s) need to be retained i.e., tractor play frame should be supplied to each company.
- ii. To approve cost of removing Multiplay Slide Climber (£500) and Climber (frame/net) (£300).

It was **RESOLVED** to engage RPM to remove the multiplay slide climber and climber (frame/net) at the prices stated. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

- iii. It was agreed that Cllrs Dugmore and Thomas will remove seat/tyre from the Cableway and Swing – Single Point Tyre to take them out of service and hazard tape the multiplay slide climber and climber (frame/net) as an interim measure until they are removed by RPM. This will be undertaken on Friday 17 December in the afternoon.
- iv. To consider whether to replace the cableway and swing – single point tyre now or as part of the Recreational Community Facility Project.

Following discussion, it was **RESOLVED** to not replace the condemned equipment until we have reviewed what we are going to do as a total package. (Proposed Cllr Mann, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour).
- v. To approve the cost of replacing tennis posts and tennis nets for both courts (£720.00 plus VAT)

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the cost of replacing the tennis posts and nets at a total cost of £720.00 plus VAT. (Proposed Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

2. BINDP:

This is progressing. The BINDP has been submitted to Stratford District Council and we are currently engaged in answering questions posed by Matthew Neal at SDC.

3. Recreational Community Facility Project (RCFP):

i. To approve flyer to be circulated to residents:

Thanks was given to Cllr Gates for the excellent work he had undertaken in producing the initial flyer to go out to residents directing them to the additional information on the website.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the flyer save for finalising any things like the URL on the bottom or any bits of details of the costs. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

It was raised that the follow up leaflet and village survey/questionnaire also need to be approved. The follow up leaflet would be appropriate to go on the website providing all the detail/information that residents will need with hard copies available from the parish council office. It was suggested that the village survey should go out by mail to ensure that those without access to the internet are included in the consultation. As a public body it is possible that the electoral role could be used to send them to the named residents of each property within the village – it would have to be investigated to see if this would be an appropriate use of the electoral role. The initial flyer should be hand delivered in the same way as the recent flyer seeking new members of the parish council had been done. It was suggested that other people be involved in the delivery i.e., members of the working group. It was requested that the clerk forward the postcodes covering the village to Cllr Tressler.

It was agreed that the parish council must be transparent by giving villagers details of what the project would cost them via the precept, but it is not the parish council's place to inform them of county/district council tax rises for the forthcoming budget year. It needs to be made truly clear to residents that what we are asking them to agree to is to purely pay for the RCFP. What we need to do is to make clear that the scope of this document is for the project only and that the other, regular annual increase of the precept will still be there on top of this. The village survey will be one survey per household and should be kept to one medium. The most appropriate medium would be paper form, with each survey form having a unique number on it so that duplicate surveys cannot be submitted. A stamped addressed envelope could be sent with the survey to encourage households to return the survey. Cllr Tressler agreed to investigate the cost of this.

It was **RESOLVED**, that, with tidying up the clarity of the scope, we will use the document received from A. Maliphant to go on the web site and that the Village Survey be posted to all households in the village. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

ii. To agree timeline:

- 13 December - this evening's meeting to make approvals requested,
- 14 December - flyer printed for immediate circulation: agreed,
- Further information posted on the parish council website with hard copies available for those who do not have access to the internet: agreed,
- Survey questions prepared by survey monkey and in hard copy - agreed not survey monkey, only hard copies, because of verification,
- First week of January 2022 – public meeting attended by the architect then survey goes out for four weeks: survey unable to be sent out until after results of the investigation of costs of postage is received and approved at the next parish council meeting. The public meeting will be the 'kick off' for the survey and therefore needs to be pushed back to a point in time where we know we have the survey ready to go. A date to be agreed at the next parish council meeting,
- During January 2022 – focus groups to help design the playground,
- Business plan revised for presentation to parish council meeting – 10 January 2022,
- 28 January 2022 – deadline for survey replies: this will go back to the four weeks after the 'kick off' date,
- Extraordinary parish council meeting to review survey responses: if this is to be arranged, it will have to go back by the same period as the deadline for surveys,
- Public Works Loan (PWL) application to go to WALC for checking by County Officer before submission to Government: this will depend on the public's response,
- Outcome of PWL - expected to be known within three months,
- February 2022 – undertake tender for playground to inform appropriate funding bids: discussed earlier and designs will be drawn up (see 21/184 1.i. above).

The end of January deadlines was based on setting the precept. The discussion at the November meeting reviewed this and the possibility of using reserves to cover the interest from the PWL during the first year was proposed if the village agreed for a PWL to be applied for. As a parish council, we cannot add anything to the precept until we know the loan has been approved, therefore the rise in the precept outlined in the information to be given to residents will not be implemented until 1 April 2023 – this will be made clear in the information that is put on the web site.

Timeline as proposed as above, with the exception of the 'kick off' public meeting suggested for 4 January 2022 goes back by a week then everything that is a consequence of that including end date of survey, meeting to review the survey responses, and anything based on the decision we make off the outcome of that meeting goes back by the same.

The initial flyers need to be distributed but firstly the web address to go on the leaflet must be identified, and secondly the availability of printers to produce the leaflet (A6 size, double sided on postcard card x 1,500 copies). Cllr Tressler to obtain a quote for this from the printers. To be delivered to residents 7/8/9 January 2022.

Councillor Kettle joined the meeting at this point.

21/185 Reports and Questions

- The proposed merger between Stratford DC and Warwick DC has been narrowly agreed by both councils and the proposal, following the detailed work being undertaken, will go to the Secretary of State.
- Adrian Harding, Interim Head of Planning is likely to be in post until the merger takes place.
- Corner of Ladbroke Road: two of the wooden bollards have been knocked down again and this is likely to continue to happen. A solution needs to be looked at i.e., the replacement of these with metal bollards or large rocks.
- Plough Lane: remains of a car – the damage was caused by the malfunction of a ratchet securing an item of equipment on a trailer. This has been dealt with.
- Plough Lane – meeting held with Patch Bryne, and the work required to the ditch will be undertaken.

21/186 Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council is scheduled to take place on Monday, 10 January 2022 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

Meeting closed at 21:52

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

APPENDIX A

Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/21 and 12/12/21 inclusive. Includes due and unpaid transactions.
Excludes transactions with an invoice date prior to 01/04/21

	Budget 2021/2022	Reserve Movements	Actual Net	Balance
INCOME				
Bishops Itchington Parish Council				
10 Precept	£90,000.00	£0.00	£90,000.00	£0.00
20 Council Tax Support Grant	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
30 Burials	£2,000.00	£0.00	£2,880.00	£880.00
40 Sec 136 & Other Reimbursements	£1,300.00	£0.00	£0.00	-£1,300.00
50 Playing Field	£400.00	£0.00	£9.98	-£390.02
60 Interest	£100.00	£0.00	£3.17	-£96.83
70 Grants	£0.00	£0.00	£7,395.00	£7,395.00
80 Misc	£250.00	£0.00	£60.00	-£190.00
90 VAT Refund	£0.00	£0.00	£9,732.12	£9,732.12
100 Pavilion Fund	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council	£94,050.00	£0.00	£110,080.27	£16,030.27
Total Income	£94,050.00	£0.00	£110,080.27	£16,030.27
EXPENDITURE				
Bishops Itchington Parish Council				
200 Salaries & Expenses	£30,047.00	£0.00	£17,193.99	£12,853.01
210 Councillor Allowances	£500.00	£0.00	£0.00	£500.00
220 Administration	£7,320.00	£0.00	£6,187.30	£1,132.70
230 Grounds Maintenance	£21,914.00	£0.00	£15,354.65	£6,559.35
240 Cemetery & Churchyard	£5,340.00	£0.00	£1,087.31	£4,252.69
250 Playing Field	£10,692.00	£0.00	£725.69	£9,966.31
260 Grants	£7,500.00	£0.00	£6,894.80	£605.20
270 Neighbourhood Plan	£2,500.00	£0.00	£2,450.00	£50.00
280 Other Expenditure	£1,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00
290 VAT	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
300 Contingency	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
310 Parish Office	£5,290.00	£0.00	£3,293.36	£1,996.64
320 Pavilion Project	£5,000.00	£0.00	£8,341.50	-£3,341.50
Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council	£97,103.00	£0.00	£61,528.60	£35,574.40
Total Expenditure	£97,103.00	£0.00	£61,528.60	£35,574.40
Total Income	£94,050.00	£0.00	£110,080.27	£16,030.27
Total Expenditure	£97,103.00	£0.00	£61,528.60	£35,574.40
Total Net Balance	-£3,053.00		£48,551.67	

APPENDIX B

BIPC Accounts Payable

Bishop's Itchington Parish Council

Accounts Payable 13 December 2021

<u>To Whom Payable</u>	<u>Ref No</u>	<u>Ex Vat</u>	<u>Vat Payable</u>	<u>Totale</u>
<i>Urgent accounts paid since last meeting requiring the formal approval of the council</i>				
E Biddle (office rent 01/12/21)	s/order	£ 411.67	£ -	£ 411.67
Onecom (phone & b/band 30/11/21)	d/debit	£ 83.73	£ 12.75	£ 76.48
Three Business (Mobile Sim 22/11/21)	d/debit	£ 4.17	£ 0.83	£ 5.00
E-ON (Pavilion Electricity 17/11/21)	d/debit	£ 25.05	£ 1.25	£ 26.30
Imperative Training Ltd (Defib Pads 09/12/21)	211200	£ 52.00	£ 10.40	£ 62.40
Sub-total		£ 556.62	£ 25.23	£ 519.45

Accounts for payment on 13 December 2021

J Kirton (Salary)	211201	£ 47.70	£ -	£ 47.70
V Powell (Salary)	211202	£ 76.16	£ -	£ 76.16
K Stevens (Salary)	211203	£ 1,317.76	£ -	£ 1,317.76
HRMC (PAYE)	211204	£ 337.32	£ -	£ 337.32
WWC Pension Fund (November)	211205	£ 429.86	£ -	£ 429.86
Biffa (Trade Waste)	211206	£ 271.05	£ 54.21	£ 325.26
PWC (Bus Shelter)	211207	£ 45.00	£ -	£ 45.00
PWC (Bus Shelter)	211208	£ 45.00	£ -	£ 45.00
V Powell (Expenses)	211209	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
V Powell (Expenses)	211210	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
Southam Agricultural Services (Yellow Land Strimmer Service)	211211	£ 129.71	£ 25.94	£ 155.65
K Stevens (Expenses)	211212	£ 100.33	£ -	£ 100.33
Thomas Fox LTD (Mowing/strimming/fencing/hedge cutting)	211213	£ 1,607.93	£ 321.60	£ 1,929.53
Warman Consultants Ltd (Fund Raising)	211214	£ 525.00	£ -	£ 525.00
WALC (Event -Local Council Climate Action Day)	211215	£ 30.00	£ 6.00	£ 36.00
WALC (Event -Protecting Public Rights of Way)	211216	£ 25.00	£ 5.00	£ 30.00
SLCC Enterprises Ltd	211217	£ 2,627.00	£ 525.40	£ 3,152.40
SLCC Enterprises Ltd	211218	£ 787.00	£ 157.40	£ 944.40
Sub-total		£ 8,421.82	£ 1,095.55	£ 9,517.37

TOTAL	£ 8,978.44	£ 1,120.78	£ 10,036.82
--------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------

Invoices checked & agreed.

Signed: K Stevens RFO

Signed: _____
Councillor

Signed: _____
Councillor

