

# BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting 8 November 2021 at 7.30pm

### Present

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

### Absent

3 Vacant seats

### In Attendance

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

### Public

2

Councillors were advised of the passing of former councillor, Peter Holmes. The parish council wished to record their sadness at his passing and thank him for his work contribution whilst he was a parish councillor.

### 21/148 Apologies

None

### 21/149 Declarations of Interest

Cllr's Tressler and Kettle declared an interest in the planning application 21/01768/LDP – Christmas Hill Farm. Both councillors will leave the room whilst this item is discussed.

### 21/150 Dispensations

None.

### 21/151 Minutes

Ordinary Parish Council meeting held on 11 October 2021

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the ordinary parish council meeting held on 11 October 2021 as a true and complete record of that meeting. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

### 21/152 Public Forum

- i. Nemo Raceway: A local resident advised:
  - The current owners obtained the site in December 2019 and have been developing it ever since,
  - It is a commercial business,

- A number of large events have been held with in excess of 400/500 people attending,
- They have had an enforcement notice placed against them for camping on the site but have found ways around it i.e., camping in the adjoining field and the field at the back to support their national and international events,
- They are effectively racing nitro remote controlled cars around a track,
- They have invested a significantly large amount of money in the site,
- The intensification in engineering and construction works is way beyond the original planning permission that was granted in 2009 for what was meant to be a hobby club,
- The application was approved by SDC even though Bishop's Itchington parish council opposed/objected to it,
- Recently, Nemo submitted a planning application for camping on the site – reading the document that accompanies it there is a 'veiled threat' that they will use the land adjoining/behind the site for a general campsite if planning approval is not forthcoming for the site itself,
- The site itself, in terms of its environment, the resident understands that they are going to submit a further planning application to cover the site in terms of its construction and the amount of engineering works that are being undertaken and modifications,
- The drawing that goes with the camping does show changes to the site layout in order to facilitate camping and parking on site,
- The resident lives at Lower Spring Farm, which is 750m away from the site,
- The site is accessed via Knightcote Bottom Lane which is a small narrow lane that often falls into disrepair and floods on a regular basis
- The resident advised that he would be objecting to the application but that he does not put a lot of trust in SDC as they do not seem to have much interest in it – in the past he has written to the leader and chief executive officer without receiving a response. The resident has taken legal advice regarding the site and had a professional planning lawyer write to them, to which he received a very dismissive response. The resident feels that a strong representation is required from Bishop's Itchington and surrounding parish councils
- There is no benefit to the local community from this development in any shape or form and the resident is not aware of any local people using it – it is all from afar with the owners living near London. What is the purpose/point of having it here?

ii. Alan Coles (Mill Pit Farm, Waterside Barn) regarding planning application 21/02290/FUL. Mr Coles advised that he had submitted a change of use application to change the use from a holiday let to a family let. The idea of this is

not to separate the property and he has no interest in splitting it, selling it or anything, it is more to do with the family – his daughter, her husband and their young child live in it at the moment. His daughter is not particularly 'well off'. The reason they are living in there is that his son-in-law got pancreatitis and was immobilised for six months. They had to leave the house they rented in Radford Semele as they could not afford the rent, so they moved in with them. They had tried to do the holiday let on the apartment and someone stayed for one night and there have been no other enquiries. As they are trying to give their daughter a home, it is not now being advertised. They have had a viability study done on it now and have realised it was never going to pay for itself as a business to support them. One of the downsides is that they are not a 'chocolate box' village so there are not many people who want to come here being also a long way from Stratford. They are a close-knit family who want to stay together and this way they have their granddaughter close by. He understands that the original planning application was not to build a family residence but to build an apartment as a holiday let but the viability study submitted states that it is not viable, it will only just about 'wash its face' if not make a small loss. If the parish council decides to object and the family must move out, there is no intention of renting it out as a holiday let. He is struggling with ill health/disabilities and with this being a first-floor apartment, he is in no fit condition to complete the work to the apartment.

## **21/153 Planning Matters**

### **i. 21/02290/FUL**

Mill Pit Farm, Waterside Barn, Hambridge Road, Bishop's Itchington – Removal of Condition 3 (Holiday Let Restriction) of permission 16/00991/FUL.

Cllr Christian-Carter advised that having read the financial viability report, she had no problem with the removal of Condition 3 as and the upstairs being used as an annexe ancillary to the main dwelling. Cllr Thomas asked if there had been any comments made by the neighbours – none have been received. Cllr Tresler stated, that given the details from Mr Coles, it will be used for domestic use by the family only but that this should be stipulated.

Cllr Dugmore advised that he was conflicted over this: having seen the roll out of this since the original application in 2014, the condition that it be for holiday and not residential use was as a result of the council's preception that this was a holiday let to get around planning policy that which would otherwise have made it unacceptable. What we are now seeing is what the council of the day anticipated which was a new dwelling circumventing those policies in this manner. Hence he is conflicted based solely on strict planning terms. There is an answer but he is struggling now with how we rationalise and settle 'it will not be hived off as a separate dwelling' when we know already that the original commitment has now come back seven years later to be overturned. How can we then know this will remain so and it will not become a separate dwelling. It was mentioned that there is a social element to also consider. Since the original application there has been

a relaxation of the concept of what an annexe is – at one time it had to be physically attached to the house.

It was **RESOLVED** to remove the parish councils previous objection, support the removal of condition 3 (holiday let restriction) but request an additional condition that the building is conditioned as an annexe ancillary to the main dwelling thereby restricting it's use to family and friends (proposed by Cllr Christian-Carter, seconded Cllr Thomas, six in favour, one abstention by Cllr Kettle)

ii. **21/03162/VARY**

Nemo Raceway, Knightcote Bottom, Knightcote – Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 09/00675/FUL dated 17 June 2009 to allow a camping use associated with existing Radio-Controlled Model Car facility. Original description of development: Permanent use of land forming part of field as radio-controlled model car racing hobby club. (Upgrade of temporary to permanent permission).

Cllr Christian-Carter provided her views as follows:

**The Planning Statement is weak, inconsistent, contradictory and incomplete:** Parts of it have been redacted, so we have no way of knowing if these parts add any weight/information to the proposed development.

Events per year – a maximum of 12 per year, intended average is 6 per year. Also, there is no condition limiting the number of events (perhaps there should be?). There is no mention of the maximum number of parking spaces required for camping. Any number over 40 is medium scale and any number over 80 is large scale.

She takes issue with the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties being dismissed so lightly, as evidence exists already that the impact on the residents of Lower Spring Farm is already considerable. In the Planning Statement it says that: "The caravans/tents are provided by those intending to camp so are outside the control of the applicant." This in itself is extremely concerning and also note the use of the word 'caravans'. In our opinion, the applicant has to ensure that the site is managed effectively at all times.

It is claimed that the proposed siting ("close to the existing mature boundary hedge") will lessen the visual impact – from where exactly? The photos she took on 31 May this year show a major visual impact being created as you drive east to west along Knightcote Bottoms. She does not know whether these would be seen from Lower Spring Farm residences but the conclusion that "There is no impact from the ancillary camping activity on the nearest residential properties" is highly questionable.

The 'Permitted Development Fallback', whilst correct, would need to be 'policed' as anything over 28-days use (and there is no guarantee of this) would require planning permission. In any case, the fact that there is already a Condition in the 2009 permission for no camping means that this condition has to be varied, i.e., removed. The part that states, "This could be used to not only provide camping for these events but additional camping for commercial gain without any mechanism to control hours of use, number of vehicles/pitches and so on", she found to be particularly concerning as well as somewhat threatening!

**SDC's Planning Policies:** Cllr Christian-Carter felt that the key policies are not only CS.24 (Tourism and Leisure Development) but also AS.10 (Countryside and Villages), along with SPD Part K (Holiday Lets and Caravan Parks). She was of the view that the requirements of CS.24 have not been met, along with Part u of AS.10 not being met with what is being proposed. Likewise, SPD Part K covers the safe movement for cars and caravans to and from the site, plus the need for effective screening and not being visually intrusive. Again, there is no evidence of these requirements being met.

**Site Plan is not to scale, does not show any details of where the proposed camping tents are to be placed:** An "indicative" layout drawing is provided, which is simply not good enough.

**Missing:** No traffic management plan, especially with the introduction of caravans, or any mention of the number of maximum traffic movements on each race-day/weekend.

Cllr Christian-Carter hoped that the Highways Authority would object given the access limitations to this site, and the implied introduction of caravans.

**Other matters raised by Councillors included:**

- Flooding – photos on Nemo's website showing this, where even cars cannot get onto the site.
- Water goes into the River Itchen, part of which is in a SSSI. Any disturbance of the topsoil would be a major problem.
- Campers need to purchase a camping ticket – implies a commercial activity.
- Photographic evidence that the site is already overburdened with vehicles to the extent that on race days, cars are parked on the verges each side of the existing entrance suggesting capacity for vehicles is inadequate, particularly if there are then loads of vehicles for caravans, trailers and motorhomes. At a weekend, cars are having to park on the road because the site does not have sufficient capacity, so if the car park is converted into a caravan site, it will reduce the capacity further which means there will be an increase of the number of cars parked on the sides of the road, as no overflow car parking availability has been provided, therefore creating a highways issue. Cars parking on the road also restricts visibility for entrance/egress to the site. The police visited the site in October 2021 and there were over 300 people on the site, and so if caravans/motorhomes are admitted on to the site, where are these 300 people going to park. There is no mention anywhere as to what the maximum numbers allowed are to be. Mention is only made about the number of meetings, with no mention of the volume of people/cars/camping units/caravans/motorhomes.
- The agent is trying to make clear that there is no commercial camping going on stating that there is no charge made for camping, but this is followed three paragraphs later by saying that 'campers are required to purchase a camping ticket' – this indicates that there is an exchange of monies therefore there is

a commercial exchange taking place. Secondly, this, therefore means they know the numbers, in which case why have they not shared them? If they did, it could support their application but, as they have not disclosed the numbers, it infers that the numbers are too high for small scale camping. They also say they will only be there for two days but, on bank holidays, i.e., Easter, they started camping on the Thursday before and left late on the Monday afterwards. They have also conveniently left Easter off the list of events held in 2020/21 but an event was held.

- They are now accessing adjoining fields where they park or camp (right of the site or back of site) – there is a question as to whether the landowner has given permission for the field to be used for this purpose. The fields in question have now been ploughed this year, and as soon as the crops had been harvested the fields were used for camping/caravanning. Does permitted development for camping include caravans and motorhomes?
- Large parts of Page 4 of the Planning Statement have been redacted. As this covers the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, we have no way of knowing what it says and whether what is there is valid or not.
- Noise nuisance levels and how far it transmits from those camping.
- If a small campsite is up to 40 units and no facilities have to be provided, not everyone will have their own toilet facilities, so what will happen to all the human waste? There is an existing small toilet block on site that is for general use and is not restricted to just campers (they had planning permission for one port-a-loo, as photographed in 2009). Concerns were raised that it would be very convenient for people to dispose of human waste into the watercourse.
- Health and safety issue associated with the number of people on that site contained within the small boundary, together with highly inflammable liquids, such as nitrous oxide would be compounded by the addition of camping/caravans/motorhomes.
- Stratford DC, over the years appear to have been very lax in enforcing the original temporary conditions. Where we are today is that the adjoining fields that they have been using to park on have been ploughed so they will not be harvested until next July at the earliest. As they will be holding events at Easter and the Spring Bank holiday, there will be a huge problem as traffic is not going to be able to get onto the site, therefore effectively making Knightcote Bottoms a 'no go zone'. The parish council can only object strongly to this saying that from 2009, when it was just a few people using it with remote controlled cars, it has developed into something totally different and is now a commercial entity. There are not only environmental health issues, there, are also environmental issues in general. It is not acceptable that you can have something given limited planning permission in 2009, let this to be run down, for someone to take it over and think they can develop the site as they like. It has a large impact on a lot of things in the immediate area.

It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council takes the points raised by Cllr Christian-Carter, adds the traffic issue, flooding, campers have to purchase a camping ticket and that there is a very large section of page 4 that has been redacted which is specifically relating to the impact on amenity of residents, which raises two issues: i). we need to know what that is as it is a material planning consideration; and ii). the agent states that “There are no design factors to consider as no permanent structures or fixtures are proposed” which is absolutely immaterial to the nuisance and harm the site causes already when it is occupied however temporary that use is. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Mann. Six in favour, one abstention by Cllr Kettle)

iii. **21/01768/LDP**

**Planning Inspectorate Reference Number:  
APP/J3720/X/21/3282578**

Christmas Hill Farm, Gaydon Road, Bishops Itchington – Occasional letting of two bedrooms in 6 bedroom house to overnight paying guests.

Cllrs Kettle and Tressler left the room for this item.

The history of this is that an application for a lawful development certificate for proposed use had been submitted and refused by SDC. Prior to the LDC/P application a full application for a commercial change of use had been submitted and this had also been refused.

- Reading through it we are aware of the situation at the property and have had information from the immediate semi-detached neighbour. Even though the planning agent’s opinion is that the character of occupation would not change, this is an opinion that WCC Highways does not agree with having already made clear its position on the traffic impact.
- It is also known that the units being offered are self-contained units with kitchenettes, which undermines the assertion being made that it is the incidental letting of rooms within the family home. This fact also supports further that it is a commercial let, not an incidental letting of a couple of rooms in a family home, and this ascertainment is relying on the assumption that the family would have the equivalent occupation for friends or family guests, which seems a bit of a stretch that they would have someone in there as they claim for 39 weeks of the year, in term time, Monday to Thursday only, as we know they are in excess of this claim already.
- The approach of the planning agent, whilst not a planning consideration, does appear indicative of the rest of it which is we are already making a load of noisy comings and goings, we would like to just carry on thank you very much.
- From our point of view with this one, it might be worth reiterating the existing issues that have already been raised from a Highways point of view, and from residential amenity that the neighbours have submitted.

- The planning statement which is suppose to be a full statement of case is so thin and full of subjective comments that the planning officer will no doubt make numerous comments.
- They do not want to go for full planning, as they know they would not get it because of the access issues, which there is nothing they can do about that, and also no mention is made of the semi-detached neighbour.
- No reference is made to the house being semi-detached and therefore a noise nuisance or disturbance for the neighbour, when the parish council knows for a fact that there is.
- They went for planning permission a couple of years ago and it was refused as county highways authority objected and the suggestion to alleviate the problem of the width of the access drive and where it merges onto the highway could not be achieved. They then decided to try another way via the backdoor which is to go for a development certificate for proposed use but it still does not address the highway issue that they do not have the width of driveway to accommoitate those numbers.
- As they intend to operate a section of the house as a stand alone commercial business, they have had to apply for a change of use and in the process of doing that the highway authority becomes a statutory authority that has basically responded to say no.
- There is the residential amenity issue of the adjoining neighbour across whose land they will be travelling – they do have an easement that allows them to drive over part of the adjoining neighbours land.
- We need to highlight the fact that the adjoining neighbour is not mentioned anywhere in the planning statement case. There is an impact on the adjoining resident: it is harmful to the social amenity of that property because of the increase in traffic across it; traffic driven by persons unknown because the adjoining neighbour effectively has no idea as to what is going on with the 'toing and frowing' of people who they have no idea of who they are, yet they have a temporarily legitimate reason to be immediately next to his property giving privacy concerns and, personal security concerns, however these have conveniently not been mentioned anywhere within the reports. As we know, residential amenity or loss there of is a significant and valuable planning consideration.

It was **RESOLVED** to submit further information encouraging the Planning Inspectorate to consider the detriment of residential amenity and that the residential character of the area is likely to be compromised. Also, to reinforce the fact that we know the highways authority has already made a clear and consitent decision, and they have not changed their objection (in the two preceeding applications) (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

Cllrs Kettle and Tressler rejoined the meeting.



## **21/154 County, District & Parish Liaison**

**SDC/WCC Cllr** Kettle advised that:

- Covid 19 has been extremely bad in Bishop's Itchington Ward, and we have had the worst rate in the whole of Warwickshire although this has now improved.
- Avian Flu has hit Stratford and currently we have lost 20 out of 80 swans to avian flu. There is a very low possibility of transmission to humans therefore if you see a dead bird, do not touch it but do report it to SDC.
- HS2: Fosse Way will be closed on 12 November.
- Knightcote Road – Lighting has been installed. Scott Tompkins (senior officer at WCC) has said he will come back and review it – meeting arranged for Wednesday night and will include Cllr Dugmore as the parish council representative. The new lights are shining directly into a resident's bedroom. The clerk had also received a complaint from Briar Cottage regarding the damage caused to the grass verge whilst the work was being undertaken – Cllr Kettle advised that this is a matter they would have to take up with Bovis,
- Dadglow Road: An issue has been raised by residents in Dadglow Road as Bovis have raised the height/level of the field by 1.5m causing issues with drainage but Bovis has said there is not a problem. It is likely that enforcement will become involved.

## **21/155 Finance**

### **1 Monthly Financial Report**

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the Monthly Finance Report ending 31 October 2021 (Appendix A). (Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr Gates, all in favour).

### **2 Bank Reconciliation Reports for October 2021**

The bank reconciliation report for October 2021 had been completed by the Clerk. Cllr Kettle and Cllr Gates have checked it and are happy with it.

### **3 Accounts for Payment**

It was **RESOLVED** that the Accounts Payable on 8 November 2021 be authorised for payment by Cllrs Gates and Cllr Dugmore (Appendix B). (Proposed Cllr Gates, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour).

## **21/156 Councillor Vacancies**

The final draft of the flyer was agreed by everyone – Clerk to confirm this with Russ and request 1,500 copies be printed.

Distribution – leaflets to be bundled up in 'Scene' rounds. They will be ready on Friday and need to be delivered over the weekend (the parish council needs to ensure Bishop's Hill and Furrowfields are included). It was agreed that Cllrs Tressler and Cllr Dugmore will divide them up in the office and councillors can collect them over the weekend. Details of the meeting will also be put on the Website and Facebook.

## **21/157 ROSPA Inspections**

A number of issues have been highlighted following the ROSPA inspections that need to be addressed. Whilst we are aware of something that has been identified as potentially dangerous and we do not address it, we have a liability issue, therefore, it was suggested that those items identified as such need to be taken out of service as soon as possible.

The items in question are:

- Multiplay – Slide Climber
- Cableway
- Swing – Single Point Tyre
- Climber (frame/net)

The problem is that the swing – single point tyre and cableway are well used items of equipment therefore to just take them away would cause issues with users/parents of the play area and, therefore, how do we manage the expectations of people in the village. If we were going to remove items, we are going to need to undertake some form of public relations exercise. Immediately we should remove the climber (frame/net) and see how much it would cost to repair or replace the other three items as, until we know costings, it is impossible to make an informed decision. Due to the shape of the playground, the only item of equipment that will fit the space where the cableway is located is another cableway should the current one be removed.

It was suggested that the climber (frame/net) be removed and then to get an estimate from Tom Cooper to repair the cableway, swing – single point tyre and Multiplay – slide climber. If we are unable to remove the equipment immediately, the only thing we can do is remove the exposure which is a function of risk, and if this means that we take the seats off so the equipment so it cannot be used then that is what we should be doing.

As we are discussing patching things up so they can be used, the next discussion should be as to whether it is worth spending any money on this. Two separate conversations are being undertaken, the first being risk and liability (there is evidence in the report that is flagged up in red and these items need to be checked off first so as to stop any liability) and then we can look at what we want next – those particular items that we may have immediately taken out of service to reduce our liability what do we do, repair or replace with similar or something else.

Concern was raised that although the report says some items are not compliant with the requirements of the relevant standards, when installed they did meet the relevant standards/regulations of the time.

It was suggested that we consider changing the age range policy for the play area, as currently it caters for a wide range of ages and a lot of areas have made their play areas solely for younger children as these far easier to maintain and manage. This has been achieved by the design of the equipment installed. It was agreed that this suggestion should be moved into a working group discussion.

If an item of equipment has been flagged that it is potentially going to cause an accident, then there is no choice but to take it out of use as we will be seen as negligent and liable if an accident occurred. A note should be attached to each item advising that it has been removed for safety reasons and as to whether it will be replaced so as to mitigate any aggravation that may come from elsewhere.

It was **RESOLVED** that those items that have been marked remove immediately, have the specific elements identified as requiring removal, and are safely removed to eliminate the possibility of someone being exposed to the hazard and therefore the risk that has been identified (Multiplay – slide climber report suggests there are at least three fairly fundamental elements to that piece of equipment that are no longer considered safe to use, and climber (frame/net) remove, swing – single point tyre decommission and put up laminated notices to say where they have gone, why and process to replace. Details should also be placed on social media and the parish council website). (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Gates, all in favour).

As an interim, tape to be put round the equipment and signs advising 'do not use' whilst the parish council can engage a contractor to remove the two items of equipment and decommission the swing – single point tyre and zip cableway.

It was further **RESOLVED** to find a contractor to remove the climber (frame/net) and Multiplay - slide climb. Decommission the swing – single point tyre (take away tyre) and cableway (remove seat) and remove the top bar on suspended log walk (agility trail). (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Gates, all in favour).

Hard courts: The slippery area can be cleaned but care would need to be taken if using a pressure jet washer so as not to have an adverse effect on the surface. It is a moss/algae issue, and this can be sprayed. Cllr Mann to advise the Clerk of possible contractors.

#### **21/158 Extension of Clerk's Delegated Powers**

It was **RESOLVED** that as the parish council is now meeting in person that the extension of the clerks delegated powers will be rescinded and therefore revert to the normal protocol. (Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, all in favour).

#### **21/159 Buffer Zone (between Parrish Close and Mandale Close)**

Cllr Mann has replaced the padlock and thereby gained entry to the space. It is a 'jungle', and you are unable to get in to see it. He explained that the parish council needs to find someone/group who want to use it and then pay to clear the space and take out the roots. He estimates that the work will cost between £1,000 and £1,250 and quotes will be required. Cllr Mann agreed to provide a 'spec' for the work required and it was suggested that quotes be obtained with the work to be carried out February/March 2022 so that a group can adopt it from 1 April 2022. It was suggested that a grant application form be filled in to for the funding available via the county/district councillor.

#### **21/160 Speeding Traffic – Station Road**

A request to extend the verge mowing further up station road was requested – this would be the responsibility of WCC, and, as they would not accommodate this, it was suggested that if residents required this, then they should undertake it themselves. There was at one point a vehicle activated sign downhill on Station Road and when

we enquired some years ago about the cost of replacing it, the cost was between £3,000 and £4,000. Even if the parish council could afford a sign, there is an issue of placement as the residents requesting the sign are just within the 30mph area, therefore a sign would need to be positioned further out of the village within the 40mph zone and therefore would be irrelevant. Unfortunately, it would be very difficult to install anything there that would be effective in reducing or tackling the speeds of traffic approaching the specific location and therefore the parish council is unable to help.

**21/161 Environment & Properties**

**1. Children’s Playground:** to be deferred until the December meeting

**2. BINDP:**

Following further editing, the BINDP has been submitted to Stratford District Council and Matthew Neal is dealing with it – we are now awaiting his response.

**21/162 Reports and Questions**

None

**21/163 Exclusion of Public and Press**

**1. Pavilion Project:**

- i. Update on current position: Cllr Mann has been working with Andrew Maliphant and Jayne Warman. HS2 have come back to us asking specific questions – these have been answered.
- ii. A meeting is to be held with the contractor to establish if any cost cuts can be achieved.
- iii. Public Works Loan – surveys will need to be run in the village including the use of Survey Monkey and questionnaires/leaflets. The wording of the survey is crucial – working group for survey formulation – Cllrs Christian-Carter and Mann, Jayne Warman and Andrew Maliphant.
- iv. The playground – In light of the ROSPA inspection report, the working group is looking at renewing the whole playground and proposes that the funding for this is included in the funding being sorted to undertake the pavilion project. It was **RESOLVED** to combine the pavilion project and the replacement playground in to one project. (Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Christian-Carter, 5 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention).

**21/164 Date of Next Meeting**

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council is scheduled to take place on Monday, 8 October 2021 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

**Meeting closed at 22:17**

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

## APPENDIX A

### Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/21 and 03/11/21 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	
<b>INCOME</b>					
<b>Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>					
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	£2,615.00	£615.00
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	£2.77	-£97.23
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
<b>Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>		<b>£94,050.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£109,814.87</b>	<b>£15,764.87</b>
<b>Total Income</b>		<b>£94,050.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£109,814.87</b>	<b>£15,764.87</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>					
<b>Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>					
200	Salaries & Expenses	£30,047.00	£0.00	£14,985.59	£15,061.41
210	Councillor Allowances	£500.00	£0.00	£0.00	£500.00
220	Administration	£7,320.00	£0.00	£5,690.75	£1,629.25
230	Grounds Maintenance	£21,914.00	£0.00	£13,548.34	£8,365.66
240	Cemetery & Churchyard	£5,340.00	£0.00	£1,087.31	£4,252.69
250	Playing Field	£10,692.00	£0.00	£632.36	£10,059.64
260	Grants	£7,500.00	£0.00	£6,894.80	£605.20
270	Neighbourhood Plan	£2,500.00	£0.00	£0.00	£2,500.00
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	£2,881.69	£2,408.31
320	Pavilion Project	£5,000.00	£0.00	£6,532.50	-£1,532.50
<b>Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council</b>		<b>£97,103.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£52,253.34</b>	<b>£44,849.66</b>
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>£97,103.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£52,253.34</b>	<b>£44,849.66</b>
Total Income		£94,050.00	£0.00	£109,814.87	£15,764.87
Total Expenditure		£97,103.00	£0.00	£52,253.34	£44,849.66
<b>Total Net Balance</b>		<b>-£3,053.00</b>		<b>£57,561.53</b>	

## APPENDIX B

<b>Bishop's Itchington Parish Council</b>					
<b>Accounts Payable 8 November 2021</b>					
<b>To Whom Payable</b>	<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Ex Vat</b>	<b>Vat Payable</b>	<b>Totals</b>	
<i>Urgent accounts paid since last meeting requiring the formal approval of the council</i>					
E Biddle (office rent 01/11/21)	s/order	£ 411.67	£ -	£	411.67
Onecom (phone & b/band 29/10/21)	d/debit	£ 60.99	£ 12.20	£	73.19
Three Business (Mobile Sim 25/10/21)	d/debit	£ 4.17	£ 0.83	£	5.00
E-ON (Pavilion Electricity 26/10/21)	d/debit	£ 79.90	£ 4.00	£	83.90
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 556.73</b>	<b>£ 17.03</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>573.76</b>
<i>Accounts for payment on 11 October 2021</i>					
J Kirton (Salary)	211101	£ 47.50	£ -	£	47.50
V Powell (Salary)	211102	£ 76.16	£ -	£	76.16
K Stevens (Salary)	211103	£ 1,317.76	£ -	£	1,317.76
HRMC (PAYE)	211104	£ 337.12	£ -	£	337.12
WWC Pension Fund (September)	211105	£ 429.86	£ -	£	429.86
Clintplan Ltd (The Yellow Land - Nature Spotters Handbook)	211106	£ 100.00	£ -	£	100.00
Kirkwells Ltd (BINDP)	211107	£ 2,450.00	£ 490.00	£	2,940.00
Playsafety Ltd (Annual Inspections for Playground, Field & H)	211108	£ 212.50	£ 42.50	£	255.00
RBL Poppy Appeal ( Wreaths)	211109	£ 34.50	£ -	£	34.50
SLCC Enterprises Ltd (Consultancy Charges A. Maliphant)	211110	£ 1,809.00	£ 361.80	£	2,170.80
PWC (Bus Shelter)	211111	£ 45.00		£	45.00
K Stevens (Expenses - Padlocks & Cord Pull)	211112	£ 9.88		£	9.88
Thomas Fox LTD (Mowing/strimming)	211113	£ 1,659.31	£ 331.87	£	1,991.18
N Thomas (Expenses - Wood & Woodstain)	211114	£ 48.66	£ -	£	48.66
MK Waterman (Expenses - Villages Planters)	211115	£ 102.00	£ -	£	102.00
Water Plus (Pavilion Water)	211116	£ 19.62		£	19.62
Viking Direct (Stationery)	211117	£ 108.77	£ 21.35	£	128.12
	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>£ 8,807.64</b>	<b>£ 1,247.52</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>10,053.16</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£ 9,364.37</b>	<b>£ 1,264.55</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>10,626.92</b>