

**Minutes of Langham Parish Council Meeting
Held on Tuesday 27th February 2018
At Langham Village Hall**

| | | |
|------------|---|----------|
| Attendance | Cllr. B Palmer – Chairman Cllr. Duncan Cllr. Hosmer Cllr. Manning Cllr. G Palmer Cllr. Wright C.Cllr. Hemsley Helen Duckering – clerk 5 members of the public | |
| Apologies | Cllr. Higgins Cllr. Ovington | |
| Item 1 | Prior to the meeting, representatives of the Village Hall Trustees spoke to explain future plans to ensure the hall remains in good order for the future. The most pressing issue is the drains and quotations are being sought. Funding is being sought from various sources and the trustees intend to present a fully costed proposal to the Parish Council. | Actions |
| | The meeting opened at 7.45pm | |
| 2 | Declarations of Interest and Dispensations None | |
| 3 | Minutes of last meeting held on 30th January 2018 These were agreed and signed by the Chairman. Proposed Cllr. Manning Seconded Cllr. Duncan . | |
| 4 | Matters Arising Actions from the previous meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.Cllr Hemsley advised that the streetlight in Ranksborough Drive is not maintained by RCC. It was agreed that the Parish Council would write to the residents of Ranksborough Drive advising that responsibility for the maintenance of the light, on a private road with an unknown power supply source, rests with them. • Quotations for the Mickley Lane gate are awaited and one further will be requested. • All other actions completed. | HD HD |
| 5 | Clerks Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small wall on Church Street. This has been reported to RCC again as it is impeding the highway. RCC to visit site. • GDPR – Legislation is due to change on 25th May and the position as regards the Data Protection Officer role for Parish Councils is still unclear. Some guidance has been received and the clerk will consider and report back | HD |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 6 | <p>Correspondence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter from Historic England regarding the protection status of the Langham and Barleythorpe War Memorial. Langham Village History Group have corresponded directly with HE and the clerk will respond in support of this. • Letter from RCC requesting suggestions of an improvements to bus stops. The same request was made and completed in the last year and therefore no further improvements required at the present time. | HD |
| 7 | <p>Installation of kerbstones along Burley Road</p> <p>It was proposed that Rutland County Council install kerbstones on verges outside 40 and 42 Burley Road.</p> <p>Proposed Cllr. Manning Seconded Cllr. G Palmer</p> <p>4 in favour 1 against</p> | |
| 8 | <p>Quotation for grass cutting and ground maintenance contract for 2018/19</p> <p>It was proposed that Mow and Sow's quotation for the 2018/19 season be approved.</p> <p>Proposed Cllr. Duncan Seconded Cllr. Manning All in favour</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Limiting number of dogs walked by one person in Langham at any one time</p> <p>Cllr. G Palmer outlined concerns regarding the number of professional dog walking companies using Langham to exercise dogs – in large numbers and sometimes uncontrolled. It was agreed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The clerk would investigate the options available to regulate/restrict the number of dogs allowed to be walked • The Chairman would place a notice in the Langham News asking that dog walking companies behave responsibly and Chairman will write to the companies asking for the same. • The clerk contact Rutland Safety Partnership to investigate any control actions. | <p>HD</p> <p>BP</p> <p>HD</p> |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <p>10</p> | <p>Proposal for Parish Council to write to Rutland County Council to oppose the D85 bridleway</p> <p>It was proposed that Langham Parish Council write to Rutland County Council objecting to the creation of this bridleway and asking that should the bridleway be allowed, a full risk assessment be conducted for the impact on residents of Ranksborough Park.</p> <p>Proposed Cllr. Duncan Seconded Cllr. Hosmer All in favour</p> | <p>BP</p> |
| <p>11</p> | <p>To receive Munday's Close Working Group progress report</p> <p>The report was received and noted. Some works were completed on 17th February and further scheduled. Cllr. Wright re-advised that any works to trees in a Conservation Area are subject to planning permission.</p> | <p>HD</p> |
| <p>12</p> | <p>Finance</p> <p>Current Position The clerk circulated the current financial summary. Appendix 1 & 2 attached, and these were approved.</p> <p>Proposed Cllr. Duncan Seconded Cllr. Hosmer All in favour</p> <p>Accounts for Payment None</p> <p>Burial Ground</p> <p>Cllr. Hosmer requested that the clerk research the process to have land consecrated, as an option to extend the current space available in the burial ground.</p> | <p>HD</p> |
| <p>13</p> | <p>Planning Planning updates were circulated. Appendix 3 attached.</p> | |
| <p>14</p> | <p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.Cllr Hemsley circulated details of CIL money collected for Langham. <p>The meeting closed to the public at 8.30pm</p> | |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 15 | <p>Co-option of a new Parish Councillor</p> <p>Following a discussion of applications received, it was proposed that Jane Sweeney be co-opted as a Parish Councillor to Langham Parish Council</p> <p>Proposed Cllr B Palmer Seconded Cllr. Duncan</p> <p>4 in favour</p> | |
| 11 | <p>Date and time of the next meeting 27th March 7.30pm</p> | |
| 12 | <p>Meeting closed at 8.45 pm</p> | |

| Summary of Action Points | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------|----------|
| Number | Description of Action | Responsible | Due Date |
| 1 | Clerk to write to residents of Ranksborough Drive regarding streetlight | HD | ASAP |
| 2 | Clerk to request additional quotation for Munday's Close gate | HD | ASAP |
| 3 | GDPR legislation to be reviewed | HD | ASAP |
| 4 | Clerk to send response to Historic England in support of History Group correspondence | HD | ASAP |
| 5 | Clerk to investigate methods of restricting dog walking numbers and contact Rutland Safety Partnership | HD | ASAP |
| 6 | Chairman to place entry in Langham News regarding dog walkers and to write to Dog Walking companies | BP | ASAP |
| 7 | Chairman to write letter to RCC in opposition of D85 bridleway | BP | ASAP |
| 8 | Clerk to advise MCWG of requirement for planning permission for treeworks | HD | ASAP |
| 9 | Clerk to investigate process to consecrate additional ground in burial ground | HD | ASAP |

Balance as per Bank Statement 15th February 2018

£35,184.75

| | Cheque Number | Un-presented | Presented |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Expenditure | | | |
| 16-Jan Langham Village Hall | IB35 | | 163.00 |
| 25-Jan BIFFA | IB36 | | 234.00 |
| 06-Feb CPRE | 100167 | | 36.00 |
| 15-Feb H Duckering | IB37 | | 612.60 |
| 15-Feb HMRC | IB38 | | 12.00 |
| | | | <u>1057.60</u> |

Receipts

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| 19-Jan-18 Co-op funerals | | | 50.00 |
| | | | <u>50.00</u> |

Balance as per account

£35,184.75

Plus un-presented credits

Less un-presented cheques

Balance as per calc.

£35,184.75

Appendix 1

Langham Parish Council
 Finances April 2017- March 2018
 The financial year is divided into six two-month periods.

| CURRENT PERIOD: | | 5 | |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| INCOME | 2017-18 | Year to date: | |
| | | | |
| Precept: | 22,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 22,000.00 |
| Grass Cutting: | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 1,358.00 |
| Street Lights: | 2,400.00 | 2,400.00 | 1,853.38 |
| Burial Ground: | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 | 3,390.00 |
| Sundries: | 600.00 | 500.00 | 215.66 |
| Interest: | | | |
| VAT: | | | 2,082.57 |
| TOTAL: | 28,000.00 | 26,000.00 | 30,899.61 |
| EXPENSES: | | | |
| Clerk's Salary: | 6,000.00 | 5,000.00 | 5,783.09 |
| Clerk's Expenses: | 500.00 | 416.67 | 542.83 |
| Street Lights - electricity: | 1,600.00 | 1,333.33 | 482.13 |
| Street Lights - capital: | 2,000.00 | 1,666.67 | |
| Grounds & Open Space: | 6,500.00 | 5,416.67 | 4,775.00 |
| Insurance: | 1,050.00 | 875.00 | 1,086.14 |
| CIIR expenses: | 300.00 | 250.00 | 70.00 |
| Grants: | 1,750.00 | 1,458.33 | 517.00 |
| Audit: | 300.00 | 250.00 | 200.00 |
| Subscriptions: | 500.00 | 416.67 | 403.36 |
| Hall rental: | 200.00 | 166.67 | 163.00 |
| Chairman's Fund: | 100.00 | 83.33 | 100.00 |
| Contingency: | 500.00 | 416.67 | |
| Waste Collection: | 900.00 | 750.00 | 780.00 |
| Village Hall: | 1,500.00 | 1,250.00 | |
| Neighbourhood Plan Expenses | 300.00 | 250.00 | |
| Burial ground: | 1,100.00 | 916.67 | 1,084.73 |
| VAT: | | | 292.43 |
| Play area | | | 18.85 |
| TOTAL: | 25,100.00 | 20,916.67 | 16,298.56 |
| OVERALL SURPLUS/DEFICIT: | 2,900.00 | 5,083.33 | 14,601.05 |
| Current a/c: at 1 Apr 2017: | 20,583.70 | | |
| Adjustments: | | | |
| 2017/18 opening balance: | 20,583.70 | 20,583.70 | |
| Income to date: | 30,899.61 | | |
| Expenditure to date: | 16,298.56 | | |
| Surplus/deficit to date: | | 14,601.05 | |
| Bank balance at period end: | | 35,184.75 | |

Alterations to existing stables and indoor school, replace existing groom's accommodation and new mobile home for groom/manager.

This application concerns a working equestrian business in open countryside.

The original footprint of the building will not be extended. The proposed viewing gallery, reception and toilets are consistent with a modern riding school's customer needs. The parking facilities, including those for cars, bicycles, minibus and disabled space, remain unchanged. The proposed alterations to existing stables and indoor school are appropriate and acceptable. However, it would appear that a 'change of use' to Equine School might be required.

The existing mobile home is to be replaced. It is not possible to find out how long the present mobile home has been in situ or if there are any time constraints or conditions of use. If the mobile home has been granted a permanent stay, there are no objections to a similar sized replacement. However, if there are conditions of use, this item may need to be reviewed. On viewing the site, it appears that there are already two static homes on the property. The plans suggest that the caravan on site is a small, towable one – in fact it is a static one. The application should be resubmitted with accurate data and plans that are not misleading.

The application form for the proposal states that Keyworker Housing will consist of one 1 bedroom and two 2 bedroom units to house 3 staff compared to the existing 1 member of staff. Existing employees are 2 full time and 1 part time staff. Proposed staff would be 3 full time and 2 part time staff. It is proposed that an additional mobile home is erected on the site but it is not clear if this is to accommodate 1 or more workers. A small yellow 'post it' note has been attached to the form stating "Check units for staff??" which may indicate some confusion regarding this matter. It is not clear whether either of the units is to be used for overnight duty accommodation. No reasons for requiring additional staff have been given. The plans pictorially suggest static caravans, however, there is no clear description of the type of homes planned. The box marked 'key worker housing – proposed' has been ticked and then 'unknown'. The application could be interpreted as any type of home that does not fit the other 6 descriptors provided. There is no guide to the size of the units. The application should be represented with clear description of the type and size of residential units and materials to be used. The application also states housing 2 members of staff and of having 3 units, the drawn plan shows only 2 units – which is it? Again, the plan should be represented with details of how many units are proposed.

This land falls within Langham Neighbourhood Plan's 'Planned Limits of Development' *Policy HR2a: Important Green Spaces – Preservation of Green Separation Zone: In line with RCC's Review of Important Green Spaces 2012 (point 3.4) and the Landscape Character Assessment, this Plan will enforce a Green Separation Zone (GSZ) between the Southern Planned Limit of Development and the Southern Parish Boundary to preserve the rural setting of the Parish (See Figure 4.4).*

Some safeguarding of this area against future development is needed. Whilst this is an Equestrian unit, it is looking to become equestrian and residential – the latter category is not in line with LNP 2016.

Alterations to stable and indoor school – Recommend Approval subject to 'change of use' application to 'Equestrian School'.

Replacement of mobile home – Recommend Approval as long as existing and any new conditions permit continued use.

Additional mobile home - Recommend Refusal and suggest that application is represented with more accurate data and detailed description of what is required and exact use.

2018/0124/FUL 17 Fairfield Close Two storey side extension to dwelling

17 Fairfield Close is a detached 3-bedroom house built in the 1960s. Some identical houses in both Fairfield Close and Well Street have been extended in a similar way to the above application. This is classed as a minor extension and verified as such by Rutland County Council.

The proposal is to extend the side, front and above the existing store, study and kitchen areas. The garage area is still depicted as a storage facility but this may be because it is too small for a modern car. This would not be a problem as there is adequate parking provision in front of the property.

The Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the proposed development, with floor levels the same as existing, will not exacerbate any flooding problems within the locality.

There will be acceptable separation between the above property and the adjacent dwelling and the extension will have a similar appearance to the original house. The roof tiles and walls are to match existing but materials for windows and doors are not stated. Consideration should be given to using wood for all joinery. (LNP Policy D3e) Wood is a sustainable material with excellent thermal qualities.

Recommend Approval

2018/0151/CAT 5 Sharrads Way Fell 1 No. Willow tree.

It was not possible to identify this tree from the road. In the opinion of a tree surgeon it is diseased and poses a hazard. The tree has no amenity value and the proposed felling is acceptable.

Recommend Approval