

**Draft Minutes of the Ipsden Parish Council meeting held at Ipsden Memorial Hall
on Monday 31 July 2017 at 6.30pm**

1	<p>Present: Members: Mr Nick Miller - NM (Chair), Mr John Jeffery - JJ, Mrs Wendy Clark – WC, Mrs Heather Llewlyn - HL Clerk: Mrs Amanda McCrea – AM SODC: Cllr David Nimmo-Smith - DNS Public: Mr Martin Small</p>	Action
2	Apologies: Cllr Mark Gray (OCC)	
3	Minutes of Previous Meeting The minutes of the previous meeting of 11 May 2017 were agreed and signed by the Chair.	
4	SODC report: Cllr Nimmo-Smith reported that the Local Plan which is due to become active in January 2018 is currently one of SODC's principal concerns. It was pointed out that Ipsden is protected from aggressive building by developers because it is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. IPC councillors expressed the view that a few more houses would, in actual fact, be beneficial to the village. DNS said this would be sympathetically heard by SODC.	
5	Matters Arising	
5.1	A4074: Meetings have been held between IPC councillors, OCC and Thames Valley Police in June and July (see attached notes). Council members discussed the issues again and agreed to apply to OCC for a reduction in the speed limit to 50mph based on speed survey results gathered last Sept.	AM
5.2	<p>Playground: NM has managed to fix one of the goalposts that was recently damaged and it was agreed to wait and see how long this one survives before spending any more money on new ones.</p> <p>NM reported, after investigation, that the cost of replacing the existing climbing frame would be more expensive than previously thought. It was agreed that the A4074 should take financial priority for now as the play equipment is still in satisfactory condition.</p> <p>NM to ask Mr Jackson to top-cut the recreation area. JJ to look into recruiting someone to carry out the playground checklist on a monthly basis. Council agreed to use Wicksteed Leisure again for this year's playground inspection.</p>	NM JJ AM
5.3	Passing place maintenance: Once OCC have completed their intended passing place repairs, Mr Jackson will carry out work to the remaining areas of concern.	
5.4	Oxfordshire Together: Clerk reported that she is still awaiting the grant for verge cutting and will chase again. Council members asked that verges are not scalped and that shrubs and saplings are left where possible.	AM
5.5	Annual Summary: A first draft of the Annual Summary for publication in The Window was discussed and approved subject to some minor editing.	AM
5.6	<p>Telephone Box: Mr Small expressed concern over the proposed purchase (£1) of the telephone box which is on his land. He is happy for the village to adopt the kiosk but felt he should bring up the question of maintenance, liability and insurance. Council assured that these matters will be addressed and expressed the view that this is a heritage icon which it would be a shame to lose.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would not be used as a mini-library since books are already available in support of the Air Ambulance at the village shop, but that it would be used to house tourist information and a sign indicating the whereabouts of the defibrillator (at the village hall). The information will be displayed in the windows and the kiosk locked to avoid misuse and the necessity for cleaning. WC and HL agreed to set up and maintain provision of the information to be displayed.</p> <p>The contract remains to be signed. Clerk to obtain signatures and submit with payment to BT.</p> <p>On a related issue, Mr Small mentioned that the defibrillator will need a new battery sometime in the autumn. The cost is approximately £250 incl. VAT which council agreed to fund.</p>	WC/HL AM
5.7	The Mere: Replacement of the fence was discussed but sadly deemed to be unaffordable.	

5.8	Website: Clerk informed Council that funding (£1700) has now been obtained for a new website, in order to comply with the transparency code, since the current one is in need of updating. Council agreed to go ahead with briefing a website designer and thanked JJ for all his work in setting up and maintaining the current website. JJ will supervise building of the new website and will work with and gradually hand over maintenance to the clerk.	JJ/AM								
5.9	Correspondence: The District Councillor's community grant was discussed. There is £1000 available for a variety of projects subject to approval by SODC. Parish councils are required to match-fund or at least make a contribution. The deadline is mid September for the first application and there may be more available at the end of the year. Clerk to investigate possibilities and liaise with council members.	AM								
6	Finance:									
6.1	Payments for approval: Council approved the following invoices:									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>£</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Litter picking - June</td> <td>40.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Litter picking - July plus ditch maintenance and cleaning of bus stop</td> <td>140.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annual Insurance cover</td> <td>335.18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	£	Litter picking - June	40.00	Litter picking - July plus ditch maintenance and cleaning of bus stop	140.00	Annual Insurance cover	335.18	
Item	£									
Litter picking - June	40.00									
Litter picking - July plus ditch maintenance and cleaning of bus stop	140.00									
Annual Insurance cover	335.18									
	The current account balance is £4396.36 as at 31 July 2017 which includes a VAT rebate of £247.03 and the aforementioned grant of £1700 for a new website. The deposit account balance is £5574.26.									
6.2	Council approved Clerk's salary for the period 12 May to 25 July 2017 (10 weeks) - £450 and office service charge for May/June 2017 - £40.									
6.3	Internet banking: NM reported that Barclays do not provide a facility for a third party, ie. the clerk, to view statements online so it was agreed to carry on with paper statements.									
6.4	Audit: Clerk reported that the annual return has been submitted to BDO, the external auditor, and the notification of the public right to view the accounts has been displayed in the village shop and on the website as required.									
7	Planning: Clerk reported that the following planning applications have been approved by SODC: P17/S1870/FUL: Keepers Cottage, replace lean-to with new building to extend farm shop P17/S2181/LB: The Old Farmhouse, removal of internal wall									
8	Any Other Business: Further to an Independent Remuneration Panel report by South East Employers, payment of parish councillors was discussed and considered inappropriate.									
9	Date of next meeting: The next meeting of the Ipsden Parish Council will be held on Tuesday 10 October 2017 at 6.30pm in the Ipsden Memorial Hall.									
	The meeting closed at 20.22.									

Approved by:

Date:

(Chairman)

Present: Keith Stenning, Tony Kirkwood, Mark Francis, Cllr Mark Gray – OCC
 Nick Miller, John Jeffery, Amanda McCrea – IPC
 Alexander Woollard (The White House), Mark Jones (Braziers Park)

<u>Double White Lines</u>	<u>Action</u>														
<p>TK started by confirming that the painting of double white lines on the Ipsden stretch of the A4074 as proposed by IPC would not be acceptable to Thames Valley Police who had previously given the following response to MF:</p> <p><i>'As we know Double white lines are used to prohibit overtaking where visibility is restricted and there is written criteria setting this out. It is important the road marking is not used where this requirement is not met. It is clear with the road being straight through the crossroads that forward visibility is good which would suggest DWL lines are inappropriate and that other warning signs may be a better option'.</i></p> <p>IPC are still at liberty to liaise with TVP direct to give their arguments for the painting of double white lines. KS/TK agreed to forward the contact number for Chris Hulme at TVP so that AM can arrange a meeting.</p> <p>The painting of double white lines would necessitate the installation of 'cats' eyes' and is, in effect, more expensive than originally thought at possibly £10-15,000 depending on the length of the stretch of road.</p>	<p>KS/TK/AM</p>														
<p><u>Speed Reduction</u></p> <p>TK explained that a speed limit reduction would be subject to consultation and warned that, once again, the police would object because enforcement is difficult. However, if supporting measures such as carriageway roundels and speed limit repeaters, white gates, and/or a solar speed limit reminder sign are considered in conjunction with the speed limit reduction, TVP would be more likely to agree.</p> <p>It was agreed to carry out another speed survey since the last one was placed on a bend where drivers were slowing down anyway. The next one will be fixed to the North Stoke sign by the Church Lane crossroads.</p> <p>Once the speed survey is completed, IPC can then apply for a reduction to either 40mph or 50mph. The cost of the application would be £2600. A second application (in the case of a request for 40mph failing) would cost £1000 approx.</p> <p>NB. A 40mph speed limit stretch would not be as long as a 50mph speed limit stretch and would not reach as far as The Street.</p> <p>Speed reduction costs are roughly as follows:</p> <table data-bbox="81 1590 1310 1848"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>£</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Speed survey x 2</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cabinet consultation</td> <td>2600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd cabinet consultation</td> <td>1000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Speed limit signing and traffic mgmt repeaters/roundels</td> <td>5000 -10,000 depending on length of stretch and no. of</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solar sign reminder</td> <td>7000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White gates</td> <td>MF to quote</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>MG suggested talking to North Stoke/Crowmarsh PC re sharing the cost of the work.</p>		£	Speed survey x 2	200	Cabinet consultation	2600	2 nd cabinet consultation	1000	Speed limit signing and traffic mgmt repeaters/roundels	5000 -10,000 depending on length of stretch and no. of	Solar sign reminder	7000	White gates	MF to quote	<p>KS/TK/MF</p> <p>MF</p> <p>IPC</p>
	£														
Speed survey x 2	200														
Cabinet consultation	2600														
2 nd cabinet consultation	1000														
Speed limit signing and traffic mgmt repeaters/roundels	5000 -10,000 depending on length of stretch and no. of														
Solar sign reminder	7000														
White gates	MF to quote														

Present: Chris Hulme – Traffic Management Office, Thames Valley Police
 Tony Kirkwood, Traffic and Road Safety Team, OCC
 Cllr Mark Gray – OCC
 Heather Llewellyn, John Jeffery, Amanda McCrea – IPC
 Alexander Woollard – The White House, Ipsden

<u>Double White Lines</u>	<u>Action</u>
<p>The parish council's wish to paint double white lines on the Ipsden stretch of the A4074 was explained to Chris Hulme of Thames Valley Police as per the residents' petition and citing examples of near-misses that have occurred as well as the known fatal accidents on this stretch of road.</p> <p>CH reminded council members that he had previously given the following response to Traffic Management:</p> <p><i>'As we know Double white lines are used to prohibit overtaking where visibility is restricted and there is written criteria setting this out. It is important the road marking is not used where this requirement is not met. It is clear with the road being straight through the crossroads that forward visibility is good which would suggest DWL lines are inappropriate and that other warning signs may be a better option'.</i></p> <p>IPC council members pointed out that visibility <i>is</i> restricted to drivers pulling out of Church Lane because of the hump in the A4074 south of the junction which means that once committed to pulling out, drivers have to accelerate to ensure safe exit because oncoming vehicles are travelling at a much greater speed.</p> <p>CH and TK acknowledged that the junction is sub-standard but stated that, from experience, the addition of double white lines does not prohibit over-taking enough to warrant the expense involved (c £20-25,000).</p> <p>The positioning of the bus stop was discussed and TK sent an email to the Area Steward with a photograph asking for it to be moved back in order to help with visibility. CH also pointed out that the cutting back of vegetation belonging to The White House would also help with visibility.</p>	<p>OCC AW</p>
<p><u>Speed Reduction</u></p> <p>TK had explained at a previous meeting that a speed limit reduction would be subject to consultation and warned that, once again, the police would object because enforcement is difficult. However, if supporting measures such as carriageway roundels and speed limit repeaters, white gates, and/or a solar speed limit reminder sign are considered in conjunction with the speed limit reduction, TVP would be more likely to agree.</p> <p>CH advised that, in his experience, a reduction in speed limit to 50mph would not make traffic slower or safer and that since TVP do not have the resources to police such a limit, he would not be able to act on complaints from IPC of possible future failure in road safety improvement if the speed were to be reduced. IPC members stated that their hope was that the speed reduction would act as a deterrent at least and that surely an occasional police presence would enhance this.</p> <p>It was further explained that if the speed survey shows that the average speed is around 50mph, approval to go-ahead with the proposed measures stand more of a chance than if the average speed is around 60mph. It was acknowledged that this seems perverse but the reason is that the reduction needs to be realistic or it will go unheeded by motorists. TK promised to send a link from the Surrey County Council website with speed limit guidance. AM to chase speed survey results.</p> <p>Warning signs were discussed once again and it was agreed that measures such as white village gates, a second VAS (vehicle-activated signal), SLOW markings and rumble strips should be considered alongside the speed reduction and double white line proposals.</p>	<p>TK AM</p>