

BRICKHILL



PARISH COUNCIL

2020/21

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Brickhill Parish Council held virtually on Thursday 25th February 2021 commencing at 7.30pm.

Present:

Cllrs Fitzpatrick, Green, Blakeman, Ward, Durham, Johns, Charles Royden, Rider, Corinne Royden, Grant, Reeve, Jarman-Webb, Rani, Borough Cllrs Phillipa Martin-Moran-Bryant and Moon, 154 members of the public and the Clerk (Mrs S Bottoms) were in attendance.

Absent: Cllr Holloway.

Summary of the meeting: -

Table 1 – The Minutes

Item	Description	Action by
i)	<p>Apologies for Absence: Cllr Holloway.</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick welcomed all present and discussed the format for the meeting. The meeting was open to the public, but the opportunity to speak limited to Brickhill parish residents. He noted that a number present will have attended the earlier meeting with Richard Fuller MP. He thanked Mr Mike Barlow, for allowing him to attend and listen in. He noted some will have attended the full council meeting at Bedford Borough Council last evening.</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick shared a screen showing a timeline for the last couple of years regarding EWR and his understanding and recollection of the involvement in the process by the parish council. In 2019, EWR launched a consultation on the rail link between Bedford and Cambridge. The parish council first discussed it at its February 2019 meeting with the agreement that parish councillors would look at the consultation documents and e-mail comments back to the Clerk by the following Friday so she could compile a draft response in time for the March parish council meeting. Cllr</p>	

✉ St Mark's Church and Community Centre, Calder Rise, Bedford MK41 7UY

💻: Website: <https://brickhillparishcouncil.gov.uk> ☎: Tel: (01234) 271 708

✉: e-mail: clerk@brickhillparishcouncil.gov.uk

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>Fitzpatrick was not clear how many did that. There was a public consultation meeting which he attended at the Scott Hall in Barford Avenue on the 15th February 2019 which he believed others also attended, one of a number of such meetings which EWR publicised on a card generally circulated. Shortly after, he and Cllr Holloway attended a meeting, also at the Scott Hall with other parish councils across the East of Bedford and representatives of EWR at which EWR attempted to get the parish councils' perspective on things. Then in March 2019, at the parish council meeting the parish council agreed to support a route which passed through Bedford, either D or E. He does not recall who was present at that meeting from members of the public. He expressed his thanks to Chris Bailes for recording that meeting and others meetings held around that time. Both Woodlands Park parish councillors at that time (Chris Bailes and Michael Jarman-Webb) put a leaflet out around the properties in Woodlands Park but Cllr Fitzpatrick does not recall much response to it. At the March 2019 parish council meeting, both those councillors argued their case, the matter was discussed and the parish council reached the decision referred to above. Nothing further happened until earlier last year when the Government and EWR announced their preference. EWR then later organised some further meetings including at Ravensden Village Hall. Nothing further happened until the recent February parish council meeting at which it was agreed to have this extraordinary meeting to give residents the opportunity to debate the issue further. Other than on its social media, the parish council did not issue any reference to the original consultation in 2019. The timing of our newsletters (5 per year) did not fit with the consultation. Cllr Fitzpatrick apologised to those residents who feel that the parish council did not consult widely enough. The parish council does not deliberately try to upset residents and it is here tonight to listen to what residents have to say.</p>	
ii)	<p>Declarations of interest in items on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) To receive written requests for a dispensation: None received. ii) To consider any requests for a dispensation: 	

Item	Description	Action by
	Cllr Fitzpatrick said that he was a paid employee of Network Rail but had no financial interest in EWR. Other than providing factual information, he would not be expressing any personal views nor taking part in any voting this evening.	
iii)	<p>To agree that the meeting will be recorded and available via the Brickhill Parish Council Facebook Site.</p> <p>This was agreed.</p>	
iv)	<p>Public Open Session on East West Rail:</p> <p><i>After this, the meeting will close to any further public participation, but the public are welcome to observe the discussion in 5 below</i></p> <p><u>Mike Barlow</u>: Shared a slide presentation. Emotions had run high at the February meeting which he did not apologise for as the preferred route E will adversely affect the enjoyment of the home life of many residents. He had looked up on the Government website what it means to be a parish councillor and discovered that a parish councillor's primary role is to represent the interests of the residents of the parish and provide a bridge between the community and the council as well as being an advocate for local residents and signposting them to the right people in the council. To keep them informed about issues which affect them. The recent virtual meeting he organised with Richard Fuller MP on the 17th February attracted almost 70 attendees and the recording of that has had over 750 views. The view of Richard Fuller is that the consultation was flawed and they are in correspondence as to a way forward. Mike Barlow will be collating the e-mails he has received and forwarding them to Richard Fuller. He also gave out his e-mail address and he has had hundreds, many from concerned residents both from Woodlands Park (especially impacted) but also across Brickhill worried about the impact on their lives. None has been in support of Route E. His aim in</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>speaking was to get the Brickhill Parish Council to agree to rescind its support of Route E. He wanted to demonstrate what has changed since the parish council gave its support in 2019 in order that it could reconsider that decision. He then shared 5 slides with the audience. He believed that the consultation was flawed because one set of costing was provided prior to the consultation which showed Route E as being the most expensive. The post consultation figures showed Route E as the second cheapest. The real concern is the increase in the scale of costs (between 50% and 80%) for the other routes which means that there was either some incompetence at the start of the consultation or reverse engineering, either way, a bridge needs to be built between those two sets of figures. That change was never communicated during the consultation process so no consultees got the opportunity to respond to that. With regards communication, many residents say they never received a card or any communication. Local press is no longer available in the same form so it has got more difficult for councils to communicate to residents through such channels. But it can mean that local councils are not held accountable. The argument that if residents are just realising what has occurred regarding EWR and Route E, it is their fault, is not valid but rather the communication has not been good enough. He looked at the economic case for Bedford. The borough council input, in his opinion, has been suspect. A consultant was employed to validate the answer it gave to the consultant. The borough council told the consultant it had to be a northern route and to cost optimise only those routes. They were not asked to consider the southern routes nor an in/out solution in the South. Tax payers money was used to do this. This, in his opinion, was not even handed. The borough council consistently quotes £6m as the total incremental Annual GVA from a northern route (13% increase per annum). The suggestion is that this is a massive bonus which in his opinion is not. This is £36 per person per year extra contribution to the economy of having a northern route. Most local residents given the choice of this contribution to the economy from having a railway in their backyard, or not, would choose the latter. Bedford Borough Council also claims to have had no influence on the matter and that the decision to prefer Route E was made by EWR and it is just a consultee. But ordinary consultees do not get the opportunity to employ a consultant to act as referred to already above. The Borough Council also has a seat on the EWR Consortium Delivery Board and the Mayor</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>is also part of the English Economic Heartland Transport Forum and others and so in his opinion it is difficult to justify no influence. There has been a serious underplay as to how much disruption there will be to Bedford with potentially years of roadworks, redevelopment works, traffic, congestion etc. Little has been said by Bedford Borough Council about this. Very seriously, in his opinion, the Borough Council has reneged on the Green Infrastructure Plan of 2009 which expressively pulled out the land between Brickhill and Clapham as protected from development. It was one of the first reports published under the current Mayor's first period of office. The role of freight or diesel powered trains has also largely been ignored in the consultation and Brickhill Parish Council had to ask EWR if it was included in its business case. Why has Bedford Borough Council and the Parish Council not held EWR to account for this? EWR give vague answers regarding electrification. He believes there are no plans to do so otherwise they would be doing so on the current section of track being constructed. If Bedford Midland Station is used, the congestion etc around the area would make it possibly quicker to drive to Cambridge. The Mayor is chairman of the Strategic Transport for England Economic Heartland. That body published a report in 2020 in which it explicitly states that EWR will be fit for freight and for 12 and up to 20 freight trains per day (dependant on demand) and the maximum loading gauge on the track will be used. Network Rail in its 2017 freight report forecast freight will increase at a rate of 3% per year. They are pushing for each train (because of predicted demand) to be the maximum allowed in the UK. In terms of proximity to his property it could be 50m away and possibly 30m away from Anjulita Court. To get across the hilliest sections, cuttings of up to 30m deep and 95m wide will be needed and cuts across the green infrastructure belt referred to above. There are 3 alternatives put forward in the consultation, more environmentally friendly especially for the up to 20 freight trains per day bypassing Bedford. Trains are noisy especially out in the countryside where there is less noise. If Bedford Borough Council wishes for the service to access the town it could be served with an in/out passenger service with the freight by passing the town. Other services already do. Bedford is not attractive and the support for the current route is trying to address the symptom and not the cause.</p> <p>Communication on this issue has been awful by all parties and needs fixing with regards this and future issues.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p><u>Resident 2:</u> Noted that at the March 2019 parish council meeting, Cllr Bailes raised the concerns of residents of Woodlands Park and the wider Brickhill parish to the possible impact of EWR proposals regarding Route E. It was important that voices of residents especially those most affected were heard clearly. Later in the same meeting (item 11 to consider a proposal that the parish council write to support an interchange at Bedford Midland as part of the EWR consultation). That was all the public had to go on and residents were not aware that the parish council would be responding to the EWR consultation and the disastrous implications of that response on residents. The agenda item was ambiguous and unclear to the residents. Why could that decision not have been delayed? Cllr Fitzpatrick at that meeting had said it was difficult to visualise routes from the maps produced at the time. The maps displayed this evening make it much clearer and were not available to residents of Brickhill at the time. Cllr Bailes had asked EWR and it had confirmed it would include 24 hour freight. Many of the councillors at the meeting where the decision was taken were of the view that the route was only for passengers. Cllr Fitzpatrick recognised that a significant visually intrusive structure would be needed to get up the hill near Clapham. At the meeting there was some discussion of how the trains would be powered and that diesel would have been needed to power up this hill. Cllr Fitzpatrick suggested that the parish council could put forward some questions to EWR and express preferences and he was ambivalent about pushing this onto the parish. She thanked him for that. But after an eight minute discussion, the parish council voted by a majority in favour of supporting routes D or E. What mandate did the parish council have? Why was an extraordinary meeting of the parish council not held at that time to share the fact that the parish council was intending to support routes D or E. In just over 3 weeks over 1600 signatures have been collected to ask for route E to be reviewed. The original consultation was flawed. How many respondents to the consultation were in favour of each route? She had responded to the consultation and did not vote for route E. The parish council had not fairly represented the views of residents. The parish council needs to show how the views of residents going forward will be represented and work with Bedford Borough Council to find alternatives which will not carve up North Bedfordshire.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p><u>Resident 3:</u> Supported the views of the previous speaker. She respected the parish council and believes it does a good job for all sorts of reasons but it has failed to represent residents on this matter. She has spoken to over 100 residents in the last couple of days and no one supports this decision. Please debate again this evening and reconsider your decision of 2019.</p> <p><u>Resident 4:</u> She has been a Brickhill resident for nearly 50 years and was shocked to hear, in the last few weeks, about the preferred route and its impact on Brickhill. She was also surprised about the lack of consultation by the parish council on this major change to the local environment, the biggest for many years. Surely it merits more consideration by the parish council. Many others support this view. All chose Brickhill to live and raise families because of a belief it is a quiet, unpolluted area reflected in the higher house prices. Why is the parish council supporting the decimation of our green areas? Why has the parish council not notified residents of its support of route E? The role of the parish council is to represent and protect its residents which supporting route E does not.</p> <p><u>Resident 5:</u> Born in Bedford and a Brickhill resident for the last 55 years. He attended the consultation in Sandy in March 2019 and was horrified to see a route which crosses Carriage Drive, a route walked by him and his wife over many years. He wrote to Charles Royden following the Sandy visit to express his concerns and suggest that perhaps few residents were aware of the situation and asked if he personally shared his dismay regarding route E. In effect asking him to take action to inform residents before the end of the consultation. No neighbours were aware of this proposal. He felt that the reply suggested routes D and E were too expensive so would not be considered. He has since received a modified response from Charles Royden suggesting he would prefer the route to be in the far North of the corridor towards Twinwoods and away from the residential areas of Brickhill. He asked Charles Royden for more detail on the route especially if it crosses Carriage Drive. He did not know. During the consultation, all had to work with low detailed maps. Having studied the OS map, there seems only one option to come off the railway line North of what is being proposed and that is just South of the junction on Paula Radcliffe Way South of Browns Wood into Twinswood. In his opinion all routes crossing Carriage Drive are unacceptable. The route going the farthest North</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>in the corridor is not the ideal route. He noted that none of the Southern routes went in and out of Bedford. Why have the routes South not been thoroughly costed? What was not clear was that at the time of the consultation, Bedford Borough Council favoured pushing for route E. He then referred to the engagement of a consultant by Bedford Borough Council as referred to by Resident 1. A revaluation of all routes including an in/out route is required. He believed that the original consultation was not adequate in that not all options were considered and the public consultation was a disgrace. Many residents of North Bedford would have been unaware of what was being considered so took no interest in the consultation. He is appalled that the council can support the destruction of the countryside in a huge arc around the edge of Bedford as opposed to routes creating significantly less damage.</p> <p><u>Resident 6:</u> Why did the parish council rush the vote at the March 2019. Did the information provided make them feel that Route E would not be considered because it was too expensive? Reams of documents suggested that diesel trains could be run on a route and haul freight and for it to be zero carbon. The electrification issue had been dealt with. Where all parish councillors fully conversant with all the background documentation and information on the whole matter of the EWR routes? Did they engage and give enough debate on the matter? The worst communication is that which does not reach its audience. The parish council should have checked if residents had received it and if they had a response. He believed that the parish council had made a serious misjudgement in its decision on that night. Living close to Anjulita Court, he was alarmed to see the slides shown by Resident 1. Cllr Fitzpatrick agreed to work through the questions in the e-mail he had received and provide a response.</p> <p><u>Resident 7:</u> Supported the earlier speakers. She recalled the leaflet and vaguely recalled the card which she completed and said no. If the parish council had the information available at the time of the decision in March 2109 that is now available would it have made the same decision and most importantly, what is the parish council going to do to get us out of this situation. If it is not possible, what investment are you going to put into this. Are you going to do something? Residents are committing their own time and resources to trying to get out of this situation.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p><u>Resident 8:</u> With so many people not aware and very passionate about the matter can the parish council admit, it has failed its residents.</p> <p><u>Resident 9:</u> Supported the earlier speakers. It is appalling this railway is going anywhere near Brickhill.</p> <p><u>Chris Bailes Ex: Woodland Park Parish Councillor:</u> There had been a hasty presentation by EWR in the January of 2019, he reported it in the “Woodlands Park” item on the parish council agenda. He was amazed and very disappointed that it was only he and Parish Councillor Michael Jarman-Webb who voted against route E. This route would decimate the area just beyond Woodlands Park. They paid for and circulated a leaflet to all residents in Woodlands Park and tried to get out the message on this and Graze Hill not as parish councillors but as neighbours. He raised the freight query with EWR. He hopes that the parish council will reflect on its earlier decision.</p> <p><u>Resident 9:</u> Will the parish council be responding to the questions raised tonight and what is the economic benefits to Bedford of the route E?</p> <p><u>Resident 10:</u> Supported everything said by residents in the meeting already. Does not understand why EWR sections 1 and 2 have been reinstated on the old varsity line, the Bedford to Bletchley is already running, so if they are continuing to reinstate the old varsity line why is the section from Bedford to Sandy not taking place? That needs addressing by Bedford Borough Council who may have reasons why they do not want this to be used. That needs to go to EWR. This will not be a passenger line, the Government has already promised a dual carriageway from the Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet. From J13 of the M1 to Cambridge and in 5 years time, most cars will be electric so this will be a fairly green route. There is also the cost of using a car and parking outside Cambridge vs the more expensive use of the train and the lack of convenience. So this will be a freight railway.</p> <p><u>Resident 11:</u> Expressed concern about the environmental impact. She has lived in Brickhill for 25 years and is passionate about green space and the environment. She can hear owls in her garden. There is a real need to</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>reconsider this route. She noted that the hedge has come down at Graze Hill. She appreciates that 165 houses need to go there but the noise of the train and the works will desecrate the area. Through lockdown, many have been helped physically and mentally by open spaces. There are skylarks, badgers etc.</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Graze Hill development: This is separate from the EWR issue. The parish council will willingly provide residents with any information it possesses regarding that development and what the parish council has said about it. Mike Barlow commented that he has been in contact with the developer who have had no communication with Bedford Borough Council or EWR to say this route is happening. ii) Varsity Line: EWR are using the old route across from Oxford to Bletchley and then to Bedford. Unfortunately parts of the remaining line has been built over especially into Sandy and beyond it is a very wavy line. For whatever reason, EWR never proposed to use any route that incorporated the old track bed East of St Johns Station. iii) The parish council must try to support residents whatever happens. It is unclear what weight is given to the decisions reached by the parish council. We need to work out in that context what we do next. <p>The many comments posted in the “chat” facility reiterated the sentiments and views expressed by the speakers.</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick will attempt to address any additional issues raised outside of this meeting.</p> <p>The meeting then closed to further participation and moved to item 5.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
v)	<p>Discussion by Parish Councillors and agreement to any further action</p> <p>Cllr Royden said it was common knowledge that he supports a route which comes into Bedford Station as it is important for the future of the town. Failure to be part of the Oxford Arc means that the town loses all kinds of economic benefits. That is supported by most Bedford Borough Councillors from all different political parties and that was demonstrated by the vote at the full council on the previous evening including the leader of the Conservative Group. It is a view which has been part of Bedford Borough Council's policy for the last 25 years and is well known. He appreciated that people have said that it has not been well publicised, but at the time it was part of the mayoral elections and all the candidates were in favour of a Northern route at the time. He believes that route E is the chosen route and he wants to get the best out of that. He would rather that it did not have to be route E, but we have to deal with the routes offered by EWR and he wants to ensure that the chosen route makes the least impact on residents of Brickhill. He believed that Brickhill Parish Council have taken that seriously and he apologised if residents do not feel that is the case. In parish council meetings, councillors are using electronic devices to access the paperwork for the meeting, making notes etc and it is not that councillors are not paying attention. He referred to references that he suggested back in 2019 that it was "pie in the sky". He acknowledged that he may have said that because he probably thought he would not live to see it. We cannot order a new consultation, the MPs may be able to do that via the minister but not by us as it affects the whole of the line which had been decided by EWR. In terms of the council lobbying for this route, it has because that is the policy of Bedford Borough Council and it is in the Local Plan. He has looked at the document which is produced by EWR and not the borough council and Grant Shapps has said it is the cheapest and fastest route with least environmental impact. They tell us it will be a net zero carbon railway and we can only believe what we are told. We understand that the Government said last week that is looking at full electrification or part electrification using battery hybrid electric rolling stock or hydrogen traction. One of the things councillors voted for last evening was that Bedford Borough Council will be lobbying to get the best it can out of this deal which has been put to it. It is not the borough council but EWR who have looked over the whole of the line and</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>the economic benefits of the line serving Northern Cambridge and the villages. He had said at the February parish council meeting that it was important for someone from EWR to attend this meeting as they need to answer the questions and concerns being raised. He would vote tonight to support a meeting attended by EWR and for them to explain their intentions on this route. He apologised if he had failed to answer any other questions raised, he has tried to be honest and open with everyone.</p> <p>Cllr Ward thanked all for attending. She questioned what as a parish council it could do. Could it organise a judicial review? If the parish council organised a further consultation, what impact would that have, who would be consulted and who would we send the outcome of that consultation to? She acknowledged she was not an expert on this project and was willing to be educated as she would live in reasonable proximity to the new train line. What would be the impact of her reversing her previous vote? The parish council gave out to residents what information it knew at the time but moving forward we can reassess and look at what action can be taken.</p> <p>Cllr Grant thanked everyone for attending and welcomed the engagement. He was also trying to educate himself about railways and what he has found out echoed what has been said earlier and some go somewhat further. The costs are rather academic as costs escalate during the project e.g. as is the case with HS2. The timescale for 2030 for the Oxford to Cambridge line, he believes will not be met. All the routes are massively environmentally damaging so there is no good route, the emissions will be out of control and it is hard to work out where the economic benefit goes. There is no benefit to Bedford just having freight rumbling through. He has paid attention over time to the progression of the project and heard little about freight and to his knowledge has it has started to feature as a new issue for him. He questioned the 100 miles per hour between Bedford and Tempsford and there and Cambridge so there is a lot of non-specific information circulating about what we will end up getting. His concern was that a huge</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>infrastructure will be going in which is not used much at all. So we may end up with all the disruption and no benefit in particular to Brickhill.</p> <p>Cllr Rider thanked all the speakers tonight and for the points they have raised many of which she understood. She is also a resident of Brickhill having lived here for 35 years and enjoys living here. She supported many of the points made by Cllr Royden above. But this decision will be made by EWR and the Government and not by us. We need EWR to attend a meeting to answer the concerns that our residents are asking. EWR and the Government reached the decision for Route E on the 19th January 2020 following the consultation, because it provided the best return for taxpayers, the most popular route with those who responded to the consultation and the best option for enhancing and supporting the environment. She and Charles Royden both live in Brickhill and work hard for the residents and will continue to do so.</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick shared the e-mail received from EWR dated 24th February to say they were unable to attend this meeting. The parish council had thought at the February parish council meeting that it would have been useful to have EWR to attend this meeting to explain more and to answer questions. They did not reply to our earlier e-mail correspondence. At the recent Town and Parish Council meeting, he had specifically messaged a EWR representative and explained that there had been no response to our request. He has attended two recent meetings with EWR at which he had learned nothing new except that they were planning to go out to consultation shortly about route E unless directed otherwise by the Government or the senior leadership in EWR to change their approach. In the e-mail, EWR said they would be happy to address any questions and we could do that using some of those raised earlier in the meeting.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>Cllr Green said that in order for Bedford to benefit from EW rail the line must come into Bedford. The only route being offered now which does that is route E. Bedford as a whole will be a winner but he understands that Woodlands Park and those on the edge of Brickhill closest to route E will feel they may be losers. But he did not feel that the whole of Brickhill will be losers. Brickhill is an integral part of Bedford so overall Brickhill will be a winner. We must co-operate and engage with EWR to minimise the environmental impact of route E on Brickhill and especially Woodlands Park. There is the possibility of that section going through a tunnel as it may be cheaper to do that than other options.</p> <p>Cllr Durham was not a member of the parish council when this original vote was put through. He wondered how the current parish council would have voted. Would it have been the same or different? Brickhill residents want the parish council to support them and not the borough council and what it wants. Is there anything we can do to get the route looked at again? In March 2019 we did not know all the issues which we are more aware of now. He does not recall freight being mentioned at the meeting he attended with Cllr Jarman-Webb at Cople. At the recent Town and Parish Meeting, the representative from EWR steered around the question. People did not believe this would ever happen which influenced their taking part in consultations and now realise it is.</p> <p>Cllr Jarman-Webb said that when he was elected he stood as an independent to represent the people who voted for him. Residents have made it clear what their wishes are in this meeting. In March 2019, he and ex Cllr Bailes were the only councillors who voted against supporting route E. He believes that as residents are now becoming aware of it and are voicing their opposition.</p> <p>Cllr Jarman-Webb proposed a motion that:</p> <p><i>Brickhill Parish Council rescinds its decision taken in March 2019 to support routes D and E and that the councillors vote against route E and that Brickhill Parish Council join forces with those other parish councils affected on the route</i></p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p><i>all of whom are opposed namely, Renhold, Wilden, Ravensden, Colmworth, Clapham, Oakley and Great Barford.</i> Parish councillors are here to represent the interest of their parishioners and should defend them and not support other causes that includes borough councillors who are also parish councillors. This motion was seconded by Cllr Durham. Cllr Jarman-Webb asked for a recorded vote.</p> <p>Cllr Royden said he would be in support of the earlier suggestion by Cllr Ward to go out and consult Brickhill residents as a whole. It would not be right to vote without those residents having the opportunity to contribute. We are dealing with the facts as Grant Shapps MP has given to us about fastest, cheapest etc. The parish council could then put the views of the residents to EWR in a way which was not possible tonight.</p> <p>Cllr Ward amended the motion by Cllr Jarman-Webb: <i>to include a consultation with residents as there are residents who have not been able to contribute electronically.</i> This will make our stance stronger when we go back to EWR. Cllr Jarman-Webb said that he was happy to incorporate this amendment into his original motion.</p> <p>The substantive motion is:</p> <p><i>Brickhill Parish Council rescinds its decision taken in March 2019 to support routes D and E and that the councillors vote against route E and that Brickhill Parish Council join forces with those other parish councils affected on the route all of whom are opposed namely, Renhold, Wilden, Ravensden, Colmworth, Clapham, Oakley and Great Barford to oppose route D and E. In addition for there to be a consultation with all Brickhill residents as there are residents who have not been able to contribute electronically.</i></p> <p>Cllr Royden could not support taking any further action regarding the decision taken in March 2019 until all residents had been consulted and the results of that consultation put to EWR. Residents tonight are clearly concerned about</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>many things which EWR and the Government are contesting. Arguments have been heard tonight which quite clearly the Government disagrees with completely. He would want to hear from someone in authority either EWR or the Government to answer before voting to rescind the original decision taken in March 2019.</p> <p>Cllr Durham felt that the parish council has more information now than it had in 2019 to withdraw support and felt that the residents want the parish council to take a stance now and not wait for a further consultation.</p> <p>Voting took place on the substantive motion:</p> <p>In favour (Cllrs Jarman-Webb, Rani, Grant, Durham, Ward), against (Cllrs Charles Royden, Corinne Royden, Rider, Johns, Reeve, Green). Cllr Blakeman abstained and Cllr Fitzpatrick did not vote. So the motion was lost.</p> <p>Cllr Royden proposed a new motion:</p> <p><i>that Brickhill Parish Council consults with Brickhill residents and holds a meeting with EWR.</i> Cllr Rider seconded the motion.</p> <p>He agreed that there needed to be a time limit on organising a consultation and receiving results but not limit it so that residents feel they had the chance to respond.</p> <p>Cllr Rider said that although she and Charles Royden did not support the earlier motion it does not mean that they do not support Brickhill residents. They have worked hard and will continue to do so to support residents. Cllr Royden said they try to consult all the time but it has been difficult visiting households with the COVID crisis.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>Cllr Royden withdrew his motion because of the length of time of the meeting. He felt that a motion should be put out to councillors that they all could tentatively agree to for consideration at the March parish council meeting. Over the next few weeks it might be possible to talk to Richard Fuller MP who may be able to help resolve this.</p> <p>Cllr Ward proposed the motion:</p> <p><i>Brickhill Parish Council will consult with the residents of Brickhill Parish on the EWR Routes which run through this area with the intention of completing that in time for the April Parish Council meeting. Meanwhile the Parish Council will work hard to try to get a decision maker from EWR or the Minister for Transport (Grant Shapps) to attend the April meeting to address the issues and concerns raised through our consultation. At the April Parish Council meeting parish councillors, in the light of the result of the consultation and any responses from EWR or the Minister for Transport, will vote whether to continue to support Routes D or E or rescind the decision taken in March 2019 and vote to no longer support Routes D and E. That vote will take place irrespective of whether EWR or the Transport Minister agree to attend.</i></p> <p>Cllr Jarman-Webb seconded this motion.</p> <p>The Clerk said that due to technical issues with Zoom, it was sensible to agree to ask those councillors who were unable to re-join to vote via e-mail.</p> <p>At the meeting 5 voted in favour and 2 voted against and 1 did not vote. Following consultation with those councillors who had dropped out of the link. The final vote was 6 in favour, 5 against and 1 did not vote, so the motion was passed.</p> <p>The Clerk agreed to inform the public of the final outcome via the Brickhill Parish Council Facebook.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	Cllr Fitzpatrick ended the meeting at 10.42pm.	

DRAFT

Approved by

.....
Chairman
1st April 2021