

Minutes of the Meeting of Brickhill Parish Council held virtually on Thursday 1st April 2021 commencing at 7.30pm.

Present:

Cllrs Fitzpatrick, Green, Blakeman, Ward, Charles Royden, Rider, Corinne Royden, Grant, Jarman-Webb, Rani, Brazier, Borough Cllr Moon, 85 members of the public and the Clerk (Mrs S Bottoms) were in attendance.

Absent: None.

Summary of the meeting: -

Table 1 – The Minutes

Item	Description	Action by
1.	Apologies for Absence: Cllrs Holloway and Johns and Borough Cllr Phillippa Martin-Moran-Bryant.	
2.	<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: With regards item 7. Cllr Fitzpatrick declared that he is paid employee of Network Rail but has no financial interest in EWR. He will be contributing to the discussion on the item but will not be taking part in any voting on any motions raised. 	

Item	Description	Action by
3.	<p>To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 4th March 2021: The minutes were signed as a true record of the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p>To note the resignation of Ann Reeve and action being taken to fill the vacancy: Cllr Fitzpatrick noted that Ann Reeve had been a long standing member of the Parish Council and thanked her for her hard work and support during that time. The Clerk noted that there had been no request for an election to fill the vacancy, therefore the Parish Council is free to co-opt. The Clerk will advertise the vacancy on the website, social media and noticeboards with consideration given to filling the vacancy at the May meeting.</p>	Clerk
5.	<p>To note the resignation of John Durham and action being taken to fill the vacancy: Cllr Fitzpatrick noted that John Durham had only been on the Parish Council for a short time and it was a shame that he had decided to resign. The Clerk has notified Bedford Borough Council and is now awaiting news as to whether an election is to be called.</p>	Clerk
6.	<p>Public Open Session (15 mins):</p> <p>East West Rail:</p> <p><u>Resident 1</u>: addressed the Parish Council. He was concerned that the Liberal Democrat members of the Parish Council were block voting on the issue of EWR and the Parish Council's attitude towards it. Residents are being encouraged to respond to the latest consultation which gives two options within the Route E</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>corridor. The Liberal Democrats on Bedford Borough Council have been supporting this route for years. Cllr Headley has been busy overselling the tiny economic benefits of Route E. Hopefully these will be recalculated to take account of the fact that 97 families are at risk of being impacted by the loss of their homes. Why has Cllr Charles Royden as portfolio holder from Transport and the Environment not been representing the interest of his constituents by explaining the impact and massive disruption of building a railway through an urban environment. This will involve a decade of re-working. We should not just have to accept this. The Parish Council at its last meeting voted to support the Northern parishes and I understand that today it has received a letter from BFARe asking for public money to support its residents to fight Route E, initially £200 to cover the expenses of running the campaign and £1,000 towards the legal expenses of getting legal advice regarding pursuing a judicial review which the other Northern parishes are pretty unanimously putting in a £1,000 each. This is being done through a not for profit limited by guarantee company which would limit any liability on behalf of the parish councils. He suggested that the Parish Council votes to fund that this evening and demonstrate its support. He understood that there is a meeting hosted by the Mayor and Bedford Borough Council with the Parish Council in April. Other parishes are having similar meetings and he believed they were asking that the meetings are opened up to the public. He argued that this Parish Council should do the same. The message to take back to the Mayor is that the town and rural part of the borough which represents one-third of the voting population expect the borough council to challenge Route E and to go back to EWR and point out that there is a straighter, flatter, shorter route available which follows an existing transport corridor which does not destroy the environment, people's homes and lives for a spurious economic gain. The consultation for a route needs to be fact checked and re-opened and needs doing now.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p><u>Resident 2:</u> He thanked the Parish Council for sending a letter to EWR rescinding the earlier support given in 2019 to Route E. It was noted that the original letter and this letter had both been signed by the Clerk. At the March Parish Council meeting, he had been concerned that there had been no formal consultation in 2019 yet on the next item on that March agenda, Borough Cllr Royden had berated the previous lack of consultation with local residents by BPHA regarding a planning application. So why is it acceptable not to consult with Ward residents about proposals by EWR which will have a major impact on people's lives? This is hypocritical. It is party political as he has written to Borough Cllr Stephen Moon and the Leader of the Labour borough councillors who have said that in general they were supportive of the railway but not the specific routes. He wants the parish councillors to rescind everything they have been saying because it does not have the full support of every borough councillor. Cllr Fitzpatrick said that the letter sent by the Parish Council in 2019 was very straightforward and brief, and said that the Parish Council supported the Northern routes either D or E and had included some other brief comments. The recent letter sent rescinding support for Route E was equally short. Resident 2 continued by saying the open letters issued by Borough Cllrs Royden and Rider were ambiguous because of the reference to the fact that they are parish councillors in Brickhill and borough councillors. Most people will read that as here is our full support. You are going down a route which your parishioners and voters have not and are not supporting. That letter should be withdrawn and re-published.</p> <p><u>Resident 3:</u> There has been no publishing of the rescinding of Route E in any of the Liberal Democrats Focus newsletters. What are Cllrs Charles Royden and Rider and the other liberal democrat parish councillors actually doing to support the rescinding of Route E in the public eye. It is reasonable to ask that they should</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>rescind their support in the published information circulated around the parish to demonstrate that the Parish Council is not backing the route.</p> <p><u>Resident 4:</u> Why is the public chat disabled as this stops those attending from making public comments regarding what is being said? By not having this open, the Parish Council is censoring discussion. At the March meeting there was an agreement to undertake a consultation then all of a sudden it has been decided not to undertake this. Why did this happen? He was of the view that the consultation should still go ahead to get an informed decision from residents and not just the 180 present at the meeting. The suggestion was made at the last meeting that those opposed to Route E do not want the railway to come to Bedford. That is not the case, everyone wants the train to come into Bedford on the Bletchley line and leave via St Johns on the old varsity line. The Midland main line crosses the Bletchley line near the retail interchange park and where this happens is the perfect place for a new station and car parking. This would be the most common sense and logical place and he cannot understand why anyone would think differently. Cllr Fitzpatrick said the chat had been disabled because at the previous meetings there had been some abusive and inappropriate comments made which were not acceptable in a public meeting. This is a virtual meeting replacing our normal in person meetings at which such comments would not have been acceptable. Cllr Fitzpatrick said that this proposed route had been investigated and for whatever reason ruled out and we have been trying to find out why. The resident said that EWR should review this decision.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
7.	<p>To note the action re: EWR following March Parish Council Meeting and agree any further action:</p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that the letter rescinding support for Route E had been sent but EWR have not confirmed receipt of it. The Clerk explained that is not unusual as no confirmation was received regarding the letter sent in 2019. Cllr Brazier asked that the Parish Council should have also rescinded support of Route D as well. Cllr Fitzpatrick responded that the tone of the meeting in March was supportive of rescinding both routes. It was noted that the latest EWR consultation started yesterday and there was a pre-consultation event held by EWR which a number of parish councillors and borough councillors attended at which EWR outlined the same information as is now available on its website. Concern was expressed at the very short notice given by EWR which made it difficult for some to attend. More documentation will continue to be added to the EWR website. EWR are sending out a version of their consultation document to households in the consultation area but did not specify what that is. The assumption must be that it will be the whole of Brickhill parish. There are also a number of virtual meetings. Yesterday's meeting did allow questions to be asked but it was largely EWR talking to the attendees. It was resolved that the Clerk should write to EWR to ask if some of those sessions directly relevant to the parish of Brickhill could be held in the evening or weekend to enable those at work to attend. Cllr Brazier was concerned that the meeting of the previous day was very Cambridge centric and the Bedford areas on the route were not furnished with the same level of detail. Perhaps Bedford Borough Council should be asking for that level of detail as well and not ostracising Routes A, B and C. Cambridge still seem to have a North and a South route. It is not clear that the previous consultation which resulted in the selection of Route E as the "preferred" route was right</p>	Clerk

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>and proper. Cllr Brazier asked if the Borough Council had held a meeting with EWR, Cllr Royden was not aware of any and he certainly had not been involved but would find out in any had taken place.</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick said that following on from the comment raised by Resident 4, the reason the Parish Council changed its mind about the consultation was that there was a meeting held between himself, the Clerk and Cllrs Brazier and Jarman-Webb on the evening following the March Parish Council meeting. When the consultation was discussed it did not seem logical to consult at this point having already decided to rescind support for Route E. There is this new consultation and it will be up to the Parish Council to decide whether to consult or what it wants to do otherwise. The consultation ends on the 9th June. All residents were encouraged to take part in the consultation and information will be put on the Parish Council's social media and noticeboards. Cllr Royden said that Route E is all that is on the table and it is important to get the best out of that route for Brickhill. Some of the routes proposed in that corridor go well North of the country park. So it would be possible to infill with planting and trees so it is well away from the urban area of Brickhill. Following discussion and in order to take further action following the March meeting, it was resolved that Cllrs Brazier and Jarman-Webb should undertake a fact finding exercise to find out what action the other Northern parishes who are against Route E are taking and to circulate that information to all the parish councillors and the Clerk so the matter can be further considered and further action agreed at the May Parish Council meeting. More detail would be needed regarding the request from BFARe (see under correspondence) to fund action against Route E before the Parish Council could agree to financial support. It would be necessary to complete the grant application form and comply with the conditions. The Clerk would forward to Cllr Brazier a copy of the grant criteria and application form. Cllr Brazier believed that the Parish Council should make representations that Route E should be re-consulted on as the process gone through in</p>	<p>Cllr C Royden</p> <p>Cllrs Brazier and Jarman-Webb</p>

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>the earlier consultation by EWR was flawed. This should be pushed by the Parish Council at its meeting on the 20th April. It was further resolved that it was also important for the Parish Council and all residents to engage with the current consultation because otherwise the final route may be decided with no account being taken of their views. With regards the meeting to be held between parish councillors, the Mayor, Cllr Headley and Jon Shortland on the 20th April, it was resolved that the Clerk should write to Jon Shortland and ask if that meeting could be opened up to the public.</p>	Clerk
8.	<p>Financial Matters: To consider and agree action on the following:</p> <p>i) To approve bank reconciliations and any accounts for payment:</p> <p>It was resolved to approve the bank reconciliations and the accounts for payment. See Table 2 below.</p> <p>ii) To note the need to return outstanding NDP grant monies and to agree to re-apply for new funding:</p> <p>Cllr Fitzpatrick reported that the Parish Council has been in receipt of a grant of £10,000. Unfortunately, events including COVID has impacted on the ability to progress the development of the NDP. To date there has been a spend of £1,890 of that grant. Monies not spent in the financial year</p>	Clerk Cllr Fitzpatrick and the Clerk

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>must be returned, in our case totalling £8,110. It was resolved that this sum should be returned and further funding applied for once the scheme re-opens. Hopefully once this pandemic is over it will become easier to consult with residents and get their views. Volunteers are always needed to help with the production of the NDP.</p>	
9.	<p>To receive reports from the Borough Councillors: A report had been received from the Brickhill Borough Councillors and the Clerk had put a copy on the website. They also attached to that report the letter received from EWR explaining why they are not able to use some of the routes suggested. Borough Cllr Stephen Moon said that the walk around Woodlands Park to look for snagging issues is now set for next Thursday. Cllr Rani will also take part. Borough Cllr Moon will also continue to press for resolution regarding adoption which is dragging on. The adoption of the common grounds had taken place but not of the roads. Cllr Royden offered to help if needed but unfortunately it is in the hands of the developers. Borough Cllrs Royden, Rider and Moon were thanked for their reports.</p>	<p>Clerk Borough Cllr Moon and Cllr Rani</p>
10.	<p>To consider the average speed camera scheme for Brickhill Drive and agree any action: The proposed scheme designed by Bedford Borough Council officers had been circulated for consideration at the March meeting but no decision had been reached because the discussion had moved on to restricting heavy goods vehicles in Brickhill. The Clerk had recirculated the scheme. Cllr Brazier asked if there had been consultation with residents about it. It was noted that there has been pressure from local residents over many years for cameras to be sited here. Cllr Charles Royden said that residents in the Brickhill Ward had been made aware of the intention to site cameras in Brickhill Drive and to date he had received nothing but support. This was the reason that Brickhill Drive has been chosen to invest Parish Council monies as well as</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>some of the ward funds of the Brickhill Borough Councillors. The decision was taken a considerable period of time ago and significant costs had been incurred to date in designing the scheme. Cllr Charles Royden noted that the design is produced by Borough Council highways officers in conjunction with the police and he reassured his fellow parish councillors that the police were supportive of this scheme as this is an accident black spot in Brickhill and fines will be issued. Following further discussion, it was resolved that the Clerk should contact Allan Burls to confirm its support of the proposed scheme and to clarify his comments regarding police support. It was further resolved that the Clerk should put a copy on the website to give residents an opportunity to see the proposed scheme. There can be no change to the location of the cameras as the highways officers involved in designing the scheme have given professional consideration as to the best locations for the cameras to be most effective.</p>	Clerk
11.	<p>To note the existence of the Bedford Freight Strategy document and to receive any update on the actions taken and the progress of the new version: It was resolved to move this item to the May agenda.</p>	Clerk
12.	<p>To receive an update for the upgrade of the Mowsbury Walk play area:</p> <p>The Clerk has already placed the order for the three new items of equipment to be installed consisting of new junior and baby swings and a hip hop to replace the net. This was at a cost of £10,018.12. With regards installation, the Clerk had gone out to three companies and received quotations. At an earlier meeting, it had been resolved to allocate from reserves £20,000. Since then, one of the gates and the signage will need replacing thus increasing the necessary spend. The most expensive quote was for £18,673 and the cheapest</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	<p>£13,666.27. RPM were in the middle at £14,836. The Clerk recommended using RPM as the Parish Council had been happy with the quality of the work at Waveney Green. The total cost of the project would be £26,939.62 including the new gate and signage.</p> <p>It was resolved to accept the quotation from RPM and to agree to meet the additional £6,939.62 by moving to reserves the £4,000 expected to have been spent in the last financial year with the remainder to be funded from monies in the budget for 21-22 for Mowsbury Walk.</p>	Clerk
13.	<p>To receive an update re: BPHA plans to replace garage blocks in Mallard Hill and Rooksmead with houses:</p> <p>The Clerk reported that she had received a response from BPHA on the 19th March to say that letters were sent out to residents on the 18th February. The responses it has had back were that residents are pleased BPHA are doing something with the garage sites to enhance the area, as currently they attract anti-social behaviour, fly tipping and generally bring the area down. The planning application for the Rooksmead site has been submitted and the one for Mallard Hill is due to be submitted next week. If the Parish Council has any further questions then it is welcome to contact BPHA.</p>	
14.	<p>To note the successful planting around the Brickhill signs and agree further action:</p> <p>It was resolved to move this item to the May agenda.</p>	Clerk
15.	<p>To note the Annual Parish Meeting on the 21st April at 7pm:</p> <p>The Clerk noted that this is an opportunity for local groups (of which the Parish Council is one), schools and churches to update residents on what they have been doing over the last year and plans for the future.</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
	Notices have already been posted about this on the website, social media and the noticeboards. Invites have gone out to the local schools, churches and the guides and scouts as well as some known groups.	
16.	<p>Correspondence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e-mail from Jon Shortland re: meeting with BBC re: Route E (7th March) • Bedford BC Traffic Reg Orders – Dove Road, Tyne Crescent and Kennet Rise. • Bedford BC The minutes for Standards Committee, Tuesday, 16th March, 2021 • BBC information from the February Parish Town and Council Network • BBC Dispensation advice and form • Richard Fuller – Virtual meetings. It was noted that after the 7th May, meetings must be held in public which remains a concern as many younger people will not have been vaccinated. Efforts are being made to encourage the Government to review this. The Clerk will write in support of virtual meetings continuing as more residents have been engaged in parish council matters than is the case with in person meetings. • Correspondence x 2 from a resident. This will be added to the May agenda. 	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
17.	<p>To review the list of outstanding matters and agree any further action:</p> <p>This was reviewed.</p> <p>Request for litter bins on Ashmead Road:</p>	

Item	Description	Action by
18.	<p>Date of Next Meeting:</p> <p>Thursday 6th May 2021, at 7.30pm (the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council) on Zoom. Joining details will be circulated with the May agenda and available on the Parish Council website.</p>	

Table 2 - Bank Reconciliations for Approval (see item above)

Payee	Reference	Amount Paid	Transaction Details
Mr Routh	BACS 81	£ 56.00	Plot Deposit and Key Refund
Aquamart	BACS 83	£ 400.46	Aquamart
J Shipman	BACS 82	£ 56.00	Plot Deposit and Key Refund
Bedford Borough Council	BACS 84	£ 1,087.87	WG Litter and Grass
Bedford Borough Council	DD	£ 3,598.03	Salaries March

Payee	Reference	Amount Paid	Transaction Details
Associated Telecom Solutions	DD	£ 13.80	Telephone Charges
NPower	BACS 85	£ 47.99	Electricity for Fountain
Paul Riches Skips	BACS 86	£ 327.00	Skip for Allotment
St Marks Church Community Cent	BACS 87	£ 188.33	Office Hire February
Bedford Borough Council	BACS 88	£ 1,346.40	Tree lights Waveney Green
Wave	DD	£ 197.26	Water - Allotments
	Total Payments	£ 7,319.14	

Approved by

.....
 Chairman
 6th May 2021