

Minutes for the Annual meeting of Moulsoe Parish Council held on
Tuesday 4 May 2021, remotely via Teams meeting at 8pm

Present Councillors: Steve Waters (SW); Nigel Richards (NR); Chris Oakley-Holton (COH); Belinda Oakley-Holton (BOH) to 9pm; John Hamilton (JH)

Ward Councillors: Peter Geary (PG) to 8.45pm

Public: 3 Residents for part of meeting

Clerk: Kay Hamilton (KH)

Prefix for all minute items **2105/**

As a remote meeting, any documents requiring a signature will be signed after the meeting at the earliest opportunity.

1. To Receive Apologies for Absence:

Apologies received from Ward Councillors Keith McLean & David Hosking

2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair:

Chair Steve Waters	Proposed by John Hamilton
	Seconded by Chris Oakley-Holton
Vice Chair Nigel Richards	Proposed by Steve Waters
	Seconded by Belinda Oakley-Holton

3. Disclosures of Interests:

SW employer hosts the domain for the village website, NR is tenant on land within MK East development

4. Approval of Minutes:

Council **APPROVED** the minutes of the meeting on Tuesday 9 March 2021

5. Police Report:

This was given at the Annual Parish Meeting as follows

PCSO Ormston reported there had been no crimes within the parish during the time period 12 January 2021 and 4 May 2021.

There is new a website www.police.co.uk which is the national website for policing in England. You are able to input your postcode and it will provide details of any crime in your local area.

The fires reported at the Travellers site on Willen Road are being looked into by the police and local council officials.

Community Speed watch is now able to continue and Arlene will be in the village with colleagues. She will also undergo training on the Sentinel speed monitoring equipment.

6. Public Representations:

Resident from the parish to the council regarding the MK East development.

Resident would be meeting with representatives from MK Council technical and the developers to discuss what can be done to limit the impact on their properties from the development. Resident has queried the proposed road layout of the suggested infrastructure with the developers. There's also concern of the type of house being built close to the properties, there are no details available yet on this.

NR had hoped that the East perimeter road would reduce the traffic on the A509, as it should take the traffic heading to the M1 away from the A509 and with A509 being downgraded to a lower grade road they expect it to take less traffic. The junction between the A509 and the east perimeter road is important to be got right.

Highways agency have indicated that there will not be a noticeable drop in traffic on the A509, but a possible reduction in HGV traffic.

The development will be built and the need is to be realistic and influence the design as much as we can and clarify what needs to be done to benefit all within the parish.

Ward Councillor Geary explained that with developments there are very different issues as to what the householders can ask for and what the parish council can ask for. It is important for householders to get any agreements in writing ensuring that a timeline for the delivery of specific requests is included.

This development is Moulsoe Parish for the time being, not only important as to what happens to the village but also what happens within the development area. Moulsoe Parish is building a community in the development area. This may become a new parish of its own, but over the next 5-6 years Moulsoe Parish will be the ones building this community. There is likely to be a boundary review.

It is advised to compile a list detailing the impacts that the development will have on the existing communities in the area. There is a need to work collaboratively with the developers, but also a need to have a list of issues that will need to be addressed. The list of impact and concerns needs to go to both MK East consultation and MK Council consultation.

The design of the development should comply with the guidelines issued to them by MK Council and National planning.

Ward Councillors would like to coordinate with parish council regarding responses to the application and would be happy to work with everyone to get the comments in to MK Council.

Getting the traffic in and out of this development as fast as possible is important if there is congestion on MK side at the M1 or within the development that will be a permanent problem so needs to be right from the start.

NR – queried the possibility of a weight restriction to stop the construction traffic coming through the village. It has been refused in the past for various reasons such as emergency vehicle access.

Emergency vehicles will still use roads under weight restrictions also traffic using roads for access can also use weight restricted roads.

The Construction Management and Enforcement plan for the development is important. The plan should say no construction traffic through the village and detail how it is going to be enforced. That comes after the planning application but does need to be a condition of the application.

7. Ward Councillor's Report:

MK East – as above

DRT – this has had some teething problems, if residents have issues can Keith McLean be notified.

8. Parish Council Business & Matters Arising from Last Minutes:

8.1 MK East - Suggestion from a resident that there is some aerial photos taken of the parish as it stands before any construction starts on the land to document the area. Drone footage was suggested, drone may be limited for height to photo the wider area. Councillors will look into this.

MK Council Planning website – initially very difficult to see all the documents relating to application. There is now a separate page that makes viewing much easier.

Design and Access Statements - several arrows in the diagrams showing direction of travel in the future heading south to Salford and then a semi circular curve around Moulsoe to Cranfield for possible mass transit system.

Pedestrian bridge over the M1 from the MK East SPD seems to have disappeared and is an essential link for active travel to get to the coach-way.

Timescales are to start earth moving Spring 2022, there will be some archaeology to do. Weight limit has 2 purposes to keep the construction traffic out of the village and keep out Cranfield construction traffic.

To secure perimeter around the development perhaps Parks trust should be gifted the land being used as a buffer for the village.

A combined approach from council, church and MCA was suggested to put forward how the current community facilities would be impacted

SW – concerned that Newport Road on the plans will have a T junction, village traffic will need to make a right turn to leave the village. Getting out of the village will be an issue. Suggest that there should be an access road off the roundabout to the village.

Eventually the road off the T junction may link to the Cranfield by pass mentioned in MK 2050 creating a backlog of traffic exiting the village at the T junction. Currently Newport Road is the access road to Cranfield.

JH – Compared to earlier plans they now seem to be building further south and east. Part of the green buffer is a school field, the location of that makes it practically in the village, that needs pushing back away from the boundary of the village.

It's not clear how any of the plans will improve the traffic flow and there's no mention of the traffic from the industrial units at J 14. At certain points in the day there could easily see queues into the village from the proposed T junction.

Drop In Chat – 16 May 2021 – 3pm – 4.30pm Councillors will be on the verandah at the Millennium Hall to chat to residents about the developers. Clerk to ask St. James for some larger scale copies of a few key layout plans.

8.2 Planning – 21/00858/PANOTH – Glebe Farm – Councillors had considered the application before the meeting and had no comments to make on the construction of the agricultural building.

- 8.3 Defibrillator** – Councillors had requested the cost of a defibrillator for the phone kiosk
Installation £200
Cabinet - £495
Device - £1000
Signage - £100

Clerk had concerns that there may be an issue with the power to the kiosk, the light does not seem to be working so that needs to be checked before moving on with the installation and purchase of the equipment. Councillors will look into the power issue, once that has been rectified Council **APPROVED** the purchase and installation of a device.

9. Parish Councillor Reports:

JH attended the Parish Forum meeting, main topic of discussion was the level of child poverty in MK 1/3 of children within the borough are considered to be living in poverty.

NR attended the MKALC meeting discussions included the Ox/Cam arc and the level of policing in MK particularly in Newport Pagnell

10. Finance & Administration

10.1 Annual Audit

- 10.1.1 Council **APPROVED** Section 1, the Annual Governance Statement
- 10.1.2 Council **APPROVED** Section 2, the Statement of Accounts
- 10.1.3 Council **APPROVED** and **SW** signed exemption from Limited Assurance Review

10.2 Accounts:

- 10.2.1 Council **CONFIRMED** the Barclays Account Balance of £13936.54
- 10.2.2 Council **APPROVED** the accounts as at 30 April 2021
- 10.2.3 Council **APPROVED** payments
 - Clerks Salary £472.22
 - B Oakley Holton £ 25.00 reimbursement for PCSO retirement gift
 - K Hamilton – £46.93 reimbursement for cost of Condolence book
 - BMKALC – £66.39 subscription fees
 - Idnet – £36.00 Domain hosting
 - Auditing Solutions - £186.00 Audit fees
- 10.2.4 Insurance: Clerk had received renewal quotes for insurance cover for 2021-22 and due to a change in underwriters policies the premiums had risen by £200 from last years prices. This was not Moulsoe specific and had affected other small parishes. Clerk was awaiting a quote from another insurance provider.
Due to the insurance renewal date of 1 June Council **AGREED** that Clerk would provide councillors with the new quote via email and they would agree a provider with the decision to be minuted at the July meeting. The council **AGREED** to opt for a 3 year deal if this was offered by the chosen insurance company.

10.3 Governance:

- 10.3.1 Council reviewed the Standing Orders, and **ADOPTED** the Standing Orders for 2021
- 10.3.2 Council reviewed and **ADOPTED** the Financial Regulations

10.4 **Correspondence:** There was no correspondence to be actioned

Meeting Closed 22.12

Signed

Dated