

## **MINUTES OF A MEETING OF FOXTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**HELD ON MONDAY, 5<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2004, AT 7.45 p.m.**

### **PRESENT**

Mr Pusey, Mr Broadley, Mr Barnes Mr Blakesley, Dr Grindley, Mr Hockley, Mr Kennedy, Mrs Thake

District Councillor Mrs Roberts

Andrew Baxter,  
CCC Director of Education

Bob Sproson  
CCC Head of Secondary Support and Inclusion

### **IN ATTENDANCE**

20 members of the public

### **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Mr Chilton and County Councillor Anthony Milton

Mr Pusey welcomed all to the meeting.

### **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

There were no amendments, and all were agreed that the Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2004, should be signed as a true record.

### **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

#### *The Old School Site*

Mr Pusey said that officers from the County Council, Andrew Baxter (Director of Education) and Bob Sproson (Head of Secondary Support and Inclusion) had come to the meeting to outline plans for the site. Mr Pusey said that he proposed to make a general introduction, and then ask Mr Baxter to respond to a number of questions already put to the County Council, and others subsequently raised. He would then invite the other councillors to speak, followed by members of the public.

Mr Pusey said that since the site had been vacated in 2002, the Parish Council had, jointly with the District and County Councils, been seeking to have the site used for low-cost housing. A village consultation had been undertaken on this, which had produced a very favourable response. The Parish Council thought that they had a commitment from the County Council in favour of this use of the site, and the District Council Planning Department had looked at the site to estimate how many, and what type of, housing could be built. However, since a visit of educationalists to the site, it appeared that the County Council had now no intention working with the Parish Council to this end. He said that the County Council had still not established its title to the site. Mr Pusey had sent a letter to County Councillor Ramon Wilkinson that had been passed to Brian Harris (Head of Education Property) but had received

neither a reply nor an acknowledgement. The letter had repeated the 16 questions put to Allan Davison (Head of Estates, Property and Procurement) – it seemed that the Property Department had not talked to the Education Department.

Mr Pusey said that the County Council was experiencing difficulty in finding accommodation for a group of boys forming a unit at Littleton House, Girton. The group comprised about 30 boys and 5 teachers. The boys have behavioural problems, although not of a criminal nature, and are difficult to teach. He understood they would come to the Foxton by car or taxi and their school day would be from 9 am to 3 pm. He then put a number of questions to the visiting officers:

- To what extent would boys from the unit be “at large” in the village?
- What happens to the group when they are not being taught?
- What happens after two years when this group has finished the course – would there be a further intake?
- What arrangements would there be for lunchtime and catering?
- What measures would be taken to make the site secure – neighbours had expressed concern as to whether their fences would be strengthened?
- How would parking be dealt with when there is no off-street parking space?
- Would this be a meaningful consultation?

Mr Baxter then replied. He described the group of children in question as having more difficulty than most in making the transition from childhood to adolescence. This did not always result in aggressive behaviour – some children were very quiet and introverted. Others were more aggressive, but all required very specialised teaching. He said that each teacher had a teaching assistant and said we were not talking about young offenders or children with a criminal record.

The issue (of using the Foxton site) arose in the context of a major reorganisation of special schools in the County that involved reducing the number from six to three. The three schools would be larger and would have purpose-built accommodation. It was hoped the project would be completed by September 2006. The difficulty at the moment arose from moving the children presently housed in a special unit at Girton. The Littleton House pupils would eventually be housed at Harbour School, Wilburton, but the intake there would be phased in. He said that it was not proposed to accommodate additional children at Foxton to those presently in the unit at Girton – about 24 in number.

Although the children exhibited difficult behaviour, they would be managed by well-trained staff. They would attend the school five days a week between 9 am and 3 pm with some flexibility in the way the afternoons were spent. Some pupils would go, under supervision, to other sites. Transport to and from the school would be organised whatever the time of day. Mr Baxter gave an assurance that pupils would never leave the school site unsupervised.

Concerning traffic issues, Mr Baxter said that there would be additional traffic/parking and it was planned to have some on-site parking for staff at the front of the site. Works on the site would include some exterior work, internal decoration and a general tidying up of the site.

Mr Baxter agreed that a higher fence would be needed, which it was intended to provide, subject to planning permission.

He said that children would normally arrive in twos and threes: their arrival could be phased to reduce traffic problems.

Mr Baxter assured the meeting that the school would not be residential. As far as catering was concerned, this would either be food prepared on site or brought in – a decision had not yet been made.

#### Consultation Process

Mr Baxter said that other options had already been considered and the County Council was now left with only two serious options, of which Foxton was the most likely to be chosen. He said this was an operational decision, and the Education Department was not required to get a formal endorsement from the County Council. Mr Baxter said he would keep councillors informed. On the issue of consultation he said he was doing this now, and explaining the conditions for success. If the Foxton site were decided on, the village would be consulted on the details of the proposal.

#### Questions/Comments from Councillors

Mr Kennedy said that Allan Davison had described the accommodation of this group of children on the site as “a remote possibility” and said he felt the Parish Council had been misled. He asked whether pupils would never leave the site unsupervised.

*Mr Baxter said that the other options they had considered would not be available for September this year. Mr Sproson said that 8 members of staff would be on site giving a ratio of 2-3 pupils per member of staff.*

Mr Blakesley asked about possible aggression.

*Mr Sproson said that staff were well trained to deal with aggression, and that when the children are managed by competent staff their difficulties recede. He said the two senior staff members were outstanding. He also said that these children like to be active and don't like to be sitting down.*

Mr Pusey asked for a comparison of the Girton and Foxton sites.

*Mr Sproson said that there had been 80+ children on the Girton site dropping to only 25 in the last year. He had no knowledge about traffic issues, but thought that Foxton would not be disadvantaged by the accommodation of these pupils.*

Mr Hockley said the main issue was the long-term use of the site. It was desired that this would be for the benefit of the village and the planning situation should be determined.

*Mr Baxter agreed this was an important point and that difficulties with the Trust Deed should not allow that work to be arrested. He said he would be happy to ensure that the Property Team continues its work on this front. (Mr Pusey thanked Mr Baxter for this assurance)*

Mrs Thake asked whether the parents of the children involved had been informed of where they are going.

*Mr Sproson said that there had been a meeting with parents who wanted their children to remain with the present staff at Girton, although they were not happy*

*about the uncertainty. However, the central need for the children to move with that particular staff group was catered for.*

Mrs Thake pointed out that the site was too small to provide good facilities for recreation and asked whether the Recreation Ground would be used.

*Mr Baxter said that Mrs Thake was right about the need for clarity for parents and children – the difficulty for the Education Department was that the decision had not yet been made.*

Dr Grindley asked for how long a period the reorganisation of special schools had been planned.

*Mr Baxter said the review started two years ago. If everything had gone to plan some of the children in question could have gone to Wilburton. However, problems with capital grant and assembling staff teams caused delays.*

Dr Grindley asked how the accommodation at Foxton compared with that at Girton.

*Mr Sproson said that at the moment, the pupils were not making full use of the Littleton House site. Their classroom accommodation was much the same there as it would be at Foxton, although there would be no gym at Foxton. It was possible the children would use the gym at Melbourn.*

Dr Grindley asked whether there would be a craft room.

*Mr Sproson said this would not be provided.*

Dr Grindley asked what facilities would be provided.

*Mr Sproson said that at 14-16 years, the children would have localised provision. Mr Baxter said that, speaking generally, children with emotional difficulties would be at Wilburton until age thirteen, and would then move to pupil referral units (PRU's). He said the issue with this particular group of pupils was keeping the coherent group of staff to which they were accustomed – this was the critical factor.*

Dr Grindley asked to know what other option was under consideration.

*Mr Baxter said he hesitated on this because, although there was no reason to keep it a secret, because the site was within Cambridge City, he felt it would be discourteous to mention it before people concerned with this site knew what was being considered.*

Mr Broadley was also concerned about the long-term future of the site and asked what guarantee there was that, once this group of children had finished its course, the site would not be used for other educational purposes.

*Mr Baxter said that whatever the issues were that remained to be resolved, these should be addressed during the period of intensive use.*

District Councillor, Mrs Roberts then addressed the meeting.

Mrs Roberts said that she was sorry that County Councillor Milton was not present as this was such an important issue for the village. She said that nothing was ever straightforward with the County Council – they had been giving those involved the run-around over the old school site for the past two years and had led them to believe that the chances of this group of children being accommodated on the site were minimal.

Mrs Roberts had suggested earlier that Foxton Parish Council (FPC) hold a special meeting, but it had taken the County Council at its word. She also referred to allegations that had been made about pupils at Littleton House that had involved a police investigation: if there were any truth in these allegations, then she would be very concerned.

Mrs Roberts asked why we should believe that after two years the site would be released, and said she would encourage FPC not to support the County Council officers tonight. She said this was a new parish council that had never had to deal with anything like this before and said she wanted a proper consultation. The County Council should have told FPC about the likelihood of the site being used in this way a month ago.

Mrs Roberts remarks received applause.

Mr Baxter said he had been accused of lying and incompetence and refuted this.

Mr Pusey then opened the debate to the public.

#### Questions/Comments from Visitors

Ms Stephanie Brittan said she had worked with children with learning difficulties in a professional capacity and had no qualms about such children coming to the village; her concern was with the children themselves. Moving the children to a different site would exacerbate their difficulties, she said, as they cannot cope with these sorts of changes. She was also concerned about traffic movements. Ferrying the children to and from the site was only the start – other professionals besides the normal staff would visit the site for reviews etc, and this would involve extra traffic.

*Mr Sproson said that, of the current group of students, nine had moved back to Girton from Harbour School at Wilburton, where there had been difficulties. He said the young people were most concerned not to lose their relationship with their present staff.*

Mr Shelford asked how much would the scheme (to accommodate these students at Foxton) cost.

*Mr Sproson said he did not know what the cost would be. Mr Baxter said that estimates were being obtained at the moment and that cost would be one of the factors in making the decision between the two options available. He said the cost would be met from the Education budget.*

Mr Boreham said the issue was generating a great deal of emotion and said that it was nonsense for the Cambridgeshire County Council to say that it is consulting the village. He said one had to look at the long-term interests of the community that needed the site to be used to the benefit of the village. He asked what sort of assurance could be given that, if a lot of money is spent on putting the school in order, these children would be moved elsewhere after two years.

*Mr Baxter said that the successors of these children would go to the Harbour School.*

Mr Boreham said this was not quite the assurance that the meeting was looking for.

*Mr Baxter said that the County Council would work with FPC and the District Council to have an agreement about future use during the two-year period.*

Mr Apps said, “We pay your salaries and you impose something other than what the village wants”. He said there had not been enough consultation and that the County Council didn’t care what the village thought.

*Mr Baxter said the Education Department had to meet the requirements of the law and had to answer to the taxpayers of the whole county. He said that CCC would take on board the problems of increased traffic.*

Mr Boreham said that he was referring to consultation on the actual decision. (Mr Pusey added, “As defined by best value”)

*Mr Baxter said that this meeting fulfilled those needs.*

Karen Butler-Clark said that residents of Station Road had no problems with the old site being used in the way the County Council was considering.

Andrew Baker said he was concerned about the tone of the language used in the article in “The Laurentian” and stressed the need for a balanced perspective.

Miriam Grant said that if the scheme goes ahead, it would be a valuable experience for the children involved.

Another member of the public said some questions lead one to think there was a straight choice between getting the site and having a school.

*Mr Baxter said the issue of title to the site had taken time to resolve, but the matter was getting to a position where these issues can be resolved. He said that consultation was taking place, albeit later in the process than he would have liked, and that he would be happy, on behalf of CCC to engage in detailed discussion about the future use of the site.*

Mr Pusey said he would like this in writing.

*Mr Baxter said that while the use of the site remained the same – educational – the use of the site was an officers’ decision. However, the sale of the site would be a matter for members.*

Stephanie Brittan said that if nine students had returned to Girton from Harbour School there must be some accommodation available there, so why could they not go back to Harbour School.

*Mr Sproson said that the students in question had had an unhappy experience at Harbour, and it would be difficult to ask them to go back again. He didn’t know in detail what went wrong, but there had been conflict between staff and students and problems with non-attendance.*

Mrs Roberts said that she was pleased to work with people with learning difficulties, but the fact was that the councils had worked for two years to get a housing project on this site and said this could be a matter for the Ombudsman, because the County Council might not be following best practice. She said that FPC was duty bound to carry out proper consultation with the village.

Mr Pusey said that a consultation letter from the County Council should go out to all residents in the village. With a decision to be made by May, he said we were looking at crisis management. He said that anxieties were not about this group of children, but about the drift that had gone on.

*Mr Baxter said he would draft a letter and send it to Mr Pusey.*

A member of the public made one last point by saying that it was no use teaching children the virtues of “inclusion”, if, outside school, the message was different.

Mr Pusey thanked the CCC officers for attending the meeting.

(The Clerk was to reply to a letter received from Mr Mansell, all of whose points had been dealt with in the debate.)

*Road surface, Hardman Road*

The CCC Highways Department had looked at the road and said that no major works would be needed ie there was nothing to stop the top surface being applied.

*Wheelie bins for the Sports Pavilion*

It was confirmed that these had been delivered.

*Code of Practice*

The committee had not yet met.

*Minor Road Improvements*

Mr Hockley said than he was due to meet Phil Sharp (CCC) on 26<sup>th</sup> April.

*Parking in Fowlmere Road*

Mr Pusey had received a copy letter from the Maitlands to the CCC Highways Department seeking its help in resolving the problems they are experiencing from cars parked in Fowlmere Road. Mr Pusey read the letter to the meeting and proposed that a letter of support for the Maitlands should be sent to CCC Highways Department and all were agreed. The letter was passed to Mr Hockley, who agreed to write to CCC Highways Department.

*Potholes in Maltings Lane*

The Clerk said she had received a letter confirming that these would be repaired.

*Kebab Van*

This was no longer parked on the unofficial lay-by on the A10 by the level crossing. Mr Pusey had received a letter from Dawn Poole questioning the basis of the complaints about the kebab van. The letter was read out to the meeting.

*Visitors' Questions – Faulty Streetlamp*

Mrs Thake said that although the loose globe had been attended to, the lamp was still not operational and she would progress the matter.

*Any Other Business - Paper Recycling Bin*

The Clerk confirmed that both the paper recycling bin and the dog litterbin (at the end of the path from Illingworth Way onto the Recreation Ground) had been emptied.

*Any Other Business – Barrington Road Sign*

Mrs Roberts said that an officer had visited the site and hadn't found anything amiss.

## **CODE OF CONDUCT**

Discussion of this agenda item was deferred until the committee looking into “Standing orders and Chairmanship” had met and could make recommendations.

## **REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEES**

### **RECREATION AND AMENITIES**

In the absence of Mr Chilton, his report was read out to the meeting by Mrs Thake.

She said the committee met during the past month and gave the report of the meeting as follows:

Apologies were received from Mr Pusey and Mr Broadley. Items considered were:

#### **1. Recreation Ground**

A number of issues were raised regarding the Recreation Ground.

- Some of the street lamps were still not working Mrs Thake had agreed to chase up the contractors to see what progress was being made.
- A request has been received from the Cricket Club for a new chain and combination lock to be fitted to the gate onto the Recreation Ground, following an attempted break-in to the storage containers. (*Dr Grindley said that the Football, Cricket and Bowls Club stores had been bolt-cropped*)
- The proposed new compound was discussed, as to whether it needed to be as large as proposed in the new layout, as the sightscreens had weathered the strong winds of recent weeks. Dr Grindley stated that, with reference to the attempted break-in, it was as much for security as a place to store the sightscreens.
- The Five-a-side goal posts were discussed, as a request for them to be moved had been made, in order to let the grass recover. A suggestion had been made to move them over to the other side of the Recreation Ground in front of the new pavilion. This was one of the original sites when they were first installed and had met with opposition on safety grounds (balls going into the road) and obstructing the front of the pavilion: for these reasons they were moved to their present location. Different sites were discussed and it was agreed to move one set to the sockets near the hard court - when the grass had recovered they could be moved back.
- A letter had been received from a representative of the Bowls Club, stating that the tall fence behind the goal posts of the football pitch is in a poor state. This, it is claimed, due to its being used as a goal and wicket by local children. The club had asked that FPC replace/repair it as necessary. It seemed unclear if this fence is the responsibility of the Council. Mrs Burns was asked to check back through the records to establish if FPC should in fact pay for the repair.

#### **2. Skateboard/BMX Project**

Mr Broadley was unable to attend the meeting and as such no more information was available, except that consultation letters had gone out to the various bodies concerned. The Bowls Club had been in contact regarding the



cesspit that is on their boundary. Dr Grindley was aware of its existence and had allowed for this in the plan produced being suggested.

### **3. Recreation Ground Extension**

No new information was available, although Mr Barnes did state that the school is going ahead with the hedge planting beside the green fence, next to where the practice nets will be. This could cause a problem to the Astra-Turf being suggested.

### **4. Free Hedging**

Mrs Thake had informed the meeting that the free hedging needed to be collected, it was suggested that Gary Dash be asked to quote for planting it along the fence. Mrs Thake was also going to ask Peter Mead if he could store the hedge for the council until it was planted. *(Mrs Thake said the hedging was now in her back garden and she expected a quotation from Mr Dash this week)*

### **5. Village Hall**

Mrs Thake was asking Gary Dash to quote for installing a cover over the gutters, to stop beer cans etc. from being thrown onto the roof and blocking the flow. Gary Dash was also being asked to provide a quotation for fixing the green metal seat (that was originally near the old pavilion) to the concrete base near the play area, as the seat keeps being moved around the Recreation Ground and ends up in front of the new pavilion (being used by youths at night).

### **6. Signs**

As the County Council have turned down the request for a Village Hall sign, Mr Chilton said he would be grateful if a decision could be made as to the Council supplying its own.

The last item was discussed. Mr Pusey said that he had written to Mr Sharp (CCC) and read his reply to the meeting. The letter, which said amongst other things that visitors to the village could be advised by letter of the whereabouts of the Village Hall, was met with gasps of disbelief. Mr Pusey, although uncertain of his powers, proposed that the council should provide its own sign. Mrs Thake seconded the proposal, and all were agreed.

Mr Pusey mentioned that a request from Mr Pester for a sign to say that the area between the shrubs and his rear fence did not constitute part of the Play Area. There were difficulties over this, as the land referred to is part of the Recreation Ground, and the wording of the sign was referred to the Recreation and Amenities Committee.

Mr Broadley reported on the progress of the Skateboard Project. A consultation letter had been sent out with a deadline for reply of 26<sup>th</sup> April 2004, just before the exhibition of plans on 1<sup>st</sup> May. The matter of the cesspit had already been taken into account. Both St Laurence PCC and the Football Club had responded to the consultation letter and the contents were summarised. . The PCC wished the initiative well but asked that users of the Skateboard Park to be aware of the proximity of the church, and to ensure that their activities are conducted with due consideration to those using the church. The letter from the Football Club raised no objection to the proposed Skateboard park, but reminded the council that, during the

building works for the new housing development and Community Building, the electricity and water supplies to the old pavilion had been cut off - this had prevented the use of the new floodlights. The Football Club requested the Parish Council to meet the cost of reconnecting the electricity supply to the new floodlights. The matter was referred to the Recreation Ground Trust.

Mrs Roberts said she had approached Clive Onslow, who had said that he would assist with the preparation of the Skateboard Park area.

### **FINANCE**

Mr Hockley gave details of the Bank Accounts as follows:

Current Account	£273.96
(This included a VAT refund of £223.11)	
Deposit Account	£7859.39
(This included interest for the period 8/12/03-7/3/04 of £5.76)	
Cambridge Building Society	£6197.29

Mr Hockley asked for the following cheques to be approved:

CALC (annual subscription)	£293.73
CALC (subscription to "Local Council Review")	£12.50
Eyre Electrical Ltd (repair of light globe)	£171.03
Anglia Office Systems (repair of printer/photocopier)	£64.14
V W Mead (refuse collection and ground maintenance, March)	£45.16
Inland Revenue (tax on JEB/VWM earnings for three months to 5/4/04)	£123.80

Mr Blakesley seconded the proposal, and all were agreed that these payments, totalling £710.36, should be made, and that £487 be transferred from the Deposit Account to the Current Account.

As time was getting on it was agreed to defer the matter of signatories to the Cambridge Building Society Account until the next meeting. The Clerk had obtained the signature of the previous signatories (no longer serving on the Council) on the requisite form.

### **PLANNING**

Mr Blakesley reported as follows:

#### **Applications considered at the Planning meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> March**

Mr and Mrs Broadbent	Application No. S/0237.04/F for the erection of a dwelling following demolition of existing bungalow at Orchard End, 31 Shepreth Road. Approved.
J Welch	Application No. S/0292/04/F for erection of light industrial and storage units at 27 Royston Road.

Some concern over the visual impact of the rear of the premises on the village, but, in general, supported.

Mr & Mrs L Wilson

Application No. S/2318/03/O for the erection of two bungalows following demolition of existing bungalow at “Longridge”, 22 Caxton Lane.

There was concern that the new building would be closer to Caxton Lane and the consequent increase in disruption from building works, and about the possibility of the road being blocked by builder’s vehicles.

**Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness:**

A Miller

Application No. S/0343/04/LDC for use as coach depot for up to 15 coaches including shed and 2 portable buildings for coach preparation/maintenance and parts/office at 22 Cambridge Road.

Approved.

**Tree applications:**

Stobbard

Application Reference No. C/11/17/30/4 to reduce both a Cherry and an Acer tree by 25% and to re-pollard 6 Sycamores at Barrons Farm.

No comments.

P Browne

Application Reference No. C/11/17/30/4 to fell one Sycamore and to reduce another by 20% at “The Bury”, 51 High Street.

The council would be disappointed if these trees were to be lost and hoped that, if possible, they would be retained.

**Applications considered at the present meeting:**

Hutchison 3G UK Ltd

Application No. S/0483/04/F for the erection of 18m high telecommunications tower and associated development at Barington Equestrian Centre in the Parish of Shepreth.

No recommendation.

Mrs C E L Brooksbank

Application No. S/0530/04/F for a greenhouse, fence and gates at 22 Station Road.

Approved.

Mrs C E L Brooksbank

Application No. S/0529/04/LB for alterations viz replacement of modern front door with 3-

plank oak ledges, braced and boarded door at 22 Station road.

Approved.

Mr and Mrs Young

Application No. S/0556/04/F for conversion of a garage to a sitting room

The Council was not able to recommend approval.

Mr and Mrs Payne

Application No. S/0579/04/F for a dwelling at 59 Fowlmere Road.

Refused for the same reasons as the previous application from Mr and Mrs Payne, including creeping back-land development.

An extract from a report by SCDC Planning officers had been received that recommended refusal of the Application (S/0292/04/F) from J Welch for the erection of light industrial and storage units at 27 Royston Road. Grounds for this recommendation included the site being outside the village framework, and traffic issues.

### **RECREATION GROUND TRUST REPORT**

Mr Pusey said there had been progress on the map of land ownership for the Trust. He reported that some tiles had been lost from the Village Hall roof, but that tilers had been on site by Monday morning and the matter was being dealt with by both RGT and the Village Hall Trust.

A joint letter had been sent by Mr Pusey (RGT) and Mrs Howell (VHT) to the County Council and some of the outstanding work had actually been done, so the snagging list was reduced. Mrs Howell (in the visitors' seats) said that a new boiler had been supplied and some electrical work had been undertaken. There was still no agreement on the five replacement lights, as the units recommended had no facility for emergency battery back up.

Dr Grindley said that improvements had been made to the showers. A "sleeping policeman" had been made between the showers and the dry area; shower curtains had been installed, a broken door replaced, and shelves in the cleaner's cupboard had been screwed to the wall. The pavilion faults had now been dealt with, but new faults were arising, such as the taps not being robust enough for their purpose.

### **DOVECOTE/MEADOW PROJECT**

Mr Pusey reported that a meeting of the Friends of the Dovecote/Meadow project had been held on 25<sup>th</sup> March.

A rough estimate of £7000 had been given for new thatch for the Dovecote.

Dudley Pusey and Catherine Cairns had met with Jenny Jones, who, although she did not rule it out, thought that the meadow was unlikely to be used for educational purposes.

A joint approach to the grassland management of the two areas of meadow within the school's responsibility had been suggested.

Jenny Jones had raised serious concerns about the path through the meadow – the school is opposed to the principle of the path, as there are already a number of problems with anti-social activities in the car park area. However, there was a strong demand in the village for this new path. The village consultation day on 1<sup>st</sup> May would give the Friends' Group another opportunity to talk to villagers and gain feedback. The two householders backing onto the path would be encouraged to attend this event and Jenny Jones would be given the response to the consultation day.

Mr Pusey gave an update on the legal situation and said there would be a meeting with Richard Hodgson (CCC) who would try to get the Heads of Terms ready by 1<sup>st</sup> May.

Mr Pusey had reported the Dovecote roof as being in a dangerous state, and orange hazard tape had been erected round the Dovecote on 27<sup>th</sup> May.

Dr Grindley had offered his professional services once the lease is finalised. Despite the historical record, he could find no physical trace of the building's being used as a dovecote. It was decided that further research was needed.

Rob Mungovan and Catherine Cairns had helped to complete a grant application form from the Local Heritage Initiative. Dudley had also written to SCDC regarding the possibility of grant assistance. Rob Mungovan had provided Dudley with a blank set of planning application forms. The first necessary step was to complete the building survey.

The village consultation day had been discussed in detail.

Catherine Cairns would contact Rob Mungovan to confirm arrangements for the conservation task day for the meadow to be led by the Green Belt Project on Wednesday, 5<sup>th</sup> May.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

The Clerk did not summarise the correspondence received since the last meeting, as the most important items had already been covered earlier in the meeting and it was getting very late. The correspondence is given in full below:

- 1) Letter dated February 2004 from Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service (South Cambridgeshire District) with an article on the new Arson Reduction Group.
- 2) Letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> March from CCC South Highways Division saying that the potholes in Caxton Lane will be repaired.
- 3) Letter dated March 2004 from Cambridge Police Authority re the recent budget decision and the consultation with the Home Office on the future structure for policing in England and Wales, and enclosing leaflet "Policing: Building Safer Communities Together".
- 4) Letters dated 3<sup>rd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> March from SCDC Commercial Services re Kitchen Waste Bins.

- 5) Letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> March from DTI/DEFRA re Partnership in rolling out Broadband to rural communities: enclosing brochure.
- 6) Letter dated 6<sup>th</sup> March from Foxton Bowls Club re repairs needed to the chain link fence between the bowls green and the football pitch.
- 7) Letters dated 9<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> March from CCC Environment and Transport Department re changes to local bus services.
- 8) Letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> March from CCC Environment and Transport Department advising that a Prohibition of Waiting Order (at Foxton, Station Road) was made on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2004, and enclosing a copy of the Press Notice.
- 9) Letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> March from Philip Sharp, of CCC Environment and Transport Department, refusing to agree to the erection of a sign to the Village Hall and Recreation Ground.
- 10) Letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> March from St Laurence PCC re the proposed Skateboard Park expressing the hope that the users will show consideration to those using the church.
- 11) Letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> March from Foxton Football Club with its comments on the proposed Skateboard Park, and requesting that the Parish Council meet the cost of reconnecting the electricity supply to the new floodlights.
- 12) Letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> March from SCDC Finance and Resources Department apologising for a printer's error on the Council Tax Bills recently issued: enclosing copy of "Your Services, Your Council Tax 2004-05"
- 13) Letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> April from SCDC Finance and Resources Department enclosing copies of a leaflet for anyone thinking of standing for election as a Parish, District or MEP Councillor. (Spare copies at Post Office)
- 14) Information from CALC including:
  - Agenda for the next meeting of the South Cambridgeshire District Association on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2004
  - Memo re the County Training Partnership and Training for AQA 2004: enclosing brochure
  - Memo re spare copies of "Local Council Review".
  - Invitation to clerks to attend a barbeque at Catworth on 9<sup>th</sup> July
- 15) Information from Cambridgeshire ACRE including:
  - Invitation to enter the 2004 Calor Village of the Year competition: enclosing guidelines and submission sheet.
  - "Harvest" March/April 2004
  - Leaflets "Arts in Cambridge on Tour" and "Is your Community up to the Challenge"
- 16) SCDC booklet "Spring into Action 2004" – sports activities in the Easter Holidays.
- 17) SCDC Cambridge/City Council Sports Development Service Disability Sports and Social Clubs Directory 2004.
- 18) SCDC publication "Springboard - Cambridgeshire's toolkit for the Arts".

- 19) Letter dated March 2004 from the Society of Local Council Clerks outlining its services and enclosing leaflet.
- 20) Sawston Newsletter, March 2004 and memo on Neighbourhood Watch
- 21) Local Council Review, March 2004 (enclosing booking form for NALC Annual Conference).
- 22) Poster for New late train service from Cambridge.
- 23) "Clerks and Councils Direct" magazine, march 2004
- 24) Publicity material from Glasdon; SMP (playground equipment); Matta Products (playground surfacing); Record Playground Equipment (with details of seminar).

### **VISITORS' QUESTIONS**

Mr Wilson had been unable to attend the Planning Meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> March when his application (S/2318/03/O) had been considered, and wanted to know the source of the comments made by the Council about the application. Concern had been expressed about the siting of the proposed new build closer to Caxton Lane. Mr Wilson said the District Council had requested this.

*Mrs Roberts said she would look into the matter.*

Mrs Hockley asked the Council's permission for the Women's' Institute to hold a plant/produce stall on the grass area holding the village sign at the top of Station Road on Saturday, 29<sup>th</sup> May between 9.30 and 11.30 am.

*The Council raised no objection to this.*

Mr Apps thanked the Council for bringing the public's attention to the issue of the old school site.

### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr Pusey asked for a short meeting before the village consultation day on 1<sup>st</sup> May. It was agreed to fit this in on the evening of the Annual Parish Meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2004. Mr Kennedy said he had arranged to get display boards for the presentation on 1<sup>st</sup> May. Mr Pusey said a notice had been placed in "The Laurentian".

Mrs Roberts said that she was concerned that the County Councillor, Professor Milton, had not been present at this meeting, when what was likely to be the biggest issue facing the village had been discussed, and thought he should be contacted and briefed. Mrs Roberts said her problem was not with the children with behavioural problems, but with the County Council and its lack of openness.

**Please see next page**

### **DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

It was confirmed that the **Annual Parish Meeting** would be held on **Monday, 26<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at 7.45 pm in the Village Hall Meeting Room.** (Mr Blakesley gave his apologies for this meeting)

The next meeting of the Parish Council would be the **Annual General Meeting** to be held on **Monday, 17<sup>th</sup> May at 7.45 pm in the Village Hall Meeting Room.**

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.55 pm.