

**Draft Minutes of the Remote Meeting of Fiskerton Parish Council held at
7.30pm on Monday 10th August 2020**

Note: these are draft notes only of the meeting; and will be formally accepted at the next full council meeting, therefore may be subject to change.

Present: Cllrs Canner (SC); Darcel (CD), Harrison (MH), Hill (CH), Walker (AW), Wall (RW),
Also in Attendance: D/Cllr Welburn, C/Cllr Fleetwood (arrived at 7.31pm), Mrs M Vail (clerk)
There were no members of the public present.
Meeting started at 7.30pm.

105/20 Open session – suspension of standing orders for 15 minutes:

Open session was not required due to no members of the public present.
It was **RESOLVED** unanimously to approve a proposal to move item 9 (minute ref below: 113/20) into closed session due to it containing information of a confidential nature.

106/20 Apologies for absence: None

107/20 Declaration of interests:

AW declared the following interests:

Item 8iii – AW knows the resident. Item 8vii – AW is a VHC member and also a trustee.

108/20 To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2020:

CD requested that minute ref 94/20 include individual comments as made at the meeting. It was **RESOLVED** unanimously, with the inclusion of these additions, to approve the minutes as a true record. **Action: clerk**

AW noted that maximum capacity numbers for the VH had been incorrectly reported at the last meeting; and they should have been 23 (main hall); and 9 (coffee area/lounge).

Action: clerk

109/20 To consider next steps for the Neighbourhood Plan (NP):

CD had circulated a document laying out suggested next steps to move the NP on; including to hire the Reepham and Cherry Willingham Village Hall. However, it was now thought that Fiskerton Village Hall could be available. AW advised that it will reopen as of 1st Sept 2020; and CD confirmed it was not a problem to delay the NP meeting. RW noted various preparatory measures being undertaken in August to allow the VH to reopen on 1st Sept; and further advised that FPC would need to know who would be attending in advance; and keep a register of attendees so as to both control numbers and to assist Track and Trace if required. CD noted that the meeting would only be open to those who had expressed an interest in being involved. It was **RESOLVED** unanimously to use Fiskerton Village Hall for this meeting.

The format of the NP meeting was then considered; and the proposed dates of 17 Sept (for final NP to be presented to the public), 13 Oct (for finished documents to be presented to FPC), and 20 Oct (to submit documents to WLDC) may need to change. CD noted that, with changes to planning legislation in 2021, CIL (Community Infrastructure Levies) may cease, but there may be a different levy instead.

RW – nothing has been said about raising money – CD confirmed that, with the possible exception of printing the final plan, there would be a zero cost as he and AW can carry out the required work; suggesting using the original NP with modifications.

CD – WLDC have confirmed that the previous consultancy reports can be used as long as caveated with the date originally produced; and that subsequently the questionnaire was circulated and these are the answers received from the questionnaire.

Noted that, if projections are for approx. 50 new houses in the village, then people may ask is a NP even needed? CD noted the need to give people the option to decide.

MH – noted the need to look at the policies.

AW, RW, SC, CH are happy with the above.

110/20 To reconsider, with a view to reversing, the decision not to open the playground till September (Special motion brought by CD and CH):

In addition to comments made above under item 108/20; CD noted:

- 1) Several residents have expressed concerns they have not be allowed to make their own decision for their children to use the play area in line with government advice; and this decision does not follow government advice.

- 2) Statements made in the previous meeting either to delay or to open the play park did not meet the criteria of objectivity as required by the Code of Conduct; nor were correct in the context they were made.
- 3) How can the statement: 'I would not let my child use the equipment' be objective for making decisions for the entire village? This is an emotional statement, whereas an objective risk/benefit approach on behalf of the village is required. Parents can then decide whether they wish to use the play park or not.
- 4) How can the statement 'the playground should open in September in line with the VH and school' be objective as there is no logical reasoning behind it: the playground is no less safe in September as it is now.
- 5) Several statements made were incorrect in the circumstances in which they were made eg no requirement to wash/sanitise the equipment before the play park is reopened. The only requirement is for a risk assessment and for appropriate signage. The comment on bleach is incorrect.
- 6) Two councillors had, pre-meeting, already circulated their determination not to open the park until September – this hardly meets the code of conduct re objectivity
- 7) Replacement swing chains had not been ordered as anticipated in Sept 2019 – they were identified as a MEDIUM risk in the external inspection report.
- 8) Village children deserve the opportunity to use the play park if parents allow it; and not have a non-expert opinion forced on them.
- 9) At the last meeting, FRP had not been in possession of the correct factual information regarding professional cleaning.

Councillors then commented as follows:

CH -noted her agreement with CD, feeling that at the previous meeting FPC had not had the correct factual information; and that decisions should be made on legislation, guidance and facts; not on irrational fears. She had understood that, legally, a professional clean was required: this is incorrect and she would not have voted for it if known. She had obtained cleaning quotes; and also noted that AW had not obtained the professional cleaning quote he had been asked to get. CD asked CH not to make this personal. Age guidance of 14 years. Facebook comments were made on the matter; including some personal ones

RW – Code of Conduct had been discussed a few months earlier. Item 7 in the Code of Conduct states that if a matter is agreed upon, it shouldn't be discussed again for a further 6 months unless a special motion raised by 2 or more councillors for the matter to be discussed again. Seem to be going over the Code of Conduct again and seem to be wasting a lot of time. CD – Standing Orders allow for special motions to be brought by 2 councillors; and the current one was requested in writing by CD and CH.

RW - Not practical to make decisions and then get a letter of objection -one letter should not force FPC to change its mind. CD confirmed 1 letter and approx.. 6 Facebook posts had been received; of which some, not all, were of the same opinion. CH confirmed she had witnessed parents on a daily basis ignoring the chained gates.

RW - ROSPA's inspection/risk assessment due in August could help FPC out of this situation. As experts, FPC would be foolish not to follow their advice.

MH – at the last meeting she had said it was better to open the play area and for parents to take responsibility; but she had reluctantly followed the majority opinion. She felt that councillors had not had full information. Noted that CH had taken a lot of flak on this matter; and that MH had been approached by parents concerned and frustrated that the play park remained closed. Considers FPC needs to be a little more lenient; and that a deep clean is necessary before reopening, plus appropriate signage. PC must take responsibility.

RW – if ROSPA due to do an inspection, it would be hard for FPC to disagree with it as they are experts in this area who carry out inspections daily. Foolish not to follow their guidance exactly. Not known if ROSPA have yet been to site. **Action: clerk** to obtain exact date of ROSPA visit, plus seek their advice on a play area clean.

Cleaning quotes obtained by CH were £200 for play area only, or £250 for play area plus shelter. CD – a clean is suggested because the play area is filthy.

SC – if people are already using the play equipment before it has been cleaned, they aren't concerned; therefore why should FPC clean before it gets the right information?

CD – we want to reopen asap, as soon as ROSPA have inspected. CH – what about deep cleaning it; the company who quoted use a jet wash? RW – if ROSPA recommend a deep clean, then we should do it. But if they say it just needs a general clean because it is dirty, councillors could clean it up.

MH – concerned that ROSPA may be behind schedule with its inspections which will not be of help to FPC. Need to find out when ROSPA are due and if delayed, FPC needs to clean it and open with appropriate signage.

AW opined that FPC had made the right decision in keeping the play area closed; noting that those parents currently ignoring the chained gates will not clean after themselves; and will ignore signage. FPC have a duty of care to reduce transmission of the Covid 19 virus.

AW – queried the requirement for a risk assessment and cleaning as part of this, noting the need to be led by it. CD confirmed a risk assessment had been completed, with cleaning not listed on it as obligatory – councillors had offered to clean. AW queries why, then, clean if the risk assessment says otherwise.

Three proposals were then made as follows:

- 1) A proposal was made by MH that an urgent date from ROSPA be sought; and if an urgent date is not possible, to consider reopening the play park with appropriate signage; and for a volunteer to carry out a general clean (RW, CD, SC can do this). AW noted that government advice is for frequent cleaning. CD – had issued information ahead of the previous meeting where this was covered. SC confirmed his agreement with MH's proposal, and re cleaning a pressure washer was required. The proposal was not voted on.
- 2) CD proposed that it be reopened asap, especially if ROSPA can inspect in August, and that a professional cleaner is brought in to clean it. The proposal was not voted on.
- 3) CH proposed that the playground is opened asap, contact ROSPA to ascertain if they can undertake their risk assessment, and the professional cleaning company is engaged to deep clean, including the youth shelter. In favour – CH, CD. Not in favour – RW

The above three proposals were not voted on as it was felt they were too unspecific.

The following proposals were then made:

- 1) A proposal to carry out a simple clean was made, and it was **RESOLVED** with four for (RW, MH, SC, CD) and two against (AW and CH) to approve this proposal.
- 2) A proposal that the play park reopen asap subject to having received advice from ROSPA's visit, was made, with three for (AW, RW, SC) and three against (CD, MH, CH, who want it opening sooner). With the chairman's casting vote, it was **RESOLVED** that the play park opens when everything is in place for it to be safely used ie cleaned and signage put up

111/20 To consider matters relating to website accessibility:

FPC has not made much progress on this matter compared to other local parish councils; to whose websites CD had provided links (circulated by the clerk). The current website can be modified to meet accessibility requirements; and AW noted that preparations are on schedule for presentation to the September meeting; he requires some time to train the clerk in its use; and requested a vote at this meeting as to which website FPC will use moving forward to avoid him putting in unnecessary work. RW noted that the website has not been a problem.

The LCC website is free, unlike the current website, and is already compliant with the required accessibility legislation, therefore is futureproof. Training is free; which councillors should take advantage of; and LCC have people who can help.

A proposal to accept the LCC website was supported by CD and CH, but RW, MH, AW and SC all abstained, so it was suggested that the clerk advise on her preferred website once she has completed training on 14 August 2020. **Action: clerk**

112/20 To consider correspondence received and any actions required:

i. Resident in respect of play area being closed:

Item considered within item 110/20 above.

ii. Resident in respect of ASB at village hall:

The clerk had reported known incidents to the police who had confirmed there have been no official reported incidents in the last couple of weeks and the NPT are aware and patrolling wherever possible. This matter falls more under the remit of the VHMC who were very concerned, and had discussed matters at length; including giving very serious consideration to what actions it could take (eg. improving the current CCTV; installing a barrier). **Action: clerk** to reply to resident.

iii. Resident in respect of required maintenance work to open space (Morris Homes); also any response received from Morris Holmes:

Resident had been in correspondence with Morris Homes who appear to not be in a position to help, therefore the resident has requested confirmation of when FPC could carry out the required maintenance (noted that 4 fence posts are required).

FPC has mown the grass; replaced a fence; planted trees; but had not repaired another resident's fence when that had blown over. RW noted that FPC does not own the land nor does it have any direct responsibility; and suggested that, as a gesture of goodwill, FPC as a one off, without prejudice, goodwill gesture of a 50/50 split of the costs; and recognise this as a party fence.

AW noted that the resident in question is a friend; and that a precedent would be set in taking the above action, so FPC would need to be consistent in its approach to everybody.

CD suggested writing to Morris Homes, in light of their comments to the resident that FPC and Morris Homes are in negotiations to transfer ownership of the land to FPC, that in anticipation of FPC being given the land, FPC will implement RW's suggestion. Once in FPC ownership, FPC can carry out repairs. **Action: clerk** to write to Morris Homes

D/Cllr Welburn suggested that a strategy/policy be put together in respect of Morris Homes for future reference to guide future actions.

She then gave apologies on behalf of C/Cllr Fleetwood who had left the meeting. D/Cllr Welburn left the meeting at 9.04pm.

iv. WLDC - Public Payphone removal consultation:

FPC would have liked to keep the payphone, but were not aware of anybody known to have objected.

v. First Ever National Impact Survey Launched by Neighbourhood Watch:

Noted. No action required.

vi. Police and Crime Commissioner for Lincolnshire – Youth Commission:

Noted. No action required.

vii. VHMC – income from solar panels on village hall roof:

The VHMC had made a written request that they be given the income from the solar panels. AW noted his intention to abstain from any voting; being a Trustee; but noted that FPC were liable for the maintenance of the panels. His understanding was that the initial intent had been for the income to go towards projects around the village; however, the village hall is a worthy cause and the income would be of huge benefit to them; and he suggested an equal three way split as follows: one third of income each to village hall, FPC for all other projects requesting a grant, and FPC retained for them maintenance.

RW, also as a Trustee, advised he would abstain from voting.

CH considered the VHMC should not have any money as she considered it had mismanaged money in the past.

MH – FPC should support the village hall to some extent, but they need to do their bit too.

SC agrees with MH. The village hall does require repairs; and matters require resolving so that both organisations make money; and perhaps the three-way split is the way to go.

CD supports CH. The agreement with Lark Energy had been that the money comes to FPC to be directed to good causes; of which the village hall is one. CD considers that FPC have been good at giving the village hall money, and are on the way to providing more money via the roof

repairs, so would prefer to keep matters as is. Noted that FPC need to obtain such monies from somewhere, and that it can't increase its income whereas the village hall can. Both CD and CH, as District Cllrs, have offered the village hall money for a café to kickstart raising some money. CD has one serious concern – roughly, for each £10 the village hall takes in, it spends about £15 over a year – and considers the village hall needs to do more to bring back regular users it has lost. CD complimented one member of the VHMC for the work in increasing village hall activity as a village hub.

A proposal was made to apportion the income to FPC from the solar panels on an equal three way split as follows: one third of income each to village hall, FPC for all other projects requesting a grant, and FPC retained by them for maintenance – CD, CH against, MH and SC undecided, AW and RW abstained. Chairman's casting vote was against therefore the proposal was not carried.

At this point, the meeting moved into closed session.

113/20 To consider any responses received, and any new actions required, in respect of the following:

i. Feed in Tariff (Scouts/British Gas):

An update on progress to date was given; including information provided by British Gas; and agreed that further information should be sought from British Gas. It was **RESOLVED** unanimously to approve the required actions. **Action: clerk**

ii. Village Hall roof repairs:

A list of potential grant providers had been supplied by Community Lincs. The VHMC considered that FPC was to lead on this project; not least as it could reclaim VAT; but acknowledged that some applications would require a VH signatory. CD noted that he had thought this was down to the VHMC as discussed at previous meeting. AW noted that quotes as presented to Community Lincs had all been obtained on an 'excluding VAT' basis ie seeking grants at a lower amount. RW noted that both organisations were very small, and that he and AW were likely to do the work regardless of which organisation led.

RW proposed, seconded by SC, that this is called a parish council project – it was **RESOLVED** unanimously to accept this proposal for FPC to lead on this project to raise money.

Confirmed that the VHMC was currently quorate but the future did not look good; which is a serious issue if it ceases to exist and could be bad for FPC who is a trustee.

Next meeting: 14th September 2020

Confirmed not to hold an Annual Meeting until May 2021

Meeting ended at 9.48pm

Mrs Michelle Vail
Parish Clerk/RFO to Fiskerton Parish Council

Dated 17/08/20