

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the special meeting of the Joint Parish Council held at Sherbourne Village Hall
on Monday 23 August 2010

Present: Cllr J V Murphy (Chairman)
Cllr: Mrs W Barlow, R Clay, Mrs M A Hayward, R G Mulgrue, A B Rhead, W
Worrall, Mrs A Gordon, Mrs P W Wilkinson, N F J Thurley, J T Wright,
Apologies: Cllr: Mrs D S Cobb, D C Morrow, M J Metcalfe,
In Attendance: Cllr L Caborn

Opening

- 99 The meeting opened at 7:30 pm
100 Two members of the public were present.
101 Apologies for absence were noted.

Public Participation

- 102 Mr Graeme Lovel drew the JPC's attention to the problems of "rat-running" in Sherbourne.
103 The Chairman said that the problem had been identified [previously and had been](#) considered at the Community Forum. [WCC would review the roads in due course of the C & D roads review but meanwhile the WRW SNT would be carrying out some high visibility monitoring of the situation.](#)

Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

- 104 No declarations were made.

Warwick District Council Local Transport Plan (LTP3)

- 105 Following wide-ranging discussions it was agreed that the Chairman would draw together salient points and, in collaboration with Cllr Rhead, respond on behalf of the JPC to the invitation from WDC to comment.
106 The submission is at Annex A to these minutes.

Council Tax Referendums

- 107 The matter of council tax referendums, with particular interest in capping precepts, was debated and the response at Annex B to these minutes was composed by the Chairman and sent to the Local Government Finance Directorate.

The Community Right to Build

- 108 It was generally agreed that too little information was available to allow a detailed analysis of the Government's proposal in the very brief time available. Accordingly the response at Annex C to these minutes was made to the sponsoring government department.

Closure

- 109 The meeting closed at 9:15 pm.

Date of Next Meeting

110 The next meeting of the JPC is on Monday 13 September 2010 at 7:30 pm in Barford Memorial Hall.

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

ANNEX A

LTP3 Draft Consultation Feedback form		
Strategy	Paragraph	Comments
<i>e.g Cycling Strategy</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>Comments in reference to the specific paragraph to be made here</i>
Transport Mitigation Measures	7.6.32 Table 4.3	<p>PROVISION OF BANBURY SPUR – NEW LINK FROM A452 to C209 BARFORD ROAD – whilst this appears to be being promoted to relieve traffic A46 /M40 routes INTO Warwick it must be recognised that it will also create other journey opportunities THROUGH BARFORD which is clearly undesirable given the current amount of commuter travel through the village from the South, little of which was reduced by the excellent Barford Bypass (which only reduced A429-A429 through traffic).</p> <p>The C209 near the Banbury Spur is already a dangerous piece of road which is unable to take any significant increase in traffic, and indeed at many times of day it is already over-capacity with significant queuing towards Warwick. At times of M40 congestion the current links to the C209 already produce grid-lock congestion into and through the village with travellers trying to bypass the obstruction, often with the assistance of Sat Nav systems</p> <p>Clearly Junctions 13 and 14 were not best designed when the M40 was built. It would be better to concentrate on J13 now, giving N and S M40 access and exit, whilst providing a more efficient link to Greys Mallory and the improvements to Europa Way and its junctions which are currently clearly operating at over-capacity.</p>
		IMPROVEMENTS TO J13 & 14 OR REPLACEMENT WITH A SINGLE JUNCTION – as above, plus a redesign of J13 could make J14 superfluous and could improve user-friendliness for all concerned. Changes at J13 would impact a minimal number of residents and deliver major benefits for all road users in the area
	7.6.49 M40 J13 & J14	<p>The high rate of accidents and the congestion both demand effective and decisive actions to produce an enduring result and not merely palliative short-term responses – a redesign of J13 is the only sustainable response – see above.</p> <p>Any suggestion of a link to Barford Road must be resisted – it was aired before the M40 was built, was dismissed at the time of the Public Enquiry due to severe negative impacts and local resistance and will be no more acceptable now.</p>
	7.6.32 and 7.6.31.5	A cycleway from Barford to Wellesbourne should be added. This formed one of the required actions in the Barford Parish Plan, which was endorsed by WCC Warwick Area Committee in 2006. The A429 is a fast, single carriageway road with a high proportion of HGV traffic travelling between the Wellesbourne Airfield Distribution Park and J15 on the M40. The lack of

LTP3 Draft Consultation Feedback form		
Strategy	Paragraph	Comments
		cycleways discourages cyclists from using this route as the Inspector at the Barford Bypass Public Inquiry noted and commented. Completion of this route would link the Wellesbourne to HRI cycleway with the Barford to J15 cycleway, a matter of only 1.25 miles. This should form part of the WCC Sustainability Targets for the immediate future.
	7.6.35	Public Transport – Bus. In view of the probability that the planned Quality Bus Corridor (QBC) from Leamington Spa to Stratford via Barford (Route 18) will not be completed during the life of LTP2 due to public expenditure cutbacks this QBC should be carried forward to LTP3. A QBC for Route 16 is already included in LTP3 (section 23.5) but this route serves fewer local communities than Route 18. Therefore Route 18 should take priority as it serves Sherbourne, Barford, Wasperton, Charlecote, Wellesbourne and Tiddington en route to Stratford. . This should also form part of the WCC Sustainability Targets for the immediate future.
		There should also be a new bus service to Warwick Parkway Railway Station from the three villages to the south. There is no practical way of reaching this station by public transport from such areas as Barford, Wellesbourne and Tiddington. Such a route would help reduce congestion at the frequently over-subscribed car park at Warwick Parkway while again contributing to WCC's Sustainability Targets for the immediate future.. Currently the Bus Services are not providing the service that could be used by the villages within the JPC if more consultation was forthcoming.
	7.6.23.5 and 28.3	The provision of electronic real-time passenger information systems at bus stops should not be confined to urban areas, but should include the principle stops in major villages. It is actually much more important to know of cancellations or late-running where the frequency of the service is less.
	16	Maintenance – This council has ongoing concerns, underlined by information contained in this LTP3 proposal that WCC continues to invest in capital expenditure which cannot be and currently is not adequately maintained – this is classically illustrated in section 16.4 where the expected life of lighting columns is stated as 100 years based on current budget provision against a stated design life of 25years! Similarly where road engineering is implemented for speed control there must be adequate budgetary provision to ensure that these features do not degenerate to become just different road hazards.

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

ANNEX B

Question 1. Do you agree that local precepting authorities, such as town and parish councils, should be included within the provisions for council tax referendums? If so, are there details about the budget setting process for local precepting authorities which need to be taken into account and will the double lock' mechanism work to protect the majority of town and parish councils?

Yes, we agree that PCs should be included.

We would have liked more indication of how the double lock system would have actually worked (eg a % and de minimis amount could have been suggested?)

Question 2. Are the Local Authorities (Conduct of Referendums) (England) Regulations 2007 the right model for organizing and administering council tax referendums?

Yes

Question 3. Are there any practical difficulties in requiring council tax referendums to take place no later than the first Thursday of May?

Yes - delay from precept setting to ratification - delay into the financial year.

Question 4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of holding a council tax referendum on the same day as another local referendum, or jointly with a local and/or general election? Current regulations allow for higher expenses per elector in a referendum than in a local election - would this raise any concerns if both votes are held on the same day?

Advantages:

- *economies of scale - but will these be passed on to PCs???*
- *single poll day - less demanding on electorate possibly better turnout???*

Disadvantages:

- *multiple voting paper confusion - eg Scottish elections previously*
- *referendum may be delayed if other elections due?*

Why are referendum costs higher? - surely it is a support or not (yes/no vote) so simple to print, organize, count and report. we can see extra costs to PCs having to promote their scheme to get support from the electorate, but they should not be trying to do anything that they do not believe will get majority support.

Question 5. What provision, if any, should be made for properties where the council tax payer is not a local elector?

None. Presumably this is the case where the property is a second home?

We have more concerns where the property is in multiple occupation (not necessarily just student rooms, flats etc) eg where there are grandparents, parents and adult children all resident together but just a single nominated CT payer.

Also if Mr & Mrs are named CT payers do they get 2 votes, whereas if just Mr is named then one vote only????

This all sounds very messy!

We believe that the referendum should go to all registered electors regardless of who pays CT.

Question 6. Does the timetable at Annex A provide sufficient stability and certainty for local authorities when planning their budgets? Does it provide sufficient time to organise and administer referendums?

Yes - BUT Secretary of State must set principles early enough to allow PCs to set their precepts, AND KNOW whether they will trigger a referendum and hence need a shadow budget ready in case the referendum rejected the preferred budget/precept.

Question 7. Is it right to give local authorities the discretion to issue new bills immediately, offer refunds at the end of the year or allow credits against liability in the following year?

Absolutely NOT! - CT-payers will not want their money held hostage by DCs when they have stated clearly that they do not approve the precept/budget.

Where a referendum is triggered it would be much better to start CT collection at the lower rate (as per the shadow budget/precept) and only increase the collection if the referendum is approved. This would be much less problematic, even though in most cases one should expect that the higher precept will be approved if it is appropriate and has been democratically arrived at.

Question 8. How should billing authorities treat bank interest earned on excessive increases that have been rejected in a referendum?

They should be returned to local councils (PCs) or otherwise used to defray the costs of the referendum.

Question 9. What practical difficulties, if any, would there be for a billing authority seeking to recoup the cost of a referendum held on behalf of one or more precepting authorities?

There should be none. PCs should allow for the cost of the referendum when they know that one will be triggered and such cost should be included in the preferred AND the shadow precept. Indeed it could even be retained/withheld by the DC rather than then paid to the PC?

Question 10. Are there any technical difficulties with the removal of alternative notional amount reports?

We see issue where our function and finance change through influence beyond our control - eg grant support or concurrent services support is withdrawn by the DC but we are still expected to deliver the same services, then in such a case the precept would need to increase and perhaps trigger a referendum? OR where the DC unilaterally withdraws services, particularly in rural areas, which are deemed essential, when this would merely impose extra referendum costs on our electors. These problems are particularly likely in the times of austerity ahead?

Question 11. With the abolition of capping, is there any reason why authorities should be required to calculate a budget requirement each year?

We view proper budget calculation as an essential financial and planning discipline, whilst still recognizing that smaller councils will, by dint of their local and sporadic focus, need flexibility to respond to occasional and sporadic events, particularly when higher authorities have less control.

John Murphy
Chairman, B,S&W JPC

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

ANNEX C

Broadly speaking this council supports the CONCEPT which it believes to be embodied in this proposal, however we feel that at present there is far too little detail of exactly what is proposed and therefore wholeheartedly support the submission made by NALC/WALC, which is;

“NALC eagerly awaits more details on this power which will be contained in the forthcoming Localism Bill. We will be seeking a clearer definition of community organisations, who will have the freedom to give the green light to new local developments without a specific application for planning permission, as long as there is overwhelming community backing in a local referendum. Furthermore we will demanding answers to how the process of the local referendum will be met. The National Association argues that where a community brings forward a development scheme it should be granted because it: - Has the support of the local (parish and town) council and the community, on the basis of a high quality community led plan - Shows evidence of need – Is of suitable scale and size, with no overwhelming site constraints on drainage, archaeology, and biodiversity. Further to this, NALC believes this should apply to all development schemes, not just those involving community ownership. “

Furthermore, as we generally believe that when determining planning matters more note should be taken of local opinion and knowledge we would hope to see some form of corollary to this proposal which gave local democracy the ability challenge or even veto planning proposals and decisions when they were deemed to be not in the local interest.

We await further detail and proper consultation on these matters.

John Murphy

Chairman, B,S&W JPC