**The Duntisbournes Parish Council**

**Draft minutes of the**

**Parish Council meeting**

held at 7pm On 23rd November 2021 at the Village Hall

1. Welcome from Chair of Council
2. **Recording of attendance** Parish Councillors **Rupert Lane, Jane Edwards**, **Jamie** (W J ) Eykyn, Julian Weston, **Richard Bliss**, **Valerie Dyson** and **District Councillor Julia Judd**. Mr Morris attended as an invited speaker. 4 members of the public attended
3. **Apologies for absence** recorded Parish Councillor Eammon Cuthbert. County Councillor Joe Harris did not attend.
4. **Public session** at the Chair’s discretion (10 minutes at discretion of chair of the meeting). No points were raised
5. Council **approved the minutes** of the meeting held on 18th October 2021 (note Standing orders etc to be carried forward to February 22 meeting)
6. Council received verbal **report from District Councillor Judd**- monthly report distributed via email. Other points raised included CIL payments, 5 years spend by date. Queens Platinum Jubilee in June 2022 noted. Discussions took place on “20 is plenty” and other options available. Boundary review (see emails)
7. Council **did not receive a report from County Councillor Harris** and was therefore unable to receive updates on matters that Councillor Harris agreed to follow up
8. Local Signage

 NO LORRIES signs (white signs with black lorries/red cross) are urgently required. DC Judd has forwarded historical photographs to County Councillor Harris

1. The Grove Culvert - Glos Highways agreed to deal with this during this financial year to avoid flooding downstream, action to inspect took place last year and works had been booked to unblock the culvert. Highways Manager (Dan Tifney) has not responded quickly to emails but promises have been made to unblock the culvert this autumn. **Has been jetted through and clear - completed**
2. Glos Highways and Parish Council liaison
3. Motorcycle Nuisance **see Long Ford information below**
4. Grit Bin exact location required- **Middle Duntisbourne location has been discussed with CC Harris/Cllr Dyson and is now waiting installation**
5. Long Ford Collapse /wall- County Councillor Harris offered to be able to contribute some of ‘Highway’s local’ budget ‘(a small pot of money County Councillors have to contribute to highways works) in order to get this off the ground and asked if the Parish Council be able to contribute some money as well. **CFWD**
6. Road at the underpass and the parallel road to A417
7. pot holes and patches which have been reported to Glos Highways. Other roads have been done outside the Village boundaries but not within the village boundaries
8. Council approved financial reports and payment list

Council approved £250 for village and £250 for church subject to official requests

The Parish Council will take on the additional cost of grass cutting Mason Green (common land) agreed

1. **Council agreed budget and precept for 2022/23 which must be submitted before next meeting (see attached). It was agreed to increase precept to £8000 with any surplus to go to reserves**
2. The Parish Council discussed the financial implications of the Long Ford Collapse and what would happen after any repairs are completed.
3. Council wanted to look at closing the Long Ford to vehicle traffic once repairs have been done and invited Mr Morris to make a presentation on how this may be achieved. Changes to Highways require one of the following HA 1980 s116 “stopping up order” County Council makes a representation to magistrates, which is initiated by PC under s137, other methods include TRO, Town and County Planning Act or possibly on a voluntary basis.
4. HA 1980 s116 needs to show that the **road is un-necessary and would not be applicable** in this case. Costs £5-6K (leisure is classed as a necessary use, un-necessary use is a matter of fact and if people are using it, it is necessary)
5. TRO takes 18m-2yrs and cost is in range of £20k and needs to go through Highways Team. **This is likely to be the most successful route.**
6. Voluntary method may be applicable in this case and needs the co-operation of other organisations (such as Trail riders fellowship) and is informal but needs Highways Authority approval. It was stated by Mr Morris that Trail Riders Fellowship have been locally using the lanes without difficulties. Cost likely to be zero and may be amenable to such organisations. It is not legally enforceable. Highway authorities would need to approve any signage installed.
7. **It was agreed to pursue a voluntary basis as a first option. Contact details of the clerk to be shared with Trail riders Fellowship representative. Clerk will contact County Councillor Harris to seek his and the Highways authority support.**
8. Historic England may also support closing of the road to vehicle access
9. Other lanes (motorcycle nuisance) were discussed and it was felt that they have been wrongly classified on the definitive maps. But no action was agreed on the way forward on this matter
10. Police Reform Act could be used if dangerous actions are used eg speed.
11. It was also discussed if speed bumps would be useful in the area.
12. Council received updates on matters from previous meeting
13. Noticeboard in Leer by Cllr Edwards - completed
14. Police Community Group -Cllr Edwards -nothing to report- remove from agenda
15. Neighbourhood Watch – Cllr Edwards – messages via WhatsApp - remove from agenda
16. Highway issues update and Council agreed actions as follows
	1. “20 mph is plenty” County Councillor Harris previously gave an update on the practicalities and costs in the region of £20k for a TRO which could be spread amongst smaller parishes (3 or 4) but would take 18 months to 2 years.

Parish Councillors would need to consider if they would be in favour of providing funding to move the project along faster in the next financial year. Budgetary constraints were noted

* 1. Alternative schemes such as gates/signs were considered. Clerk provided some costings (see attached) as was requested at the previous meeting**. It was felt that stone troughs /flowers could be sourced as a first idea. 4ft x2ftx 2ft size was suggested- Cllr Dyson will look into this.**
	2. definitive map of PROWS – register of paths and explanation given and timescale noted of 2026 – see County Council website. Clerk to send link to Councillors
1. Planning matters considered

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| application ref | address | Closing date | PC submission /DC decision |
| 21/04211/FUL | Foxbury Hill Farm House MiddleDuntisbourne | 8/12/21 | Emailed 17/11/21**Support – Clerk to submit** |
| 21/04196/TCONR | Whiteheads Well, Duntisbourne Leer | 23/11/21 | Emailed 15/11/21**No comments** |

Duntisbourne House update- still in process – DC Judd will follow up

1. Correspondence received for Council
2. Stone Walls/Ivy – Cllr Lane responded
3. Any other business for information purposes only - none
4. Date of next meeting 22nd February 7pm (focus Standing orders/code of conduct policies)

Close of meeting 20.36pm

Financial reports for November 21 meeting

Cash book to 31st October 2021

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| payee | date | CHQ NO | AMOUNT | CURRENT A/C TOTAL FOR YEAR TO DATE |
| opening current account balance | 01/04/2021 |  |  | 2312.59 |
| PRECEPT | 22/04/2021 | RECEIPT | 3713.00 | 6025.59 |
| B HOLDER EXPENSES/SALARY | 27/04/2021 | 197 | -149.89 | 5875.70 |
| TANNERS | 02/05/2021 | 198 | -1174.80 | 4700.90 |
| B HOLDER SALARY | 25/05/2021 | 199 | -119.91 | 4580.99 |
| B HOLDER EXPENSES | 25/05/2021 | 200 | -132.74 | 4448.25 |
| HMRC | 25/05/2021 | 201 | -119.92 | 4328.33 |
| B HOLDER SALARY | 25/06/2021 | 202 | -119.91 | 4208.42 |
| GAPTC | 25/05/2021 | 203 | -77.05 | 4131.37 |
| ZURICH INS | 25/05/2021 | 204 | -140.00 | 3991.37 |
| B HOLDER SALARY | 28/07/2021 | 205 | -119.91 | 3871.46 |
| cdc | 22/04/2021 | RECEIPT | 54.01 | 3925.47 |
| B HOLDER SALARY | 28/08/2021 | SO | -119.91 | 3805.56 |
| B HOLDER SALARY | 28/09/2021 | SO | -119.91 | 3685.65 |
| easement  | 17/08/2021 | RECEIPT | 19.00 | 3704.65 |
| b holder overpayment (refunded) | 01/08/2021 | so | -239.82 | 3464.83 |
| m c & b j holder  | 03/09/2021 | RECEIPT | 239.82 | 3704.65 |
| PRECEPT | 23/09/2021 | RECEIPT | 1237.00 | 4941.65 |
| B HOLDER SALARY | 28/10/2021 | so | -119.91 | 4821.74 |
| b holder | 21/10/2021 | 206 | -76.66 | 4745.08 |
| CIL receipt | 28/10/2021 | RECEIPT | 1066.89 | 5811.97 |

Budget against Actual to 31/10/21

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| budget to date | BUDGET | ACUTAL YEAR TO DATE | BALANCE AVAILABLE TO SPEND |
| PRECEPT | 4950.00 | 4950.00 |  |
| CIL RECEIPTS | 0.00 | 1120.90 |  |
| inter account trans | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| wayleave | 0.00 | 19.00 |  |
| VAT to be reclaimed | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| other receipts | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
|  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| INCOME | 4950.00 | 6089.90 | 0.00 |
| SALARIES | 1800.00 | 959.29 | 840.71 |
| **ADMIN EXPENSES** | 610.00 | 239.38 | 370.62 |
| **INSURANCE** | 160.00 | 140.00 | 20.00 |
| **GRANTS & DONATIONS** | 600.00 | 0.00 | 600.00 |
| **payroll costs** | 90.00 | 0.00 | 90.00 |
| **SUBSCRIPTIONS** | 100.00 | 77.05 | 22.95 |
| **NOTICE BOARDS** | 1000.00 | 0.00 | 1000.00 |
| **GRASS CUTTING** | 300.00 | 0.00 | 300.00 |
| DEFIBRILLATORS | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| AUDIT & LEGAL FEES | 1200.00 | 1174.80 | 25.20 |
| DOG BINS | 252.00 | 0.00 | 252.00 |
| COMMUNITY PLAN | 1000.00 | 0.00 | 1000.00 |
| FROM RESERVES | -2162.00 |  |  |
| **Expenditure** | 4950.00 | 2590.52 |   |
| contingency/balance |  | 3499.38 |  |

Payment list to be approved

B Holder expenses

J Edwards – notice board reimbursement £161.99

Standing order form to be amended to include £26 per month working from home with effect from 28th December 21.

F J Drake & M J Drake £170.55 (installation of notice board)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| BANK RECONCILATION to 31/10/21 |  |  |  |  |
| 01/04/2021 | OPENING BANK BALANCE |  | 2312.59 |
|  | EXPENDITURE FOR PERIOD | 2590.52 |  |
|  | INCOME FOR PERIOD | 6089.90 |  |
|  | NET EXPENDITURE |  |  |
| as at above  | BANK BALANCE AS ABOVE |  | 5811.97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| as at 31/10/21 | BAL PER S/M  |  |  | 5931.89 |
|  | LESS U/P CHEQUES |  |  |
|  | hmrc | 201 | 119.92 |  |
|  | reconciled balance |  | 5811.97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total bank balance |  |  | 5811.97 |

 reserves

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **earmarked reserves** |  |  |  |  |
| COMMUNITY PLAN |  | 1000.00 | TO BE MOVED TO LEGAL FEES |
| GENERAL |  |  | 62.59 |  |  |
| DOG WASTE BINS |  | 250.00 |  |  |
| NOTICE BOARD |  | 1000.00 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2312.59 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bank balance at 31/3/21 | 2312.59 |  |  |

Budget /precept for 2022/23

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| budget to date | BUDGET | ACUTAL YEAR TO DATE | Notes to be considered | **22/23** |
| PRECEPT | 4950.00 | 4950.00 | Inflation 5% | 5198 |
| CIL RECEIPTS | 0.00 | 1120.90 | community project 5 year use by date |  |
| inter account trans | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
| wayleave | 0.00 | 19.00 |  | 19 |
| VAT to be reclaimed | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
| other receipts | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
|  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
| INCOME | 4950.00 | 6089.90 |   | 5217 |
| SALARIES | 1800.00 | 959.29 | 1800+5% | 1890 |
| **ADMIN EXPENSES** | 610.00 | 239.38 | wfh+mileage | 400 |
| **INSURANCE** | 160.00 | 140.00 |  | 160 |
| **GRANTS & DONATIONS** | 600.00 | 0.00 | church/village hall  | 600 |
| **payroll costs** | 90.00 | 0.00 |  | 90 |
| **SUBSCRIPTIONS** | 100.00 | 77.05 |  | 100 |
| **NOTICE BOARDS** | 1000.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
| **GRASS CUTTING** | 300.00 | 0.00 |  | 300 |
| DEFIBRILLATORS | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |
| AUDIT & LEGAL FEES | 1200.00 | 1174.80 |  | 150 |
| DOG BINS | 252.00 | 0.00 |  | 250 |
| COMMUNITY PLAN | 1000.00 | 0.00 |  | 1000 |
| FROM RESERVES | -2162.00 |  |  |  |
| **Expenditure** | 4950.00 | 2590.52 |  | 4940 |
| **Balance un allocated**  |  |  |  | 277 |

Council to consider which/if any project funding should be set aside for out of the budget of 2022/23

CIL receipts have a 5 year spend by limit

RFO draws Council’s attention to NALC legal briefing on Parish Council’s donating/financial supporting Churches or its property including open churchyards. Legally the Council does not have a specific Power to support Churches or its property. A council that considers making a financial contribution in these circumstances needs to consider whether it is prudent to take an action that it can not be certain is legally valid

NALC LO1/18 Financial assistance to the Church (as distributed)

“20 is plenty” follow up

Village Gates to reduce Speeding

Some of the findings given are based on a good quality simulator research study into speed reducing treatments (Jamson et al., 2010). The research specifically compared UK treatments on UK style roads. The research findings are considered to be very conservative, as the study only recruited young (19 to 25 years old) male drivers – younger drivers, and specifically young male drivers are most likely to be speeding, therefore research which is found to be effective on this group is thought to be at least equally effective on other motor vehicle users.

Results from this study found speed limit countdown signs to be the most effective treatment at village entries. Compared to other treatments, the countdown signs ensured vehicles had already reached a slower speed for the village entry. Other treatments showed drivers started to reduce their speeds closer to the village, entered the village at a higher speed, and continued to decelerate after the village gateway.

For Dragon’s teeth with speed limit markings on a red background, three good quality studies were used to reach the figure given. A study from Iowa State University introduced this treatment in isolation from any other intervention. It found relatively modest speed reduction of between 1 and 2 mph. The study design is good, assessing vehicle speeds over a long time period using a covert data collection technique, however there were no control points used, and only three instances were analysed. The second study, from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) of the United States implemented *only* the speed limit markings with a red background. At a 35 mph speed limit, results showed reductions of 1 to 7 mph in the 85th percentile speed in most situations. This study used three sites for analysis, and the results are based on large sample size, however there were no control points used. The third research piece is the aforementioned study from Jamson et al. It found mean speed reductions of around 6 mph at a 30 mph speed limit village gateway when using dragon’s teeth *only*, in comparison to when there were no dragon’s teeth. Based on these three studies, the range of 1 to 7mph speed reduction is reached.

For crash reduction at village gateways, all information is based on research from the Transportation Research Laboratory (TRL 452). For this study, multiple designs for traffic calming through villages were grouped based on similar characteristics. The study design is strong, with a large selection of sites, and long analysis periods before and after intervention. The research provides evidence that measures which move towards more physical elements are the most effective. The accident reduction figures given can only be used as a rough guide, as the village gateway measures compared on this page differ somewhat from those analysed in the research.

There’s a further noteworthy piece of research not mentioned above. TRL 641 studied ‘psychological traffic calming’. The report highlights traffic calming measures which increase cognitive load; create uncertainty; emphasise a change of environment; and break up linearity. The authors state that these elements reduce vehicle speeds considerably, due to the changes they have on the driver’s thought process. This research only backed up this theory with analysis of one village implementation in the U.K. – measures included; removing the centre line; build-outs with tree planting (to create a chicane effect); stone gateways to the village; and buff coloured road sections in pedestrian heavy areas.

### Recommendation

[Physical measures](https://www.trafficchoices.co.uk/somerset/traffic-schemes/village-gateway-physical-measures.shtml) are more effective than just signs and lines alone. Physical measures are more expensive however, and could be unpopular with some residents and motorists.

The best approach will be to use the signage and road markings recommended above, and to move towards [physical measures](https://www.trafficchoices.co.uk/somerset/traffic-schemes/village-gateway-physical-measures.shtml) if this does not help to cure the issue.

[Speed cameras](https://www.trafficchoices.co.uk/somerset/traffic-schemes/speed-cameras.shtml) can also be very effective at reducing vehicle speeds through a village.

Glasdon Uk - £400 approx with individual designs and specifications available



Speed signs (Vehicle Activated )

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mains | 6 year warrantyData collectionSlow down traffic at entrance to village | Initial costCost of installationCurrently no mains connection in locationOngoing electricity costs | £2,300 to £2,500 |  |
| Solar | 6 year warrantyData collectionDirect replacement for current deviceSlow down traffic at entrance to village | Initial costSolar panel option will not be as effective in adverse weather conditions and may temporarily shut down. | £3,455 to £3,655 |  |
| **Speed Activated Device (SID) –** measure oncoming vehicles speed and display value to driver |
| **Option** | **Pros** | **Cons** | **Cost** |  |
| Portable battery powered sign | This can be moved to different locations around the village Could possibly be offered for hire to other villages to recoup some of the costs 3 year warranty | CostSomeone would need to be responsible for moving the sign around the villageWould need a contract to loan to other villages, what about damageWarranty does not cover vandalism, impact damage, theft and batteries | £2,625 to £3,175 inclusive of 2 Lead Acid batteriesUpgrade to lithium batteries £200 to £580 |  |
| Portable solar powered signs | This can be moved to different locations around the village Could possibly be offered for hire to other villages to recoup some of the costs 3 year warranty | CostSomeone would need to be responsible for moving the sign around the villageWould need a contract to loan to other villages, what about damageWarranty does not cover vandalism, impact damage, theft and batteries | £3,240 to £3,790 10w solar powered complete with spare acid battery |  |

Our ref: DMMO/2026

Date: February 2021

Dear County Councillors, District Councillors & Clerks to Parish Councils,

Public Rights of Way and the significance of 2026

I am writing to you regarding a change in legislation which means that certain unrecorded rights of

way in your area may shortly be lost.

You may be aware of historic tracks and ways within your parish which are perhaps no longer used

on a daily basis but are considered to be part of your Parish’s history. You should know that if these

ways are not currently shown on the official records of rights of way, they could be permanently

closed off in 2026 by the owner of the land over which they cross. It is important therefore that

these routes are protected now.

The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 introduced a cut-off date for adding historic paths to

the Definitive Map (which is the legal record of rights of way). This means certain routes which

existed before 1949 and which aren’t recorded on the Definitive Map by 1st January 2026 may be

extinguished. The information within this email gives you further information about why.

It is important to note, however, that rights of way already shown on the Definitive Map are

unaffected by this change and will not be extinguished as a result.

In order to protect any currently unrecorded routes, they will need to be identified and claimed

before the 1 January 2026 cut-off. These unrecorded routes exist in law; many exist on the ground

and are in current use, while others could provide useful additional routes and links to the existing

path network.

I have enclosed a document summarising the process for recording a right of way (what is known as

a Definitive Map Modification Order) and also an information sheet suggesting documentary sources

that can be accessed online, given the current restrictions on accessing archives.

However, should your Council have any queries about the “2026 cut-off” or require assistance in

how to research a route or make an application to record a path, then please do not hesitate to

contact me. In the first instance, please email modificationorders@gloucestershire.gov.uk.

Following that initial contact, we can arrange a convenient time to discuss any concerns (whether

via phone, email or by video link).

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Houldey

Engagement Officer (PROW Definitive Map)

Asset Data Team

Gloucestershire County Council

Shire Hall, Gloucester GL1 2TH

E-mail: modificationorders@gloucestershire.gov.uk