

---

# BURTON PEDWARDINE PARISH MEETING

[www.burtonpedwardine.org.uk](http://www.burtonpedwardine.org.uk)

P O Box 8397  
SLEAFORD  
NG34 0WY

Tel: 01529 460347  
Fax: 0870 123 1612  
eMail: [contact@burtonpedwardine.org.uk](mailto:contact@burtonpedwardine.org.uk)

---

## MINUTES OF MEETING

Held at 7:30pm on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2007 in the Church of St Andrew, St Nicholas with the Blessed Virgin Mary, Burton Pedwardine.

### Present

P Davy, J Davy, T Shepperd, J French, G Webb, R Carr, K Beever, A Gray, B Gray, R Sutherland, R Tilley, M Tilley, S Lancaster, G Willerton, M Willerton, C Allen, M Coy, C Wood (Chairman)

### Apologies

J Wetherall, H Wetherall

### 1. Introductions and Welcome

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7:35pm and welcomed all those present. On behalf of everyone, the Chairman thanked Mr French, previous Chairman of the Parish Meeting, for all his hard work over the past five years. The Chairman further added his personal thanks to Mr French for his assistance in the handover of responsibilities.

### 2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Chairman presented the minutes of the previous meeting, held on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2007, and asked the meeting for comments and/or corrections. There being none, the minutes were approved by a unanimous vote of the meeting on the proposal of J Davy, seconded by B Gray.

### 3. Update following meeting with Lincolnshire Highways

The Chairman presented an update on highways matters following a meeting held with Mr Rowan Smith, Divisional Highways Manager, Lincolnshire County Council on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2007. In general, the meeting had been very productive and Mr Smith had been sympathetic to the issues raised. A formal written response from Mr Smith following the meeting was outstanding:

#### 3.1. Heckington Road (Condition and Warning Signs)

Concern was expressed over the condition of Heckington Road and the speed of some traffic along this narrow road. A weight limit was likely to be unenforceable and "Unsuitable for HGVs" signs were no longer allowable. Mr Smith agreed that warning signs may help with speed and would look into the provision of signs. In addition, steps would be taken to undertake repairs to the road surface.

### **3.2. Re-signing of A17**

A review of all signs on the A17 was currently underway. In light of HGV usage on Heckington Road, LCC Highways would look at clarifying the preferred route into the village via Asgarby Road and see if the current signs on the A17 could be made clearer, especially for vehicles approaching from the East

### **3.3. 40mph Speed Limit**

The 40mph speed limit in the village had originally been scheduled as a 50mph limit, but LCC Highways had used discretion to reduce it to 40mph. However, the locations were not ideal. At the invitation of Mr Smith, the Chairman has requested the following changes to the location of the 40mph limit:

- **Scredington Road** – Relocate the 40mph limit to the location of the current "Burton Pedwardine" village sign, which is located on the other side of Burton Bridge and to the South West of Bramble Cottage.
- **White Cross Lane** – Relocate the 40mph limit to the location of the current "Burton Pedwardine" village sign, which is located on the easterly side of Brackenbury Bridge.
- **Asgarby Road** – Relocate the 40mph limit to the location of the current "Burton Pedwardine" village sign, which is located to the north of the present location and past an existing field entrance.
- **Heckington Road** – Ideally, the 40mph limit would be extended from its current position at the junction with Helpringham Road to just north east of Burton Farm. However, with no village sign this may not be possible.

Mr Lancaster raised concerns about speeding vehicles in Burton Gorse, particularly in light of three separate vehicles leaving the road in recent months. The Chairman had discussed the issue of White Cross Lane with Mr Smith, who had indicated that a speed limit along the whole of White Cross Lane was very unlikely. However, Mr Lancaster expressed a desire for some form of reduction along that part of White Cross Lane where the accidents had happened.

**Action:** Chairman to write to LCC Highways and request a further review.

### **3.4. Drainage Issues on Helpringham Road**

A number of residents had previously complained about large accumulations of water on Helpringham Road during wet weather. Mr Smith said he would look into this and make necessary improvements. Residents who have photographs were asked to send them to the Chairman.

### **3.5. Location of Notice Board**

If the Notice Board is to be located on the highway, it will require the consent of LCC Highways and it will have to be insured. Since the village was trying to remove the need for Public Liability Insurance, this was not desirable. Judith Samuel (Lay Minister) had indicated no objection to having the Parish Notice Board located in the same place as the current Church Notice Board and operating the Notice Board as a joint Notice Board, subject to the necessary permission from the current landowner.

**Action:** Chairman to write to the landowner and request permission.

### **3.6. Relocation of Post Box**

Mr Smith indicated that the current location was probably unsuitable and that any new location would have to come at the request of Royal Mail. Following previous discussions about the unsuitable location of the Post Box on the corner of Helpringham Road and Asgarby Road, the meeting agreed that a more suitable location would be on the grassed area opposite the proposed location of the Notice Board where off-road parking was possible.

**Action:** Chairman to write to Royal Mail and request the relocation.

### **4. Update on Bus Shelter**

LCC Highways had been helpful in searching their archives and finding a letter from the inaugural Chairman of the Parish Meeting to LCC Highways regarding the construction of a Bus Shelter and enclosing Plans, which were clearly of the current Bus Shelter. These provided definitive evidence that the Bus Shelter had been constructed at the request of the Parish Meeting, even though the Parish Meetings ability to actually own the Bus Shelter was still in doubt.

The Chairman proposed that the only way to uncover any potential claim on the Bus Shelter was to write to interested parties (District and County Councils, Bus Companies etc) informing them that the Parish Meeting resolved to demolish the Bus Shelter unless objections or claims on ownership were received. The proposed timetable was as follows:

30 <sup>th</sup> November 2007	Write to all Interested Parties
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2008	Deadline for Objections / Comments / Claims on Ownership
8 <sup>th</sup> April 2008	Parish Meeting to Review Responses and make Decision
1 <sup>st</sup> May 2008	Earliest Date for Demolition
31 <sup>st</sup> May 2008	Latest Date for Demolition / Handover of Responsibility

The proposals outlined above were approved by a unanimous vote of the meeting on the proposal of P Davy, seconded by J French.

**Action:** Chairman to write to interested parties outlining the timetable above.

### **5. Change to Parish Boundary**

The Chairman outlined an anomaly that existed with respect to the Civil Parish Boundary. Cliffe Farm Cottage was the only property on White Cross Lane that fell outside the Civil Parish of Burton Pedwardine due to the way the current boundary had been drawn. Mr & Mrs Green, who live in Cliffe Farm Cottage, had expressed a desire to be included in the Parish as they felt more akin to Burton Pedwardine rather than Screington Parish. The Chairman had discussed the matter informally with North Kesteven District Council who indicated that the request would be looked on favourably.

The proposal to request the change of the Parish Boundary to include Cliffe Farm Cottage was approved by a unanimous vote of the meeting on the proposal of M Tilley, seconded by J Davy.

**Action:** Chairman to write NKDC requesting the boundary change.

## **6. Planning Applications**

The Chairman outlined the status of Planning Applications Received and Determined since the last Meeting:

### **6.1. Land at Hercocks House**

Approved by the Northern Planning Committee. The Land, with associated planning permission, was now up for sale by the Owners.

### **6.2. Land next to Meadow Farm**

Refused by the Northern Area Planning Committee. Mr French and Mr Tilley outlined the events at the Planning Meeting whereby the Committee appeared to contradict themselves by refusing an almost identical application to 6.1 above. Mr French felt that the Committee had acted improperly and had completely ignored the views of the Parish Meeting. Mr Tilley indicated that another application would be submitted in due course.

### **6.3. Nursery at Cliffe Farm Cottage**

Approved by NKDC under delegated powers. Mr Lancaster expressed concern that he had not received notification of the application until very late and was concerned over possible extra traffic that the nursery may generate (see 3.3 above). Mr Willerton felt that the views of neighbours had not been heard, or had been ignored by planners.

The Chairman explained that statutory consultation was limited only to immediate neighbours and that a Planning Application Notice had been located near the site by NKDC. Planners were only allowed to make decisions based on Planning Law and whilst neighbours objections may be understandable and planners may even be sympathetic to them, Planning Law determines what can be taken into account.

The applicants had met the Chairman on several occasions and had stressed that they were not intending to create a retail nursery / garden centre on the site, rather the ability to grow plants that may otherwise be imported for sale through existing channels. Visits to the site would be "By Appointment" only. The Chairman encouraged neighbours to speak to the applications about any concerns they had.

### **6.4. Old School House**

A revision to the approved plans had been received but were considered minor by planners. The previously proposed integrated garage was now to be another Bedroom and En Suite.

### **6.5. Extension to Meadow Farm Cottage**

Revised plans had been received, although the application had yet to be determined. The meeting generally felt that the works carried out to date had been sympathetic and had improved that part of the village significantly.

## **6.6. Land Adjacent to Holme Cottage**

Revised plans had been received, although the application had yet to be determined. The Chairman reported that the revised plans were unsympathetic to the existing street scene, it was difficult to see how forward exit from the site could be achieved and there was a boundary dispute with a neighbouring property. The Chairman had therefore submitted an objection to the application and was awaiting a decision from planners.

## **6.7. Future Applications**

In light of concerns expressed about consultation, especially where neighbours may not find out about an application until late in the process, a revised process was discussed and agreed.

- On receipt of an application, the Chairman would forward brief details to all those residents who had provided eMail addresses.
- Residents in receipt of eMail notification would then cascade the information to those who did not have eMail.
- Comments and/or Objections received by the Chairman would be considered as part of the Parish Meeting's formal response.
- In the event that no Comments and/or Objections were received, the Chairman would use his discretion in responding.
- Any Resident could call a special meeting of the Parish Meeting to discuss any application. The Chairman also had the ability to call a meeting if he considered the application to be contentious.

The Chairman reminded the meeting that comments had to be submitted to NKDC within 21 days, so any meeting would need to be held swiftly.

In light of the Planning Committee's handling of the application at Meadow Farm, the meeting proposed that the Parish's two District Councillors be invited to the next Parish Meeting to hear residents' views about the future of planning in the Parish.

**Action:** Chairman to invite Cllr Roberts & Cllr Ogden to the next Parish Meeting.

## **7. Neighbourhood Watch**

The Chairman reported that there had been little activity on NHW. The new signs had been delaying following the availability of additional funding from NKDC and the possible relocation of the Speed Limit Signs, to which the NHW signs would be attached.

## **8. Parish Partnership**

The Chairman reported on the formation of the Parish Partnership between NKDC and the Parish Councils / Meetings of the District. Ann Stevenson had been appointed Parish Partnership Officer for the Cluster that Burton Pedwardine was a member. Several initiatives were discussed and for which the Chairman invited input:

### **8.1. Local Plan**

This was to be replaced by a Local Development Framework through to 2026. Residents were asked to provide feedback on their vision of the Parish in 2026 for inclusion in the visioning exercise currently underway.

## **8.2 Speed Signs**

The devolved fund for the Cluster was discussed and information on the proposed portable speed sign was circulated. Residents who may wish to suggest alternative uses for the devolved fund were asked to provide feedback to the Chairman.

## **9. Correspondence**

The Chairman outlined the various items of correspondence that had been received.

## **10. Any Other Business**

Mr Coy raised the issue of poor service from Royal Mail. Mr French indicated that he had not received any response to his letter that was sent after the last Parish Meeting.

**Action:** Chairman to write to Royal Mail again.

There being no further business, the Chairman thanked those for attending and declared the meeting closed at 9:35pm.