

## Watermead Parish Council Meeting

Thursday 15 April 2021 at 7.30pm  
Via Video Conferencing

Attendees: Cllr Severn (Chair), Cllr A Schwab, Cllr M Singleton, Cllr I Schwab,  
Cllr P Dean, Cllr M Morgan, Cllr E Rose  
BC Cllr Ashley Bond, BC Cllr Peter Cooper  
Noreen Shardlow (Clerk), Michelle Jackson (Assistant Parish Clerk)  
Stuart Mackay plus 14 members of the public

### 20.97 Apologies

BC Cllr Netta Glover

### 20.98 Declarations of Interest

To declare any personal or prejudicial interests regarding the agenda – none

### 20.99 To Receive Police Report re Protection of Persons & Property

PCSO Matthew Sansom and the team are carrying out regular patrols in Watermead, their presence is very much noticed. They now provide regular call updates to the office which over the past few weeks have included the following matters; attempted car break ins, nuisance bikes, fire in bin on balloon meadow and people on the small bandstand island. All matters are either dealt with or being monitored.

As a sign of respect, the PC held a Minute's silence in memory of HRH Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh.

### 20.100 Open Forum for Parishioners at 7.40pm – 8.10pm followed by the Council Meeting

The Chair announced that

"Members of the public are here to discuss question 19 on the neighbourhood survey. It may help you in relation to the discussions we are going to have this evening if I quickly run through the plan as far as Watermead is concerned: as part of the evidence gathering the survey is an integral part.

- **Timing:** changes to planning legislation mean that parishes without a neighbourhood plan are very vulnerable to speculative development on any and all pieces of empty land regardless of whether they are within a green belt, agricultural use or similar.
- **Parish map:** Cllr Severn shared her screen showing the Watermead Neighbourhood Plan Area designated by Bucks Council includes much empty land, such as the land to the east of Watermead between us and Birtton where we joined AVDC to take the developer to a planning hearing: they lost: they probably wouldn't in today's planning climate. **We cannot** rely on someone not coming back on this land. Other areas, while designated leisure, as we know only too well can simply have change of use.

**Housing:** we have to cover this if we don't the plan will never be accepted by the LPA. We have to consult parishioners on where and what. If we discover no land is available, or no need so much the better, but it has to be covered off in the questionnaires and the plan.

**Demographics:** we need to know who lives here and something about them as well as what they want for the future.

**Facilities:** the question about a possible new village hall has caused unnecessary concern. We are sorry about this, we were simply asking parishioners did they want one, and if so, what they might want to use it for. It's not a done deal. Unfortunately, this has not come across clearly enough, for

which we are sorry (had we had any desire to focus on that in particular we would have provided more information).

Please remember this is **our plan for everyone for the future.**

We wanted to know how much support there would be for a larger hall.

Anecdotal evidence beforehand indicated that many people wanted a larger hall, more available, away from housing, without disturbing neighbours etc. And the parish council has for several years had a sum in its budget earmarked for 'recreational facilities' which, quite frankly, is 'code' for getting the cricket pitch back into parish ownership and allowing a sports and leisure facility to be built.

### **The result?**

About the hall, of 240 respondents:

152 were in favour of a new hall and 88 against the hall - we know now there is not the unanimous support needed to justify making this a priority project at the present time.

The single most popular request is for improved path around the lakes. This is already a priority for the parish council."

### **James Bolt**

Has lived on Watermead for 26 years and is very proud of the area. He thanked Sue for the clarification but he had concerns regarding the transparency and wording of Q19. The question states that the Parish Council had discussed this but he was unable to find any record of this in any minutes. He requested to be directed to the relevant minutes or that the question be corrected. He felt the question was bias in the survey. Q18 was a good question asking about 12 areas of improvement to be ranked in order of importance. Q19 had much more wording than any other area of improvements. He therefore felt that Q19 and Q20 were bias towards a village hall. Recommended that Q19 and Q20 be remove from the survey.

*Cllr Severn thanked James for his input and points would be taken into consideration.*

### **Debbie Clarke**

Agreed with James. The Chairman's explanation of the reason for the questionnaire was very helpful and if more information had been included with the questionnaire, people may have been more receptive to it. Many of the questions appeared to be nosey and intrusive but with the explanation of why demographics were important, people would have understood the need for questioning. She also agreed with James that Q18 was a good question, but that Q19 and Q20 were leading questions. Many would not appreciate the costs involved with building a new village hall. With so much detail given on the facilities of a new hall, it gives the impression that it would be a massive project that would cost an enormous amount of money. It had not been explained how that would be paid for and stated it could potentially become self-funding. She was concerned that the PC would consider taking on such a project which may not become self-funding after huge expenditure on building. Timing of the questionnaire was also a concern just before parish council elections.

*Cllr Severn advised that the timing was due to accessing the grant funding which was needed to pay for the expert consultancy needed in putting the Neighbourhood Plan together. The window of opportunity to obtain the funding closed on 31 March.*

Debbie was also shocked by Q21.

People had raised questions regarding the questionnaire on the All About

Watermead (AAW) Facebook page and the discussion was forcibly moved to another group with the questions/points made in the AAW group removed. Threads had been deleted and in the new group when people asked specific questions of the Cllrs, the questions were unanswered.

Cllr Severn commented that as a general rule Cllrs do not respond to matters raised on Facebook but by official routes. Debbie commented that the new Facebook group had been set up by Cllrs. Cllr Severn advised that the group had been set up with the intention of driving the traffic about the Neighbourhood Plan to the new group and as a way of providing information. Results of the survey would be published on this page. Cllr Severn assured Debbie that no Cllr had requested that the thread on the AAW group be removed. Cllr Morgan had been in contact with Jo Fagan who had kindly agreed to be an Admin for the new page.

#### **Paul Lander**

In relation to a potential village hall, he was struck by the length and wording of Q19. He would need much more information to make an informed decision but was interested to know when and where a new village hall had been discussed.

*Cllr Severn advised that there had been an article in the village view about the Neighbourhood Plan which some people may not have seen. For many years the PC had a sum in its budget earmarked for 'recreational facilities' which, quite frankly, is 'code' for getting the cricket pitch back into parish ownership and allowing a sports and leisure facility to be built. Cllr Severn apologised that the question had been worded incorrectly.*

It was agreed to extend the Open Forum

#### **Ashleigh Jones**

The questionnaire refers to other key stakeholders and she was interested to know who they are. *Cllr Severn advised that there are 142 businesses registered in Watermead and neighbouring land owners were also key stakeholders. With regards to the vision for a village hall and a business hub, where would the funding come from? Cllr Severn advised that it would have to be self-funding. Discussed Princes Trust doing a joint venture with the businesses. A young enterprise area may be something to be considered and would be part of the business questionnaire due out in the next 3-4 weeks.*

As a responder to the questionnaire, she felt she had been asked questions against a prepared document of insider knowledge.

*Cllr Severn advised that Q19 would be revisited.*

#### **Donna Aldridge**

With regard to empty land around Watermead as a potential site for building a new village hall, she was concerned about being contradictory if we were to say we don't want more houses but can we build a hall. *Cllr Severn responded that you can't have residential property in floodzone 3a but that you can have properties that can only be occupied during the day. Cllr Severn advised that we have to answer question on housing in the plan. Vast majority do not want any more housing. 998 houses on Watermead and everyone received a copy of the questionnaire. A return of over 25% had been received which was expected.*

Going forward Donna believed it would be a good idea for the PC to have its own Facebook page. *Cllr Singleton responded that the PC has a website but that a Facebook page would be considered.*

#### **Debbie Clarke**

As 2 Cllrs set up Facebook group, if more had been explained within the group, maybe more people would have completed the questionnaire.

The Chairman thanked the visitors for their attendance.

### **Council Meeting**

#### **20.101 To agree the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 18 March 2021**

The Minutes were agreed and signed as a true record of the meeting. It was proposed and agreed that the Clerk should sign on behalf of the PC.

The Clerk

#### **20.102 Planning Matters**

1. **To update on any Planning Applications submitted** – no updates. The Clerk was continuing to monitor the Football Club Ground application.
2. **21/01160/APP 4 Grebe Close** – Single storey rear and front extension – it was proposed and agreed to remain neutral to the planning application but express concerns about overdevelopment of a small property into a 4 bedroomed property, parking issues and not in-keeping with the vernacular of local area.

The Clerk

#### **20.103 1 To receive Update from the Neighbourhood Plan**

Cllr Morgan commented that it was good to have got the questionnaire out. There was a lot to take in with the feedback and how best to proceed to the next stage. It was encouraging that a number of people are responding with their thoughts views and ideas which is exactly what the plan is all about and making sure that we protect the area in and around Watermead from development which is not suitable for our community. The team to start preparing for the business and landowners engagement. There is also the upcoming election which may change the dynamics of the working group. Alongside the business and landowners questionnaire, the group will start thinking more proactively about physical engagement and getting more of the community involved directly.

Everyone currently involved will continue to be involved post-election. Anyone is welcome to join the working group.

Peter Cooper commented on other neighbourhood plans and the processes they went through at the same stage Watermead is at. One thing in common with others is that parishioners become suspicious and concerned. He advised that the government via local planning authority are going to enforce a certain number of houses on every community. The advantage of having a neighbourhood plan is that parishioners can decide where the housing will go and the services/facilities that go with it. Without a neighbourhood plan, developers can build where they choose.

#### **2 Formal Complaint received from Cllr E Rose**

Cllr Rose had raised a complaint but commented that if the explanation provided at this evening's meeting had been made prior, a formal complaint may not have been necessary. Eric has been a Cllr of Watermead PC 10 out of last 12 years. The issue he raised is Q19 which states that "as a PC we are considering whether we might be able to building a new larger parish hall on land away from private properties creating a sustainable self-financing facility". No such formal and detailed discussions have taken place at a Parish Council meeting. He felt the question was wrong and misleading. Firstly, while he fully supports the idea of a Neighbourhood Plan, he felt that the questions should have been discussed amongst the Cllrs prior to submission. Secondly there had been difficulty for people logging on due to the letters/numbers of the Survey Monkey link, and thirdly he had requested a reminder of when a new village hall was discussed. No response was received. Many parishioners have raised similar issues at the meeting tonight. It was proposed and agreed to strike out Q19 and revisit.

Peter Dean commented that the reason there was so much information/wording on that question was if and only if parishioners wished for a new hall, it would be the one project that would take the most time and effort in getting funding etc. On reflection, the questionnaire should have stated that there would be further

questionnaires and consultation on what parishioners wanted.

Cllr Severn reported that the questionnaire would be closed on 30 April and a decision would need to be taken on how to communicate the results.

## 20.104 Finance & Administration

1. The payment schedule for April 2021 was agreed.

Payment Schedule		Apr-21		Payment Method (if Chq provide Number)		
Company	Invoice No	Allocation	Net Amount	VAT	Gross Amount	
Mobile Mini	7001987940	R&M Land	£53.00	£10.60	£63.60	BACS
Buckinghamshire Council	Village Hall Bin	Village Hall	£63.30	£0.00	£63.30	DD
Ian Whittome	29th March 2021	Grass	£50.00	£0.00	£50.00	BACS
British Gas	600026660	Village Hall Supply	£101.62	£5.08	£106.70	BACS
CLC Grounds Maintenance	2665-2667	Litter, R&M & Grass	£1,466.00	£0.00	£1,466.00	BACS
Michelle Jackson	Apr-21	Assistant Clerk	£240.51	£0.00	£240.51	BACS
Noreen Shardlow	Apr-21	Clerk & Office/Expenses	£1,615.31	£0.00	£1,615.31	BACS
HMRC	Apr-21	PAYE & NI	£497.86	£0.00	£497.86	BACS
G. M. Hall & Co	Apr-21	PAYE	£30.00	£0.00	£30.00	BACS
Village Hall Management	Apr-21	Hall Management	£600.00	£0.00	£600.00	BACS
Community Impact Bucks	5343	Community Building Subs	£50.00	£10.00	£60.00	BACS
North Bucks Parishes Planning C	WPC-Subs	Subscription	£20.00	£0.00	£20.00	BACS
The National Allotment Society	S3651A	Allotment Subscription	£55.00	£11.00	£66.00	BACS
Office Furniture Warehouse (Bu	I03875	Village Hall Supplies	£44.50	£8.90	£53.40	BACS
E.ON	11469595940	Bandstand Electricity	£10.68	£0.53	£11.21	DD
Buckinghamshire Council	1704421	Business Rates	£611.28	£0.00	£611.28	BACS
Dave Lucas	Mar-April 2021	R&M, Litter, Emergency Repairs including fencing & bandstand	£900.00	£0.00	£900.00	BACS
			£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
			£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
<b>Routine Payments Total</b>			<b>£6,409.06</b>	<b>£46.11</b>	<b>£6,455.17</b>	
<b>Non Routine Payment</b>						
			£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
<b>Total</b>			<b>£6,409.06</b>	<b>£46.11</b>	<b>£6,455.17</b>	
Approval for Electronic Payments - To be signed by two Cllr. Signatories at meeting of the Parish Council		Cllr Signature:		Date Approved:		
		Cllr Signature:		Date Approved:		

2. To agree the accounts to the end of March 2021(2020-2021 Year End) - The Clerk had previously circulated the accounts to the end of March 2021, which were approved.

3. To renew the following Parish Council Policies:

- Standing Orders (including Risk Assessment)
- Financial & Procurement Regulations
- Communications Policy

Cllr Rose/

- Asset Register – typos to be amended
- Memorial Policy - to be amended as per discussions at previous meeting.

The Clerk

Cllr Severn/  
The Clerk

Cllr Severn/The Clerk to investigate whether a valuation policy for assets was needed.

#### 4. Protocol for marking the death of a senior member of the British Monarchy

I was delighted to be asked to be one of the Deputy Lieutenants for Buckinghamshire in late 2020 and I am contacting you in your role as clerk for Watermead Parish Council at the request of our new Lord-Lieutenant for Buckinghamshire, The Countess Howe.

This is in relation to a confidential and discreet matter to do with any preparations you may have or may wish to consider in the event of national mourning following either the death of the Sovereign or His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh referred to as Operation London Bridge and Operation Forth Bridge respectively.

You may in the past have received information and guidance from either the Buckinghamshire Lieutenancy Office or NACO about the protocols to observe. There is no obligation for Parishes to do anything, but many might like to. The purpose of my contact is to offer any assistance you may need, to understand plans you may already have, if any, and to relay this back to the Lieutenancy Office.

Forth Bridge arrangements will be much more focussed around Windsor and a Ceremonial Funeral. For London Bridge there are day-by-day protocols. Please let me know if you require any information, but the Lieutenancy Office would like to ensure we have the latest information on your plans and would be grateful if you could confirm the answers to the following questions some of which you may have been asked previously?

1. Do you have plans for a D+2 proclamation ceremony at 15:30 in your parish? (Following the High Sheriff Proclamation at 12:30 in Aylesbury)
2. Do you have Books of Condolence and have you selected the venue where they might be available to members of the public, if so can you confirm the venue please?
3. Are you fully aware of the Flag Flying protocols – especially on D+2 for the Proclamation Reading?
4. Are there plans for a Memorial Service in your parish?
5. Would you appreciate the presence of a Deputy Lieutenant in the event of the Bridges being enacted?

It was agreed to adopt the Protocol for marking the death of a senior member of the British Monarchy.

#### 5. Remote Meetings

Communication received regarding the legislation for us to hold meetings:

“It is just over a year to the day since the Prime Minister asked us all to stay at home, and local authorities across England have risen magnificently to the challenges of this period. There has been a dramatic shift in your day-to-day operations, alongside new difficulties and demands, and I commend the efforts of all councillors and officers in supporting your communities and ensuring vital

business continues during these unprecedented times.

As you will be aware, The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 do not apply to meetings on or after 7 May 2021.

Extending the regulations to meetings beyond May 7 would require primary legislation. The Government has considered the case for legislation very carefully, including the significant impact it would have on the Government's legislative programme, which is already under severe pressure in these unprecedented times. We are also mindful of the excellent progress that has been made on our vaccination programme and the announcement of the Government's roadmap for lifting Covid-19 restrictions. Given this context, the Government has concluded that it is not possible to bring forward emergency legislation on this issue at this time.

As outlined in the Government's Spring 2021 Covid-19 Response our aim is for everyone aged 50 and over and people with underlying health conditions to have been offered a first, our aim is for everyone dose of the Covid-19 vaccine by 15 April, and a second dose by mid-July. While local authorities have been able to hold meetings in person at any time during the pandemic with appropriate measures in place, the successful rollout of the vaccine and the reduction in cases of Covid-19 should result in a significant reduction in meeting in person from May 7, as reflected in the Government's plan to ease Covid-19 risk for local authority members restrictions over the coming months.

I recognise there may be concerns about holding face-to-face meetings. Ultimately it is for local authorities to apply the Covid-19 guidance to ensure meetings take place safely, but we have updated our guidance on the safe use of council buildings to highlight ways in which you can, if necessary, minimise the risk of face-to-face meetings, and we will work with sector representative bodies to ensure that local authorities understand the guidance and are aware of the full range of options available to them.

You can find the updated guidance here:  
[www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-council-buildings/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-council-buildings](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-council-buildings/covid-19-guidance-for-the-safe-use-of-council-buildings).

These options would include use of your existing powers to delegate decision making to key individuals such as the Head of Paid Service, as these could be used these to minimise the number of meetings you need to hold if deemed necessary. Additionally, some of you will be able to rely on single member decision making without the need for cabinet meetings if your constitution allows.

While I appreciate that a greater number of authorities will be subject to elections this year due to the postponement of the 2020 elections, those councils who are not subject to elections could also consider conducting their annual meetings prior to 7 May, and therefore do so remotely while the express provision in current regulations apply. As you will know, councils who are subject to elections are statutorily required to hold their annual meeting within 21 days of the elections. The Government's roadmap proposes that organised indoor meetings (e.g. performances, conferences) are permitted from 17 May, subject to Covid secure guidelines and capacity rules. On this basis, councils should consider the extent to which their annual meetings (and any other meetings) can operate on the same basis as other local institutions in their area, taking into account their individual circumstances and requirements.

If your council is concerned about holding physical meetings you may want to consider resuming these after 17 May, at which point it is anticipated that a much greater range of indoor activity can resume in line with the Roadmap,

such as allowing up to 1,000 people to attend performances or sporting events in indoor venues, or up to half-capacity (whichever is lower).

Finally, while you do have a legal obligation to ensure that the members of the public can access most of your meetings, I would encourage you to continue to provide remote access to minimise the need for the public to attend meetings physically until at least 21 June, at which point it is anticipated that all restrictions on indoor gatherings will have been lifted in line with the Roadmap. However, it is for individual local authorities to satisfy themselves that they have met the requirements for public access.

I am grateful for the efforts that local authorities have made to allow remote meetings in their area and recognise that there has been a considerable investment of time, training and technology to enable these meetings to take place, and I am aware that some authorities, though by no means all, have made calls for the Government to make express provision for remote meetings beyond the scope of the pandemic. I am today launching a call for evidence on the use of current arrangements and to gather views on the question of whether there should be permanent arrangements and if so, for which meetings. There are many issues to consider and opinions on the detailed questions vary considerably. This will establish a clearer evidence base of opinion and enable all the areas to be considered before further decisions are made. The Government will consider all responses carefully before deciding to how to proceed on this issue.

I am copying this letter to the Mayor of London, the chairs of the Local Government Association and the National Association of Local Councils, as well as the Home Secretary and the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in respect of other authorities covered by the current meetings regulations, including fire and rescue authorities, police and crime panels, national park authorities, the Broads Authority, and conservation boards."

The Clerk advised that the hall was permitted to open for adult groups from 17 May and the next PC meeting is due to take place on 20 May. Dependent on the number of attendees we may need to continue to hold meetings by zoom for public attendance. If it was possible to hold in the hall, lateral flow tests to be undertaken on the morning of the meeting by all attendees. Social distancing to be maintained and windows and doors to remain open. Provision to be made for zoom meetings to take place if necessary.

## **20.105 Councillors' Reports and Recommendations**

### **1 To update of Land and Routine Land Work**

**Endicott Parcels of Land** - Ongoing awaiting response from Crown Estates.

**BBQ** - Waiting confirmed collection date from David Ogilvie Engineering. Cont has been made on three occasions, two to collect and one to advise about flooding.

#### **Bandstand Island Bridge/Footpath**

Shortly after our March meeting Dave Lucas installed a much safer barrier to the small lake bandstand (agreed via email).

One contractor has been to site and will be providing a quotation for the repositioning of the bridge and also the small lake path tree damage area (image below). I do have a second contractor quoting who will be attending.



### **Crematorium Screening**

Update - Meeting with Alan Jòse scheduled Friday 16<sup>th</sup> April 2021.

The meeting scheduled for 27<sup>th</sup> January 2021 with Alan Jòse of Westerleigh Crematoria was postponed due to Westerleigh Covid-19 restrictions. A new date has been scheduled to discuss the on-going concerns that the Parish has relating to the screening at the Crematorium and the "living wall" that was planted with the purpose of preventing residents of lakeside properties seeing funeral cortege's entering and leaving the Crematorium. The living wall has failed, as have other screening plants.

This meeting will also consider other planting ideas for the site that have been postponed due to the Pandemic.

**Walkway Brackets Installation** - Delayed due to flooding.

### **Balloon Meadow Benches**

Advice received from our local contractor, Dave Lucas.

With regard to curing and combating future erosion caused to the foot resting area to the balloon field benches

The Clerl

Concrete: in my view would not contour with the ground and given the movement with flooding and long dry periods could produce a trip hazard

**Cost £150 per bench**

The Clerl

Hoggin whilst potentially the primary choice this would still track and in a few seasons leave much the same problem as current

**Cost £ 80 per bench**

Cllr Singleton

MOT Type one compacted this would produce a fairly permanent solution and would contour into the ground in time giving a natural appearance

**Cost £75 per bench**



It was proposed and agreed to proceed with the concrete option.

### **Small Lake Fencing/Barriers**

Friday 9<sup>th</sup> April, Cllr Morgan sent the below image to me of the fence/barrier near to where the swan is nesting. With the amount of visitors to this area Dave Lucas very kindly attended on Saturday and made the barrier safe. I have since received the below advice from Dave for you to consider.

The fence overlooking the swan nest on the small lake has been repaired in a temporary fashion and whilst I am confident this will hold for a reasonable time in the long term I feel should be replaced at a cost of £270 the other section further

towards the nursing home is also reaching a similar state and replacement will shortly be necessary whilst this is slightly longer doing both sections would cost £500.

As a guide this would be the costing for similar sections around the lakes.



The Clerk

It was proposed and agreed to replace both barriers at a cost of £500.

#### **Request for Dog Bin on Public Right of Way**

Some months ago we received a request from a Parishioner asking can a Dog Waste Bin be placed on the Public Right of Way (PROW) to the rear of Watermead. The following response has been received from Buckinghamshire Council.

*"In relation to the dog bins on rights of ways. This is something we do not do. There are thousands of miles of rights of way (across private/un-adopted land) and it just isn't operationally feasible (or financially viable) to provide dog bins through these routes. I do understand the frustrations of local residents though. There been a lot in the press around use of rights of ways particularly increased footfall during the pandemic."*

**2 Large Lake Footways Project Update**

Cllr Severn advised that she had taken advice from an engineer and an architect who confirmed the PC would not be doing anything that would affect the water table.

The Clerk had been in contact with the contractors since the last meeting to explore various options. Grant applications have been initiated but finer detail in writing was needed to support the applications.

The Clerk

**3 Watermead Piscatorials Update**

Communication received from Martin Mynott Watermead Piscatorials. As you will see from the below email the bollard to the small lake has failed. I have also tried my key but the lock keeps spinning. Lock & Key will have to attend.

Good afternoon Noreen,

I'm writing to let you know that we have a working party planned for the Sunday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2021 08.00 – 13.00 at Watermead lake.

The planned work will be to remove the netting between the two lakes (if possible), and to tidy up the swims around the lake, also removing the fallen branch by the road bridge (again if possible), with a general tidy up of any overhanging branches.

There may well be another working party in June depending on the water level, as accessing some of the fishing swims is difficult at the moment.

Have you been able to get the access post key repaired yet, as this would help in getting equipment to the lake.

Please let me know if you require anything else doing while we are there?

Best regards,  
Martin

**4 Report received from Roman Park Community Trust**

The Trust continues to support those in need. The need is growing with requirements for school uniform and computers for pupils.

**5 To update on Allotments**

Nothing to report.

**6 To report on Village View**

Cllr Singleton reported that an editorial meeting had been arranged for 25 April. The deadline for submissions was 26 April. Cllr Singleton to continue as Editor of the Village View even if she was not elected at the forthcoming election.

Cllr Singleton

**7 To update on Village Hall & COVID-19 Measures including return of groups**

**Return of Groups** – As agreed at our March 2021 Jo Jingle will be resuming their weekly class from 20<sup>th</sup> April 2021. Copies of Risk Assessment received from Debbie Bird.

The Clerk

**Village Hall Wall**

**Update:** Contractors have now returned to site.

As advised in a recent email, the rear wall of the Village Hall has again been subject

to water damage. I provided Christopher Evans of Compton Property Management the before and after photographs that I sent to all and he immediately passed them onto Charles Mallard, Surveyor/Project Manager for the Piazza Development.

Charles Mallard visited the hall last week to inspect the damage to our wall and has agreed when ACC Facilities Management (appointed contractor for the Piazza) return they will inspect and report back the findings and Charles will provide us with an update/course of action.

**8 Compton Property Management**

Awaiting response from Christopher Evans at Compton Property Management. No voluntary contribution has been sent as yet.

**9 To update on Transport & MVAS**

Cllr Severn reported that she was still trying to obtain a new battery for the MVAS. Decision on the Zipp Mobility Scooters to be referred until the Autumn.

**10 To update on Highways**

Nothing to report.

**11 Photography Exhibition**

Cllr Rose commented that there were some super photos on the All About Watermead Facebook page and it was hoped that there would be plenty of entries. The competition had been extended to people outside of Watermead. There would be restrictions on the number of photos that could be submitted per person. It was agreed to have entries displayed digitally on the website as well as holding a display in the hall. Entries to be sent to [noreen.shardlow@watermead-gov.uk](mailto:noreen.shardlow@watermead-gov.uk)

**20.106 Date of meetings**

20 May, 17 June, 15 July, 19 August, 16 September, 21 October, 18 November, 16 December

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.40pm and thanked people for their attendance.

**20.107 Due to the confidential nature of the business to be discussed, it will be necessary for a Councillor to move a motion to close the meeting to the press and public under Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960.**

**Staff Review HR**

**Communications Policy**