

**LYDIARD MILLICENT PARISH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRA PARISH COUNCIL MEETING  
21<sup>ST</sup> July 2005 7.30 p.m. in the JCH.**

**Minutes approved as a true record of the meeting by Cllr T.H. Peperall**

The Chairman opened the evening and apologized that there was little room to move - he had not anticipated so much interest in the Agenda items to be discussed.

A large number of residents had come due to a letter the Chairman had delivered to seven homes in The Beeches, as a feeler for reaction to a cemetery in the adjacent field. One resident had duplicated the letter to other residents and had caused a great deal of unnecessary anxiety. The Chairman tried to explain that the initial response from the seven homes was sufficient for him to recommend the proposal be taken no further at the coming meeting on 4th of August when it will be an Agenda item. Had the initial reactions been favourable, the proposal would then have been circulated to the rest of the Beeches before the meeting.

**Parishioners Question Time.**

Questions on the new proposed site for a cemetery included:-

Why Mr Woolford's offer to site the school on his field had not been taken up? *WCC did not have the available funds.*

Why purchase land for Swindon parents to park on?

Why Lydiard Tregoz P.C. were to share the cemetery? *Their churchyard is full, and they are too small a Parish to afford such a scheme, but would have contributed to the cost.*

Why the Old Cemetery could not be re-used after its 80 years? *To be investigated, but there are serious difficulties in using an old cemetery.*

Why the land adjacent to the current cemetery could not be compulsory purchased? *Very expensive, although new legislation is being discussed which may help to provide grant money.*

Concerns were raised over possible use of the new site by fly tippers and Gypsies, as the proposed site is fairly secluded, and would also attract youngsters wanting to play.

Concerns were raised over crossing the road from the new site, which is known to be difficult enough from The Beeches - could there be a crossing placed near the new site? *A crossing was being considered, which would also have helped to slow traffic.*

Some other schools were mentioned, where School Governors actually tell new parents that cars are not allowed within a certain distance of the school.

Another entrance on to the main road would add to problems.

What was in it for the donor of the field? - *nothing; a very generous offer, although the land does have the complication of an Oil pipelines running across it.*

It was generally agreed that the parishioners did not want the cemetery to be moved to the Beeches side of the road, and felt that it was wrong to separate the cemeteries.

It was asked of the Chairman why all Councillors were not aware of this proposal.

*The Chairman replied that such a discussion would have occurred at a council meeting, which would have given residents unnecessary concerns. Most Councillors were aware that negotiations were taking place and that a discussion would be put held.*

The Pipeline operator who had been measuring the field told the residents that a cemetery and car park would be going onto the field, as though it was finalised, and that an agreement with Mr Hoare was imminent. *The operator spoke outside his remit, and raised unwarranted concerns.*

*The positioning of the pipeline was necessary to formulate a sketch for residents to look at.*

The question was asked why the issue of a new cemetery had not been in the Parish Plan.

*It had not been a concern of residents, but highway safety and parking had. This suggestion would have helped to solve several issues at little cost to the Parish.*

Again the footpath beside the garage was discussed and the need to make it easier to use. A solution could be a new Pelican crossing from the Sun car park to the pavement opposite.

The full Parish Accounts were requested. They are being computerised at present. The Internal Auditor has made her visit and the deadline for the accounts is 30<sup>th</sup> September.

#### Sun Representation.

This extra meeting had been called to discuss the new licence arrangements applied for by the Sun Inn and responses were initially needed by the 25<sup>th</sup> July, now deferred to 2<sup>nd</sup> August. Every club and pub in the country are having to complete the complicated new licence forms which are 26 pages long. The government are encouraging a basic standardised licence, based on European opening times, to make it easier for policing.

Blenheim Inns, are trying to be as co-operative as possible. They have offered to change their application, if reasonable requests were made by parishioners. The Parish Council had received letters in relation to the input the Sun Inn gives to the village. Lydiard Link have written to thank them for fund raising, and many other local organisations have similarly benefitted, e.g. the school hall. They allow parents use the car park, and offer similar facilities to other businesses. The P.C. also use the car park for the annual village clean up, and they take overflow from funerals and weddings and other functions. However, they have to be competitive against other local pubs, and stand to lose business if they are not. Our current owners owns 7 similar country pubs. The Village could be much worse off with a different owner, such as the Hungry Horse.

The Parish Council cannot offer its own views on the pub, it can only represent the views of local residents. This type of application is different to a planning application. The P.C. will send a representation stating the different views, and suggesting a compromise.

Consensus of opinion was asked for, one topic at a time.

If parishioners can agree amendments, then the Parish Council could represent them. The only negotiable aspects are elements that are changing, i.e. opening hours and live music. If villagers and the Blenheim Inn cannot agree, then NWDC Licensing Dept. will try to reconcile differences, and failing that, the decision will be made at a Hearing, when a Government Inspector will decide. Parishioners who make representations should be able to speak at this hearing. The Chairman had spoken to NWDC regarding representations, and they will send more forms.

Question - is the licence for one year? No - licence has no time limit - only different ownership or substantial breaches of the licence could result in the licence being reviewed.

It was noted by a Councillor that the Pub has operated successfully for several years and if he were the owner he would be asking himself 'why change a successful formula?'

Suggestions of hiring our own legal representative was mentioned but not taken up.

Consensus of opinion was asked for one topic at a time.

### **Refreshments**

The application is for late night refreshments to continue up to 1/2 hour after time is called. This can be coffee, and other hot drinks, served with at the bar. This applies to all establishments wanting to serve any form of food or beverage after specific times. They will also be able to serve alcohol to diners during that period. This replaces the existing 'drinking up' time.

*Few thought this was a good idea, and the manager of the Sun Inn explained that she would not wish to work longer hours than at present to serve food and beverage.*

### **Live Music**

This happens rarely, and the application applied for is restricting live entertainment to no more than 20 times a year, which includes any act of two persons or more.

There were concerns about noise being generated up to 20 times a year. The manager tried to assure the members that it did not mean they would have live music 20 times a year, just that provision needed to be made which will cover all Bank Holidays and special occasions.

Not all noise in the village could be attributed to the Sun Inn - many parishioners use taxis to bring them home after a night out, and local properties had their own parties and events.

There were concerns that one can only be reactive once the noise had taken place.

The Chairman urged the members to make sensible representations, as it would otherwise severely restrict the flexibility of the business, such as the event held for the Tsunami appeal.

Events like this cannot be take place, without spare event days written into the licence.

It was requested that the Parish Council ask the Company Secretary to write an open letter of intent clearly showing how they would wish to continue trading.

This would prevent the misunderstandings and fears currently being displayed, and the managers needed to be trusted to carry on doing a good job. The Manager agreed to ask the owners.

No one wanted to put the pub at risk, and all appreciated that Christmas and New Year brought trade and funds to carry them forward into the rest of the year. Their viability could be at risk if they had to close at existing times.

Again noise was brought up over deliveries and bin collection times. The Manager offered to show her delivery notes, which gave the times of their arrivals. As they work late hours, they try to avoid deliveries early in the morning. She also commented that when she was trying to sleep in after her night's work, she had to cope with village noise; talking, mowing lawns, traffic noise. There was mistrust of the Government's new system - it was not the fault of the pub owners. A resident recommended keeping a diary of licence transgressions, and advising the Licensing Authority at the time; otherwise remedial action is unlikely.

### **Licence hours. Currently:-**

Mon to Fri 11.00 a.m. to 11.00 p.m.

Saturday 11.30 – 3p.m. and 7 p.m. to 11.30p.m.

Sunday 11.30 – 3p.m. and 7p.m. to 10.30p.m.

Vote for 10.00 to 24.00, and 1p.m on Friday and Saturday. For: 11 out of 32

How many would like it amended one hour earlier than this? For: 10 out of 32.

How many would be happy for a time between these? This vote did not take place as questions then reverted back to what is the normal times?

The current amendment is until 24.00 Sunday to Thursday, and 01.00 Friday and Saturday.

These are the latest times, but the pub does not intend to be open that long.

It was clear at this point in the meeting that no common consensus was to be reached and that the Parish Council could not make an agreed suggestion when the village was split on its view.

It was agreed that all those interested should make their own 'representations' for or against, on the forms provided, and send them directly to NWDC. In the event that agreement is not reached, the decision would need to go to a Hearing.

All those who wished to be kept informed of the Letter of Intent wrote their names and addresses on a sheet passed around the meeting.

Information could be found on the parish web site, where the government web site will be linked. The Manager noted that objections should be accurate, as false claims could lead to prosecution. Cllr Smith thanked the Manager for this information but pointed out that the current comment forms in circulation did not mention any potential fine of £5,000.

### **Cemetery Fees**

It was agreed that although we only had 6 out of 11 Councillors present there was a quorum, and there were sufficient members present to debate the document.

It was confirmed that the 'How to buy a Burial Plot' document was to replace the original document, which was difficult to comprehend.

Some of the fees proposed were to go up by 50% which was felt to be a large jump. The Clerk explained it needed to go up by more than 100% in places but had restricted it to 50% and hoped it would then receive an annual upgrade to prevent it sliding behind other Parishes again. The Clerk was asked to produce prices of local cemeteries, as she had currently had only telephone conversations with various Undertakers who were able to give her a guide to local fees. Clerk to ask local parishes of similar size for their charges. In the meantime it was agreed to accept all the figures 'en bloc' in anticipation of comparisons. The fee increases will give rise to a reserve that can be ring fenced to be spent on cemetery maintenance, which has been the subject of complaint recently.

The Cemetery Sub Committee is to meet and discuss the maintenance jobs outstanding, the spoil site, and replacement gate.

### **Standing Orders**

Section 1.1.4. Item on standing down Standing Orders was questioned.

The Clerk explained that, as members of the public are not allowed to actually speak during a Council Meeting, the rules state that we need to 'Stand Down' the Standing Orders whilst we have items such as Parishioner Question Time (PQT).

This being clarified and some minor typing/layout amendments, the document was proposed by Cllr Bennett and seconded by Cllr Groom - there were no objections.

Meeting closed 9.30 p.m.