

DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Meeting held remotely on Wednesday 11th November 2020.

Present: Councillors: Day (GD – Chairman), Botham (MB – Vice Chairman), Hill (TH), Kemp (MK), Cowen (LC), Creasey (GC), Stevens (DS), Hollyman (MH), Cottell (PC) and Rotherham (PR)

Clerk to the Council: Lunn (BL)

Councilor for Urchfont & The Cannings: Whitehead (PW)

Members of the Public (for all or part of the remote meeting): Mrs Cridland, Mr. Cridland, Mr. Waters (Agent for Mrs Cridland), Mr. & Mrs Myers, Mr. & Mrs Houlden, Mr. Smith, Mr. Hawkins

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Welcome by the Chairman – the Chairman welcomed all to the meeting being held on Remembrance Day. GD congratulated the Community Bell team and Urchfont Scouts for the display in the Telephone Kiosk, the 106 year old letter from 13 year old Rex Stent was particularly impressive for its spelling, grammar and maturity. The Chairman also advised that he had represented UPC at a ceremony on 24th October to re-dedicate the Urchfont cenotaph.

2. Apologies – Cllr Cottle SC

B. PLANNING – See separate agenda.

C. FULL COUNCIL MEETING

1. Declarations of Interest – None declared at the meeting

2. Remote Public Participation / Email input from members of the public and External Reports
- None

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th October 2020

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To approve and the minutes unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting.	MH	MK	AGREED with one abstention due to absence

4. Action List Status Review and Update Reports from the Minutes of the meeting held on 14th October 2020 – BL stated that outstanding actions were few in number but sought an update on the following:

FC/71/19 – Lydeway milestone damage – PC reported that he had not received responses from WC regarding the repair of the broken stone itself, Linda Jennings had repaired the faceplate. PW offered to progress if the emails are forwarded to him.

FC/81/19 – Wedhampton / A342 Footpath signage – PC reported no progress with WC. Again PW offered to progress if emails forwarded to him.

ACTION: FC/54/20 - PC

FC/40/20 – Investigate restart of Speed Watch – GD reported that there is no prospect of restarting with previous team, only if new volunteers can be found.

5. Finance

a. Financial Summary and Bank Reconciliation as at 31st October 2020 – GD had already confirmed with BL that the relatively high in month income was due to a CIL receipt from WC. Also that the expenditure on trees related to the felling on Paddock Green which had been completed. No other questions were raised.

b. Replacement UPC computer purchase (£828.15 + £165.63 VAT) – GD confirmed that BL had sought expert IT advice on the UPC laptop which was experiencing major operating difficulties, significant errors and deterioration were identified in the hard drive and processor of the old machine which is around 6 years old and has been in use daily. Having consulted with the Chairman, BL necessarily purchased without delay a new DELL machine with a solid state drive and updated system/software which now appears to be operating well and facilitating essential UPC day to day operation.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To ratify the purchase and increase the Office Supplies budget by £828	GD	MB	AGREED unanimously

c. Christmas Tree purchase authorised by the Chairman (£350) + possible collection charge (£25) - GD explained that Dauntsey's School, who normally supply the Christmas Tree for Pond Green when they break up for Christmas, will not be having trees this year due to the COVID restrictions. Nicky Mitchell offered to facilitate purchase of a tree from a local supplier and has secured a very good deal at £350 for a 5.5-6m tree. In the current COVID circumstances GD believed that a tree is even more essential to raise spirits in the community along with the Christmas lights on the pond wall. TH agreed. DS suggested that UPC should pay for delivery from the supplier to avoid possible difficulties with collection. PR volunteered to remove and dispose of the tree after Christmas, but it was believed the Scouts would again facilitate this action as previously.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To ratify the sum of £375 to cover purchase and delivery of the tree.	GD	TH	AGREED unanimously

d. Budget for Urchfont Pond Duck supplies (£100) – BL confirmed that a request from Paul Bancroft had been circulated to councillors before the meeting. An account line has always existed for this purpose, but monies have not been required for the last two or three years. Funds are not so readily available this year, hence the request. GD thanked the 'duck people' for all their time and effort looking after the ducks.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To a budget and payment of £100.	GD	DS	AGREED unanimously

e. Projects Budget 20/21 – MK outlined a budget request for storage at Farmers Field. MH noted that the Rights of Way (ROW) group are also looking for storage, MK knew of this but suggested that the proposed location is not ideal for this but could be used in the short term. MK reported that enquiries had been made about hiring a 40ft container from Snook's, but in the view of Friends of Farmers Field (FoFF) this would be too big for their needs and they also had concerns that any vacant space would be sub-let. TH raised the question of security, PR suggested that the 10 foot container would be the same type used on construction sites holding significantly more valuable kit. The question of insurance cover would need to be clarified with the UPC insurers.

ACTION: FC/55/20 - BL

LC stressed the need for urgency in view of the need to remove equipment from its current location by Christmas. PC suggested that a 20 foot container should be considered to ensure sufficient storage space now and in the future, the cost differential would probably be minimal. PR commented that locating a 20 foot container could be an issue in view of limited space, delivery constraints and visual impact. Nevertheless PC suggested that a 20 foot container should be considered to cater for Farmers Field and ROW equipment, DS

agreed. BL suggested that the existing shelters could be removed to make way for a larger container, but MK said that these are used for cover for visiting groups and FoFF casual meetings and was of the view that they should not be removed. GC asked whether planning permission will be required, if the container has wheels then probably not but if no wheels then maybe, this needs to be checked.

ACTION: FC/56/20 – MK/PR

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To approve a budget of up to £3000 to purchase and locate a 10 foot container in Farmers Field	MK	LC	AGREED, 8 for and 1 against

f. Preparation for 21/22 PRECEPT and budget – BL stated that he intends to prepare a draft budget for the December meeting with the aim of setting the PRECEPT at that meeting or at the latest finalising at the January meeting. The agreed PRECEPT demand has to be submitted to WC by 18th January. Contrary to earlier information, PRECEPT instructions from WC Financial Planning are exactly the same as in 2019 with the exception of dates and the D Band Tax Base Figure for the Parish which has increased from 544.15 to 552.46. PW confirmed that there is no requirement to cap parish council PRECEPT demands for 2021/22. To facilitate preparation of the draft budget, BL requested all councillors to provide their expected financial requirements for 2021/22, this is primarily for new and updated projects but can be a perceived need to increase a Fixed or Running cost line. PLEASE PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION TO BL BY 25th NOVEMBER.

ACTION: FC/57/20 - ALL

6. Lead Councillor, Working Groups, Clerk & other Written Reports (See Appendix 1 - attached on website only)

a. Clerks Report – BL updated his report by confirming that he had now received the External Auditors report from PKF Littlejohn LLP, no comments or observations were raised.

b. Councillor Reports – GD advised that Wadworth’s had appointed new landlord’s for The Lamb Inn with effect 17th November, with the intention of re-opening post lockdown. He took the opportunity to welcome the new landlord’s Lucy and Chris to Urchfont.

7. Land Adjacent to Yew Tree Cottage – BL confirmed that the email from the UPC solicitor providing advice on adverse possession and the case in question had been distributed to all councillors prior to the meeting. For clarification purposes, TH confirmed that he had initiated enquiries about this piece of land, not Mrs Minty. TH has now written to Mrs Minty’s solicitor, who made the initial enquiries on adverse possession when Mr Minty was alive, to try to confirm whether UPC could now apply using earlier evidence and to gain an estimate of likely cost. He is awaiting a response due to absence of the solicitor involved. TH had also spoken with Mrs Minty to explain the current UPC position, as a result she has removed her previous intention to covenant that the site should not be developed if gifted to the council. PC questioned whether there would be conflict of interest between the UPC solicitor and Wansbroughs, TH believed not as the UPC solicitor had suggested using Wansbroughs. GD believed that the situation is far more complicated than originally anticipated and also wondered whether there would be any other financial or tax implications in addition to solicitor costs, is now the time to agree the way forward? LC agreed on the basis that the piece of land is not really fit for community use and could bring more issues with it than benefits. PW expressed the view that if there are no covenants suggested then the land could be sold by UPC.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To cease investigation and pursuit of this potential opportunity forthwith.	GD	MB	AGREED unanimously

8. Tree Survey Actions / Quotes for Remedial Works – In the absence of SC, GC confirmed that he and SC will prepare a report for the December meeting. Tree 1672 on Paddock Green has been successfully felled.

ACTION: FC/59/20 – SC/GC

9. UPC Environmental Group (UPEG) – GD confirmed that he and MB had taken part in a special UPEG meeting on 26th October at which he had assumed the role of Chairman. Minutes of that meeting are attached at Appendix 2 (on website only) describing the current status of activities within UPEG and what happened when GD and MB attended, thus enabling the public and councillors to catch up should they so wish. Minutes of subsequent and future UPEG meeting will be distributed to all councillors. GD emphasised the arrangement that UPEG had made with 'Plant For Our Lives' who will supply trees and provide tree planting training to volunteers, there is no currently known funding requirement for this activity. It is understood that they provide insurance cover, but nevertheless BL has agreed to consult the UPC insurance company about such activity. UPEG are looking for volunteers to undertake the training and assist with planting in due course at 3 sites including the Baish and in Connock, Plant For Our Lives will interact with land owners as necessary.

MB referred to the UPEG report for this meeting which had been distributed to all councillors prior to the meeting and is attached at Appendix 3 (on website only), in particular he highlighted the proposals it contained. The following was agreed:

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To approve an additional budget of £500 for 20/21 UPEG activities	MB	GD	AGREED unanimously

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To give approval in principle to the 21/22 proposals 1 to 4 in the UPEG November report	MB	GD	AGREED unanimously

In terms of the proposals on Contracts with Suppliers and Requests for Funding / Grants, BL pointed out that the following already appears in the UPC Environmental Policy approved in March 2020:

"4. Due Diligence 4.1 The Council shall carry out due diligence prior to entering into any contract for the provision of equipment or services to assess the impact on the environment of the supply chain and to ensure the Council does not knowingly, or foreseeably, act in breach of local regulations protecting the environment and where feasible to enable the Council to limit its environmental impact in selecting those goods and services."

It was agreed that all appropriate policies should be amended to reflect the UPEG proposals contained in the November report, drafts to be prepared for approval at the December UPC meeting.

ACTION: FC/60/20 – BL/GD/MB

No further questions were asked on the UPEG November Report.

10. B3098 Speed Zones – PW apologised for the fact that an update is not available at present.

11. ROSPA inspection of Children's Playground / Recreation Ground – MK confirmed that the ROSPA playground report had been received, all is good with no actions required. The only comments related to the poor condition of the shelter which was expected, this needs to be addressed in the budget for 2021/22 to prevent further deterioration. BL confirmed that Government guidelines permit the playground to remain open during the current lockdown period.

12. Update on Current Parish Issues not covered by above agenda items – None raised

13. External Meetings – none reported

14. Councillors' Other Reports – none reported

15. Items for Future Agenda – In addition to issues and actions raised in above agenda items

- a. Pathway to Oakfrith Wood (To be addressed when physical meetings in Village Hall are restarted with public attendance)

Date of Next Scheduled Meeting: 9th December 2020

Meeting Closed at 9pm

APPENDIX 1 TO NOVEMBER 2020 UPC MINUTES

a. CLERK'S REPORT

1. Update on Clerk's actions from July Meeting

FC/47/20 – Acceptance of Office etc. documentation to Pete Rotherham – sent On 15th October and have subsequently been returned completed.

FC/51/20 – UPC Solicitor letter on land adjacent to Yew Tree Cottage to be copied to all councillors – emailed on 5th November 2020.

FC/52/20 – COVID 19 - UPC contacts to be published. Published in Redhorn News (November edition) and on the website under Latest News.

2. Finance – The Financial Summary and Bank Reconciliation as at 30th September 2020 have been distributed to all councillors with this agenda. This information demonstrates that the accounts are in good order and gives detailed information on spend and anticipated spend against approved budgets. The predicted Reserve at 31st March 2021 is higher than the target primarily because of the unexpected Small Business Grant received from WC and reduced expenditure to date.

I have been notified by WC that we will receive more information by the 9th November 2020 about the potential effects on 2021/22 PRECEPT demands due to predicted reduced business rates and council tax collections due primarily to COVID issues. I will update you at the meeting. Nevertheless, UPC will need to carefully consider approving any future requests for project funds in particular until we are better informed on the status of the PRECEPT 21/22.

3. Internal and External audits – Paperwork is still with the external auditors, I have received one supplementary question to date regarding the published period for Elector's Rights, a response has been sent.

4. UPC Computer – You will all be aware that I have been experiencing significant problems with the UPC laptop which is around 6 years old and constantly in use. Following extensive investigation, specialist IT advice indicated that the hard drive and processor are failing fast. As a result and because of the extensive time, frustration and difficulties being experienced, having consulted with the Chairman I have now purchased a new computer which is currently being commissioned.

5. Boomcast Multi-Media Broadcast System – Due to other demands, I have not yet been able to contact the contact in Easterton to establish more about this system and its potential benefits which might be of use to UPC.

Bob Lunn, Clerk to the Council

b. COUNCILLOR REPORTS

i. The Lamb Inn - Wadworth & Co have advised that they had agreed a new tenancy for The Lamb to commence on Tuesday 17th November. However, the recently announced national lockdown may affect this. I am awaiting further information and may provide a verbal update at the meeting.

Cllr Graham Day

APPENDIX 2 TO NOVEMBER 2020 UPC MINUTES

Minutes of the Special UPEG Meeting held on 26 October 2020

Present on Zoom: Katharine Wale (KW), Peter Newell (PN), Lisa Kinnaird(LK), Charlotte Hill-Baldwin (CHB), Liz Clifton-Page (LCP), Sam Dixon (SD), Graham Day (GD) and Mark Botham (MB)

A recording of this meeting is also available on the Shared Google Drive.

Opening of the Meeting

KW opened the meeting and welcomed GD and MB.

KW recapped and summarised UPEG achievements over the past 8 months.

- March 2020 UPC adopted the Environmental Policy
- June 2020 UPEG produced a comprehensive set of aims, objectives and milestones (AOMs) which UPC agreed to.
- July/August 2020 The Top Tips leaflet giving suggestions on how to reduce your carbon footprint was produced and distributed to every household in the Parish.
- Following on from public consultation which asked for suggestions of potential planting sites UPEG embarked on a programme of tree and hedge planting in coalition with Plant For Our Lives. This runs from November 2020 to March 2021.
- UPEG has built up a relationship with WC and received praise on its approach and content of the AOMs which are being shared with other Parishes across the County.
- UPEG has started a project on calculating and analysing the Parish Carbon Footprint.

Discussion on the position of UPC and UPEG

GD took over as Chair introduced himself and expressed disappointment that Richard Bromley (RB) could no longer complete the Carbon Footprint audit. GD described his very positive meeting with RB.

GD explained the UPEG terms of reference and that following the resignation of Lewis he and MB would step in as short term UPC UPEG councillors.

GD referred to the minutes of the last UPC full council meeting 14 October 2020 and stated that there is a feeling among Councillors that they don't really know what is going on with UPEG. GD and MB are to return to Council and clearly communicate UPEGs actions and try to recruit 2 new councillors to join the working party.

MB stated it was his intention to do what he can to work with UPEG, to join in with its activities and add value.

PN asked GD for clarification regarding UPC minutes 14.10.20. where it had stated that the objectives and individual roles were not in line with the agreed terms of reference (T of R). PN reiterated that UPEG had been very careful to insure the AOMs have been approved by the council and monthly reports to UPC had been delivered and if there was a problem with the objectives this should have been raised with UPEG before now. There was agreement that it was only the membership of UPEG that was not in line with T of R.

KW stated that UPEG appreciated the efforts made by GD and MB at recruiting two new councillors. KW stated that UPEG was very grateful and recognized the importance of a good relationship with UPC.

CHB expressed frustration and asked how many Councillors were currently on UPC, GD confirmed they were at full compliment. CHB asked if it was likely that 2 councillors would like to get involved. GD said he didn't know. GD explained that Lewis had tried to recruit one new Councillor but failed. GD confirmed that as Lewis had now resigned as Chair of UPEG and member of UPEG (although he'd like to still be involved somehow), this meant that GD and MB now had to find two new councillors. GD and MB see themselves in a facilitator role and stated that UPC would very much like the environment group to continue. GD and MB are trying to understand better themselves what UPEG are doing and then feed that back to UPC. CHB stated she fully understood GD recruitment dilemma, but could he confirm that up until a month ago there was a two way communication mechanism in place and so it was only in the last month there had been a communication hiccup. CHB believed this shouldn't really mean that the T of R should change. GD confirmed he didn't want to change the TofR but rather wanted to understand better in addition to the minutes, and with a more personal flavour what was going on.

LK stated that UPEG had without fail supplied UPC with a monthly report and that the last UPEG report to council 14.10.20 had not been discussed by UPC. LK asked if it could be discussed as UPEG really needed some answers to questions raised in the report. LK shared the report on the screen with everyone for feedback.

Agenda Item 1 Discussion of UPEG Report to Full UPC Meeting 14.10.20

Facebook

On the topic of FB Page, GD stated that the whole question of communication was something he'd started in May 2020 when LK was a Councillor and he'd asked her to write a paper on how UPC could evolve its communication interfaces with the public. Then in September 2020 UPC voted not to have a FB page but now UPEG had started a trial FB page and as UPEG was a working party of the UPC this meant that UPC effectively had a FB page, which is not what it wanted. Lewis had asked UPC to turn a blind eye and suck it and see for the trial period. CHB and LK pointed out that Community Bell had a FB page and asked if the same thing applies to every group linked to UPC. GD stated that this was another example of where UPEG was out of terms with UPC because it had a FB page and UPC didn't want to do FB or any other social media.

Walnut Close

GD stated that Bob Lunn (as a Walnut Close resident himself) had supplied UPEG a commentary on the proposed Walnut Close residents letter and that Lewis had reported to UPC that despite Bob's comments the letter remained unchanged. KW agreed that this was the case and explained that the letter was to provide residents with some simple questions about how they might like to retain or change the environment of Walnut Close. For eg hedges, wildflowers or simply fewer mows. It was intended to provide a platform for all residents to express a view rather than assume that one persons view represents all of those who live there. It was effectively meant to be a survey. CHB asked if that had now got the go ahead. KW said it hadn't been considered by UPC to date. GD agreed there had been no discussion by UPC. KW said nothing is going on with the proposed letter because it is stuck with full council. LK stated that as far as she could see the communication from UPEG to UPC had been regular but the problem lay with the communication from UPC back to UPEG and the lack of UPC actions on our reports is where the problem lays. KW agreed and stressed the amount of work that went into the monthly reports that had been offered to UPC for consideration and sometimes action but that UPEG got very little back, it seemed the content of reports just got slipped to the next meeting and the next meeting and so on. Communication flow from Council to UPEG is where the difficulty seems to be.

GD stated that this was her view. KW confirmed that this was her view. CHB suggested that it was more than a view because we were looking at action points that were not being progressed. The whole purpose of UPC

and UPEG minutes and actions is to progress actions. If that's being held up because of the lack of communication one way or the other than we need to have some sort of resolution in place to make that happen. GD said he and MB would attempt to fill this communication gap. CHB asked GD if he was going to raise it with UPC and get a solution and agreement regarding the progressing of actions. GD said that before he did that he would need persuading about the merits of the Walnut Close Letter. KW said UPEG had read Bob's response and that there was nothing wrong with what he said regarding his personal comments, but his personal comments don't necessarily speak for all the residents. LK stated that Bob had had his say so surely everyone else should have the same opportunity. GD said he would like to work through Bob's comments and also wanted to know why Walnut Close had been singled out. KW answered that UPEG had widely advertised to ask people and the UPC for suggestions of potential planting sites. Walnut Close was one of the suggestions made by a parishioner. KW felt it was unfair to ask people for their opinions about something and then just leave them hanging in the ether not being addressed so it was our duty to follow them up. There were 23 potential sites suggested in total, many of which have been followed up with land owners, many of the potential sites were presented to the UPC for consideration but this got no response. KW stated that knowing that Walnut Close had a covenant on it, and because of Covid, the survey seemed the most democratic way to approach it. GD said he was not aware of any of this. KW repeated the process that UPEG had undergone from the point of asking residents for suggestions to the draft Walnut Close letter. LK stated that UPEG simply wanted to survey Walnut Close but this action still needed UPC to respond. GD agreed.

Planting

KW provided a summary of where UPEG is with agreed planting with PFOL at the Baish and on the border of the Parish where it abuts the Conock Parish, this represents over a mile of planting. PFOL provide the whips at no costs and have sufficient capacity to fill any order, UPEG been told not to panic about the whips because they have plenty. KW expressed concerns that this momentum not be halted. UPEG have a strong advantage with their relationship with PFOL. The more enthusiastic volunteers UPEG help recruit and train the better, even if there is not enough areas to plant within the Parish then PFOL still have plenty of planting in the East of the Vale.

CHB reiterated that planting was one of the easiest ways to engage the community in environmental change, it's THE way in and its easy to understand in terms of carbon reduction. If that's something PFOL and UPEG can facilitate with the support of UPC, because they need to be seen to be supporting UPEG, then that will get more people engaged than anything else. GD asked who owns the land and if they were doing the planting also if we have confirmed consent. CHB explained the premis of community planting and emphasised that to get this action with the support of PFOL and their social media platform which is very effective at engaging with and getting people out planting who wouldn't normally get involved was a real achievement. It would be no good to have miles of planting and only 6 volunteers. GD asked who would own the trees. CHB answered, the landowners. GD asked the question because Derek Cook had recently asked the UPC for financial help to pay for a fallen tree and he had concerns about who would maintain the trees and take responsibility. GD raised concerns about long term commitments and the long term costs associated giving examples of defribulators, farmers field and play parks. GD stated that trees need maintaining, the landowners need to explicitly commit to maintaining the trees for their lifetime. Trees have a maintenance cost. PN described the millennium tree/hedge planting initiative and how Bodmans and Planks took responsibility. CHB explained that as part of the PFOL initiative landowners do take responsibility for the trees but without the need for caveats being put in place. KW stated that the bigger picture is if we don't do this then we then we are not doing the right thing. GD stated that he is not against planting as long as the landowner knows he/she is responsible for the cost then that is fine.

Requirements For Groups Seeking Council Support

KW explained that all of the actions that UPEG are doing and that Lewis had been reporting on are in full support of the AOMs. PN expressed concern and extreme disappointment that this component of the UPEG report to Full Council was not even discussed. GD explained that because Lewis had resigned this report had not been looked at. PN re-emphasised that that was the reason for the disappointment. LK pointed out the amount of hard work that had gone into producing the papers for consideration by UPC. GD repeated it was because Lewis had resigned. PN suggested we return to this at item 2 of the agenda.

Proposed Spring Forum at the Village Hall

PN explained this was originally suggested by GD. PN and UPEG had produced a draft programme but until the Covid situation was clearer in the Spring this action couldn't really be taken much further forward. PN thought it important to report it to the Parish Council in the way UPEG report everything else and hence the paragraph in the report. GD stated it was news to him. PN repeated that was why it was in the report, so that UPC knew what UPEG was doing. GD stated that Lewis had not asked UPC to book the village hall and that it was Bob Lunn who always booked the VH and UPC meetings. PN explained that the VH needed to be booked well in advance for an all day event. GD was disappointed that the UPEG team took one of his original ideas (a public meeting next Spring - if permitted) and went ahead and made a provisional booking without even the courtesy of checking his availability or discussing the proposed programme. PN emphasised that this was a draft for the UPEG members (at that time) for further discussion by them. It was not at that stage ready for discussion with anyone who was not a member of UPEG including GD as the details including possible speakers needed further discussion. There was/are also the uncertainties surrounding Covid 19 as to whether the forum can take place at all.

LK asked why UPEGs proposals contained within the report had not been voted on by UPC. GD explained it was because Lewis had resigned and therefore UPEG was not fully represented by UPC. KW stated that UPC had decided to abandon the UPEG report because of Lewis' resignation however Lewis's report was submitted to full council and Lewis was there but for whatever reason the report was not wrapped up. KW asked if during this special meeting UPEG could get an understanding of what UPC position is regarding the proposals contained in the report so that actions could get progressed. GD agreed.

Future Initiatives

CHB explained that the ideas came from people who have engaged with the group who are not necessarily on the committee. LK explained that many suggestions came via FB and then they were reported to UPC in the UPEG monthly report in the hope of a response. GD stated a need to build a future by improving communication between UPC and UPEG and recruiting 2 new Cllrs. CHB asked if MB and GD understood what UPEG was up to. GD replied he still had questions about Walnut Close and why it was selected. GD stated he had sympathy with a lot of the work of UPEG but that UPEG needed full council support and for whatever reason that was not forthcoming. GD asked what had caused Lewis to resign. KW replied that GD would need to ask Lewis. KW suggested that his resignation was frustration with UPC, items that UPC had failed to discuss, things get slipped from one meeting to another, UPEG has been very diligent in communicating with UPC but UPC have not been very diligent in responding to that communication. GD asked for an example. KW recalled trying several times to get UPC to consider what sites in the Parish would be suitable for planting that UPC has control or ownership of. LK stated that it took months to get a list of suppliers from UPC. KW stressed the need to move forward. MB stated that having listened carefully there were some things that he should have been aware of as a Cllr but wasn't which led him to conclude that there is and has been a communication problem that neither UPEG or UPC had realized the extent of. MB suggested that he take up the role of communications conduit to make sure that what UPEG report and how UPC respond is communicated clearly between both parties. MB stated that having looked through the Shared Google Drive there has been a lot of work done by UPEG and what a shame it would be to see it unfulfilled, not progressed

and undeveloped. MB firmly believed that part of the issue in things not moving forward is communication. KW thanked MB and discussed prioritising the AOMs.

Prioritising AOMs and Agenda Item 2

Priority 1:

PN placed Tree and hedge planting as priority 1. All agreed. CHB explained that the planting season went from Nov – March, not easy, big projects, PFOL will have paperwork with Landowners. GD asked for copy of PFOL paperwork to take to UPC as soon as possible. All agreed

Priority 2:

KW suggested this be Obj 1.1, 1.2, 1.3. PN stated that what underlines these objectives is having the UPC committed to supporting the AOMs. There then has to be a trickle down to the suppliers, contractors, those seeking grant aid etc. These suggestions made by UPEG are embedded in KW three papers. The papers and policies encourages the people with whom UPC have to work to adopt carbon neutral targets and to work with UPC/UPEG to achieve that. LK shared the 3 papers. KW explained them. Q&As and discussion followed. GD/MB agreed to present the papers to UPC at the next meeting.

Budget paper, obj 1.3 GD explained requests for projects are due in between now and Dec. Jan 2021 is when UPC set their budget. This could come forward as a project proposal. WC have warned of uncertainty over funding. PN asked how WC had power to set precept unless central Gov have put a limit on the % increase. GD repeated what PW had said that if there is less money from Gov then everybody will face cuts. They have been promised some docs in November explaining it more fully until then there is some uncertainty. PN recommended and proposed this UPEG budget proposal to UPC full council for inclusion in the UPC budget. MB prepared to work with UPEG and meet with Bob to discuss the budget proposal in detail and then submit it. All agreed. KW suggested that UPC consider paying for a Carbon Footprint audit. LK to ask Richard approx. cost involved. GD pointed out that it had been previously minuted that Richard would provide auditing services free. CHB noted that due to personal workload things change and that could be minuted. MB stated we need three quotes and it would probably cost over £1000. GD suggested we ask WC if they have any plans for auditing. LK to ask Ariane about auditing and budgets.

Agenda Item 3 Action Tracker

KW quickly explained all of the current ongoing actions, many of which had already been discussed in some detail. Discussion, Q&As followed.

Actions

11.4 KW to email Richard Curtis and LK to meet if necessary

13.6 KW suggested that the Community energy plan and sustainable transport are too meaty and need to be separated out into 2 actions. Action is to discuss at the next meeting.

GD asked if there was anything else which needed to be put to the next UPC meeting. CHB suggested that the use of social media to engage with residents was an issue which we could not skirt around and needed to be dealt with by UPC. If social media is successful for UPEG but UPC don't agree with it then that is going to be a stumbling block. Asked how that gets moved forward. GD said it was difficult because a decision had been made not to have a UPC FB page. GD asked why dwell on the differences, need to move forward on things that can be delivered. CHB said there is a lot of work involved in social media and especially to get engagement during covid it is very hard to do without social media. Danger is without it you will be reliant on

the same core people. Need plenty of volunteers for the planting scheme in Jan/Feb this would be very hard to do without social media, need to engage with younger, new people who don't go to UPC meetings and wouldn't normally get involved. KW stated it is very unusual for a PC not to have FB or social media. Most organisations have social media even if they loathe FB because it's the best way to do business and its free. Also there are anomalies with other groups associated with UPC such as Community Bell. It is an established method of communication these days and UPC is out of step. CHB explained how useful FB is for her Bridleways Assoc in terms of communication. PN stated that if UPC is not willing for UPEG to have FB presence is it possible for UPEG to have an independent FB group? MB suggested reviewing FB in 6 wks. MB volunteered to join the FB group. All agreed.

KW explained difficulty in knowing how to engage with the community shop re energy audit etc, reported no progress to date. Maybe need to go with a blank sheet of paper for their suggestions.

DONM

Monday 9th November

Chair closed the meeting

GD thanked UPEG and repeated that they were very keen to make UPEG a success and he hoped the group felt they had made some progress. All agreed they had

UPEG REPORT NOVEMBER 2020

UPEG – UPC Communications

Introduction

At the UPEG virtual meeting on 26/10 it was agreed that MB would take responsibility for ensuring that the communications between the two groups meets the following objectives:

- UPEG will submit funding requests to UPC for approval at the next UPC meeting. MB and or GD will present the requests to the full council for consideration. MB will advise UPEG within 24 hrs of the outcome of each request.
- UPEG will advise UPC of any support / assistance that it requires from UPC for the following month. Items such as helping with tree planting, assisting at public meetings, thoughts and ideas on particular topics etc will be documented for discussion.
- GD and MB will represent UPEG at UPC meetings. However, there may be occasions when detailed and specific knowledge is required. In these instances, the relevant member of UPEG or a guest speaker will be invited to attend to explain the subject in detail. All members of UPEG can request to attend the UPC virtual meetings by contacting GD by 09:00 on the day of the meeting.
- GD / MB will present UPEG proposals that require UPC sign off.

LK produces a set of minutes following each UPEG meeting. This should be appended to the UPC meeting minutes as it will enable councillors and parishioners to see the detail behind the headlines presented at the UPC meeting

MB has volunteered to encapsulate all the above in a *UPEG Monthly Report*. The report for November follows.

November 2020 UPEG report to UPC

General Items

- Lewis Cowan announced that he was resigning from the role of Chairman of UPEG and also resigning as a member of UPEG. Lewis had made a significant contribution to UPEG since its inception and all members wished to recognise his input and thank him for the time and effort he put into bringing UPEG into being.
- The terms of reference for UPEG requires two Parish Councillors to be members of UPEG one of whom will be the chairman. It was agreed at the October FC meeting that GD and MB would fulfil these roles on an interim basis.
- KW welcomed GD and MB to UPEG and after a brief introduction KW invited GD to assume the role of Chairman of UPEG.
- All agreed that Richard Bromley had been a very valuable member of the group but understood that the demands on his time from his consulting business were such that he was unable to continue his work with UPC. Unfortunately, this means that the work on the carbon footprint audit has come to a halt
- It was agreed that MB should take responsibility for timely and accurate communications between UPEG and UPC and vice versa, concentrating on matters requiring UPC approval.
- The key activity in which UPEG are currently involved is a winter tree planting exercise which GD will describe to UPC. It is also fully covered in LK's minutes which will be appended to the UPC meeting minutes.

Financial approvals required

UPEG has produced a budget forecast for financial year 21/22 the key points of which are as follow:

Proposals for UPC budget 21/22

1. *All budget lines to be set with an environmental element or consideration recorded against them (perhaps in council minutes).*
2. *A budget is to be established for Climate and Ecological Emergency mitigation (as agreed in the AOMs - see Objective 1: A Carbon Neutral Parish Council by 2030; Enabling Objective 1.3: Funds are ring-fenced for Climate Emergency mitigation) Its use does not have to be determined at the outset, but it could, for example, be used to provide match-funding for community energy solutions or to establish a 'green' community resource.*
3. *Establish a ring-fenced grants budget (suggest £1000) for local groups to apply for small grants towards carbon reduction measures.*
4. *Provide UPEG with a budget of £1000 for:*
 - a. *The Parish Environment event (initially suggested by the UPC Chairman) - Estimated cost £500*
 - b. *Printing leaflets and flyers for the Parish- Estimated cost £300*
 - c. *Community compost scheme - Estimated cost £200*

In addition MB on behalf of UPEG is seeking a small operating budget of £500 to cover agreed ad hoc requirements such as printing etc to cover the period from Nov20 to March 21.

MB has discussed the above with BL to determine how the requirements above fit with UPC financial procedures. Item 1 above will be incorporated where practical and appropriate, in particular for projects and contracts. To conform with UPC policy Items 2 and 3 will require individual project submissions and must benefit the community as a whole, individual householder or property needs are normally subject of national or unitary council grants. Item 4 has been noted for inclusion in the 21/22 budget.

Councillors will be asked to approve the concepts of items 1, 2 and 3 in line with BL's comments
Councillors will be asked to approve the Nov20 to March20 budget of £500.

Other approvals required

UPEG has prepared two documents describing the way in which environmental considerations should be incorporated in:

- Contracts with suppliers of services and goods to the council.
- Applications for financial awards or grants made to the council.

Contracts with suppliers

It is suggested that UPC policy for suppliers is amended or written if there is not one in place, to state the following:

In bids and quotations, all suppliers must attach, append, refer the council to or set out their sustainability policy. If no sustainability policy is in place, a description of how the supplier would adopt carbon reduction measures in their supply of the product or service to UPC is required.

Examples of simple sustainability policies are:

- Use of 100% green energy suppliers
- Transfer to electric vehicles when fossil fuel vehicles are past useful life
- Sorting waste into landfill and recyclable, and disposing accordingly
- Reduction in grass cutting
- Reduction in business travel - use of electronic conferencing facilities
- Use of natural or recycled materials

Requests for funding / grants

Adopt an amendment to the UPC Financial Assistance policy to state: *All applications for grants must set out how the project or activity or the work of the group or organisation will contribute to a reduction in carbon emissions.*

This may require some imagination on the part of the group. Some examples might be:

- Purchase and use of 100% recycled paper.
- Use of electronic communication as the norm (with the exception of those unable to use electronic media).
- Use of shared, public or community transport for visits (where allowed)
- Bulk purchase of materials, perhaps in collaboration with similar groups in other parishes
- Switching to 100% green energy supplier
- Application for grant for sustainable power installation

Councillors will be asked to approve these policies in principle at the November UPC meeting, Policy documents will be presented for approval in due course.

NOTE the two full UPEG proposal documents to which the extracts above relate are reproduced below:

1. UPC Environmental Budget for Financial Year 21/22

Introduction

This paper sets out a proposal to UPC for budget considerations for FY 21/22, in the light of environmental decisions made by the council during 2020. There was the agreement of an environmental policy and of Aims Objectives and Milestones in seeking to become a carbon neutral parish by 2030. Much has changed since early 2020, primarily as a result of Covid-19. However serious this is considered to be it will pale into insignificance as the Climate and Ecological Emergency tightens its grip on changing weather patterns, food and water supplies and all other aspects of our world. The decisions made by UPC to join others in response to this emergency are no less valid post-Covid-19, but the step-change in many lifestyles presents the opportunity to 'do it better'. Meanwhile the clock is ticking, ever louder.

Background

In Feb 2020 the UPC voted to adopt an environmental policy in answer to the Climate and Ecological Emergency. A policy was adopted by the council in Mar 2020, setting out the intention to 'make all reasonable efforts in its business and conduct to avoid and reverse environmental impact within the means and authority of the council'. Among the implementation steps agreed was 'considering and, where achievable, mitigating the environmental impact in every decision made by the Council'. This places a 'climate filter' for every decision made by the council.

Proposals for UPC budget 21/22

1. All budget lines to be set with an environmental element or consideration recorded against them (perhaps in council minutes).
2. A budget in to be established for Climate and Ecological Emergency mitigation (as agreed in the AOMs - see Objective 1: A Carbon Neutral Parish Council by 2030; Enabling Objective 1.3: Funds are ring-fenced for Climate Emergency mitigation) Its use does not have to be determined at the outset, but it could, for example, be used to assist householders to reduce their carbon footprint, match-funding for community energy solutions or to establish a 'green' community resource.
3. Establish a ring-fenced grants budget (suggest £1000) for local groups to apply for small grants towards carbon reduction measures.
4. Provide UPEG with a budget of £1000 for:
 - a. The Parish Environment event (initially suggested by the UPC Chairman) - Estimated cost £500
 - b. Printing leaflets and flyers for the Parish- Estimated cost £300
 - c. Community compost scheme - Estimated cost £200

Katharine Wale
4 Oct 2020
07866408897
Katharinewale59@gmail.com

2. Urchfont Parish Council Carbon Reduction Policy for All Suppliers

Introduction

UPC has agreed to seek to be carbon neutral by 2030 and an Aim, Objectives and Milestones to achieve this. Objective 1.1 is 'Urchfont Parish Council decisions, contracts and operation within its own control are carbon neutral. Milestone 1 under this objective is 'Contractors and suppliers to UPC under current arrangements are formally notified the UPC will require them (to) demonstrate energy efficiency, waste limitation and climate-friendly choices in any new or renewed contracts by 30 November 2020'.

Policy

It is suggested that UPC policy for suppliers is amended or written if there is not one in place, to state the following:

In bids and quotations, all suppliers must attach, append, refer the council to or set out their sustainability policy. If no sustainability policy is in place, a description of how the supplier would adopt carbon reduction measures in their supply of the product or service to UPC is required.

Examples of simple sustainability policies are:

- Use of 100% green energy suppliers
- Transfer to electric vehicles when fossil fuel vehicles are past useful life
- Sorting waste into landfill and recyclable, and disposing accordingly
- Reduction in grass cutting
- Reduction in business travel - use of electronic conferencing facilities
- Use of natural or recycled materials

Implementation

Step 1:

Notify all current suppliers of policy change by email or letter.

Step 2:

Use the policy from 1 April 2021

Step 3:

Commission carbon reduction expert to review policy and its application

Step 4:

Implement outcome of policy review from 1 April 2022.

Katharine Wale

4 Oct 2020

07866408897

katharine.wale59@gmail.com