

# GRINGLEY ON THE HILL PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held in the Village Hall on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2006

**Present:** Councillor G. Shepherd, Chairman. Councillors Foreman, Hargreaves, Taylor and Way

**05/06/376 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Dunkley (unavoidable concert rehearsal), Hargrave (work), Hilton (family commitment) and Tremelling (work)

**05/06/377 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**05/06/378 MINUTES**

Resolved: That the Minutes of the last meeting of the Council, held on 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2006, be approved as a correct record, subject to an amendment to Minute No. 05/06/353 (Apologies).

**05/06/379 MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

**05/06/380 PUBLIC DISCUSSION**

There were no members of the public present.

**05/06/381 ACCOUNTS**

Resolved: That the following account be approved for payment:

Powergen	Electricity	£16.86
----------	-------------	--------

**05/06/382 ANNUAL PARISH MEETING**

Members agreed that the Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting should be published in Beacon magazine.

**05/06/383 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**23/06/10 & 23/06/11**

Mr. P. Naylor

Convert existing squash court into kitchen, construct mezzanine dining room and carry out alterations at Ravencourt, High Street, Gringley on the Hill

Resolved: That no adverse comment be made.

**23/06/12R**

Mr. & Mrs. P. M. Noble

Conversion of redundant barn, with extension to form dwelling and garage at Woodlands Farm, Carr Road, Gringley on the Hill – resubmission of 23/05/28

Resolved: That no adverse comment be made.

**23/06/13**

Mr. & Mrs. D. A. Macconnachie

Erect two-storey kitchen and bedroom extension and front porch extension at Olive House, Mill Hill, Gringley on the Hill

Resolved: That no adverse comment be made.

**23/06/14**

Mr. R. C. Clapperton

Erect detached double garage at Pipers Roost, Low Street, Gringley on the Hill

Resolved: That, following a site visit, an objection be made on the grounds that (a) the proposed garage would be in front of the building line, (b), it was out of keeping with the character of the area and (c) it would adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

**23/06/15R**

Ms. K. Dobb & D. Eaton Esq.

Erect two-storey and single storey extension and carry out alterations at Jasmine Cottage, Little Lane, Gringley on the Hill – resubmission of 23/05/26

Resolved: That, whilst the Parish Council had sympathy with the objectives of the development generally, it objected to the application on the ground that the proposed extension would have an overbearing effect on the adjacent property and would result in a loss of amenity.

**05/06/384 PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISSION TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960**

Resolved: That, in view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be excluded.

**05/06/385 PARISH COUNCIL ELECTION – 4<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2006**

Consideration was given to a certain election manifesto, which was sharply critical of the Parish Council and contained information requiring explanation. For public information purposes it was noted as follows:

- The manifesto suggested that Quality accreditation would mean another layer of government in Gringley with additional costs. This was incorrect; the Parish Council would continue in the same form with no additional costs. The reasons for the Parish Council pursuing Quality accreditation were explained by the Chairman at the recent Annual Parish Meeting and would appear in the 2005-06 annual report.
- The manifesto expressed the wish that the village be consulted before any commitment was made to Quality accreditation. The position was that the Parish Council started on the road to Quality accreditation in 2003. The matter was discussed at the Annual Parish Meetings in 2004, 2005 and 2006. No-one had ever objected.
- The manifesto suggested that the Parish Council could be more open. One of the fundamentals of the Quality scheme was to provide openness. In Gringley's case this manifested itself in the following recent developments in addition to the opportunities given to the public by the Freedom of Information Act:
  - § An annual report was now produced and distributed to every household, as well as being made publicly available elsewhere.
  - § Quarterly newsletters were produced and made publicly available.
  - § An annual information leaflet was produced and made publicly available.

- § Bi-monthly councillors' surgeries were held.
  - § Residents were encouraged to contact the Parish Council. To that effect the Email addresses and telephone numbers of all Councillors and the Clerk were published.
  - § A new village website had been developed, and the Parish Council actively campaigned for more public involvement with it.
  - § Public participation at Parish Council meetings had recently been extended to include extraordinary meetings as well.
  - § The Parish Council had publicly encouraged residents to stand for election to the Parish Council.
- The manifesto asked why the Parish Council accounts were not published on the village website. The answer was that the Parish Council had only recently established the new website, which was still developing. No-one had asked for publication on the website, but the matter would be considered.
  - The manifesto stated that the accounts were sparse in detail. The position was that the accounts were produced to comply with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003. They would be unacceptable to the External Auditor, appointed by the Audit Commission, in any other format.
  - The manifesto stated that there was no indication in the accounts of how administrative expenses were made up - again suggesting a lack of openness. The position was that there was a publicised, annual window of opportunity for any member of the public to inspect the accounts – down to the last postage stamp. The candidate concerned had never availed herself of that opportunity during the life of the present Parish Council.
  - The manifesto referred to the fact that payroll and administrative expenses accounted for over 60% of the precept. The position regarding payroll was that the Parish Council had one employee, the Clerk to the Council, who was now being paid in accordance with the 2005 National Agreement on Salaries. Some parish councils had not implemented the National Agreement and some paid their Clerk less than the national minimum wage. The position regarding administrative expenses was that they were an inevitable fact of life. It was

pointed out in the 2004-05 annual report that administrative expenses had increased that year as a result of having to pay for a bye-election (£1,067).

- The manifesto referred to the fact that the Parish Council's precept was the highest per household in Bassetlaw. The reason for this was the cost of running the village services. Not all villages had the same facilities to maintain as Gringley. A lesser standard of service was always possible, such as monthly grass cutting instead of fortnightly, but had never been asked for by the public. It was probably for this reason that the village won the CPRE Nottinghamshire Best Kept Village Competition and Award for Best New Entrant in 2005.