

(These minutes are published subject to approval by the Parish Council and to any amendments that will be recorded in the minutes of the Meeting at which they are approved).

Groby Parish Council

Minutes of the Meeting of Groby Parish Council held at 7.00pm on Monday 10th January 2005 at the Parish Council Chamber, Leicester Road, Groby.

Cou/279/04-05 Present.

Members: Cllr Hagan (Chairman), Cllrs. Allison, Batty, Beck, Coates, Dickson Emmerson, Hodges, Hollick, Jones, Kennard, Lock, Marvin, Purves and Yarwood.

Clerk Mr J H Flower, Mr M Cartwright and members of the public.

The Chairman referred to the recent tragedy in the Indian Ocean and asked members and the public to observe a minutes silence in memory of those citizens of the world who lost their lives in the tsunami.

The Chairman also referred to a letter received from Cllr Purves thanking members for their thoughts and kind gift of a basket of fruit and welcomed her back.

Cou/280/04-05 Apologies for Absence.

Cllr. York, Borough Councillor Collins and County Councillor Fraser.

Cou/281/04-05 Declarations of Interest.

Personal interests were declared by:

Cllr. Dickson – Groby Parish Residents Group.

Cllr. Jones – Open spaces.

Cllr. Beck – Allotments (Husband and Son Allotment holders) and Druck (Son an employee).

Cllr. Hollick – Allotments and Village Hall.

Cllr. Emmerson – Allotments and Planning Application re Land at Rear of 30 Markfield Road.

Cllr. Kennard – Parish Plan.

Cllr. Hodges – Public Open Space particularly Stamford Drive.

Cllr. Batty – All items on the Agenda as Chairman of the Groby Parish Residents Group, Agenda Item 5 and Agenda Item 11 Correspondence Item No. 3.

Cou/282/04-05 Minutes of the Meeting held on the 20th December 2004.

Resolved the minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council held on the 20th December 2004 copies of which had been previously circulated to members, be accepted as a true record of the proceedings subject to the following amendments:

Minute Cou/269/04-05 – Public Participation – Insert after the second paragraph:

“Mr Sprason commented that they accepted the issue of child safety but there was the other issue which Ron Todner the local Liberal Democrat in Markfield kept raising which was that of children being snatched off the footpath; it was a valid point, but they would not encourage children to walk alone but would encourage them to walk in a walking bus of up to fifty children.

Cllr. Hollick commented he used to regularly cycle to the School but from Desford. Mr Sprason commented his children also regularly cycled to the School.”

Minute Cou/270/04-05 – Correspondence – Item 5 – In the Action column add **“and the resident be kept informed.”**

Minute Cou/272/04-05 – Budget 2005/06 – Add the following paragraph:

“Cllr. Hodges asked what progress had been made with the proposal to name the Castell/Marina Park the Stamford Memorial Park. The Clerk informed members he was dealing with this matter and would be seeking the views of the Memorial Committee as the next stage in the process.”

Cou/283/04-05 Matters Arising.

Cllr. Hodges commented on how pleased he was to receive the minutes so promptly following the last Meeting and how helpful that was.

Minute Cou/270/04-05 – Correspondence Item 12 – Richard Robinson Meeting with Druck – Cllr Dickson asked if Druck had been advised about this approach and if not should they. The Clerk replied Druck had not been advised of the approach. Cllr. Batty's view was this meeting was in relation to people with an anti Druck sentiment and as Druck was a vital part of the economy of the Village the Parish Council should distance itself from this proposal. The Chairman stated the view that the Parish Council should not become involved in any way with any political or other organisation that is working potentially to the detriment of any employer.

Minute Cou/269/04-05 – Public Participation – Cllr. Batty raised a concern that Mr Sprason, who was not on the Parish Council's circulation list, had obtained a copy of his letter addressed to the Chairman before it had been considered by the Parish Council and commented he would like to know from whom he had received the copy.

Cllr. Batty and Yarwood declared personal interests in the following item of business.

Minute/270/04-05 – Correspondence Item 2 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council re 53 Markfield Road – Cllr. Batty referred to a document he had handed at the Meeting to the Chairman and Clerk that was an extract from the planning file held by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. He stated that he had spoken to the Clerk before the Meeting who had received a reply saying that there were two applications one for reserved matters and one was a new application. Cllr. Batty stated he was satisfied it should have been the new application that should have determined in February 2003 and this needs to be checked further. Cllr. Batty commented that if you read the extract from the planning file it does raise some concerns. Mr Batty went on to quote from the extract. Because of his concerns he requested that the previous decision, to have a Senior Planning Officer to attend the Parish Council to answer members' questions on this development, should be pursued.

The Clerk referred to a letter received that day from Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council that commented further on the play and open space contribution for this development and also referred to the previous concerns expressed by the Parish Council on this development.

The inference in the letter was that as the outline permission had been granted prior to the new arrangements coming into force a contribution could not be sought when the application for reserved matters was made. The file note referred to a new application for a single dwelling which would have required a contribution had it been approved.

The letter also stated a Senior Planning Officer would be unable to attend this Meeting but gave an assurance that the Parish Council's concerns were being dealt with and a substantive reply would be available for the Meeting on the 24th January 2005. The Clerk said he had also been given a verbal assurance by Mr Collinson of Hinckley and Bosworth BC that no decision would be made on the latest application until the Parish Council had had the opportunity to consider the response at the next Meeting on the 24th January 2005.

Resolved that a Senior Planning Officer be invited to the next Meeting on the 24th January 2005 to answer members' questions on this development.

Minute Cou/270/04-05 Correspondence Item 9 – Community Policing – Cllr. Batty referred to the article in the WOT Ratby Magazine by Borough Councillor Chris Boothby, a copy of which he handed to the Chairman and Clerk at the Meeting and stated copies were available for members. He referred to the article and particularly the statement that the two community support officers will be paid for by the Borough Council. Having spoken to Chris Boothby it would appear that this funding has come out of the £883,000 surplus identified by the Acting Chief Executive and announced publicly. This was Ratby's bid for that funding and whilst Cllr. Boothby had been told all the surplus had been absorbed back into services with out any definition, because he persisted, Ratby was allocated funding for two community support officers.

Resolved that an explanation be sought from Hinckley and Bosworth as to where this £883,000 has been spent and how much has come back to the benefit of Groby.

PC Kelly joined the meeting during the discussion on the above item of business.

Cou/284/04-05 Police Report

PC Kelly apologised for not being able to attend the last meeting. Crime figures for Groby for November and December 2004 were provided as follows:

<i>Crime</i>	<i>November</i>	<i>December</i>
Burglary Dwelling	4	0
Burglary Other	5	2
Theft of Motor Vehicle	1	1
Theft from Motor Vehicle	5	5
Damage to Motor Vehicle	4	11
Non Domestic Assaults	1	1
Other	24	8
Total Crimes	44	28

There were no reported crimes in Field Head during the two month period.

PC Kelly commented that Budgens was no longer an anti social behaviour hotspot but there was now an issue around the Village Centre. A problem profile had been created to look at the trouble being caused by youths. Although there was a group of about ten youths involved three had been identified as the main culprits and the next step would be the issuing of a banning order to keep them away from this area. If the problem persists an anti social behaviour order would be considered.

Cllr. Jones commented that she had observed a car and a motor cycle frequently speeding up and down Pymm Leys Lane. PC Kelly stated that if the registration details could be obtained these should be reported to him.

Cllr. Batty asked about the impact of the dispersal order at Markfield and if this was affecting the number of youths in the Groby Village Centre. PC Kelly's view was that there was a small number coming down from Markfield but these were not necessarily troublemakers but youngsters who were being prevented from meeting their friends from Groby in Markfield because of the dispersal order and were as a consequence coming to Groby. PC Kelly highlighted that from his discussions with the youngsters that what they required was a meeting place.

The Chairman thanked PC Kelly for his attendance, reminding members that, and an opinion shared by PC Kelly, that the majority of the youths gathering around the Village were in fact well behaved and law abiding.

PC Kelly left the Meeting.

Cou/285/04-05 Letter from Councillor Kennard and Response from Councillor Batty.

Members consider a letter dated 29th November 2004 from Cllr. Kennard re Cllr. Batty's comments in the "Herald" and Cllr Batty's response thereto, copies of both letters having been previously circulated.

Cllr. Kennard stated that it should be noted that at no time was it ever suggested that Cllr. Batty should be prevented from voicing his opinion about any thing. He had merely asked that it be made clear to all readers of the Herald that it was his own viewpoint that was being expressed and that he was not the official spokesperson for Groby Parish Council. This would prevent any possible confusion in the minds of residents in Markfield and Stanton under Bardon who are the majority of the Herald readers. His reference to causing annoyance and distress to people outside the boundaries of Groby Parish, he believed the residents of Field Head did not yet come under this heading, was a specific reference to the South Charnwood School including its PTA and Governors. Cllr. Kennard went on to say that the proposed School Travel Plan being initiated is rightly under consultation and is not part of his discussion; it was also of no consequence to his argument as to who was the more popular of the two gentlemen concerned who were representatives of different bodies, the name calling would be left in abeyance and that he had been doing openly what he could to improve Groby without any desire to grandstand and keep his name constantly in print. Any questions as to councillors had only been done in the search for openness, transparency and accountability. He requested the Council to consider his original letter and deal with it as it thinks fit.

Cllr. Batty replied that his view was that Cllr. Kennard's letter was inane and inept as usual. The Chairman pointed out to Cllr. Batty that his comments were disrespectful. Cllr. Batty replied they had been intended to

be disrespectful. Cllr. Batty commented that Cllr. Kennard had seen an opportunity and went shooting off at the hip without checking his facts, without seeing what it was about and quoting out of context. He trusted all councillors had read the article and before Cllr. Kennard starts saying about causing hurt or offence to people outside of the area he should think about speaking up for the people within our own Parish, people who have expressed genuine concern about the safety of children attending the South Charnwood School. The letter in the Herald was not an official statement of Groby Parish Council; it was a letter from Peter Batty who is Groby Parish Councillor. He asked what price do we put on children's safety. He had discovered that children from Field Head were being denied free bus travel to the South Charnwood School but others were being provided with free travel on safety grounds because of the lack of adequate footpaths in their area. Apparently a view has been taken by those in authority that it is safe for Field Head children as young as eleven to cross the horrendously busy A50 and walk over two miles to school exposed to all the elements. His opinion was that this was scandalous and an example of penny pinching gone mad. With increasing traffic around the Markfield area and the potential danger of children being snatched off our streets is it too much to ask for free safe transport to school for all our children and grandchildren surely the safety and security of children should be priceless and not subject to penny pinching. The point was a genuine point made by a local parish councillor and before Cllr. Kennard went off and made the comments he did, which he did not repeat in its entirety, he would have been far better advised to check his facts before he went into it and making personal comments such as "the ramblings" and this that and the other and now making similar comments about trying to keep in the headlines. Cllr. Batty concluded by saying he would continue to put forward the legitimate concerns on behalf of other people, people like Mr Sprason would continue to ignore them and mislead us with deliberate misleading statements which he made to the Parish Council at the last Meeting. It was not the end of the matter, he took great exception as he was trying to do the best for the people of the Ward he represented and he was very disappointed that another councillor who has much less direct contact with the residents than he does should make such comments without knowing the facts.

Cllr. Coates commented that she felt it important that the residents of Field Head should know what is Parish Council Policy and what is opinion and that there should be some way of explaining in the Spotlight that this had not been discussed by the Parish Council. Cllr. Hodges suggested that the Parish Council should consider putting something in the Spotlight on a regular basis to improve communications with the residents of the Parish and that his personal interpretation of the article in the Herald was that Cllr. Batty was speaking as an individual and not on behalf of the Parish. He said that now that both members had had their say the matter should be closed and the Parish Council should move on.

Cllr. Dickson agreed with Cllr. Hodges that Cllr. Batty had written the article as an individual.

Cllr. Kennard, in conclusion, said that he would like to see something along the lines "the views expressed in this column are those of the author and not necessarily those of Groby Parish Council".

Cllr. Batty commented that the article was headed "A letter from Peter Batty" the strap line was put there at the choice of the Editor of the Herald. It does not say a statement; it does not say from Groby Parish Council it says "A letter from Peter Batty". He also commented that he took offence at Cllr. Coates involvement when she was talking about looking after the people of Field Head and what they should and should not know. He referred to the fact that Cllr. Coates was a Councillor for Field Head and he could not remember the last time she was involved in doing anything for the people of Field Head or representing anything or getting involved in Field Head affairs. He stated he found it quite offensive that Cllr. Coates had started making these comments about Field Head at this stage.

Cllr. Coates responded that Cllr Batty was just making personal comments and was something as councillors we should be trying to avoid. It was not appropriate to make personal comments, not all the work that parish councillors did was known to everyone and it was not always done in the Ward that the member represented. Cllr. Coates again reiterated the point that it needs to be made clear, if it is not understood by Field Head residents and Markfield Parish Council that when a parish councillor speaks it does not automatically represent the views or policies of the Parish Council.

The Chairman draw the debate to a close by stating that part of the problem was when members wore many hats there was often confusion as to what clothes were being worn. It should not be for the Parish Council to be issuing statement or disclaimers as to what individuals were saying to clarify the issue. It should be for individual members to clearly state, as advised by the Standards Board, who they are speaking for and what they are speaking on.

Cllr. Yarwood felt if Cllr. Kennard had an issue with Cllr. Batty he should speak to him directly, find out the facts first and not write a letter criticising him. Cllr Yarwood commented that this was not the first time that Cllr. Kennard had chosen to write letters criticising colleagues and referred to when he was Chairman of the

Playing Fields Committee that included Cllr. Kennard who rather than discussing concerns face to face with his colleagues chose to write to the Council to criticise his colleagues.

The Meeting adjourned at 7.55 pm for Public Participation

Cou/286/04-05 Public Participation.

A member of the public commented that they were pleased to see that some work was being done to the Old Hall.

Mr Todner a resident of Markfield referred to the survey carried in respect of the travel to school for the South Charnwood High School. He commented that the survey was not of parents but of 10 -14 year olds at the School which had been instigated by the local authority. He went on to refer to a letter he had sent to the County Council about the dangerous walking route to the School which was via a footpath and track through open countryside. The County Council had replied that it was the parents' responsibility to ensure their children arrived safely at the School. The County Council policy was that it was safe for two children of similar age to travel to school and it was their view along with that of David Sprason that this was a safe route. He stated he had asked Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council if it would support free transport for Markfield children on the basis that the route was unsafe. When he attended the Parish Meeting the Parish Council and the Borough Council supported the proposal; the only person who did not support it was County Councillor Sprason. The only reason he gave for not supporting it was that it would mean getting the Police and Safety Officer involved. Mrs Todner's view was that the route was categorically unsafe.

The Meeting reconvened at 8.03 pm following Public Participation

Cou/287/04-05 County Councillor's Report

Cllr. Fraser was not in attendance at the Meeting.

Cou/288/04-05 Borough Councillors' Reports

No Borough Councillor was in attendance at the Meeting.

Cou/289/04-05 Parish Plan Update

Mr Martin Cartwright, Chairman of the Parish Plan Steering Group updated members on progress with the Parish Plan.

Mr Cartwright reported that the first draft of the adult questionnaire had been completed and consisted of eighty to eighty five questions that residents had requested. Work was currently being undertaken in the Village on the Children and Youth Consultation.

Mr Cartwright stated he had perceived some confusion at the last Meeting when the budget was being discussed on the time scale for the production of the Parish Plan. He outlined to members the various stages culminating with the production and publication in September 2005 of the Parish Plan. Following that would be a period of implementation. Mr Cartwright provided the Clerk with an update for the Council's website.

In reply to a question from the Chairman concerning facilities for youngsters Mr Cartwright replied that the most popular item was a Leisure Centre with Swimming Pool but he accepted that the Parish Council did not have the resources to provide this.

Cllr. Hodges thanked Mr Cartwright for the clarity of his presentation and for his leadership and the work that his Group was doing and reminded members of the importance of obtaining Quality Parish Council status to ensure the Parish Council was in pole position for funding.

In response to a question from Cllr. Allison, Mr Cartwright commented there were still a small number of volunteers required for the data entry stage. Software provided by the Rural Community Council would be used to carry out the analysis of the data.

Members' thanked Mr Cartwright for his report.

Cou/290/04-05 Correspondence.

The Clerk submitted a list of correspondence, copies of which had previously been circulated to members, for the action to be determined by the Council:

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Received From</i>	<i>Summary of Contents</i>	<i>Action</i>
1	NALC	DfT Consultation re Update of Roads Circular 1/93 - Setting of Local Road Speed Limits	Cllrs. Purves and Batty be nominated to prepare a response for consideration by the Council at a future meeting.
2	East Midlands in Bloom	Details of 2005 East Midlands in Bloom Competition	Agreed that the Council enters the 2005 Competition. Hinckley and Bosworth be approached to establish if works are proposed for Groby under its scheme to enhance the gateways into the Borough Cllrs. Marvin, Jones, Dickson, Purves and Emmerson be nominated to deal with its organisation.
3	David A Sprason CC	Statements made in local magazines by a Parish Councillor regarding travel to the South Charnwood School. (Copy of letter circulated with Agenda)	Mr Sprason be informed that the Parish Council has concerns about the Travel to School Plan particularly as the information on which assumptions are being made has been obtained mainly from a questionnaire completed by students at the School without any involvement of parents. The Parish Council would be prepared to comment when the views of parents are known and these are incorporated into the Travel to School Plan
4	73rd Leicester (Groby) Scout Group	Requests for funding for enhancements to Scout HQ and permission for use of HQ for a Table Tennis Club. (Copy of letter circulated with Agenda).	The request for the HQ to be used by a Table Tennis Club be acceded to. Further information be sought on the proposed enhancements.
5	Groby Juniors Football Club	Request to use football pitch at Quarry Playing Field. (Copy of letter circulated with Agenda).	Defer to the next meeting and seek further information on the proposed use and its impact on the locality.
6	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council	Public Entertainment Renewals 2005 - Stamford Arms, Groby Community College and Groby Village Hall.	No member was aware of any issues arising out of the current use of these premises for public entertainment. Agreed no objection to the renewals be made. (The Chairman took no part in the discussion on this item).

7	Mr & Mrs Gamble	Stone Wall Corner Leicester Road and Pymm Leys Lane. (Copy of letter circulated with Agenda).	Defer to next meeting.
8	Leicestershire County Council	Temporary Bus Stop - A50 Field Head. (Copy of letter circulated with Agenda).	Defer to next meeting and seek a site meeting with the County Council prior to that meeting.

During the discussion on item 3 above Cllr. Batty again raised a concern that a letter addressed to the Chairman and which was due to be considered by the Parish Council had been obtained by Mr Sprason before the Parish Council had had the opportunity to consider it. It was pointed out that once an agenda is published all supporting agenda papers become available to the public unless it is deemed to be exempt information in which case it is marked confidential and only circulated to members. To facilitate access by the public to the full agenda papers it was agreed in the future a set should be available in the Office during normal office hours and also in the Council Chamber on the night of the meeting.

Resolved that the actions set out in the above list be approved.

The Clerk submitted a list of correspondence, copies of which had been previously circulated to members, detailing correspondence received/actioned by him for the period 15th December 2004 to 3rd January 2005. The Clerk answered members' questions thereon.

Resolved the list of correspondence received/actioned by the Clerk be noted.

Cou/291/04-05 Payment of Accounts.

<i>Payee</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Amount £</i>
G A Moore	Refund of Reservation Fee - Cremation plot	55.00
Various	December salaries	3808.51
Charnwood & Highmeres Hort	Winter servicing for parks equipment (part of bill)	609.72
HBBC	Office & Cemetery rates	225.00
D A Computers Ltd	On site annual charge	94.00
D A Computers Ltd	Extension leads / Mains adapter blocks/patch lead	20.82
S F B Tyres	Repair tyre on truck	23.50
Leicestershire & Rutland Wildlife Trust	Annual membership	30.00
Granart	Kerb Inscription	39.20
Parish Dog Warden Services	Dog warden services	153.00
Total		£1,195.24

Resolved the payment of the above accounts be approved.

Cou/292/04-05 Budget 2005/06.

The Clerk submitted budget working papers, copies of which had been previously circulated to members, setting out the Budget for 2005/06 that included the capital and revenue items agreed at the last Meeting.

Net expenditure was £172,990, an increase of £53,800 on the budget for 2004/05. If this amount were to be met wholly from the Precept it would require an increase of £73,970 (74.9%) and increase the Council Tax for Parish Council purposes by approximately £27 pa for a Band D property.

The most significant increases in expenditure related to capital schemes (£47,000), a Police Outreach Worker (£5,000) and Parks Maintenance (£6,000). The Clerk answered members' questions on the papers.

Cllr. Allison stated the issue was quite clear. Did the Parish Council increase its precept by £73,970 and leave itself £108,000 in reserves to potentially support future expenditure that may emerge out of the Parish Plan priorities or did it precept something more akin to what it did last time and don't spend any capital resources on the projects in the budget and leave the reserves at £108,000 or did it spend the money on those projects and not levy an increase and leave no monies in the reserves to spend on future projects.

The Chairman pointed out that previous decisions which had been taken on the precept had contributed to the current situation and the Parish Council was now playing "catch up" and members should be prepared, if the precept is increased significantly, to defend the actions of the Parish Council to members of the community.

Members discussed at some length the budget and the level of the precept for 2005/06.

It was proposed by Cllr. Hodges and seconded by Cllr. Batty that the budget be set as set out in the budget working papers and the precept be set at £172,990.

Cllr. Lock moved an amendment that £35,000 of the net expenditure be met from reserves reducing the precept to £137,990. The amendment failed to find a seconder.

The proposal on being put to the vote was carried. (For 10. Against 3. Abstentions 2).

Resolved that:

- i) The Budget for 2005/06 as submitted be approved.**
- ii) The Precept for 2005/06 be set at £172,990 and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council be informed accordingly.**

Cou/293/04-05 Local Transport Planning

Cllr. Allison presented a report prepared by Cllr. Lock and himself, copies of which had been previously circulated to members that identified the key responses for the Parish Council to consider in relation to the consultation document on the Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 2006 – 2008.

Cllr. Allison went on to say that the Transport Plan on which the County was consulting was about defining what their priorities were over the next few years. For the Parish it was about influencing that process so that those priorities that are important for the Parish are reflected as far as is possible in that planning process. It would be greatly influenced by what the Government was prepared to fund, what the County as a whole considers to be the priorities and what the County and City jointly consider are the priorities. Cllr. Allison referred to the report that set out five recommendations for the priorities for Groby and which he and Cllr. Lock considered the Parish should be asking the County to include in its Transport Plan. Cllr. Allison also recommended that the County should be invited to come and talk to the Parish Council before the Plan is finalised to provide an opportunity to question them on their choice of priorities.

Cllr. Hodges congratulated Cllrs. Allison and Lock on the clarity and conciseness of the report and proposed the report should be accepted.

Cllr. Batty stated he would like to make one addition to the recommendations. As the M1 Road Widening was mentioned he commented he would like Stephen Dorrell's input adding which he fully supported and had discussed it with him in detail. Stephen Dorrell's proposal

was as part of the M1 Road Widening Scheme to allow direct access to the A46 at Junction 21A for southbound M1 Traffic and providing a north bound access to the M1 at Kirby Muxloe to avoid traffic joining the A50 at Groby and going up through Field Head to join the M1.

Cllr. Lock said this particular proposal had been considered in drafting the report but whilst there were benefits in diverting traffic from the A50 for those residents who lived on or near the A50 there would be a detrimental effect for the majority of Groby residents who lived off Sacheverell Way with increased noise from traffic that would continue along the A46. Also there would be increased traffic between Junction 21a and 22 giving further noise problems to Ratby and the Groby residents that live on the Ratby side of Groby.

Cllr. Batty felt that measures could be taken to alleviate the noise from the A46 but this was not an option for the A50. He also felt that on road safety grounds and quality of life it had got to benefit a lot of people, particularly those in Field Head that currently suffer from a heavy volume of traffic.

Cllr. Purves expressed her concern at the volume of traffic and the speed at which it travelled past Lena and Wallace Drive and how the Markfield Road surface drains were in her view once again deteriorating.

Cllr. Allison suggested a form of words to amend the second recommendation in the report that would not be as specific as that suggested by Cllr Batty but would allow options for reducing the overall impact of traffic on the Parish to be investigated.

Resolved that:

- i. Priority should be given to reducing peak time traffic congestion leaving the Village by providing appropriate traffic management arrangements at the A50/A46 bypass junction ahead of the proposed M1 widening scheme. In addition special arrangements should be made during the construction phase of this major scheme to dampen and minimise the impact of additional traffic movement in and around the Village as a result of the major works.**
- ii. Priority should be given to reducing noise levels generated by the M1 as part of the widening scheme particularly given that the proposals are likely to lead to increases in noise levels and to investigate options for reducing the overall traffic impact on the Parish as part of the M1 proposals.**
- iii. Priority should be given to protecting and enhancing public transport to and through Groby and Field Head in particular protecting and improving evening and weekend services, and services from Field Head to Groby. If necessary subsidies should be provided to maintain these valuable services.**
- iv. Priority should be given to improving road safety within the Village and on the main A50 trunk road. Adequate and safe pedestrian access should be maintained between the different residential areas forming Groby and Field Head so that the community can function as a single community.**
- v. Any changes to the proposals relating to Park and Ride currently proposed for land adjoining the Village should be subject to further consultation with the Parish Council at the earliest opportunity.**
- vi. The County Council be invited to attend a future Parish Council meeting to discuss their priorities and answer members' questions before these are finalised.**

Cou/294/04-05 Landfill Liaison Committee

Cllr. Coates reported on her attendance at the last Meeting of the Landfill Liaison Committee that had taken place in mid December.

Cllr. Coates reported that all the agencies involved were working together to improve the management of the site. She went on to say there is a problem nationally with landfill sites in that waste is compacting much more than it used to and this will affect the final shape of the mound at the Landfill Site. Because of this

problem there will shortly be a planning application for landfill to continue in order to make the final outline into a hill otherwise if landfill was to cease in accordance with the current permission it would leave a depression on the top of the site. The only reason for the application was to ensure the final profile was in accordance with what had been previously agreed. Cllr. Coates stated those at the Meeting including herself had been most concerned about this proposal but had been assured that this was the only reason for the planning application.

Cllr. Purves questioned why having gone through three previous phases was the waste suddenly compacting on the final phase particularly when the site was due to close this year. She felt it did not make any sense. She went on to say that the residents in her area and Field Head would be up in arms as they had already suffered enough from the effects of the Landfill. She had also had seen a letter from the Leader of the County Council that stated he did not know where the information about a proposed extension to the planning application had come from but that no proposals had been made to the County Council. Cllr. Purves had found this had to believe. The Chairman asked for clarification as to when Cllr. Purves had communicated with local residents on this matter. Cllr. Purves responded approximately November.

Cllr. Batty concurred with the comments of Cllr. Purves and referred to his previous comments to the Parish Council when he had said a planning application was imminent. He went on to say that as the operators would have to make extra grant monies available under the Landfill Scheme, he suggested, as we were the ones that were going to suffer and as the Parish Plan was coming along that the local people affected by this should get the benefit of the additional grant monies.

The Chairman reminded members they were not discussing the planning application.

Cllr. Hodges asked if minutes were available for the Landfill Meeting. Cllr. Coates confirmed there would be minutes but they had not yet been produced. Cllr. Hodges also suggested we should be asking what additional income would be available from extending the life of the Site and seek some commitment on what Groby and Field Head would receive from it.

Resolved that:

- i) **The report on the attendance of Cllr. Coates at the Landfill Liaison Committee be accepted.**
- ii) **Minutes of the Meeting when available be circulated to all members.**

Cou/295/04-05 Planning Applications

Members considered and commented on planning applications as set out below:

<i>Reference Number</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Comments</i>
04/01460/FUL	33 Markfield Road	Erection of detached garage.	No objection subject to neighbours not being inconvenienced.

Resolved that the Clerk notifies Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council of the above comments on planning application.

Cou/296/04-05 Date of Next Meeting.

Monday 24th January 2005 at 7.00 pm at the Council Offices.

The Meeting closed at 9.55 pm.

Signed.....Date.....
Chairman