

# Wickham Bishops Parish Council

## Parish Councillors

I D Wardrop (Chairman)  
S J Nicholas (Vice Chairman)  
H M Bass  
P J Bates  
K W Jarvis  
P D Layley  
M Mickelsen  
R Mundell  
J Williams



Winner Best Kept Village 2009, 2015  
3<sup>rd</sup> Place Essex Village of the Year 2015  
[www.wickhambishopsparishcouncil.org](http://www.wickhambishopsparishcouncil.org)

## Parish Clerk

Mrs L A Bailey  
Wickham Bishops Parish Council  
The Village Hall  
Church Road  
Wickham Bishops  
Essex  
CM8 3JZ  
07542 190176

[info@wickhambishopsparishcouncil.org](mailto:info@wickhambishopsparishcouncil.org)

## Minutes of Wickham Bishops Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm

Item	Subject
21/123	<p><b>Those Present and Apologies for Absence</b> In the Chair: Cllr Wardrop Present: Cllrs Bass, Bates, Layley, Mickelsen, Nicholas and the Clerk. County Cllr Durham. Apologies for absence were accepted from Cllrs Jarvis, Mundell &amp; Williams. There were 4 members of the public present.</p>
21/124	<p><b>Declaration of Interests and Compliance with the Ethical Framework</b> Cllr Bass declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in the Five Corners Planning Application at Item 21/129 and would leave the meeting for that item.</p>
21/125	<p><b>Approval of Minutes</b> It was resolved that the Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2021 be accepted. Proposed Cllr Bass, seconded Cllr Bates, all in favour. It was resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2021 be accepted. Proposed Cllr Bass, seconded Cllr Wardrop, all in favour.</p>
21/126	<p><b>Chairman's Report</b> An invitation had been received to attend a service commemorating the 850<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the granting of the Royal Charter to Maldon on 7<sup>th</sup> October. The Chairman would check his availability.</p>
21/127	<p><b>Clerk's Report</b> BT advised that they had re-seeded the verge to the front of the Telephone Exchange and repair/removal of the lamp post was with their Technology department.  The Clerk was pleased to report that WBPC had been awarded £1500 from the Locality Fund for works to the Moody Homes footpath. It was noted that the monies must be spent before 10 February 2022.</p>
21/128	<p><b>Public Forum - a maximum of 15 minutes with no more than 3 minutes per person</b> The Chairman suspended the meeting and a member of the public spoke on Item 21/130 Implications of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
21/129	<p><b>Planning Applications and Decisions</b> Applications had been circulated to all Councillors, prior to publication of the agenda, for study ahead of the meeting. The Chairman reminded members of public present that WBPC was merely a consultee in the process and that the final decision rested with Maldon District Council. Cllr Bass as Planning Committee Chairman took the Chair for this item.  <b>21/00690/WTPO – Columbine, 31 Blacksmiths Lane. T13 Scots Pine – Fell. T11 Hawthorn – Fell. T8 Beech – Remove 2 lowest branches. 3m lateral crown reduction. T7 Beech – 3m selective lateral reduction to shape. T9 &amp; T10 Sycamore – Crown lift to 5m over the road. Remove two lowest branches over the garden. Resolved:</b> The Parish Council recommended APPROVAL on the basis that the recommendations made by MDC's tree specialist were followed, proposed Cllr Layley, seconded Cllr Wardrop, all in favour.</p>

**Minutes of Wickham Bishops Parish Council Meeting  
held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm**

**21/00807/WTPO – 6 Wellands. Oak T1 – Remove 4m of new growth back to previous cut points. Lift canopy to 5m above ground level. Remove all dead wood. Resolved:** The Parish Council recommended APPROVAL on the basis that the recommendations made by MDC’s tree specialist were followed. Proposed Cllr Bass, seconded Cllr Wardrop, all in favour.

**21/00840/FUL – Bryden House, Witham Road. Replacement dwelling house. Resolved:** The Parish Council had no objection to the proposals and recommended APPROVAL, proposed Cllr Bass, seconded Cllr Wardrop, all in favour.

Cllr Bass declared a personal interest in the following item and left the room. Cllr Wardrop took the Chair.

**21/00824/OUT – Five Corners, Maypole Road, Great Totham. Outline planning permission with the matter of access for consideration for a new detached dwelling.** Although this Application was situated in Great Totham, it was very close to the boundary with Wickham Bishops and therefore the Parish Council wished to comment. It was noted that Great Totham Parish Council had no objection to the proposals. **Resolved:** After discussion, the Parish Council recommended REFUSAL on the grounds that the access point from the proposed new dwelling was inappropriate on this narrow plot, along a busy road where the 30mph speed limit was regularly exceeded.

The following decisions made by Maldon District Council were noted:

HOUSE/MAL/21/00680, Little Hill Farm, Mope Lane. Two storey rear and side link extension between dwelling and existing annexe and associated alterations to dwelling. **APPROVED.**

HOUSE/MAL/21/00632, The Firs, 1A Leigh Drive. Construction of new porch to side of existing property. **APPROVED.**

FUL/MAL/21/00341, Fieldway, Station Road. Proposed new dwelling on land which incorporates plot of existing dwelling and neighbouring field. **REFUSED.**

HOUSE/MAL/21/00659, Shamrock Cottage, 30 Tiptree Road. Demolition of existing conservatory and lean to roof at the rear to replace with 2 storey side and rear extension. To include proposed outbuilding. **REFUSED.**

**21/130**

**Other Planning Matters**

**To note Cllr Mundell’s withdrawal from the Planning Committee and formally nominate a replacement** Cllr Williams had indicated a willingness to join the Planning Committee but as she was not present, it was agreed to continue asking for a volunteer to attend Planning Committee Meetings going forward.

**Implications of Planning Applications and Decisions on the Neighbourhood Plan To consider correspondence received from a resident expressing concern over the way in which the NHP had recently been interpreted.** The concerns of the resident were noted and understood. However, members were satisfied that each Planning Application was considered by WBPC on its merits and that the NHP and VDS were taken into account when considering Applications. The Chairman reminded the meeting that WBPC were not a determining authority, merely a consultee. The resident’s letter and WBPC’s response to the points made are attached at Appendix 1.

**Land adjoining Crabbs Farm, Back Lane, Wickham Bishops** Correspondence received from Raymond Stemp Associates (Planning & Development Consultants) offering to attend a PC Meeting to explain the proposals at Crabbs Farm was noted. The Clerk had replied advising that the PC would be pleased to comment on a formal Planning Application when it was received via MDC. In the meantime, an email had been received from the new owners of Crabbs Farm who advised that they too would be submitting a Planning Application for works to the house and explaining that the paddock adjoining was separate and not in their ownership.

**Minutes of Wickham Bishops Parish Council Meeting  
held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm**

	<p><b>21/00415/FUL Land north of Orchard Way, Mope Lane Planning Application - to note MDC's approval of the above, the apparent disregard for WBNHP Policies, and to consider any further action</b> After discussion, the meeting regretted MDC's decision which contravened MDC's own policies but felt there was no more that could be done other than note the Parish Council's concern.</p>
<p><b>21/131</b></p>	<p><b>Traffic Calming &amp; Highway Matters</b>  <b>To note the concerns of residents around parked vehicles obstructing the views of motorists at Snows Corner junction and the use of larger vehicles using Tiptree Road.</b> After much discussion, and taking account of the various measures that had been suggested and/or tried in the past, the meeting agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-approach the South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP), ask them to look at the site again and put forward possible solutions within the criteria. <b>Action:</b> <i>Cllr Wardrop</i></li> <li>• Contact the shop owners to see if visitors and staff could be encouraged to park at the rear of the shops if possible and whether improved signage in this area would help. <b>Action:</b> <i>Cllr Nicholas</i></li> <li>• Contact the Local Highways Panel, explain the problem and ask them to suggest possible solutions including perhaps physical measures such as 'build-outs' or double yellow lines at the junction to prevent parking along the first 5m. <b>Action:</b> <i>Clerk</i></li> <li>• Approach BHSA with a view to staff and visitors to the shops using the Village Hall on a short-term basis. <b>Action:</b> <i>Cllr Williams as BHSA representative.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Tiptree Road</b> It was felt that the overgrown hedges were reducing the width of the carriageway and not helping the safe flow of traffic. <b>Action:</b> The Clerk to write to all residents and ask for their co-operation in cutting back their hedges, to enable traffic on both sides to pass safely.</p> <p><b>ECC Salt Bag Partnership Scheme 2021/22</b> The meeting formally agreed to remain a member of the scheme and would give consideration to future placement of existing salt bags for optimum use during the winter. <b>Action:</b> Salt bag distribution to be considered at the October PC Meeting.</p> <p><b>Outstanding highways issues</b> Cllr Durham had met with Cllr Scott the Cabinet Member for Highways and passed on WBPC's dissatisfaction. Cllr Durham reported on each item, see Appendix 2.</p> <p><b>Local Highways Panel – To consider possible additional LHP schemes</b> As mentioned under Snows Corner, an approach would be made to the LHP for possible solutions to prohibit parking too close to the junction. Cllr Bass suggested we wait until reforms had been made to the LHP process, as outlined by Cllr Durham.</p>
<p><b>21/132</b></p>	<p><b>County Councillor Report</b>  County Councillor Durham reported briefly on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training sessions with Highways were being organised to help users understand how they worked.</li> <li>• Speed-related LHP requests were increasing. Once the revised speed management strategy was confirmed, the requests would be re-considered.</li> <li>• Cllr Scott had offered a face-to-face meeting with WBPC to listen to concerns. It was felt that a site visit was preferable to enable Cllr Scott to see for himself the issues on the ground. <b>Action:</b> <i>Cllr Durham to organise a meeting.</i></li> <li>• The Casualty Reduction Team had recorded traffic movements at the Five Corners junction over a 13 hour period and a temporary solution had been recommended which involved cutting off the second junction and extending the speed limit. Funding was available and if the scheme proved successful, it would be adopted officially.</li> </ul> <p>Cllr Durham was thanked for his report. Cllr Nicholas asked Cllr Durham to note that there had been two more road traffic accidents on Witham Road.</p>
<p><b>21/133</b></p>	<p><b>Fireworks 2021</b>  The Clerk had been in touch with Chelmsford City Council with regard to Rocket o'Clock and was awaiting their firm dates. In the meantime, the meeting agreed to ask residents to restrict their firework parties</p>

**Minutes of Wickham Bishops Parish Council Meeting  
held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm**

to Friday 5<sup>th</sup> November and Saturday 6<sup>th</sup> November in order to keep noise and disturbance to a minimum to show care for vulnerable neighbours and animals. **Action:** *The Clerk to write a piece for the Parish Magazine and advertise on FB and the Notice Boards.*

**21/134**

**Finance**

- The Meeting formally approved the August payments made in the absence of the August PC Meeting (See Appendix 3).
- Members noted the bank balance and agreed the following list of payments for the month ahead.

<b>Finance Report for Wickham Bishops Parish Council</b>				
<b>September 2021 PC Meeting</b>				
Prepared by:	Lorraine Bailey, Parish Clerk & RFO			05 Sep 21
Status as at 31 August 2021	Debit	Credit	Balances B/F	Balances C/F
Unity Trust Current Account			27,252.33	
Unity Trust Deposit Account			0.00	
Petty Cash Float			0.00	
Unbanked Cash			0.00	
Stamps			2.18	
<b>Total Funds Held 31/08/2021</b>			<b>27,254.51</b>	
<b>Unity Trust Current Account Payments for September</b>				
IP0509	J&M Payroll Services, Payroll July	-£24.00		
IP0510	J&M Payroll Services, Payroll August	-£24.00		
IP0511	WB & LB PCC, Hire of Church Hall 6 July 2021	-£54.00		
IP0512	L A Bailey, Clerk Salary - August 2021	-£714.26		
IP0513	L A Bailey reimbursement, Postage Stamps, 12 x 2nd Class, 12 x 1st Class	-£18.12		
IP0514	WB & LB PCC, Donation towards delivery of Annual Report with Parish Magazine	-£100.00		
	<b>Total Transactions</b>	<b>-934.38</b>	<b>0.00</b>	
	<b>Unity Trust Current Account Balance</b>			<b>26,317.95</b>
<b>Stamps August</b>				
	Stamp Purchase		18.12	
	Stamp Use	-5.58		
	<b>Total Transactions</b>	<b>-5.58</b>	<b>18.12</b>	
	<b>Stamp Balance 05/09/2021</b>			<b>14.72</b>
	<b>Total Funds Held 05/09/2021 including Stamps</b>			<b>26,331.95</b>

- Members noted the Monthly Breakdown and Budget Performance as at 31.8.21 prepared by the Clerk.
- The Meeting ratified the additional expenditure incurred on the purchase and installation of two dog waste bins (£250 set aside in September 2019, total cost in 2021 exc VAT £409).

**21/135**

**Governance**

Members agreed to re-adopt WBPC's Email Policy & Guidelines.  
Members agreed to re-adopt WBPC's Recording of Meetings.

**21/136**

**Correspondence**

- Essex Police Community Specials Briefing - to be considered further at the October PC Meeting.
- Highways Devolution Scheme – to be considered further at the October PC Meeting.
- The Queen's Platinum Jubilee Beacons, 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2022. **Action:** *The Clerk to contact Great Totham PC and ask if they had made any arrangements.*
- Request for pedestrian crossing at The Street near One Stop. **Action:** *Cllr Nicholas to contact the resident and explain the reasons why this was not possible in this location.*

**Minutes of Wickham Bishops Parish Council Meeting  
held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent Telephone Box vandalism and FB survey undertaken by resident. <b>Action:</b> Clerk to contact the resident and explain that BT were planning to replace the stolen apparatus and get the telephone back up and running.</li> <li>• Refurbishment works to WB Library starting Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> September for approx. 8 weeks. It was disappointing that the PC had not been consulted on the works, but it was agreed that the fact that works were going ahead was a positive step.</li> <li>• ECC Highways Team Briefing – 7<sup>th</sup> October 2021, 10am – 1pm, £20. <b>Action:</b> The Clerk to book a place for Cllr Jarvis.</li> </ul>
<b>21/137</b>	<p><b>Progress Reports from Councillors – no decisions required</b></p> <p>It was noted that the resident of Cornerways had arranged for the vegetation alongside the road to be cut back and a very good job had been done, greatly improving sight lines for pedestrians and motorists. <b>Action:</b> The Clerk to write to the resident with a letter of thanks.</p>
<b>21/138</b>	<p><b>General Village News and Events to Note</b></p> <p>Village Litter Pick – Saturday 18<sup>th</sup> September 11am outside Library Car Park.</p>
<b>21/139</b>	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting:</b></p> <p>Planning Committee Meeting – Friday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2021 11.30am, Village Hall Boardroom Full Parish Council Meeting – Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> October 2021 7.30pm (venue to be confirmed) Full Parish Council Meeting – Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2021 7.30pm (venue to be confirmed) Finance Committee Meeting – date to be arranged sometime in November</p>
<b>21/140</b>	<p><b>Close of Meeting</b></p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10pm.</p> <p>Items for October Agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essex Police Community Specials Briefing</li> <li>• Highways Devolution Scheme</li> <li>• Salt bag distribution</li> <li>• Standing item to consider whether the delegated powers in respect of Covid-19 can be lifted.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 1

Councillor Ian Wardrop  
Chairman Wickham Bishops Parish Council



14<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Dear Ian,

### **Interpretation of the Wickham Bishops Neighbourhood Plan (WBNP) and Village Design Statement (VDS) when assessing village planning matters**

I would like to follow-up on the representations I made - in writing, and verbally at the last Parish Council meeting - concerning The Pump House planning application. I pursued two themes:

1. To ask the Parish Council to look again at what has been submitted on its behalf by the Planning Committee to MDC.
2. To consider whether the Planning Committee's interpretation of the Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with what residents voted for when they supported it in the referendum.

I fully appreciate that, in the absence of the Councillors who chair the Planning Committee and the Neighbourhood Plan Group, any discussion at that Tuesday meeting would have been difficult. However, the net effect is that the Parish Council has now formally ratified the response that had been sent to MDC and it becomes a matter of record for future reference.

Theme 1 above is therefore now closed off. Theme 2 however remains, in my view, a live issue and I would like to request that it should be scheduled for discussion at the next Planning Committee meeting and/or Parish Council meeting.

The basic issue is very simple as I believe the wording the Council has submitted to MDC is contrary to that which villagers would have expected from reading the WBNP and the VDS. Irrespective of whether The Pump House application succeeds or not, the precedent created by this wording should surely be discussed in a public forum.

## Background

The Wickham Bishops Parish Council is now on record as having stated that:

***“While the Parish Council sees merit to two semi-detached properties on this plot (meeting local housing needs as per the Wickham Bishop Neighbourhood Plan)” [we would prefer] “a more traditional semi-detached cottage with garages which would be supported by the Village Design Statement...”***

## Points to Discuss

Set out below are quotes from the WBNP and the VDS which I believe support the representations that I and others made to the Council. I think clarification of the Council’s own position would be beneficial both to existing residents who are now fearful that the Council supports the principle of demolishing single dwellings to subdivide plots and build multiple dwellings, and to developers who seek precedent to maximise the development potential of plots containing older single dwelling properties.

### A. Quotes from the Neighbourhood Plan

The WBNP policies are silent on the prospect of demolishing existing housing to subdivide plots, but the Plan does make the following statements:

Section 1.2.7 notes that villagers require that ***“future housing development in this area should not further increase the existing density”*** and Section 1.2.7 goes on to show how ***“the Arcadian character and maintenance of the open, rural character of the village has been created and maintained”***.

Section 2.1.1 states that ***“In 2029 Wickham Bishops will continue to be a thriving village with its distinctive rural appearance that is characterised by the prevailing dominance of trees...”***. In The Pump House application, a key requirement for re-development is the cutting down of the specimen apple tree that dominates the front lawn area and is a strong feature of the street scene at this point. Section 3.2.1 states that the ***“tree-filled feel and character in the Parish”*** should be maintained.

### B. Quotes from Village Design Statement

The text of the VDS in Section 4 addressing “Housing Design and Development” states that:

***“Most people did not favour the splitting of properties into two households, which could potentially also increase the number of vehicles; and wanted planners to avoid too many houses on redeveloped plots.”***

Two of the Guidelines in this section of the VDS are:

***14. New developments and extensions should avoid increasing the density of the housing in the area, thus being sympathetic to the village scene.***

***17. Established plots should not be sub-divided if the consequent housing density is greater than in the surrounding area or if the impact of extra garaging, cars, off-street parking or boundary changes is not sympathetic to the surrounding area.***

The Council’s response to MDC on The Pump House, i.e. that there was merit in demolishing the established house to build two houses in its place, appears to be not just inconsistent with the VDS but diametrically opposed!

I would therefore argue that neither the Neighbourhood Plan nor the Village Design Statement can be quoted to support the ***“sees merit”*** conclusion that has now been ratified by the Parish Council.

**Will there be cases where demolish and re-build has merit? Yes, but these will be as exceptions to the WBNP/VDS policies.**

I noted in my observations to the Council that there will be exceptional sites where demolition and redevelopment can make good sense. I referred to Pine Trees which occupied an irregular 2,300 sq m plot that faced 3 roads with total street frontage of ca. 100m. This provided more than adequate separation and frontage for 3 bungalows and was consistent with the surrounding housing density. A site like The Pump House has none of those characteristics. It is one of a row of detached houses and has a single street frontage of just 21m. The total plot size is 600 sq m which is already much smaller than those of its neighbouring properties before dividing it in half. These two cases are chalk and cheese in all respects.

### **Conclusion**

I believe – and I think this would be the view of many villagers who voted to approve the Neighbourhood Plan - that a balanced interpretation of the WBNP and the VDS would lead to the Parish Council stating that any future proposals similar to that for The Pump House would be inconsistent with both those documents, and that it would see no merit in supporting them.

Sincerely,





## APPENDIX 1

### AGENDA ITEM 21/130 - IMPLICATIONS OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON NHP

This item arises from correspondence received from a resident following on from the planning application, since withdrawn, for redevelopment of Pump House, 24 Grange Road. In his letter, the resident raises a number of issues where he thinks there may have been conflict between the NHP, the VDS and the Planning Committee's response on that application. WBPC do not think there is the degree of conflict suggested by the resident for the following reasons.

**NHP Para 1.2.7** is quoted by the resident. This para mentions "should not further increase the density" and refers back to para 1.2.5 which relates to the infill expansion in the village of the 1960/70s. This, we understand, was the large developments such as Byron Drive and Leigh Drive. We don't agree that one additional property in a road such as Grange Road would affect density such as to impact on the "Arcadian character of the village"

**NHP Para 2.1.1** refers to "the prevailing dominance of trees" in the village. The resident suggests that the apple tree in the front of Pump House would go if two houses were to be built there. But there is no certainty that a straight-forward one-for-one replacement would see the retention of the tree. It is not protected and could well be removed in any future development. Nevertheless, **Policy WBen02** provides for some protection of veteran trees and this would likely be covered in any response to any substantive application.

**NHP Para 3.4.4** says that, in relation to comments received through the Residents' Survey, "any development should be by way of infill" and "small scale development of less than 5 properties per site would have less impact".

**NHP Para 3.4.8** provides that "new development should provide a mix of housing types including smaller, two bedroom and starter homes". These two paras would seem to support the possibility of more than one new property on a site previously occupied by one property.

**New development** is not specifically defined in the NHP but could reasonably include development of a plot previously occupied by one property into more than one.

**The Village Design Statement** is also referred to. We can say from experience that the Planning Cttee and the Council have frequently referred to the VDS when considering planning applications.

**VDS Paras 15 and 17** have been cited. We would argue that seeing merit in two semi-detached properties in one plot would not materially affect the density of housing in the area. The details of any application would show whether the proposals were sympathetic to the area.

**MDC's LDP, Policy D1** dealing with design quality and built environment has been referenced by the Planning Cttee in past applications in order to ensure compliance with the "sympathetic to the area" requirement.

In summary, we understand the points made by the resident, but we are content that the NHP and the VDS are taken into account when considering applications.

## APPENDIX 2

### AGENDA ITEM 21/131 – OUTSTANDING HIGHWAY ISSUES

#### 1. Improvement to warning signs, Witham Road/Blue Mills Hill (Local Highways Panel – LHP)

Another collision at Blue Mills Hill j/w Mope Lane on 10/8/21 confirms need for urgent action.  
Highway Officers “more than happy to investigate”.

#### 2. Repair/replacement of kerbstone causing H&S hazard, The Street (Essex Highways – EH)

Email from MD dated 18/6/21 confirming this should be dealt with without delay as a serious trip hazard. Still not done. This had now been carried out.

#### 3. Flooding (EH)

- 10 Church Road A Surface Water Alleviation Scheme had been arranged.
- Old Rectory, Wickham Hall Lane/Station Road Highway Officers were unaware of a report. The Clerk to let Cllr Durham have history, reporting dates, details etc.
- Hill Place Cottage, Station Road Investigated and jetted 29.1.21. Job raised to look further into problems.
- Wickham Hall Lane, near junction with Langford Road Highways not aware of any defects. The Clerk to let Cllr Durham have details.

These have been reported on many occasions over a number of years. Recent detailed emails include 4/2/21 and 25/2/21 to MD. Noted that Church Road (around no.10) will be closed for 5 days from 20/9/2021 for SWAS (surface water alleviation scheme?) works

#### 4. Repair of Blue Mills Bridge across R Blackwater (EH)

Long outstanding. Barriers have been moved and are a safety hazard. Highway Officers say there is an issue with Planning.

#### 5. Cut back vegetation, Tiptree Road from Mackmurdo Place to improve pedestrian sightlines and to facilitate new footway (LHP)

Suggested by PC to facilitate new footway but never done, despite site visit by MD in 2019. Email from MD 3/3/21 indicating footway proposal approved by LHP and awaiting funding for 2021/22. Cllr Durham confirmed that this is a funded project. Job to be carried out next financial year. Highways will re-visit September for further vegetation cut.

#### 6. Resurfacing of full length of footway, Blacksmiths Lane (LHP)

Email from T Eng 19/4/21 stating in validation. Small section done months ago; another small section now covered by cone where hole has appeared in footway. Decision to be made at September LHP Meeting.

#### 7. Bus stop markings/cage, Kelvedon Road (LHP)

Email from T Eng 19/4/21 stating funding agreed for 2021/22 but no indication of when might be done. Cllr Durham has asked for an update of when work will be carried out.

#### 8. Outcome of speed/traffic volume survey after installing White Gates at Witham Road and Maypole Road (LHP)

Was apparently done in September 2019 but no report of outcome provided to PC. Lockdowns etc. overtook further action but survey results should have been provided to PC as well as to LHP. Data collected 2018 and 2020. Cllr Durham to provide WBPC with full details.

#### 9. Rotation of SIDs (EH)

This was agreed to be done by Highways every three months. SIDs have remained in same two sites for over 2 years. Highways have no record that this was agreed.

#### 10. Explanation for unnecessary resurfacing in full length of Heathgate (EH)

No formal request from PC about this but local resident has had no response to query. Heathgate pavement was No. 5 on MDC's priority list apparently.

Meeting of Wickham Bishops Parish Council, 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021  
Published 13<sup>th</sup> September 2021

## APPENDIX 3

Finance Report for Wickham Bishops Parish Council				
<b>August 2021 (No PC Meeting)</b>				
Prepared by:	Lorraine Bailey, Parish Clerk & RFO			02 Aug 21
<b>Status as at 02 August 2021</b>	<b>Debit</b>	<b>Credit</b>	<b>Balances B/F</b>	<b>Balances C/F</b>
Unity Trust Current Account			29,068.16	
Unity Trust Deposit Account			0.00	
Petty Cash Float			0.00	
Unbanked Cash			0.00	
Stamps			5.68	
Total Funds Held 31/07/2021			29,073.84	
<b>Unity Trust Current Account Payments for August</b>				
IP0502	Maldon District Council - 2 x dog waste bins Handleys Lane and Library	-490.80		
IP0503	Wise Maintenance - grass cutting	-100.00		
IP0504	J&M Payroll - payroll services June 2021	-24.00		
IP0505	RCCE - Annual Membership subscription	-72.60		
IP0506	e.on - Street Lighting electricity 1.4.21-30.6.21	-35.52		
IP0507	Maldon District Council - Trucam charge 9 hours @ £35.06	-378.65		
IP0508	L A Bailey - Clerk Salary July 2021	-714.26		
	Total Transactions	-1,815.83		
	<b>Unity Trust Current Account Balance</b>			<b>27,252.33</b>
<b>Stamps July</b>				
	Stamp Purchase	0.00		
	Stamp Use	3.50		
	Total Transactions	3.50	0.00	
	Stamp Balance 02/08/2021			2.18
	<b>Total Funds Held 02/08/2021 including Stamps</b>			<b>27,254.51</b>