

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF HAZELBURY BRYAN PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY 13th AUGUST 2024 AT 7.15 PM IN THE VILLAGE HALL.

Present: Councillors Steve Murcer (SM), Neil Robson (NR), Ivana Booker (IB); Members of the public – 5;
Minutes: Malcolm Wilson (MW) – parish clerk.

140/24 - Apologies: Received from Val Rubie, Ken Huggins, Martin Richards and Liz Stockley

141/24 - Declarations of interest: None declared

142/24 – Adoption of the minutes of the meeting held on 9th July 2024: The minutes were approved as drafted.

143/24 – Matters arising from these minutes: Covered in the agenda. June King had been very pleased with the card sent by SM on behalf of the parish council

144/24 – Public open session: No comments.

145/24 – Finance: i) to approve accounts for payment: The following payments were approved:

Cheque	Payee		Net	VAT	Total
SO	IKServices	Dog bin emptying	£150.15		£150.15
DD	Dorset Council	Cemetery rates	£19.00		£19.00
	JB				
1572	Gardens	Cemetery/play grass	£560.00	£112.00	£672.00
1573	BDO	External audit	£315.00	£63.00	£378.00
1574	M Wilson	August pay	£305.74		£305.74
1575	R Simpson	Field grass cutting	£300.00		£300.00
1576	M Wilson	Expenses	£241.25	£30.00	£271.25
1577	ICCM	Subscription	£67.00		£67.00

ii) Year-end audit: MW reported that the external auditor had signed off the audit for the year ending 31 March 2024. The approvals have been posted on the web site and noticeboard as required.

146/24 – Planning: a) to consider any applications received: None received.

No retrospective application has been received for the site at My Tann near Pidney Hill. MW will ask DC Enforcement if they have any news

147/24 - Footpath and highways matters:

i) Meeting with DC Highways 23rd July 2025: A number of items were considered at this meeting with Roland Skeets and Amanda Penfold from Highways and SM and MW.

a). 20mph speed limit at the school: Given the Department for Transport guidelines, which DC has adopted into its 20mph policy, there is no realistic chance of a 20mph limit being installed at the school. a) The site frontage is wrong – it is too rural in appearance, with no residential buildings adjacent. Drivers would have no expectation of the road being a 20mph limit. b) There is no obvious history of speed-related accidents in the vicinity. c) It was observed during the site visit that the mean average speed of traffic might well be above 24mph. If this is the case, then traffic calming measures have to be installed. These need to be lit at nighttime. If the mean average speed is less than 24mph, then signage might work but there would be no enforcement; and, realistically, if the mean average speed is below 24mph, then very little would be achieved.

b). 20mph speed limit at the Causeway: The chance of a 20mph from the Antelope junction up to the shop, or an extended footpath route, were also considered. a) Whilst there is a residential frontage it is clear the mean average speed is above 24mph. This means traffic calming, lit at nighttime would be needed to enforce a 20mph limit. In terms of budgets and priorities the idea is a non-starter. b) The idea of extending the footpath on the Hall and Woodhouse land has been considered in the past but rejected as the site lines for the path as it emerges onto the Highway are

inadequate. RS was asked for his estimate of how much it would cost to cut down and grub out the roadside hedge and lay a rough path of scalplings etc. This would improve the visibility on the curved bend. RS thought £30k would do the job – HBPC to pay! Any work like this on a category C road would need planning permission from DC. This is a double hedge, owned by Hall and Woodhouse. However, even grubbing out the roadside half would be contrary to Policy HB2 in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the improved safety aspects might outweigh the Policy. This will be considered more fully at the next parish council meeting.

c). Blocked gullies: RS confirmed the best way to report these and ensure action is to log the issue on-line. There is one small jetter available locally but only one heavy duty jetter for the whole of Dorset. This often needs a formal road closure to be deployed.

The specific problem at the bottom of Thickthorn Lane, just before the junction with the school, was considered. There is the site of a dried-up pond in the woods, but also a large willow tree right by the drain. The landowner has an obligation to allow surface water to escape the highway, so AP will approach with a view to have the willow cut down and the stump ground out. An alternative might be to dig a new channel to allow the surface water to enter the pond area, but this might get clogged by willow roots as well.

d). Front wall of Badger Cottage, Partway Lane: The ownership has changed, The new owner has been in the house for two months. RS said the water that emerges under the wall is certainly from a spring, of which the area has dozens. There are layers of chalk and clay, and when the water in the clay reaches some chalk, then up pops a spring. RS felt there was nothing that can be done, and it shouldn't be a problem

e). BT manhole issue, Partway Lane: RS said BT need to put a "bung" into the problem manhole area. This has now been done.

ii) Rights of Way: MW had complained to the Rangers about the lack of work in cutting back footpaths as agreed under the SLA. MW expressed support for continuing to use and support the Rangers, as the income from the SLA helps fund their presence and work, but emphasised that the parish council would not pay for work that had not been done. Graham Stanley has apologised and said the work will be done very soon and he will not invoice us for this financial year. Ian Stevenson confirmed some of the work has been done but it remains to be seen if all routes will be cut. There was little enthusiasm to use an alternative private contractor. The Rangers offer a subsidised rate and the money from the SLA does help keep the Rangers in place.

148/24 – Legal land matters: **i) The Willows:** Framfields have had a change of heart. Their advice is now that as the Land Registry say we don't own it, we can neither sell it or give it away! MW has advised Keith Marsh. It was agreed that MW should write to the Land Registry (he has a named person to contact) and ask them, the creators of a problem that didn't previously exist, how to resolve this cheaply and easily **ii) Land adjacent to the village hall:** MW had met with Farnfields. They did not recommend just tarmacking the surface of land which we do not own. They have confirmed that the land is unregistered but there is no easy way to find out who, if indeed anyone, owns the land.

They can see only two possible courses of action. First, they can prepare a Statutory Declaration to document our long use right of way over the land in question. This would just need one or two people to confirm their knowledge of the right of way over the last 50 or so years. Second, they could apply for a Caution Against First Registration in the event that anyone tried to register the land in the future. The cost for this would be £450 plus vat.

Would this be money well spent as our access and usage are not under question?

It was agreed there were three possible courses of action – do nothing; do a proper resurfacing suitable for use by farm traffic accessing the fields; monitor and repair holes and rough areas. MW was asked to get an estimate for the tarmac and the village hall committee will consider their preferred approach.

MW highlighted that our insurers have confirmed there is no liability if people trip and fall on land which is not ours. If we do any work on the land this might well create a potential liability.

149/24 – The Keep – update: i) update on meadow: Nothing to report

150/24 - Recreation Field i) update on play area: MW is struggling to get contractors to provide quotes in a timely way as promised. The details received so far will be reviewed at the next Recreation Ground Committee. **ii) other matters:** The next committee meeting will be on Monday 19th August.

151/24 – Climate group: An open day on climate and ecological matters is planned for October 6th. Various presenters have been invited and organisations such as Hedgehog Rescue, Hazelbury Abuzz, Big Yellow Bus etc will be in attendance.

152/24 – Web site: Vanessa Weddell was absent but had sent a note requesting event organisers provide details to her for publicity.

153/24 – Cemetery: SM and MW had had a very informative and entertaining meeting with Julie Dunk, Chief Executive of the Institute of Cemetery and Crematorium Managers (ICCM). Key points are as follows:

- a). The ICCM provide support and guidance on cemetery matters to members. As a parish council it costs £100pa and it has been agreed we will join.
- b). JD looked at the capacity forecasts etc and doesn't feel an extension is an urgent matter.
- c). The cemetery opened in 1947 and whilst there are some instances where old graves can be re-used it sounds complicated and potentially upsetting for families. If, on digging investigation, significant remains – bones etc are there, then these have to be buried beneath the new corpse.
- d). We looked at the adjacent field, JD agrees would be ideal to purchase a small adjacent strip. She felt any Compulsory Purchase at this stage would not succeed given the current capacity. It would also be highly emotive. She felt a charm offensive with the owner, and potentially her heirs, would be the best approach. It may also be the case that another area of land in the parish might be suitable. Ultimately, if it does become full, then there is no requirement for the parish council to provide a cemetery site.
- e). Planning permission would be needed and the Environment Agency would be heavily involved with the impact on any water courses etc. At the time JD can provide contacts and guidance.
- f). She outlined risk management issues, particularly with death or injury caused by falling headstones. It seems in the 1970s and 1980s mason started to cut corners and many stones were inadequately fixed without dowels etc. She easily identified some vulnerable sites in our cemetery. She offers a full safety inspection at a cost of £300. This will identify headstones where action is required. We will use our records to try and make contact with families and highlight the problems and their responsibility to fix things. Some immediate safety measures might be needed, but this would not include laying the headstone flat on the ground. This has been deemed “disrespectful” by the Ombudsman. It might be a supporting stake driven into the ground or the like would do the job. JD said the community should be made aware of this review. (we can use signs, and Bytes). She will provide template documents to use. A full review is recommended every 5 years.
- g). JD will also review our current rules and regulations.

It was agreed to ask Julie Dunk to undertake the safety inspection. MW will begin work on the community communications about the inspection

154/24 – Community Resilience: SM, NR, James Porter and MW had met with Clare Jennings, DC's Community Resilience Officer. A community steering group need to be set up and thought give as to what exactly the community is trying to develop and achieve. CJ has provided template documentation and will be on hand to provide advice and guidance.

155/24 – Village hall: The village hall open day looks as though it will be very popular, with lots of user groups attending. It will be a day to showcase the hall and what it offers and also explore what people in the village want from the hall. The hall needs more committee members but some good candidates are discouraged by the need to become a hall trustee. Two recent fundraising events have been very successful. The Wessex Internet wifi is being fitted next week.

156/24 – Report from Dorset Council Cllr Murcer: SM's report had been circulated.

157/24 – Correspondence to note: None. NR reported an a useful “new councillors” training event run by DAPTC.

158/24 – Bryan Bytes: MW is still compiling content. It might be a bumper edition.

159/24 – Date of next meeting: This will be on Tuesday 10th September 2024 at 7.15pm in the village hall

160/24 – Close of meeting: With no further business to discuss, the Chairman closed the meeting at 8.41pm

DRAFT