

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRA MEETING OF FOWLMERE PARISH COUNCIL HELD  
IN THE SCHOOL ROOM, UNITED REFORMED CHURCH, CHAPEL LANE  
31<sup>ST</sup> MARCH 2010 AT 7.30 PM**

**PRESENT:** Cllr D Roberts (Chairman), Cllr M Bates, Cllr A Eades, Cllr P Flynn, Cllr E O'Regan, Cllr Schonken, Mrs J Wright (Clerk)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr & Mrs Price, Mrs Wooldridge, Mr Lester, Mrs Jelley, Mrs Thornton

		<b>Actions</b>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:</b> Apologies were received from Cllr Kohler</p>	
2.	<p><b>DECLARATION OF INTEREST IN AGENDA ITEMS:</b> No items were declared</p> <p>Cllr Roberts ask the PC if they were in agreement to open the meeting to the members of the public as this was not stated in the agenda. All agreed.</p>	
3.	<p><b>UPDATE ON THE ROUND MOAT:</b> (The Clerk to e-mail a copy of the report to Mr and Mrs Price)</p> <p>Cllr Roberts reported on the productive walk-round that the Councillors did on the previous Saturday in the Round Moat. There is a lot of work to be done and this will need to be rolled out as a carefully planned programme of work over the coming years. There is only one tree at present which is deemed dangerous (tree number 21) and that will need to be removed as a matter of emergency. All Councillors agreed that the Clerk should source three quotes for the removal from firms able to deal with larger trees.</p> <p>Cllr Roberts also reported that the tree officer at SCDC is currently on leave and it is only from speaking to her that the PC will be confident of progressing with any work. This is because details regarding the nesting season will be known and also SCDC will be able to advise if they're happy with the planned work or if planning applications need to be submitted regarding any Tree Preservation Orders (although this was not thought likely, as EH are probably more likely to be involved than SCDC.) Cllr Roberts to chase up the information on the tree officers return from leave</p> <p>Another line of trees which will also need work undertaken is the group labelled G20 and it should be possible to ask Gardencare (Chris Wall) to quote for this work as the trees are smaller. Cllr O'Regan has offered to meet with Chris to show him the exact trees (Clerk to pass on his details.)</p> <p>Cllr Bates advised the Councillors of the current situation with English Heritage in that the funding should be paid imminently. Cllr Bates is going to seek professional advice on filling out the forms regarding the Higher Level Stewardship Agreement, as advised by EH and once he receives costs, he will bring them to the next PC meeting for decision.</p> <p>Cllr Schonken said that once an idea of external funding had been achieved, a proportion of the precept needed to be added to that each year in order to plan the work. Mr Lester said that most residents would probably be happy to see a small increase in the contribution from their Council Tax in order to maintain the moat, an important local landmark.</p> <p>Cllr Roberts spoke to the residents about the trees along their boundaries and said that whilst there is one tree that the PC is obliged to remove as a matter of urgency,</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Roberts</p> <p>Cllr O'Regan / Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Bates</p>

	<p>there are no others which pose a danger. Many trees have work suggested and because of the restrictions on what the PC can realistically spend on non-essential tree work, they would be unable to intervene. The PC therefore propose that the work can be carried out by the individual households, at their own costs, with the following conditions:</p> <p>Once the PC have heard back details from SCDC regarding nesting times and TPO's the Clerk will write to each residence individually, stating the details from the report about the work that can be undertaken, and only that work. The residents would need to reply back in writing to say they agree to the work recommended and would hire a competent tree surgeon with the correct insurance to undertake the work.</p> <p>Mrs Thornton asked if the smaller trees that have been identified as dead could be removed and the PC agreed that that would be acceptable.</p> <p>Mr Lester kindly offered his services to help with ivy removal but this would need to be quoted for by Gardencare initially.</p> <p>The Clerk then explained the situation for voluntary work within the moat – small hand tools from individuals are fine to be used and there is an age range of 18-65 for work to be undertaken, in order to be covered by public liability insurance.</p> <p>Mr Lester also had a question regarding household insurance and it was generally agreed that it was thought to be an individual's insurance which would be claimed against in the event of tree damage etc, as long as the PC was responsible in doing all the required work to that particular tree.</p> <p>Mr Price asked if removed trees were to be replaced and it was thought that repopulating the Moat area might not be the best place but there are other settings within the village which could benefit from extra planting if necessary.</p> <p>The Clerk will pass on details to residents in their letter of possible tree surgeons and Cllr Roberts suggested they speak to the contractors about sharing the work or asking them if they wish for the wood, as they may achieve a cheaper quotation.</p> <p>Cllr Roberts asked if the residents were happy with this solution and it was felt to be a good compromise. Mrs Wooldridge commented that she could understand the financial constraints of the PC as this would set a precedent for other requests for non-essential tree work otherwise.</p> <p>Mrs Thornton added that it would be good to see the moat area properly and regularly maintained and Cllr Bates agreed that this was now the situation the PC was moving towards.</p> <p>A question was asked about how long the paint would last on the trees, which shows the markings – the Clerk to check with the author of the report, Bruce Hatton.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Residents</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>
4.	<p><b>OTHER MATTERS (FOR INFORMATION ONLY):</b>  Cllr Roberts mentioned that the situation of the trees being removed without permission on the verges by the house, Burnaby, on the Thriplow / Cambridge Road junction will be an agenda item on the next PC Meeting (20<sup>th</sup> April 2010)</p> <p>The meeting closed at 8:10pm</p>	