

2107 3 Town Clerk Tasks and Actions July 21	2
2107 Town Clerk report revised2	5
Schedule of Payments July 2021 REDACTED	35
Finance Report June 2021 REDACTED	36
1st Quarter Checks 2021-22	37
Budget Report - Quarter 1 2021-22	43
KLASSIC Quarterly checks 2021 22	45

## **Tasks and Actions Updates – July 2021**

### **Level 1**

- **Previous meeting (June) (27 actions raised on 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 3 ongoing)**

FC 2106/08 – Kirton Regeneration Group – Connectivity, Infrastructure and Town Centre improvements That NLC (Rob Waltham & Nikki Byrne) are contacted for updates on ideas and solutions for Kirton in Lindsey town centre improvements. (Cllr Garritt)

FC 2106/09 – Policies & Procedures – Recording of meetings / live streaming - That feasibility and technical matters are looked into further. (Cllrs)

FC 2106/13 – Correspondence – ERNLLCA AGM Request for Motions - That motions for the ERNLLCA AGM are discussed at the next GP Committee meeting and brought back to the next Full Council meeting. (On agenda)

- **PK – 10 actions raised on 12<sup>th</sup> July (7 outstanding or ongoing from previous meetings)**

PK 2107/05 – Town Events – Platinum Jubilee - That the Community Renewal Group lead on the planning and development for this event. (Community Renewal Group)

PK 2107/05 - Town Events – Platinum Jubilee - That Cllr Fox contacts a piper within the town with forward notice to gauge interest. (Cllr Fox)

PK 2107/05 - Town Events – Civic Award - That the Civic Award is publicised from September with a closing date of the end of 2021.

PK 2107/08 – Town Improvements – Market Place - That quotations are sought for repairs to the wooden cladding around the Market Place pump. (Cllr Fox)

PK 2107/08 – Town Improvements – Public Transport - That the Town Council will collect more data on this issue through the work of the Community Renewal Group. (Community Renewal Group)

PK 2107/09 – Next Agenda – Civic Award

PK 2104/04 – Events – That **Cllr Fox** liaise with NLC on matters around the conker tree. (Cllr Fox)

- **GP – 8 actions raised on 12<sup>th</sup> July (3 outstanding or ongoing from previous meetings)**

GP 2107/05 – Play area development plan - That Cllr Garritt formulates results from the survey and prepares a report for publication to inform residents of the planned action. (Cllr Garritt)

GP 2107/08 – Grove Street Cemetery - That the Clerk seeks a replacement bench made out of recycled materials similar to those outside the Surgery at Traingate.

GP 2107/08 – Grove Street Cemetery - That the Clerk approaches contractors for the required works to secure and improve the base for the replacement bench.

- **Earlier meetings (1 action remains outstanding)**

FC 2012E/08 – Car parking provision - 1. That the Council applies for a Public Works Loan, in anticipation of the arrangements to purchase the land and the cost of making it into a car park. That the Town Council seeks £100k and only draws down what is needed. 2. That the Council enters into negotiations with the landowner to secure the land (designated people to do this. The landowner has the right to confidentiality, and this must be managed appropriately, ie, privately, with a small group identified to do this). 3. That the Council secures three indicative quotations for the development of the site. These will be based on the design agreed and considering all the specialist reports secured through the design process, making it clear that the Council is aware of the limitations and difficulties. That these processes are carried out in the order item 3, item 1, item 2.

## **Level 2**

### **Assistant Clerk Actions**

FC 2104/03 – Events (PK Action) – Legacy Christmas Lighting – That the Council look to selling the lighting frames as the cost for refurbishment and display would be high.

PK 2010/04 – Events – Streetsports - That the Clerk continues to engage with the Active Communities Development Officer to progress the provision and then passes the project to the Assistant Clerk when the grant is approved.

PK 2010/07 – Policy/Procedure – KLASSIC - That internet access and wi-fi provision are costed for further discussion.

### **Allotments**

FC 1912/11 – Allotments – that the funding application is progressed by **Cllr Startin**.

### **Play area development group**

GP 2010/05 – Play area development plan - That teenage provision is looked at as part of this development plan.

GP 2011/04 – Play area development plan - That the working group consider the information provided by the Town Clerk and bring recommendations back to the Committee or Full Council.

GP 2101/04 – Play area development plan - That the working group review the responses once the survey has closed at the end of January.

GP 2102/05 – Play area development plan - That visits to neighbouring parks mentioned in the responses are carried out to gather information on equipment and positioning.

GP 2102/05 – Play area development plan - That Cllr Cooper analyses the top 10% responses so that costings can be sought around these responses and put into the five-year plan.

### **In Bloom Actions**

PK 2010/05 – In Bloom – Grounds Maintenance - That In Bloom provide dimensions and location for the GG Steels flower bed following their meeting to be held on 20th October – **dimensions required for contract**

PK 2010/05 – In Bloom – Wormwood Hill - That Cllr Frankish contacts NLC to chase up the discussions from March around management of the water issues at the site and the potential tree works prior to further projects starting at the site.

PK 2010/05 – In Bloom – Wormwood Hill - That any further projects at the area are taken to public consultation prior to final development and that this includes speaking directly with the neighbouring residents.

## **Level 3 – reminders and work sat with outside bodies**

PK 2002/04 – Town Events – That Cllr Gunn seeks costings from a contact to seek better value than the quotations already considered.

PK 2003/07 – Assets – Litter bin – That the Clerk arrange for the bin provided by Burley's to be installed near to the bench on South Cliff Road prior to the junction leading towards York Road.

PK 2009/06 – Assets – Heritage Trail concept – That the Clerk continues to work with Kirton in Lindsey Society on proposals for heritage information boards to develop further detail and costings.

PK 2101/04 – Events – Civic Award – That planning is pushed back to the autumn

PK 2102/06 – In Bloom - That a dog waste bin is requested for Grayingham Road.

FC 1906/10 – Cemetery – Cllr Startin to liaise with contractor to arrange for the clearance of the majority of the rear area of the cemetery.

FC 1909/04 – Footpath Interest Group - That the process for registration of the four routes described is sought from NLC.

FC 1910/08 – Neighbourhood Plan - That the requests from the Neighbourhood Plan Group are approved; web content to be submitted to the Clerk for the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan page and content input.

FC 1910/08 – Neighbourhood Plan – That the Group submit the Neighbourhood Plan funding application to the Clerk for completion and submission.

FC1912/19 – Open Spaces – land registry – That the required forms are completed and assistance from Councillors is requested from the Clerk as appropriate.

FC 2007E/15 Discussion – COVID-19 Legacy Response - The Council unanimously agreed this matter needed detailed discussion and careful thought, and that the time to do this would likely be next Spring.

FC 2011E/06 - Town car parking provision - That a working budget for the preferred design is drawn up.

FC 2011E/06 – Town car parking provision - That a project manager is costed for the project if planning permission is approved.

FC 2011E/10 – Neighbourhood Plan - That a Neighbourhood Plan Group meeting is planned for the new year.

FC 2101E/12 – Allotments - That three quotes are obtained for the soil sampling report as recommended, and that weed suppressant membrane is installed on site.

FC 2102E/12 – KLASSIC mower – That the matter of utilising the mower on other cutting around the town is kept in mind for the end of the current contractual period for grounds maintenance works and also by the Kirton in Lindsey Community Sports Centre CIO.

FC 2104E/08 – Residents survey – That the survey is approved for publication via online means with the paper copy to follow, distributed to all homes.

FC 2104E/09 – Emergency plan/community response - That a review is carried out in mid-May, the next stage of the roadmap out of the national restrictions and volunteers are asked their views on the reclassification of the group and if they are happy to continue volunteering.

Town Clerk report

**2107/05 Officer Reports**

ERNLLCA District Committee Meeting 13<sup>th</sup> July 2021 – 7pm via Zoom

Representing Kirton in Lindsey Town Council - Cllr Fox, Cllr Startin and the Clerk.

As this was the Annual Meeting the first matter was to elect the Chairman for 2021/2022 and Cllr Knowles was re-elected unopposed.

Apologies were received from Cllrs and Clerks who had meetings clashing on the evening. The meeting was well attended by Cllrs and Clerks with stable numbers as at previous meetings.

Cllr Wells was re-elected as Vice-Chair for 2021/2022 unopposed.

The minutes of the meeting held 15 April 2021 were considered and approved and no matters arose for discussion.

The four members of the Association's Executive Committee, Cllr B Brooks, Cllr D Knowles, Cllr K Portess and Cllr D Wells were all re-elected unopposed.

Matters about the 2021 Annual General Meeting on 23rd September 2021 were considered - the decision on whether this would be face to face or remote is to be further discussed by the Executive Committee. Members attending were reminded of the request for any motions to be submitted to the meeting. The position of President remains vacant following the death of Cllr G Thurston, however the Executive Committee are still examining the future of this role. Mr T Cooper was reinstated as the Vice-President.

The Executive Committee report was discussed with points from the meeting highlighted by Cllr Knowles. The report was received.

Alan Barker give a 'quick brief' around funding for churches, a regular query to the ERNLLCA office. It was outlined that Councils are often asked to donate funding to the local church for a wide range of issues such as roof repairs, replacement windows etc, however the 1894 Local Government Act does not allow this. When Parish Councils were enacted and took on a number of charitable functions from the Church the Act allowing this also put restrictions on what a Council could do, this included donations to the Church for the affairs of the Church or their ecclesiastical Charities. This however only applies to the Church of England, the Church of state at that time. Society has changed a lot since 1894, and there is no case law to test the powers of this Local Government Act, however best practise remains that local Councils cannot fund the Church for anything which is related to worship, and this includes the fabric of the building and the churchyard. The Church has pointed to the 1972 Local Government Act to say that this changed the position, however NALC Legal argue this is not the case, the changes brought in by the 1972 Act only related to cemeteries, and there are some powers for local councils to take on disused church yards. Examples of when a Council can help Churches included community/social/educational groups using Church spaces. Closed churchyards were discussed, including the process of the 'Order of Closure' and a note that if the local authority takes on the responsibilities for local churchyards they can levy 'special expenses' on the local council to cover the costs of them doing so. There are examples in the East Riding where this is currently happening, but no known examples as yet in North Lincolnshire.

The next discussion was around training for Cllrs and Clerks, again led by Alan Barker. The recent programme was a mixture of internal and external providers but all held remotely. ERNLLCA have taken a cautious approach on the external providers they have invited to run training but have found this a success approach as the external providers can provide much more regular training programmes compared to the three members of ERNLLCA staff.

It was noted that Finance training continues to run through to the end of the calendar year, the Disciplinary training had led to requests for a Grievance training course which was currently getting looked into and planned for the end of September. The Being a Good Councillor course is to be run again online, reduced to a two session programme. Planning training is also planned for the autumn. Requests for Diversity training have also been received and will be run by Breakthrough Communications. An effective report writing course for Clerks has enough interest to run. Alan asked for ideas from Councils for other training requirements and confirmed at all training is currently to remain remote.

The agenda allowed for an open forum, no matters were raised. Cllr Startin announced this would be his last meeting as he was stepping away from the position of Cllr. He received a number of remarks to note the loss to local councils that this would bring.

Alan Barker asked for input from Councils for future agenda items, reminding those present that the meeting is their meeting and should be shaped by the things they want to discuss and have information about.

The next meeting was confirmed for Tuesday 12th October.

KCOM Sponsorship Manager – phone contact 16<sup>th</sup> July 2021 (Clerk)

KCOM – James Fairbank – Social Media/Sponsorship Manager

Originally from the Brigg area, so knows the North Lincolnshire area fairly well. In all areas KCOM are expanding into the company are seeking assistance from Town and Parish Councils to connect with community groups to understand the community involvement & charities in each area. KCOM will commit to community projects in each area they come to. For larger areas such as Kirton in Lindsey they are able to help further and are open to discussion on any projects which could benefit.

KCOM want to know what drives the community in each area, what would residents really like to see achieved in the place where they live. Examples provided are free internet for 18 months for sports centres and community centres. They would like to be kept informed of events in the area which they could have stands at to provide information about their services. They see Town and Parish Councils as the eyes and ears in the town.

KCOM seek Community Champions in each area they come to, someone who can champion the work of KCOM, post information online, deliver leaflets and answer the queries of other residents. There are incentives from KCOM for these Community Champions, including discounted access to KCOM services. Ultimately, the Community Champions will influence KCOM on where any community funding is ultimately spent. Bishop Burton in East Yorkshire was provided as an example of a successful Community Champion scheme which made KCOM feasible in an unplanned area.

The expansion programme had 'planned' and 'unplanned' areas, Kirton in Lindsey was always a 'planned' area and so didn't need to achieve the 1/3 interest level which unplanned areas do need to. Residents still need to register their interest in the services and that gets them first in line for the new services KCOM provide.

Examples of the kind of community projects sponsored by KCOM include Barrow Karts festival (a £500 donation to two local charities); sponsorship of Barton Club Sports; fencing for a church at Croxton; the digging of a trench for a community group at Drifffield; litter picking sessions; free internet for village halls in various East Yorkshire villages, support of the Brigg In Bloom works and discussions are just starting with Messingham about what would work best for them.

KCOM ask – the Town Council to see out Community Champion(s) in the town, to put forward suggestions for community / charity funding which residents would support and consider a need for and to support the roll out in the town, encouraging residents to register for KCOM services.

Larkfleet Residents Meeting – 20<sup>th</sup> July 2021 - 5:30pm via Microsoft Teams

Representing Kirton in Lindsey Town Council: Cllr Pat Frankish, (Cllr) Kathy Cooper\*, Cllr Hazel Fox and the Clerk. Also attended by residents including Wayne Eynon, Becky and Simon Featherstone and Jack Startin. \*Cllr Cooper notes that she deliberately signed into the meeting as an affected resident, not a Town Councillor.

Chris Dwan welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided a brief outline of the current position from Larkfleet's perspective. He noted that he was new to the role, having joined Larkfleet in May.

It was unusual to have such a consultation at this stage as the planning permissions for the development were all in place, with consent and design approvals agreed.

Queries developed following the flooding incident to neighbouring properties in January 2021 and a temporary stop notice was put into place by NLC in May 2021 while additional relevant conditions were signed off to mitigate against future problems.

Larkfleet became aware of misinformation causing concern locally and so organised this meeting to provide the opportunity for residents to have their questions answered and to help maintain an open dialogue on site going forward which will be reinforced when a site manager is on site shortly.

Planning approval was granted in Nov 2017 and the s106 conditions required were signed off in April 2018. Full approval was issued, with conditions. Conditions included further information on the drainage plans and it took longer than it should have for NLC to provide agreement on these.

As everything is now agreed the development is progressing despite delays caused by the pandemic and the temporary stop notice.

Principle design was approved by NLC and the flood risk documentation was also approved by the LLFA – issues with flooding in back gardens in January 2021 led to meetings with NLC and drainage engineers and led to the development of an alternative strategy with the introduction of French drains. This updated drainage scheme was signed off by the LLFA while the temporary stop notice was in place.

Wayne Eynon noted that he felt the outline provided was unsympathetic to residents who had experienced the flooding – this was a disaster to them and not a process or technicality. Wayne asked for assurances to be provided that the systems in place would prevent flooding to existing properties happening again in the future and assurances that the flood prevention methods, including the French drains would be maintained. Wayne further asked for assurances of who would take responsibility and cover the costs of all future damage if flooding does occur – which residents are expecting due to their knowledge of the area and view of the ongoing works.

Jacob Evans provided more detail on the drainage measures and explained the construction of the French drains in that they are lined with membrane to allow water from the housing development into the drain but not allow it to flow out onto existing properties. The homeowners who purchase the new properties will be legally required to maintain the French drains at the bottom of their gardens in perpetuity. Becky Featherstone questioned information that the gardens of the new homes would be sloped down to the level of the existing properties as this was not the view from her property as the French drain was in line with the top of her six foot garden fence and it was difficult to understand how the levels of the site had been worked out.

Wayne noted with thanks confirmation received earlier that the electrical cable which travels across the site will be buried underground as part of the development works and thanked Larkfleet for that confirmation and reassurance. It was confirmed that a management company would maintain the open spaces of the development, including the attenuation pond every two weeks in perpetuity, and ongoing investigation will be carried out by the management company to confirm that the mitigation is working and effective.

Wayne asked about the finalised boundary treatments for the site when the temporary fencing is removed and asked for confirmation of the actual boundaries of the site. Options for post-and-rail, hit-and-miss and hedge boundaries were discussed. Residents noted preference for high solid boundaries rather than partial/low boundaries. Hannah Guy confirmed further discussion and development of the boundary treatments would be continued with residents. It was further confirmed that the management company would be responsible for the maintenance of the boundary treatments as part of their open spaces responsibilities – Hannah was however unsure if this would be weekly or monthly maintenance.

Wayne again asked for some assurances from Larkfleet about who would take responsibility and cover the costs of all future damage if flooding does occur, this was not responded to.

Kathy Cooper asked when Severn Trent Water gave Larkfleet permission to enter into their drainage network in the corner of the site, noting this area was not to be built upon due to the Severn Trent network beneath. It was noted that permission was given to Larkfleet by Severn Trent as part of the s106 agreements and the connection points were outlined in a letter to Larkfleet. A copy of the letter was requested. Kathy asked for details of who the management company would be and how long they would be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the open spaces of the site. Larkfleet confirmed that the management company would be in place from the date the final plot on the site is sold, however Larkfleet may have them on site prior to this time and cover the costs required for this additional timeframe. The management company would be in place in perpetuity throughout the life of the development, unless responsibilities were passed to NLC through any agreement between the management company and NLC.

Kathy raised questions about the height of the development, 2 metres above the level of neighbouring properties and how this was allowed to be taking place. Chris referred to Condition 23 of the planning permission, the flood risk assessment of May 2017 and the drawings dated March 2017. The drainage design was finalised and updated as part of this planning condition with the flood risk assessment and there was variation between the initial plan and revised levels. Residents noted again the serious concerns about the difference between levels of at new development and neighbouring properties and that a figure was never given for consideration. Hannah Guy noted that figures were absolutely given, and a finished floor level (FFL) was noted on the documentation for each property to be built. There was no one figure to give or a range to confirm as each plot will have a different floor level.



Discussion moved to understanding the site better and the Larkfleet representatives having office based roles. The representatives agreed it would be best to visit the site and meet with small groups of residents at their properties to view the development from their gardens and understand better the concerns they have. Requests for the designs to be amended, for instance for bungalows to be put into the development were rejected as unfeasible – it was emphasised that the development had planning permission in place and so was ‘appropriate, approved and legal’ and so would go ahead as approved.

Jack Startin queried the foul water capacity noting that Severn Trent had previously reported that their infrastructure was at capacity, so how could it cope with additional connections approved within the connection points letter as the information provided suggests when the new estate is added in it will be overwhelmed. Jack asked for details of the outflow rate from the French drain to the attenuation pond noting that the pond could also be overwhelmed. Larkfleet responded that all this detail was taken into account by Severn Trent, however they did not have specific figures available for the meeting. Jack asked if the testing of the system would include replicating a 100 year event of flood risk and Larkfleet responded that it was not confirmed that the system would be tested. Jack suggested it would reassure residents and Larkfleet themselves if the system was tested.

Simon Featherstone queried the strip of land running between the new development and his property as he had had confirmation from the developers that the land was a ransom strip retained by the previous landowner. His concern was for a tree which was in poor condition and had branches overhanging his garden which were dangerous. Hannah Guy noted the enquiry was now with her and confirmed that the area described was not the ransom strip area and was fully owned by Larkfleet and so she would now look into this and find out what could be done regarding the dangerous tree.

Billy Green noted that the NLC stance was that the surface water scheme provided by Larkfleet was as required and compliant. He was assured that it would prove the test of time, it will be safe and it will work. The cut off drain will work while the development is in progress but will not be required so much and will become less of an issue when the development is completed. He noted that the ownership and maintenance is needed to be agreed by the management company.

The meeting closed following further discussion about the gathering and sending of the information requested and arranging on site meetings and small meetings with concerned residents at their properties. Larkfleet were thanked for arranging the meeting and for the future continued dialogue promised with concerned residents.

**20/07/2021: Post-meeting communication from Wayne Eynon to Chris Dwan, Jacob Evans and Hannah Guy, copied to Becky Featherstone, Ward Cllr Neil Poole, Cllr Cooper, Billy Green, KLTC, Glenn Ireland, Rob Waltham, Holly Mumby-Croft, Denise Hyde, Cllr Frankish, Ward Cllr Trevor Foster and Simon Green**

Dear Hannah, Chris and Jacob,

Firstly, thank you for arranging the Teams meeting tonight about the Tudor Reach Development. I know that passions were running high, but I thought progress was made.

As discussed we (the residents) look forward to meeting you in our gardens, in the very near future to point out what we see all the fuss is all about and what we see are the ongoing problems. More importantly, how we can work with you to try and find an amicable solution that will hopefully

appease the worries of the residents without any major changes to your plans, which you have clearly pointed out will not change but could be adjusted slightly to show good will on your behalf.

As I said we do not want to start the relationship with the new residents with a bitter taste in our mouths, after all it is not there fault.

As I said these solutions could be, but not limited to:

1. 6 feet solid concrete post fences built to the rear to the 3 properties without a hedge to the rear. Aldo if requested make higher the existing fences of residents who have low fences and very thin hedge to the rear. ( this will not cost you much and will go a long way to show willing on your behalf, after all you will be fencing 91 properties anyway).
2. Those houses in your development that back on to current houses should have at least 6 foot solid fence to the rear, which I would assume is the norm anyway. This will be needed to stop people moving there gardens over the french drain.
3. The gardens of the houses that back on to the existing properties could be lowered to the same level, thus keeping privacy intact. They could have steps to the rear. There is presidencies for this already in Kirton on Windmill Way, and I would assume it will make the new residents happier as they will not be looking down on the surrounding houses when in their new gardens. I count a maximum of 17 of your properties that would need slight adjustments to the rear, some I would imagine will require less steps than others.
4. The dying tree should be investigated for it's health and if required cut back or removed. This will prevent massive upheaval when the development is finished. The last this you want it falling on an dwelling, old or new, especially after you have been informed of the potential problem and you now own that tree!
5. Details of who we complain to if the new residents try a land grab or the french drain start to get overwhelmed or water start making its way into our gardens. Perhaps I suggest a photo log is taken as evidence so there can be no doubt in the event of future disputes! This can only reinforce information that will be held by the land registry.
6. The management company is not the way forward, why not sign it over to NLC and they should adopted the development. This will mean that they (NLC) are happy with your design and plan and we know who to go to in a crisis. Management companies are never that good or well accept by residents and as NLC are VERY HAPPY with your design and plan ( Billy Green, NLC said so on the meeting) I am sure they would welcome this solution, after all they have just adopted the new development opposite and will take on Windmill Plantation in the near future. This I am sure you agree will be a better and more rounded solution for Larkfleet, and as NLC are so supportive of your development I am told they would gladly adopt the site! If they are not happy to adopt it, I would suggest that itself speaks volumes! (Please feel free to comment NLC)
7. Perhaps a small good will remuneration payment could be paid to residents who back on to the development! This will go a long way to help build bridges and make the constant noise and dust from machinery, builders and deliveries more bearable. Again, this money could be used to allow residents to screen of the rear of our gardens and maybe build a shed or similar to look at something more pleasurable than the towering houses that will loom above us. (20 properties at a total of say £500 each , small change in a development of your size).

8. Look again in detail at the french drain, is it doing what you are paying for? Becky has already told you that the drain is 1.5 meters above her garden, why is it not at the same level as her and surrounding properties Gardens ? Are you getting value for money, is it fit for purposes, will it work as planned?

I would also like to make one small point, both Billy Green (NLC) and Chris made the point that the drainage scheme was designed by “very intelligent and highly qualified people” I must remind you that the same people designed the scheme that failed before the heavy rain earlier in the year that flooded our gardens! Also similar “very intelligent and highly qualified people” designed the Space shuttle, and look what happened there!

Also I wish the same “very intelligent and highly qualified people” would stop stating a once in a 100 year storm or event, we here in Kirton in Lindsey have experience those same storms 3 times in the past 11 years! You have been warned!

Also your contractors have a massive dorsal water pump running 24 a day for the past 2 weeks keeping the ground water out of your drains while they work on them! May I remind you we are in July and have not seen proper rain for months. Let’s hope your pumps work well when the water table rises in the next few months, and I hope you get your damp proofing correct!

Lastly, regardless of who signed off what plans and when, ask yourself when you stand in our gardens with your properties towering over ours, IS THIS FAIR AND HOW WOULD YOU FEEL IF IT WAS YOUR BACK GARDEN! Remember the first rule of planning is to do no harm to others.

I hope all this makes sense and know we have a constructive dialogue, let’s keep talking.

I look forward to meeting you all in my garden in the very near future and also hopefully you will think the suggestions I have made above make sense and will go a long way to regaining our trust.

**20/07/2021 - Post-meeting communication from Becky Featherstone to Hannah Guy, Chris Dwan, and Jacob Evans, copied to Wayne Eynon, Ward Cllr Neil Poole, Cllr Cooper, Billy Green, KLTC and Simon Green**

Good afternoon Hannah,

Thank you for the meeting the other night and listening to our concerns, I just have a few questions or requests if possible.

Could you provide us with the drainage plans or point us in the direction of those you spoke of that have the floor levels attached, as we can not find them in the plans on the North Lincolnshire planning portal that we have access to.

A quick question in regards to these, before we were flooded and the french drain being installed, where was the surface water runoff meant to have been going from your raised plots? Can Jacob or Billy maybe shed some expert light on this? Also on your conditions should the western boundary have drainage installed before any more footings go in? Do North Lincs need to inspect any of this work, I’m not an expert but I’m not impressed by the lack of care and time I’ve seen given to these drains.

Can you also clarify if the french drain is to be incorporated into the new gardens? As two different answers were given to this question the other night, we’re still unsure. A 6ft fence on your side would solve our issues, at least with people stood in their gardens being able to overlook ours.

In regards to the tree at the back of number 8, your plans to change the 4 plots at the front in 2019 also included that bat boxes were to be installed in it. That hasn't taken place yet as far as I'm concerned and it really does need assessing with some work undertaking on it before this happens. As you have already dug back down to our ground level at the back there, will this be happening before any building takes place? As an aside, with all the experts involved on both sides it is ironic that your 2019 plans had to be changed again as no one seemed to be aware of a water pipe going under the houses. It's little things like this that have left us with no faith in our planning department or confidence that things will be done right.

I look forward to hearing from you and meeting in person soon.

**2107/07 d. Communications regarding Larkfleet Homes development (prior to the meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> July)**

**19/07/21 Becky Featherstone to Rob Waltham, Ward Cllr Poole, Denise Hyde, Holly Mumby-Croft MP and copied to Wayne Eynon, KLTC and Cllr Cooper**

Good morning,

Can we ask whether anyone from the Local Authority will be attending the virtual meeting tomorrow evening? Residents were not consulted on these 'newly' agreed plans, something we believe we should have been given the right to, through a 21 day consultation period following the stop notice being issued. As we have not been made privy to these 'new' plans and have yet to be shown any evidence from the original agreed plans to raise the height of the floor level that high from, we think it only 'the right thing to do' that someone who knows what they should be doing is in this meeting and can provide said evidence. ( I also attach a note put on a further application from one of your officers. Why would they write that if the levels had been agreed originally?)

We ask again as well who owns the large over bearing tree, with an enormous dead branch that hangs over our garden. They claim, conveniently it is ransom land and owned by the farmer they purchased it off, yet in their 'agreed plans' it says they are to install bat boxes! How can they do that if they do not own it? I should point out that since this site has started the bats we used to see rapping our garden have disappeared.

Larkfleet have told us that they do not yet have a full time site manager, which is obvious. If you are keeping such a good eye on this site yourselves, then I implore you to come and look at this french drain they have installed. We're not experts but given its starts lower at the entrance of their site and slopes up behind our garden, one of those affected by their raised ground level and water run off, I fail to see how this is going to work. I heard them while they were digging it out, it was like listening to the chuckle brothers. They said they were aiming for a manhole? Given another resident has said they have been pumping water out of their drains already, it does not fill us with confidence that any work being carried out is to an acceptable standard. Also given there is a huge amount of mud still piled at the back of ours, how have they even worked out the level for the french drain? Is this drain going to be in the new residents gardens? And will there be conditions of living there, e.g you can't fill it in or build anything in the back without a permeable surface?

We ask again, this raised land and now french drain only has the hedge holding it up. What is going to stop that land from shifting? How can a hedge survive when mud is piled up one side of it? And the 'hedge' where we live is mostly level with their ground and as I've said repeatedly not an evergreen. It will provide no privacy to us, ALL back windows from the new houses will over look our garden as will the residents stood themselves.

We are disappointed that there has been no correspondence from anyone at North Lincs to us regarding any of our concerns or showing us any proof of the levels in the agreed plans. If this had been agreed then surely the drainage would have already be agreed? Maybe I should have had my husband email as male residents seem to have get a response?

I hope to see at least one of you or someone from the council in this meeting tomorrow, otherwise what is the point? Lark Fleet can just continue to say and do what ever they want without anyone holding them to account.

Regards

Becky and Simon Featherstone

Reference	PA/2021/619
Proposed Development	Planning application to vary condition 2 of PA/2017/389 namely to re-organise plots 1, 8
Date	With respect to this application and the repositioning of various plots to facilitate Anglian Water apparatus.
Decision	I know we can only comment on the application that is before us, but are you aware of the ongoing issues with respect to this site, particularly relating to finished floor / platform levels and the resultant surface water run-off onto 3rd party land/property. It has been previously discussed with the developer that a cut off drainage feature be installed on northern, southern and western boundaries to prevent surface water run-off. This application makes no mention of this?
Consent	
Site Location	
Parish	
Ward	
Grid	
Office	
Contact	
Contact	
RELAT	



**16/07/21 Wayne Eynon to Simon Green, KLTC, Rob Waltham, Denise Hyde, Ward Cllr Poole, Becky Featherstone and Cllr Cooper:**

Dear Simon,

Thank you for your email.

As I suspected NLC knew all along and where responsible for the levels on Tudor Reach development. I still do not understanding how it is seen as acceptable to allow developers to build new houses high and dry and let the water flow into our house. Also the fact that they are so high is beyond me.

I know a drain french drain is being built to take the water away, can I please have it is writing that you, NLC will be responsible for the maintenance of the drain and also if it gets overwhelmed, which it will you will pick up the cost of any damage to surrounding properties, after all you have said it is a suitable solution, which we all know it is not going to be!

It is a sad state of affairs when long established residents are thrown under the bus in order to appease greedy developers!

Please also note that you spell my surname Eynon not Enyon!

I look forward to to receiving your written assurances about the french drain.

Kind Regards

Wayne Eynon

**15/07/21 Cllr Startin to KLTC Cllrs**

Hi all,

Obviously Larkfleet are wanting to reassure residents local to the development that they have put in place measures to stop flooding of nearby gardens & homes. They will probably do this by installing drainage sufficient to stop a repeat of previous flooding. If it works, great. However the water will have to enter the greater area drainage system (which eventually goes into the Trent using the River Eau which goes via Scotter.

I'm wondering if Scotter PC, West Lindsey DC, & the Internal Drainage Board have been involved & kept up to date with recent events. It's one thing to get the water away from Kirton but equally important is that it mustn't make a problem, physically & financially, for others further downstream (as has happened in other areas of the country). I think this should be raised with those groups & with Larkfleet.

**15/07/2021 Cllr Startin to KLTC**

Also think, in case Larkfleet don't invite them, that Scotter PC & W.Lindsey DC should be at least alerted to the meeting. I don't have contact details readily to hand for them I'm afraid.

And wondering if Network Rail should be included, although flooding maybe doesn't directly concern them (but the attenuation pond, to alleviate site flooding, if not re-sited could potentially undermine the embankment).

**15/07/21 Hannah Guy to KLTC**

Hi Neil

No I won't be inviting any of them.....there is nothing for them to say or contribute to the talk. The drainage scheme is agreed, and all connections foul and surface water are approved by Anglian Water, LLFA and NLincs Council – so the wider drainage points are not and never were in question. This is for a localised issue that occurred in the winter just gone.

There is no internal drainage board consultation or requirement on this site, as they were not a consultee or contribution on the original planning approval back in 2018.

I am becoming a little concerned that that this meeting is being 'hyped' as something that its not going to be and there will be some disappointed people.....the meeting is for information sharing only.....just to be clear there is no scope to alter the agreed scheme and the agreed construction as being built at present. This is because it is all approved. Some of the respondents to my letters and your Town Councillors are, I fear under the impression that this is a public meeting that is more a 'consultation event' and peoples views and opinions will go some way to make changes.....I must stress that this is not the case.

And I apologise in advance if this is the expectation.....I have replied to all respondents that this is the case and hope that the message is getting through.

Kind regards

Hannah Guy, Planning Manager, Larkfleet Limited

**15/07/21 Becky Featherstone to Wayne Eynon, KLTC and Cllr Cooper**

Morning,

That really is an unbelievable reply. I will forward it to my cousin whom I'm sure will have something to say about the levels as he's already said no where in the plans did they provide evidence of elevations and therefore were not given full planning permission. It is also clear that they have not been on site.

This hedge they keep talking about as we know in places is level with the developers ground! As for the french drain if you look from the road it actually humps up at the back of our property.

Well I have almost finished writing my complaint to the ombudsman and I will let you know what my cousin comes back with.

I'd like to say I'm shocked but I'm not!

Becky

**14/07/21 Hannah Guy to KLTC**

Good Morning Neil

I confirm that the meeting will be set up online Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> July at 5.30

I will be sending joining instruction to those who contact me. The meeting as I have already stated is for the local residents to the development and to look at the issues that arose locally for them and to look at how what has been arranged and organised to stop this happening again.

The purpose of the meeting is just that.

The 'wider' residents of the town should not be directly impacted by this issue.....also to confirm the meeting is not to discuss the principle of the development. It has already been approved and all the details therein agreed by the Authorising Council and North Lincs Planning Department. I won't be able to agree to change anything new brought up. Hopefully this goes some way to explain the meeting's purpose, as I am wanting the expectations to be clear.

Thanks ever so much and kind regards.

Hannah Guy, Planning Manager, Larkfleet Limited

**14/07/21 Wayne Eynon to KLTC, Ward Cllr Poole, KLTC, Cllr Cooper, Becky Featherstone, Rob Waltham, Holly Mumby-Croft MP and Denise Hyde**

All,

See below a response from Hannah Guy at Larkfleet. In short it looks like they are putting the blame firmly on NLC for allowing them to submit plans that are clearly not up to standard.

It will be interesting to hear what NLC have to say? I think NLC should now explain why they allowed this development to go ahead and not conduct due diligence on the plans, in particular the levels and out flow from the site.

On a side note, Larkfleet have had a water pump running all night to keep water out of their drain holes. This does not good as the foundation of the new houses will always be under water!



**14/07/21 Wayne Eynon to KLTC, Becky Featherstone and Cllr Cooper**

Kath, Becky, Neil (KLTC),

Well it seems that NLC did know what they were signing off and it looks like they were happy with the plans. My point 1 (below) about the levels has just been overturned as they (NLC) signed it off.

Why we bother having elected officials when they acts with such ignorance to residents I don't know.

Not sure where to turn now or what else to do !!

**14/07/21 Simon Green to Wayne Eynon**

Dear Mr Eynon,

Many thanks for your email dated 6th July 2021.

I can assure you that officers from North Lincolnshire Council are liaising with the developer (Larkfleet Homes) to ensure that they are constructing their scheme in accordance with their planning permission and that the flooding that has taken place earlier in the year is mitigated accordingly.

As you are aware officers from the Lead Local Flood Authority had a meeting on site to discuss the flooding that occurred earlier in the year and provided advice on the mitigation that can be included to overcome the flooding through the submission of new drainage plans.

The Local Planning Authority are monitoring the situation and issued a Temporary Stop Notice to cease development until the new drainage plans could be approved. This has resulted in amendments to address the flooding issues that have occurred.

The council are in ongoing discussions with Larkfleet Homes and monitoring the site to ensure it is developed in accordance with its planning permission. Larkfleet have been instructed to undertake a public meeting with residents which has been arranged for 20th July 2021 at 5:30pm, via MS Teams. You should receive an invite shortly.

In response to your four main areas of concerns:

1). At the assessment stage for both the original planning application and the discharge of conditions an assessment was made of the impacts of the land raising on the amenity of existing residents. It was the officers view that the proposed development has been designed in such a way as to ensure that it is sympathetic, in terms of scale and proximity, to existing development located outside the site boundary, including the residential properties to the south. The new dwellings are designed to face the access road, with their rear gardens facing the adjacent properties to the south of the site. There is a separation distance well in excess of 20 metres between the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings and those of the nearest dwellings adjacent to the site. Whilst there is no policy or guidance which sets a specific separation distance, it is generally adopted good practice to seek a minimum distance of 20 metres between habitable room windows in order to protect amenity. The impact of the development on adjacent residential properties will be further mitigated by the retention of existing boundary hedging. It is considered that the separation distances between new and existing dwellings will prevent unacceptable loss of light, overlooking or overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

2) The semi perforated carrier drain is suitably sized, and it provides a positive outfall into the downstream watercourse network at greenfield run off rate. When the development is built the water run-off will be minimal as the 'as built development' will capture the majority of upstream surface water flows into the developments drainage system. The invert level of the pipe is comparable to the respective ground level of the neighbouring properties.

3) I note your comments on Severn Trent and the capacity issues associated with this development. It is difficult for the council to comment on this matter, and I would suggest Severn Trent would need to respond on these points directly.

4) The council has contacted Larkfleet regarding your high voltage cable concerns and the overhead electric cables are indeed being grounded under new road network and this has been agreed with Northern PowerGrid. The cable will remain as overhead pylons off site and will just divert underground through the Tudor Reach development.

I trust this response provides you with a suitable response to your email.

Simon Green

Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Commercial

North Lincolnshire Council

**12/07/21 Hannah Guy to Wayne Eynon re meeting**

Thank you for your email ....

I'll send out the joining instructions at the end of the week. ....

I know that we discussed the points that you were concerned about on the phone the other week. I'd like to cover those, so I'll have the agreed and approved points ready for you. Namely on the issues of Levels and the approved foul water solution. Please do let me know if there's anything else as I can prepare for you.

I must stress at this point though, that the agreed scheme and position as being constructed, is approved by Council Officers and also the Technical agreeing bodies of Severn Trent, Lincs County Highways and Lead Local Flood Officer at NLincs. The emphasis of the meeting is to explain and explore the scheme that is agreed and reassure interested persons, that Larkfleet will do all that is able during the build process to keep you informed of the progress and stages we will go through. I'm hoping at when a site manager is in residence on site permanently, that he will become the first point of contact.

Look forward to catching up next week: and

Kind regards

Hannah Guy, Planning Manager, Larkfleet Limited

**12/07/21 Hannah Guy to KLTC re meeting**

Good afternoon.

Apologies the meeting is on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> July....at 5.30 pm....anyone who has contacted me directly I have confirmed this will them.

I shall send the joining instructions at the end of the week and to confirm, the emphasis of the meeting is to explain and explore the scheme that is agreed and to reassure interested persons, that Larkfleet will do all that is able during the build process to keep you informed of the progress and stages we will go through. I'm hoping that when a Site Manager is in residence on site permanently, he will become the first point of contact.

The agreed scheme as being constructed, is approved by Council Officers and also the Technical agreeing bodies of Severn Trent, Lincs County Highways and Lead Local Flood Officer at NLincs.

If you have anything specific that you would like to raise, please do let me know and I can prepare beforehand.

Kind regards

Hannah Guy, Planning Manager, Larkfleet Limited

**07/07/21 Becky Featherstone to Wayne Eynon; Holly Mumby-Croft MP; Rob Waltham; Denise Hyde; Ward Cllr Poole; KLTC; Cllr Cooper; Nicholas Ray; LLFA**

Good morning,

Following on from Wayne's email yesterday I share my disappointment again at the lack of action taken against Lark Fleet and the blatant illegal building that is being allowed to continue. I have stated my reasons for this in my previous email to Holly after seeking expert advise on their plans and confirming what we all know that they were not given permission to raise the ground level that high.

You have quite frankly failed in your duties to protect residents and if a response isn't swiftly received I will lodge a complaint with the ombudsman and explore further avenues if necessary. I attach further photos, one of a builder and a digger stood on their side, to demonstrate how our neighbours are going to be able to look straight over our fence. The digger is considerably smaller than a house but I'm hoping you'll be able to imagine how imposing these houses are going to be. I quote again from the planning expert 'no engineer could justify those levels or the EA as you claim.'

Maybe a site visit yourselves to appreciate the seriousness of this would be beneficial. I also attach a photo of their french drain..the depth of this is to OUR ground level! How is this going to prevent their surface water coming onto our land? Again you have failed to properly hold them to account. They are now filling it with gravel which tells me you have done NOTHING about the illegal height of their ground levels.

I am writing this full of anxiety and anger, this site is adversely affecting my health and that of other residents. We have been quiet up till now trying to let you 'do the right thing' but you are proving that you can not be relied upon.

I sincerely hope we are consulted with some haste,

Becky and Simon Featherstone



**06/07/21 Wayne Eynon to Corey Garner, Becky Featherstone, KLTC; Ward Cllr Poole, Nicholas Ray; Cllr Cooper**

Corey,

Thanks for your prompt reply. I look forward to hearing due course what Holly and NLC council have to say and what action will be taken.

For what it is worth I and other residents have lost complete faith in the whole planning system and feel the either NLC planning department have completely messed up and not carried out due diligence or even worse they are just letting Larkfleet ride roughshod over the whole planning system!

Either was it is a very sorry state of affairs!

**06/07/21 Corey Garner to Wayne Eynon**

Dear Wayne,

Many thanks for including Holly in your email regarding this matter.

From our end, we are currently chasing this up with the Local Planning Authority following the Stop Notice which was issued, on the next steps. As soon as we ascertain further we will update local residents as a matter of course.

Kind regards  
Corey Garner

Senior Caseworker, Office of Holly Mumby-Croft

**06/07/21 Wayne Eynon to Holly Mumby-Croft MP, Rob Waltham, Denise Hyde, Ward Cllr Poole, KLTC, Becky Featherstone, Nicholas Ray and Cllr Cooper**

Dear Holly, Denise and Rob,

I hope this email finds you well! I am sorry to email you directly however the residents who live on the Ingsdale Estate in Kirton in Lindsey are now at breaking point, we feel completely let down by local and national government!

Despite the promises to hold Larkfleet to account and ensure that their development does "no harm" to the already surrounding estate (Ingsdale), Larkfleet are back on site and they have made no changes to the plan of the development.

There are 4 main areas of concern:

1. The ground levels of the new estate are 2.2 meters higher than the surrounding estate, which cannot be right! How has this managed to get past planning? Why was this not spotted in the first place? Why should we sit in the shadows of the new development? The minimum would be make them build bungalows instead of houses where they back on to Ingsdale to keep the heights down. This would be an easy fix.
2. The French Drain that Larkfleet is building around the estate to stop us from flooding will only work until it is full! When it is full, the water will run off into our gardens! Why should we all get wet and the new house sit high and dry?
3. I am now watching the developer connect into the current sewer system in on the Ingsdale Estate, which Cllr Poole has a letter from Severn Trent stating is already at capacity! This will mean that when it rains our (Ingsdale) drain lids will pop off and the pumping station will switch off, we will be knee deep in sewage and Tudor Reach which is 2.2 meters higher will sit high and dry! I am told Severn Trent have to by law upgrade the pumping station to take the new inflow, if this is the case then at least make sure this is completed before the new estate starts to overwhelm the pumping station. Again an easy fix to help reassure the current residents.
4. Larkfleet have confirmed with me that they will not be burying the high voltage cable that currently goes across the open field, in the air. This will I assume go across the roofs of the new houses, every closely I may add. How can this be correct? It will only take a child with a kite to hit the power cables and there will be a death, I feel this is a Grenfell Tower scenario, and I do not want to be the one that said told you so! (see attached photo) . I know there was a plan to bury the cable, as contractors approached Mr Steel who owns the land where the cable rises above ground to get access to bury it. I assume this has been a cost cutting exercise by Larkfleet! Easy fix again that could prevent deaths !

Apart from one letter from Holly and some messages from Cllr Poole on WhatsApp it seems that the residents are just being ignored and Larkfleet are doing what they want? If nothing can be done to stop or change the points above, then at least tell the residents so we can prepare to get wet in the future when it rains.

As our elected members I implore you to at the very least communicate what you are doing on our behalf!



**05/07/21 Chris Dwan to KLTC in response to letter sent following June Full Council Meeting, copied to various staff at Larkfleet, Ward Cllrs, Chris Barwell; Holly Mumby-Croft MP**

Hi Neil

Your email is well timed as, just this afternoon, one of my colleague's provided an email to Chris Barwell confirming our proposals to undertake a short Microsoft Teams meeting event to provide local residents with an update in relation to the development of our Tudor's Reach site.

We have recently received confirmation from the Local Planning Authority that Condition 23, relating to drainage, is formally discharged and so we have recommenced construction on site this week accordingly.

The purpose of the public event will be to provide a non-technical overview of exactly what has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Local Planning Authority from a drainage design perspective at the site, in order to relieve any remaining concerns for neighbouring residents.

The meeting is proposed for 5.30pm on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2021. Invites will be going out shortly to the local residents of both Richdale Avenue and West Dale Crescent. We will also be extending invites to the Local Council ward members and will make sure you are also included.

Should you have any queries at this stage, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Chris Dwan

Planning Director, Larkfleet Limited

**02/07/21 Chris Barwell (NLC) to Ward Cllr Poole, fwd to Cllr Cooper, Cllr Frankish & KLTC 05/07/21**

Good afternoon Cllr Poole,

As you are probably aware contact was made with Larkfleet Homes to require them to undertake a public event with the affected local community, and it was suggested that KLASSIC Park would be a suitable location. The Larkfleet Planning Manager agreed to this event and stated they would confirm the details of this event during the week commencing 28th June 2021.

As we have not had any details sent through yet I have contacted them over the last couple of days to remind them and urgently requiring an update.

Kind regards  
Chris Barwell MRTPI  
Development Management Lead  
Development Management  
Economy & Growth  
Business Development  
North Lincolnshire Council

**05/07/21 – Cllr Cooper to Ward Cllrs**

Good morning gentlemen,  
Work has recommenced on site this morning. Can you advise please what agreement has been reached between Larkfleet and NLC in order for them to restart on the site? Particularly of course in relation to the works height and drainage. I and neighbouring property owners are still very concerned regarding the works adjacent to Severn Trents current drain system which Larkfleet were denied access to in the Millward report on their initial planning application in 2017.

I've checked with KLTC clerk this morning to enquire whether any update has been sent prior to contacting you. Please advise ASAP.

Kind regards  
Kathy Cooper (Cllr)

**2107/07 – Planning**

Planning Moratorium update from North Lincolnshire Council:

08/07/2021 – Chris Barwell

Moratorium update

Good afternoon Neil,

Thank you for your email and please accept my apologies for the delayed response.

My understanding is that a request was made to North Lincolnshire Council to consider a Moratorium on all new residential development in specific settlements (including Kirton in Lindsey). It was not solely for the Tudor Reach development.

In order to determine the suitability of a moratorium it is necessary to consult with Severn Trent Water and Anglian Water to gain an evidence base so that it will carry greater weight both legally and in the decision-making process. The Lead Local Flood Authority is engaged in discussions with both water companies currently.

Once this engagement has finalised then discussions will take place on the next steps.

Kind regards  
Chris Barwell MRTPI  
Development Management Lead  
Development Management  
Economy & Growth  
Business Development  
North Lincolnshire Council

To receive any communications regarding planning application PA/2020/588 at land off Ings Road

Thanks for your enquiry. I have looked into PA/2020/588 and find that:

- Kirton in Lindsey Town Council's objections appear to have been set out in full on the planning webpage.
- In response to objections, the applicant provided further information on the removal and protection of hedgerows in June 2020.
- The Case Officer dealt with Kirton in Lindsey Town Council's objections, and the hedgerow issues in particular, in some considerable detail in the committee report.
- Appropriate planning conditions were proposed to secure the further evaluation and protection of hedgerows.
- The Planning Inspector also considered the hedgerows and used the proposed conditions.
- If permission had been refused, and if the hedgerow had been found to be "Important" in terms of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, then the creation of an access would still be likely to be permissible under regulation 6.

See: [The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/24)

I hope this provides some clarification.

Kind regards  
Andrew Taylor  
Natural Environment Policy Specialist  
Place Planning & Housing  
Economy & Growth  
Business Development  
North Lincolnshire Council



## **2107/08 – Kirton Regeneration Group**

### **Connectivity, Infrastructure and Town Centre improvements**

#### Update from NLC on infrastructure: flood risk and shopwatch/pubwatch schemes following Town & Parish Liaison presentations

06/07/2021: Good Morning Neil,

*Chris Ramsbottom requested that we respond collectively with regards to the Town and Parish meeting held in June and the questions posed, please see below in reply:*

*“ North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) has developed its Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) under its obligations as a Lead Local Flood Authority. This went out for consultation and was published in 2016.*

*We recently carried out a S19 Flood Investigation Report under the Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) following the events of November 2019. The link can be found here:*

[NLC Section 19 Flood Investigation report \(northlincs.gov.uk\)](http://northlincs.gov.uk)

*The LFRMS has identified a number of small community areas at risk of flooding from local sources. More detailed investigation and appraisal is required in a number of these areas in order to effectively model, identify and quantify specific risks, and to develop options to mitigate those risks.*

*Kirton in Lindsey has been identified in the LFRMS as an area at risk of localised flooding which (in 2016) estimated that approximately 900 people are thought to be at local flood risk with the area also containing 2 critical assets also at flood risk. It was classified into the second highest priority category in the document of areas to be further explored and flood alleviation measures implemented where possible. The LFRMS highlighted that in order to further flood mitigation in the area an increase in understanding of drainage/groundwater/watercourse issues is required. It is noted that groundwater flooding has previously been an issue at Kirton Lindsey. Therefore, understanding these multiple flood risk mechanisms is imperative in order to identify potential solutions and actions.*

*As part of the Investment Funding, Kirton Surface Water and Groundwater Study was accepted, and we are now working towards further understanding springs within the locality.*

*NLC has already expended costs internally gathering information to enable a consultant to further develop a flood alleviation scoping study of Kirton, to better understand the groundwater issues, and the surface/ground water issues that arise from this. This included information from previous site drainage investigations, collation of data from parish councils and residents, GIS data (flood maps, ground water, site geology, local knowledge etc).*

*The groundwater issues within the Kirton settlement caused flooding issues that NLC have had to respond to with tankers to stop flooding on an emergency basis. This is not a sustainable solution and NLC wish to be more proactive in identifying a solution to prevent this moving forward. This study is due to be carried out this year.*

*The new developments within Kirton have been commented on by NLC as LLFA and will not increase flood risk to the community. “*

*With regards to formation of ice as a result of springs, below is a list of salt facilities provided within the Town of Kirton, as you can see whilst it would be hard to predict where springs emerge most of the areas have some provision for self-help or are on a treatment regime.*

**Highway yellow salt bins**

Orchard Close  
Church Street  
Highfield Drive  
Wesley Street  
Traingate  
Queen Street  
Turner Street  
Whitewell Close  
Cornwall Street  
Church Street  
Park Hill

*[Clerk note: York Road missing from this list]*

**Parish green salt bins**

Market Place  
West Cross Street  
St Andrews  
Windmill Way  
Millers Close  
Milestone Close

*[Clerk note: Dunstan Hill/West Cross Street missing from this list]*

**Precautionary Salted Routes**

B1398  
B1400  
Dunstan Hill  
Cornwall Road (Part past school )  
Grayingham Road

**Secondary Salted Routes**

Gainsborough Road  
Queen Street  
Wesley Street  
St Andrews Street  
Traingate  
Queen Street  
Church Street  
March Street  
Richdale Road  
East Dale  
Ings Road  
Torksey Street  
Moathouse Road

If you require further clarification or indeed a meeting to discuss further this can be arranged including Ward Members.

Kind Regards  
Mick Johnson  
Highway Operations Manager  
Assets and Infrastructure

#### Pubwatch / Shopwatch schemes

In terms of the Pubwatch and Shopwatch schemes mentioned at the Town and Parish Liaison meeting, NLC confirmed that pubs and shops in Kirton in Lindsey are not currently included in the scheme, and following enquiries by the Clerk and contact with both public houses in the town by the Pubwatch Co-ordinator in Brigg, both pubs noted that they did not consider it beneficial for them to join the scheme at this time.

#### **Request from resident on update to enquiries presented at the March Council Meeting, a reminder of the information provided at that meeting:**

##### **Resident Internet Connectivity and Town Centre –**

##### **First query:**

Please can you let me know whether the Town Council is involved in any efforts to improve broadband and also the Town Centre in Kirton Lindsey. If so is there anything I can do as a member of the public? eg write letters of support.

If not can I invite the Town Council to consider these issues.

I believe the town still does not have fibre optic cables so that it must impede progress for many local businesses to have such poor broadband. Of course the centre of town could do with more business. It looks very tired and sad to me with so many closed shops. I do not know if say the Town Council has approached the District Council to see if there is any funding available for improving the appearance of the area. I appreciate that as a lay person I do not have much standing in this but as a member of the public I feel I must continue to raise this.

##### **Initial information sent in reply:**

*Thank you for your email.*

*In terms of improving broadband for Kirton in Lindsey, North Lincolnshire Council is leading on the improvements for North Lincolnshire and has a voucher scheme in place to help rural premises with broadband speeds of less than 100Mbps. Applicants can use vouchers worth £1,500 per home and up to £3,500 for each small to medium-sized business to support the cost of installing new fast and reliable connections. Projects must be made up of at least two eligible premises and so a 'buddying up' scheme between family, friends and/or neighbours is recommended. The current scheme is due a refresh at the end of March, and is likely to be replaced with a similar scheme.*

*The scheme is supplier led, and potential customers visit <https://gigabitvoucher.culture.gov.uk/> and select a supplier to contact who is active in this area, once a supplier has been identified, North*

*Lincolnshire Council officers can assist with projects but cannot get involved until that initial decision has been made by an application.*

*The Town Council can support and champion infrastructure projects or needs, but cannot lead on them or otherwise introduce them.*

*In terms of improving the town centre, the Town Council is in support of more businesses occupying this area, however cannot control how owners make use of their properties, and is pro-active in objecting to planning applications (such as the recent one for 13 High Street) to change use from business to residential. Unfortunately the Town Council doesn't have the final say, and final decisions have to be based on planning legislation.*

*For some years North Lincolnshire Council ran a scheme to support businesses improve their shop frontages with repairs and returns to traditional styles. This was in the form of a grant scheme where the businesses were required to cover a percentage of the costs and North Lincolnshire Council, on agreement with the works to be carried out, would cover the remaining. The Town Council along with North Lincolnshire Council promoted these opportunities with local businesses but none decided to take up the scheme.*

*As part of joint working with North Lincolnshire Council, the Town Council continues to look at ways to improve the Market Place and other areas of the town and progress on matters is unfortunately slow. All ideas which residents put forward are considered and discussed and the attraction of new businesses to the town is always considered to be of benefit.*

#### **Follow up queries:**

North Lincolnshire Council's connectivity voucher scheme only applies to such low speeds as to make it of no assistance to our neighbourhood. The town does not have fibre optic cables running from the exchange to it. This means everyone will have issues with Broadband speeds when they wish to say stream a movie for example or upload multiple designs for business purposes. Has the town registered for a Community Fibre Partnership? If not; why not? If enough residents of the town wanted fibre optic cabling brought to the town this might persuade Openreach without the cost burden falling on residents. Also if some funding is needed, can the North Lincolnshire Council be approached to see if there is anything within its remit.

I appreciate there are limits on the Town Council's powers but in my view the centre of town looks sad and neglected. Can I invite the Town Council to discuss this with a view to lobbying North Lincolnshire Council to introduce a scheme to re-vitalise the town centre. Clearly any funding or plan could only be put together by the District Council but if the Town Council does not put forward anything to it will be a case of "if you do not ask, you do not get". I have a number of suggestions the Town Council might want to put together in a "lobbying document" to the District Council including:

- a. Grants to new businesses taking on empty shops
- b. Further pedestrianisation of the market square area
- c. An employee of the District Council to be a part-time Town Centre Manager to work on getting fibre optic broadband into the Town, more business into the Town Centre, the improvement of its appearance and the promotion of the town generally
- d. A coloured map/ plan to be placed strategically in the town sign posting with appropriate illustrations all the historic sites to include the whipping post, the former gaol, former cattle market, manorial area where Catherine Parr lived, the healing well etc Gainsthorpe

medieval village, the areas of Gainsborough Road where the legend of “Black Shuck” applies etc

- e. Names of any new developments /roads to have associations with history of Kirton Lindsey e.g “Burgh” after the manorial family. (I note the new road at the top of Gainsborough Rd is for example called Maple Close. This appears to have no relationship with the flora or history of Kirton Lindsey but if nothing else has been suggested.....)

I hope these ideas are of assistance. If the Town Councillors want these ideas or similar ones put together in a comprehensive document I am happy to volunteer to assist them. I leave these matters with the Town Council.

**Second response:**

*I will include your correspondence on the next Town Council meeting agenda for discussion, thank you for taking the time to put together these suggestions.*

*Just as a side note around the naming of streets, I understand Sylvester Street is named after the Burgh family, however there are now some guidelines which are to be adhered to regarding the naming of new streets and naming streets after ‘people’ are no longer encouraged at a national level. This doesn’t mean there aren’t exceptions nor that there aren’t other historical associations which can be used of course.*

*Whenever consulted, the Town Council do try to take into account historical matters for street naming, such as the retention of Beechcroft within Beechcroft Drive, the name Bowling Green Gardens off Station Road and I understand Maple Close refers to the nearby Maple Lea. The Town Council isn’t always consulted, but when asked the matter is always discussed at Meetings of the Council which are held in public and in which the views and opinions of residents are always welcomed.*

*As mentioned above, I will include your correspondence on the next meeting agenda for discussion.*

**Required: Decision from Council on any actions to be taken.**

**2107/10 – Dog fouling campaign – Pooper Snooper app suggestion**

POOPER SNOOPER! - the light-hearted way of addressing a serious issue...

Do you know about the Pooper Snooper app which will allow you to easily flag up dog fouling incidents as and when you come across them, as well as register dog waste bins so that other dog walkers with the app can find their nearest bin.

The problem of dog waste on the pavements and open areas of Kirton in Lindsey is an ongoing concern, and Cllr Fox’s work to promote responsibility and engage the North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) dog warden has helped with this a great deal. Kirton in Lindsey Town Council continue to engage with NLC on the locations of bins around the town to make sure they are in the right places, but this takes time.

The Pooper Snooper app provides an easy way to develop evidence-based feedback about areas of particular concern. This will help us identify the troublesome areas and we can look at further methods of targeting those, with the help of enforcement officers.

The Town Clerk is currently registering all of the dog bins and litter bins (remember litter bins are dual use and you can use them for bagged dog waste too) in Kirton in Lindsey and it would be great if as many people as possible could take a look at the app and consider using it to register any uncollected dog waste spotted in the area.

The app allows you to log: dog waste bins; dog fouling spotted; dog fouling cleaned up by you (not your own dog's). The information stays on the app for a few weeks to ensure the same poop isn't registered as more than one incident by different users.

Don't forget, if you are able and willing to identify irresponsible owners who aren't picking up after their dog you can report them to North Lincolnshire Council to issue a fine.

The Pooper Snooper app can be downloaded from the Apple or Google stores. Have a go and get logging! Remember - by using the app to report dog fouling incidents, it creates a 'heat map' highlighting problem areas where new bins could be installed or enforcement officers could focus their time to help try to address this ongoing issue.

For more information go to: <https://www.facebook.com/PoopaSnoopa/>

## **2107/11**

### Grove Street Cemetery

**19/07/2021 Cllr Gunn:**

*I've had a complaint about the inspection of the cemetery.*

*The company who've inspected have put stickers in excess of 100 on gravestones including my families. Yes some of the stones do require attention, mine certainly does not, and others are the same.*

*Yet this inspection have omitted some stones that are very visibly in need of attention.*

*It appears this inspector has been over zealous and has targeted stones provided by one particular company that have ceased trading.*

*Of course my personal opinion is this inspection is for this company to gain business in repairing gravestones.*

*I will be visiting the cemetery to see this myself.*

**2107/13**

Correspondence for Discussion

**b. Gainsborough Road concerns 01/07/2021**

I would like to bring your attention several problems we are encountering along the B1206 and other items.

- the verges are in desperate need of trimming... during our walks of the past few days we have experienced problems seeing round the bends and mounting the verge as safety refuge when vehicles pass.
- the recent reduction in the speed limit is futile.. it can be a race track... we are unaware that it is policed.
- Our perpetual reports of iceing on our bend has escalated. A driver demolished our hedge and front gates in January, within hours a second left the road. Fortunately his insurance reinstated the boundary with great inconvenience to us. All we ask is that a short section is put on gritting programme
- the new development at Maple Close is still causing concern. A Highways maintenance vehicle is often parked on the kerb on the bend. This reduces visibility when driving and obstruction when walking.
- it is quite evident that NLC has not supervised the development diligently, we complained on several occasions. there remain two road signs on the verge. The embankment grass was inadequately graded... bricks protrude dangerously.. the grass looks healthy but appears not to be included in KL mowing programme.
- The PM Mr Cameron and successor promised high speed internet for all.... why does it stop at Maple Close? Our internet speed is derisory barely fit for programme streaming
- the single yellow line outside the Junior School is irrelevant... a number of cars regularly park there during the restriction periods. It is almost impossible to negotiate on farm vehicles and heavy wagons. Is it policed?

Thats got a load off my chest... lets hope that we get some resolution.

Stay safe... thanks for all you do

**c. Clerk annual leave / Friday Digest update**

Annual leave confirmed as Mon 16<sup>th</sup> August through to Friday 27<sup>th</sup> August. To agree and processes required to be put into place during this period. For the Council to clarify the expectations and requirements over reporting from meetings attended by the Clerk and Cllrs. The Friday Digest reports which the Clerk compiles each week were discussed at the P&D Committee meeting, with the following recommendation put forward: *"That going forward the Clerk is not required to have to send out these weekly reports as they are both time consuming and generate more work. The Clerk should be trustworthy enough that a weekly hours check need not to be done, he can continue to do these reports for himself as a reminder/work list if needs be.*

*Alternative - If Councillors feel they have the need, a timesheet/hours email can be sent out if required as an update, or kept as a timesheet for the Clerks records which can be requested for by any Councillor at any time."*

**d. SLCC Training – Appraisal Techniques (15th Sept) £30 – webinar**

Details: Get the most out of your appraisal

Good appraisals are fundamental in the employer/employee relationship and offer both parties a key opportunity for giving feedback and agreeing work goals and development needs.

Without regular and effective appraisals, the council risks wasting effort on the wrong priorities and even subsequent employment problems if performance or attendance become an issue.

SLCC is offering a one-hour webinar called “How am I doing?” designed for those being appraised.

#### Course Content

This webinar will explore the basics of appraisal, share tips for before, during and after the face to face meetings and explain how to get the most from this frequently dreaded process.

#### **e. ERNLLCA training – Diversity request for interest**

It was brought to the attention of ERNLLCA that there was some interest in equality and diversity training. We are looking to see how much interest there is in the following course. If there is enough interest in the below course this will be provided by Breakthrough Communications.

Embracing equality, diversity and inclusion in your council.

This session will focus on understanding protected characteristics, the difference between direct and indirect discrimination and the definitions of equality, diversity and inclusion – and how they relate to the internal and external work of parish and town councils. The aim being to raise awareness to barriers to progress for diverse communities and barriers to productivity for staff.

If there is interest in the course please let me know a preference of daytime; morning or afternoon, or evening. Thank you

#### **f. ERNLLCA – Annual Meeting – motion for consideration from Cllr Frankish**

Proposed motion for submission: (First draft): *“Kirton in Lindsey Town Council call upon NALC to pursue revision of the planning laws to protect existing properties from the risk of flooding. Present Policy is permitting development on flood plains without adequate water management. This is putting local properties at risk. We urge Government to establish conditions on Local Planning Authorities, Drainage Boards and Water Companies to work together for the benefit of the safety of all.”*

#### **g. HWRCC – North Lincolnshire Community Network Summer Roadshows**

Join us during August at one of our [North Lincolnshire Community Network SUMMER ROADSHOWS](#).

We are holding our ‘COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS’ in 4 areas of North Lincolnshire to make them as accessible as possible for everyone.

Each ‘meeting’ is aimed at people that live and/or work in and around these 4 areas – you can decide which one is most relevant to you. We would like to invite community leaders, groups, those that manage community buildings; anyone that has a real interest in what their community has to offer or should offer in the future. This is a good opportunity to discuss things that have worked well with other community groups and get advice from colleagues and have a cup of tea and a cake with likeminded community focused people.

We will also be inviting some of our colleagues that can provide advice, guidance and support on matters you may wish to discuss.

**PLEASE NOTE:** Each person attending **MUST** complete a separate registration form to enable us to comply with any restrictions within venues, access requirements and for



refreshment purposes

<b>ISLE OF AXHOLME area</b> Thursday 5 <sup>th</sup> August 10am – 12 noon Thurlow Pavilion Station Road Epworth DN9 1JU	<b>BARTON area</b> Thursday 12 <sup>th</sup> August 10am – 12 noon Ropewalk Maltkin Lane Barton-upon-Humber DN18 5JR
<b>BRIGG area</b> Tuesday 17 <sup>th</sup> August 10am – 12noon Broughton Village Hall High Street Broughton DN20 0JX	<b>SCUNTHORPE area</b> Tuesday 24 <sup>th</sup> August 10am – 12 noon Crosby Collective (was Park Library) Avenue Vivien Scunthorpe DN15 8LG

**h. VANL – Documents from EGM / membership renewal decision**

*See separate file of documentation*

**i. LIVES – Request from previous Civic Award recipient for promotion of the work of the organisation.**

Request that the Town Council does more to promote the work of LIVES.

**j. NLC – Fuelled Summer Programmes activities request for the Green – 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021. Decision making update.**

**k. Victim Support – request for donation**

Supporting people in Humberside affected by crime

The outbreak of coronavirus has had a profound effect on crime. For many victims, the pandemic has been, and will continue to be, life-changing.

Therefore, I am writing to ask if Kirton-in-Lindsey Town Council would kindly consider a donation to Victim Support so that we can be there for people in Humberside.

**The impact of crime in a pandemic**

Our report - [Crime and Covid-19 \(November 2020\)](#) – found that the pandemic has exacerbated the challenges faced by victims. Challenges such as the delays to trials and financial hardship are expected to persist long after all restrictions are lifted.

The demand for our services has continually risen over the last sixteen months. As restrictions have been lifted we have found more and more people coming to us for support. For example, despite an initial dip in calls, 59,000 people attempted to call our Supportline last year (20/21), compared with 50,000 calls in the previous year (19/20).

**Victim Support – what we do**

We aim to empower victims, provide specialist help and ensure they know their rights.

We offer a free and confidential service to victims of crime, their families, friends and anyone else affected. We support people from all communities, whatever crime they have suffered, whenever it happened, even when they have felt unable to report it to the police.

Our locally based teams offer information and advice, advocacy, emotional support to work through the complex emotions resulting from crime, practical support including those related to personal safety, access to restorative justice and referrals to other agencies.

### **The benefits for your community**

Our skilled staff and volunteers are deeply rooted in your community. The high quality of our volunteers' training and the skills with which we equip them develops your communities and has a positive local impact beyond the criminal justice system. With their help, victims of crime are better able to recover and move on with their lives. Together, we can reduce the devastating harm that crime has on people in your community.

### **What victims say about us**

Here is just a small selection of the feedback we receive:

- "Your organisation has been a lifeline for me."
- "I don't know what I would have done without you. I could never have faced court without your support."
- "This is the biggest fight I've had to face, but we will get through it. I didn't have support like this when it happened to me when I was younger – I had no one to believe me. But Victim Support sticks by you – I thank them from the bottom of my heart."

### **Your donation**

Every contribution to the work that we do can make a big difference. For example:

- £50 could pay for us to give 5 burglary victims information about securing their homes in the future
- £250 could help us to support 10 young victims of bullying and harassment.
- £300 could help us to develop ongoing tools that aid a victim to cope and recover from crime
- £450 could provide a member of staff to give immediate support for 24 hours via our Supportline
- £500 could help us provide ongoing support for a family recently bereaved due to a violent crime

If you would like any further information about the impact of donations at Victim Support or would like us to complete an application for funding – please let me know.

Thank you for taking the time to read our appeal.

Yours sincerely,

Jordan

**Jordan Goucher**

Fundraising Manager

### **I. The Forge Project – invitation to attend AGM on Wed 8th September 2021 at 5:30pm**

[illegible]

# Kirton in Lindsey Town Council Finance Report June 2021

## RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS MADE DURING JUNE 2021, RECONCILING THE

### CASHBOOK WITH THE BANK STATEMENTS AS AT 30/06/2021

#### Cash book information:

Balance carried forward April 1st 2021:	£125,862.54
Receipts to May 31st 2021:	£62,419.24
Payments to May 31st 2021:	£45,275.12
Balance carried forward June 1st 2021:	<b>£143,006.66</b>

RECEIPTS			RECEIPTS	
REF	DATE	PAYER	DETAILS	
			<b>Balance C/F 01/06/2021</b>	<b>£143,006.66</b>
R22	02/06/2021	Public Sector Deposit Fund	Interest	£1.33
R23	04/06/2021	Clixby Active Pro Ltd	Community Sports Sessions user fees	£14.00
R24	09/06/2021	Samuel Jacob Memorials	Cemetery - Memorial applications MaCAULLEY/ENDERBY	£310.00
R25	11/06/2021	Clixby Active Pro Ltd	Community Sports Sessions user fees	£10.00
R26	18/06/2021	North Lincolnshire Council	Traingate Project Grant Claim 3 (Final)	£2,000.00
R27	18/06/2021	Clixby Active Pro Ltd	Community Sports Sessions user fees	£20.00
R28	21/06/2021	PM Seers	Cemetery - Exclusive Right of Burial fee	£300.00
R29	22/06/2021	North Lincolnshire Council	Community Sports Sessions grant funding	£3,714.00
R30	23/06/2021	Samuel Jacob Memorials	Cemetery - Memorial application JONES	£160.00
R31	27/06/2021	HSBC	Gross Interest	£0.67
R32	28/06/2021	Clixby Active Pro Ltd	Community Sports Sessions user fees	£16.00
R33	29/06/2021	North Lincolnshire Council	Devolved grass cutting & Parish Paths funding 1	£8,675.00
			<b>RECEIPTS, June 2021</b>	<b>£15,221.00</b>
			<b>RECEIPTS, 2021/22 year to date</b>	<b>£77,640.24</b>

#### PAYMENTS

REF	DATE	TO WHOM PAID	DETAILS	PAYMENTS
P54	03/06/2021	O2	Business Mobile contracts	£47.45
P55	03/06/2021	Hemswell Surfacing	Bench bases and installation	£966.00
P56	03/06/2021	Lawn N Order	Highway verge devolution services (3)	£913.50
P57	03/06/2021	AJ Bartlett	Traingate Project expenses - planting	£38.00
P58	04/06/2021	Diamond Jubilee Town Hall Trustees	Office Rent and Broadband June 2021	£314.00
P59	04/06/2021	S Barrett	Grounds Maintenance - Planting contract (May)	£420.00
P60	14/06/2021	Lawn N Order	Highway verge devolution services (4a)	£913.50
P61	15/06/2021	Lawn N Order	Highway verge devolution services (4b)	£84.00
P62	17/06/2021	JM & CR Startin	Materials for cemetery - row stakes	£18.90
P63	17/06/2021	James Sutton	Traingate Project	£2,000.00
P64	22/06/2021	Nest Pensions	Pension Contributions June 2021	
P65	24/06/2021	Town Clerk	Salary	
P66	24/06/2021	HMRC	Tax/NI/Student Loan (Jun)	
P67	24/06/2021	Assistant Clerk	Salary	
P68	24/06/2021	The George Bar & Restaurant	Traingate unveiling event buffet	£400.00
P69	24/06/2021	PortalPlanQuestLtd	Car park - Planning application fee	£259.00
P70	25/06/2021	St Andrew's United Church	Church Halls meeting room hire	£20.00
P71	28/06/2021	Clixby Active Pro Ltd	Community Sports Sessions coaching fees Jun	£120.00
P72	29/06/2021	G Burley	Grounds Maintenance - grass contract (May)	£1,023.62
			<b>Total Payments, June 2021</b>	<b>£10,466.30</b>
			<b>Payments 2021/22 year to date</b>	<b>£55,741.42</b>

#### RECONCILIATION TO BANK STATEMENTS

Current Account 41305484	£2,000.00
Savings Account 01109553	£85,761.36
Public Sector Deposit Fund	£60,000.00
<b>TOTAL IN BANK AS AT 30/06/2021</b>	<b>£147,761.36</b>

#### RECONCILIATION TO CASH BOOK

Balance carried forward April 1st 2021:	£125,862.54
Receipts to June 30th 2021:	£77,640.24
Payments to June 30th 2021:	£55,741.42
Cash book total at June 30th 2021:	<b>£147,761.36</b>



## Kirton in Lindsey Town Council

### 1st Quarter Budget Monitoring Report 2021-22 (Apr-Jun)

ADMINISTRATION AND RESOURCES								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>101</b>	<b>Administration</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>1011</b>	Staff Costs ( <i>Salaries, PAYE, Pensions</i> )	£36,413.00	£3,682.19	£2,947.25	£2,928.33	£9,557.77	£9,557.77	
<b>1013</b>	Recruitment	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>1014</b>	Staff Expenses / Travel	£300.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>1015</b>	Training Staff	£400.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>1016</b>	Licences/Permissions	£100.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>1017</b>	Stationery/Consumables	£1,300.00	£22.40	£8.50		£30.90	£30.90	
<b>1018</b>	Office Rent/Meeting Room Hire	£5,000.00		£708.00	£310.00	£1,018.00	£1,018.00	
<b>1019</b>	Telephone/Broadband etc	£1,400.00	£130.68	£47.45	£71.45	£249.58	£249.58	
<b>1020</b>	Memberships/Subscriptions	£1,650.00		£997.58		£997.58	£997.58	
<b>1021</b>	Audit Costs	£1,700.00	£614.60			£614.60	£614.60	
<b>1022</b>	Insurance	£1,500.00		£890.75		£890.75	£890.75	
<b>1023</b>	Maintenance	£400.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>1024</b>	IT/Website	£500.00	£164.39			£164.39	£164.39	
<b>1005</b>	Sundry Admin	£100.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£50,763.00</b>	<b>£4,614.26</b>	<b>£5,599.53</b>	<b>£3,309.78</b>	<b>£13,523.57</b>	<b>£13,523.57</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>1101</b>	Precept	£0.00	£51,744.00			£51,744.00	£51,744.00	
<b>1102</b>	Precept grant	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>1103</b>	Income Other	£8,000.00	£9,570.72			£9,570.72	£9,570.72	
<b>1104</b>	Bank Interest	£20.00	£2.15	£2.37	£2.00	£6.52	£6.52	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£8,020.00</b>	<b>£61,316.87</b>	<b>£2.37</b>	<b>£2.00</b>	<b>£61,321.24</b>	<b>£61,321.24</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-£42,743.00</b>	<b>£56,702.61</b>	<b>-£5,597.16</b>	<b>-£3,307.78</b>	<b>£47,797.67</b>	<b>£47,797.67</b>	

	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>102</b>	<b>Grants and Donations</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>10211</b>	S137 Grants	£0.00		£10.00		£10.00	£10.00	<i>Circa £300 recommended for 2022-2023</i>
<b>10212</b>	S133 Grants - Community Building	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10213</b>	Sports Facilities LG (Misc Prov) Act	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10214</b>	Community Pot	£1,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10215</b>	General Power of Competence	£13,510.00		£13,510.00		£13,510.00	£13,510.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£14,510.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£13,520.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£13,520.00</b>	<b>£13,520.00</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>10201</b>	Income Other	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10202</b>	Grant Funding	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10203</b>	Donations	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-£14,510.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>-£13,520.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>-£13,520.00</b>	<b>-£13,520.00</b>	
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>103</b>	<b>Democratic Expenses</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>10311</b>	Members Expenses	£100.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10312</b>	Members Training	£400.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>10313</b>	Election Expenses	£375.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£875.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>10301</b>	Income Other	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-£875.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	

OPEN SPACES								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>201</b>	<b>Open Spaces</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>2011</b>	Open Spaces Contracts	£15,500.00		£1,503.62	£1,443.62	£2,947.24	£2,947.24	
<b>2012</b>	Waste / Bins / Dog Bins	£1,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>2013</b>	Play Area Maintenance	£4,000.00	£65.00			£65.00	£65.00	
<b>2014</b>	Play Area Inspection	£150.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>2015</b>	In Bloom/CPRE Entry	£50.00	£36.00			£36.00	£36.00	
<b>2016</b>	Historic Sites Maintenance	£500.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>2017</b>	Grass verges devolution	£16,278.00		£1,911.00	£1,911.00	£3,822.00	£3,822.00	
<b>2018</b>	Parish Paths Partnership	£1,071.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>2019</b>	Traingate Project	£500.00			£2,000.00	£2,000.00	£2,000.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£39,049.00</b>	<b>£101.00</b>	<b>£3,414.62</b>	<b>£5,354.62</b>	<b>£8,870.24</b>	<b>£8,870.24</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>2101</b>	Grants	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>2102</b>	Income Other	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>2107</b>	Grass verges devolution	£16,278.00			£8,139.00	£8,139.00	£8,139.00	
<b>2108</b>	Parish Paths Partnership	£1,071.00			£536.00	£536.00	£536.00	
<b>2109</b>	Traingate Project	£0.00			£2,000.00	£2,000.00	£2,000.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£17,349.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£10,675.00</b>	<b>£10,675.00</b>	<b>£10,675.00</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-£21,700.00</b>	<b>-£101.00</b>	<b>-£3,414.62</b>	<b>£5,320.38</b>	<b>£1,804.76</b>	<b>£1,804.76</b>	
<b>BURIAL GROUND</b>								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>301</b>	<b>Burial Ground</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>3011</b>	Trade Waste	£450.00	£410.40			£410.40	£410.40	
<b>3012</b>	Maintenance Works	£8,000.00	£12,000.00	£109.20	£18.90	£12,128.10	£12,128.10	
<b>3013</b>	Business Rates	£570.00	£616.16			£616.16	£616.16	
<b>3014</b>	Cemetery costs general	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£9,020.00</b>	<b>£13,026.56</b>	<b>£109.20</b>	<b>£18.90</b>	<b>£13,154.66</b>	<b>£13,154.66</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>3101</b>	Cemetery Fees	£3,000.00	£940.00		£770.00	£1,710.00	£1,710.00	
<b>3102</b>	Trade Waste Refund	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£3,000.00</b>	<b>£940.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£770.00</b>	<b>£1,710.00</b>	<b>£1,710.00</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-£6,020.00</b>	<b>-£12,086.56</b>	<b>-£109.20</b>	<b>£751.10</b>	<b>-£11,444.66</b>	<b>-£11,444.66</b>	

S144 PROMOTING KIRTON								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>401</b>	<b>Promoting Kirtton</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>4011</b>	Summer Gala Expenses	£700.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4012</b>	Lights Installation/Removal	£9,000.00	£1,987.50			£1,987.50	£1,987.50	
<b>4013</b>	Maintenance	£800.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4014</b>	Town Hall Hire/Electrics	£360.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4015</b>	Church Electrics	£60.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4016</b>	Market Stall Hire	£350.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4017</b>	Equipment Hire	£820.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4019</b>	Entertainers' Fees	£700.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4020</b>	Christmas Trees	£750.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4021</b>	Sundry PK Expenses	£50.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£13,590.00</b>	<b>£1,987.50</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£1,987.50</b>	<b>£1,987.50</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>4101</b>	Event Income - Christmas	£500.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4102</b>	Event Income - Summer Gala	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>4103</b>	Event Donations	£400.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£900.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	
		<b>-£12,690.00</b>	<b>-£1,987.50</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>-£1,987.50</b>	<b>-£1,987.50</b>	
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>501</b>	<b>Public Services</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>5011</b>	Town Clock	£400.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>5012</b>	Community Sports Sessions	£800.00		£137.95	£120.00	£257.95	£257.95	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£1,200.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£137.95</b>	<b>£120.00</b>	<b>£257.95</b>	<b>£257.95</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>5101</b>	Income	£0.00			£3,774.00	£3,774.00	£3,774.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£3,774.00</b>	<b>£3,774.00</b>	<b>£3,774.00</b>	
		<b>-£1,200.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>-£137.95</b>	<b>£3,654.00</b>	<b>£3,516.05</b>	<b>£3,516.05</b>	



CIVIC								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>601</b>	<b>Civic</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>6011</b>	Mayoral Allowance	£650.00			£400.00	£400.00	£400.00	
<b>6012</b>	Civic Tickets	£300.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6013</b>	Civic Award	£200.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6014</b>	Civic Service Expenses	£700.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6015</b>	Civic Dinner Expenses	£1,500.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6016</b>	Honours Board and Chain Updates	£100.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6017</b>	Mayor's Charity Donations	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6018</b>	Mayors Charity Night	£0.00		£17.25		£17.25	£17.25	
<b>6019</b>	Civic Refunds	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£3,450.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£17.25</b>	<b>£400.00</b>	<b>£417.25</b>	<b>£417.25</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>6101</b>	Civic Service Income	£200.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6102</b>	Civic Dinner Income	£1,500.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>6103</b>	Mayors Charity Night Income	£0.00	£160.00			£160.00	£160.00	
<b>6104</b>	Civic Refunds	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub To</b>	<b>£1,700.00</b>	<b>£160.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£160.00</b>	<b>£160.00</b>	
		<b>-£1,750.00</b>	<b>£160.00</b>	<b>-£17.25</b>	<b>-£400.00</b>	<b>-£257.25</b>	<b>-£257.25</b>	
<b>CHARITIES</b>								
	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
<b>701</b>	<b>Charities</b>							
<b>Expenditure</b>								
<b>7011</b>	The Green & Market Place	£1,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>7012</b>	War Memorial & Garden of EED	£1,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£2,000.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	
<b>Income</b>								
<b>7101</b>	The Green & Market Place	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
<b>7102</b>	War Memorial & Garden of EED	£0.00				£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-£2,000.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	

SUMMARY	Description	Approved Budget 2021-22	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter 2021-22	TO DATE	Comments
Code								
101	Administration and Salary	-£42,743.00	£56,702.61	-£5,597.16	-£3,307.78	£47,797.67	£47,797.67	
102	S137 and Donations	-£14,510.00	£0.00	-£13,520.00	£0.00	-£13,520.00	-£13,520.00	
103	Democratic Expenses	-£875.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>-£58,128.00</b>	<b>£56,702.61</b>	<b>-£19,117.16</b>	<b>-£3,307.78</b>	<b>£34,277.67</b>	<b>£34,277.67</b>	
201	Open Spaces	-£21,700.00	-£101.00	-£3,414.62	£5,320.38	£1,804.76	£1,804.76	
301	Burial Grounds	-£6,020.00	-£12,086.56	-£109.20	£751.10	-£11,444.66	-£11,444.66	
401	S144 Promoting Kirton	-£12,690.00	-£1,987.50	£0.00	£0.00	-£1,987.50	-£1,987.50	
501	Public Services	-£1,200.00	£0.00	-£137.95	£3,654.00	£3,516.05	£3,516.05	
601	Civic	-£1,750.00	£160.00	-£17.25	-£400.00	-£257.25	-£257.25	
701	Charities	-£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-£103,488.00</b>	<b>£42,687.55</b>	<b>-£22,796.18</b>	<b>£6,017.70</b>	<b>£25,909.07</b>	<b>£25,909.07</b>	
	PRECEPT	£103,488.00	£51,744.00			£51,744.00	£51,744.00	
	CT Grant	£0.00	£0.00			£0.00	£0.00	
	<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>£103,488.00</b>	<b>£51,744.00</b>			<b>£51,744.00</b>	<b>£51,744.00</b>	

<b>Earmarked Reserves :</b>	Approved	April 2021	May 2021	June 2021	1st Quarter	TO DATE	Comments
Traingate Project	£100.70		£47.25	£38.00	£85.25	£85.25	
Parish Paths Partnership	£262.05				£0.00	£0.00	
Grass Verges Devolution	£4,066.50				£0.00	£0.00	
Mayor's Charity Donations	£2,242.85				£0.00	£0.00	
Elections	£2,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
Allotment provision	£10,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
Car Parking provision	£25,000.00		£2,700.00	£259.00	£2,959.00	£2,959.00	
Play area	£10,008.44				£0.00	£0.00	
Skatepark/other sport facility	£20,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
Future Match Funding	£10,000.00				£0.00	£0.00	
Street furniture	£2,000.00			£966.00	£966.00	£966.00	
<b>Total earmarked reserves:</b>	<b>£85,680.54</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£2,747.25</b>	<b>£1,263.00</b>	<b>£4,010.25</b>	<b>£4,010.25</b>	
						£0.00	
<b>General reserves:</b>	<b>£40,000.00</b>				£0.00	£0.00	
						£0.00	
<b>Total Reserves:</b>	<b>£125,680.54</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	

## Kirton in Lindsey Town Council

### 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Budget Monitoring Report 2021-22 (Apr-Jun)

#### **ADMINISTRATION AND RESOURCES**

##### **Administration**

Areas of note: Income Other and Bank Interest.

Income Other is showing as above that expected due to the HMRC VAT refund applied for and received for the previous financial year 2020-2021.

Bank Interest the expected achieved income was reduced for this financial year due to the significant drop in bank interest rates last year in response to the public health crisis. The combined interest from the bank account and Public Sector Deposit Fund account have increased the potential for interest earned above that anticipated.

##### **Grants and Donations**

All on target, and taken from the General Power of Competence heading, with funding left which can be provided if requested throughout the rest of this financial year. The only exception is the £10 donation to Lowland Search & Rescue which was not anticipated when the budget was agreed.

##### **Democratic Expenses**

Shows no spending to date.

**Overall** the **ADMINISTRATION AND RESOURCES** section presents no concerns at early part of the financial year.

#### **OPEN SPACES**

Areas of note: Traingate Project

Traingate Project expenditure shows as above that budgeted for, however the budget total is for ongoing maintenance and didn't cover the completion of the project, and the income shown for the project is the final instalment from the NLC SDF grant funding which balances with the expenditure for the project.

**Overall**, **OPEN SPACES** presents no concerns at this early point in the financial year.

#### **BURIAL GROUNDS**

Business Rates have again increased beyond that anticipated and so are over the approved budget total, and the Maintenance Works to repair the cemetery path were also above that of the approved budget. With the reserve funds available these costs can be balanced without major concern.

Receipts from Cemetery Fees are currently in line with that expected at this point in the financial year.

**Overall**, **BURIAL GROUNDS** are currently over budget at this early point in the financial year but this can be balanced with funds from reserves or potentially the fees received during the remaining months of the year.

### **PROMOTING KIRTON**

So far there the only cost is the initial deposit required by the Christmas Lighting contract, and other spending will depend on the continued Government roadmap in response to the continuing public health crisis.

### **PUBLIC SERVICES**

Community Sports Sessions have incurred some cost so far for equipment and coaching fees, however these costs are covered adequately by the grant funding and received from NLC, and weekly user fees recorded in the income line of this area of the budget. There is funding available from the grant for further purchases of equipment and further coverage of the professional coaching fees. There are therefore no matters of concern here at this point in the year.

### **CIVIC**

There is little spending and income to report at the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter for this section other than some costs for the Mayor's Virtual Quiz night along with the income from that event, and the use of the Mayor's Allowance to cover the costs for the Traingate unveiling event buffet. There are no matters of concern here at this point in the year.

### **CHARITIES**

There is no spending or income to report at the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter for this section of the budget at this time.

### **RESERVES**

The Traingate project funding from last year was used in the run up to the official unveiling, with a small amount of funds remaining for future works including planting. Car parking provision funds previously allocated for the consultant surveys and planning application were used in May and June. The costs for the installation of the benches at Park Hill and Dunstan Hill are noted against the Street Furniture reserves and this budget meets the requirements for those works, with additional funding in place for the rest of this financial year.

### **Summary**

Overall, there are no significant concerns to report with the budget at this stage in the financial year.

Neil Taylor-Matson

06/07/2021

**Accounts**

1st Quarter 2021-2022: Apr-Jun 2021

Balance carried forward April 1st 2021:	£64,960.87
-----------------------------------------	------------

**Receipts**

Pavillion/user fees	£365.00
Utilities	£150.49
Grants	£12,935.00
Bank Interest	£1.25
<b>Total:</b>	<b>£13,451.74</b>

**Payments**

Utilities	£572.71
Maintenance & Cleaning	£3,826.12
Waste	£205.14
Purchases	£3,539.00
<b>Total:</b>	<b>£8,142.97</b>

Balance at 31st March 2021	£70,269.64
----------------------------	------------

**Reconciliation to Bank Statements:**

Money Manager	20009253	£49,459.09
Treasurers	30007560	£20,810.55
<b>Total:</b>		<b>£70,269.64</b>