

Approval was given to pay £120.08 Clerk's expenses, £1440.00 to Warden Moore for electrical work, £225.60 to Saxton in Bloom, £800 to Azure Tree Services for work to trees in the village, £1560 to D Bailey-Hague for work to the dyke and verges, and £203.50 to D.C. Graham for the provision of trees.

The closing balances were therefore:-

High Interest Account	27797.35
[of which £1135.44 is the Flood Defence Fund]	
Current Account	248.44

Attendance by Andrew Dixon

Initially, the Chairman stressed the support of the Parish Council for the school. He then outlined the situation regarding the PCU application, and Cllr. Ms Marshall made the point on behalf of residents that the cost of the application was considered unjustifiable at just short of £20K at a time when the County Council is withdrawing funding for day care and grass cutting. She asked at what point was it realised by NYCC that the application should be withdrawn and Mr. Dixon replied that they had been advised throughout the process by the consultants, Jacobs. The cost of the PCU had been envisaged at £250K, and Mr. Dixon was challenged over NYCC's decision to spend so much money on a site not owned by them. Many other questions were put by both the Parish Council and by the public, to which Mr. Dixon would respond at a later date, and they included **a)** why was the school seeking a Certificate of Lawful Development – known as a D1 Certificate – for the field next to the one already in use as such when they assure the village it is only required as a playing field; **b)** why is another field required at all when the facilities of the Cricket Club are available to the school as a condition of a grant of money made by Sports England to the Club; **c)** what effect will the changes we understand the government is making to the way schools are funded this have on Saxton School, i.e. will it be detrimental? **d)** are school governors required to undertake any training, and is this monitored? **e)** are publications which originate with the school and/or its governors reviewed or regulated in any way by the County Council. Asked why the school was allowed to take in more pupils than it could accommodate, Mr. Dixon explained that any parent can request admission to any school for their child, and if they are refused they can appeal. Individual schools have no power to override the decision taken by the Appeals Panel. The point was made that it was felt that by accepting more children than the school has room for the Panel was jeopardising both the education and the wellbeing of its pupils, and contact details were requested in order that the Parish Council could protest formally. Mr. Dixon was then asked why the school had so many pupils from outside the catchment area – well in excess of 50% - since this clearly engenders a disconnect within the community, and he undertook to come back to the PC with an answer.

Attention was drawn to the declaration by the school that the £5000 contribution towards the mooted speed platform, which had been returned by the Parish Council, was now lost, since it was revenue and not capital; clarity was called for, since the governors had since re-classified the money as capital and now said it could be rolled forward.

The Chairman now pointed out why distrust had grown in the village over the contradictory messages received from the governors of the school, their request for extra playing field in particular being seen as a forerunner to a further planning application for a PCU in the future. Mr. Dixon assured the meeting that this would not happen, and the Chair asked for this assurance to be put in writing. At this point the Chairman declared this particular item closed.

Church Lighting

The Chairman advised the meeting that he had repeatedly and for a number of years requested a faculty for this work, and that the work had been instructed in the belief that one had been obtained. The work was virtually completed, and in large part was to address electrical safety issues.