Minutes of Lathbury Parish Meeting - 26 October 2026

Present:
Will Swann (Chair)
Sue Ashworth (Clerk)
Peter Geary (Ward Councillor)
PCSO C7039 Lesley Rogers
PCSO Tina Hobson (Olney)
27 members of the public

Apologies:
2 members of the public

1 - The Chair welcomed our new PCSO (Lesley Rogers) to the meeting. Lesley has been a PCSO for 9 years & recently swapped areas with our previous PCSO Jo Clarke. She shared the crime statistics for period 26 Sept - 26 Oct with the meeting which included:

1 x assault without injury
3 x road related incidents (not crime related)

PCSO Rogers & Hobson then left the meeting.

2 - There being no corrections required the Chair signed the Minutes of Parish Meeting held on 30 June 2026 as a true copy.

3 - Matters Arising from Minutes 30 June 2026:

Planning: Minerals Extraction extension planning application to be covered in Item 8

4 - The Hut

a) Fire Risk Assessment

·A Fire Risk Assessment was undertaken by Rebecca Ashworth on 16 August (Rebecca is an occupational safety & health professional & did not charge for her services).

·A Fire Safety Action Plan has been prepared with 16 actions for completion by the end of November. 10 actions have been completed to date.

If anyone wishes to see the full report, please contact Will or Sue for an electronic copy.

b) Repair to water leak (reported by Tom Hart, Treasurer)

Anglian Water wrote to the Parish Meeting on 13 August to tell us that they had detected a leak in supply on our side of the mains meter. Tests were carried out & confirmed that there must be a leak & it was up to us to fix it. We obtained two quotes & chose the quote from Aqua Gas. They attended on 19 September & fixed the leak by installing a new pipe from the meter to the hut kitchen at a cost of £1,300.

We have asked Wave (Anglian Water's retail arm) for a contribution towards this cost but they would only consider a case where it was a sudden large leak. Our leak was considered to be small and had persisted over a considerable time. Our insurance would not pay a claim for the pipe replacement as it is a matter of wear & tear. They may consider some compensation for the associated work. The committee is working on this.

We expect the cost of the water bill to reduce from a monthly average of £75 to £30 (most of which would be standing charges).

c) Condition Survey

The hut was last subject to a survey of its condition in 2007. In order to plan maintenance & make provision for the costs, we commissioned a new survey. Three quotes were obtained & we appointed Allcott Associates, a large National Chartered Surveyors company with an office in Milton Keynes.

The survey was undertaken on 23 September & the report received on 5 October. The total cost was £1,074.

·The report runs to 106 pages (including some standard text: the actual findings cover 76 pages with many photos). We have circulated the conclusions with the estimated costs for repairs & recommended maintenance (See Paper 1 on the village website).

·The total estimated cost of the works identified is £14,500. Some of the work can be undertaken by volunteers in the village; some will require professionals. The committee will provide an updated plan of action at the next Parish Meeting in May 2027.

If anyone wishes to see the full report please contact Will or Sue for an electronic copy.

5 - Highways (reported by Nigel Ashworth, LPM Highways Rep)

In July, Murray Woodburn (MKCC Head of Highways) & Phil Jeffs (MKCC Highways Engineer) visited Lathbury to see first-hand the issues the village faces. We discussed installing an Average Speed Camera (ASC) from the Sherington turn to the northern National Speed Limit (NSL) sign. There is currently a trial underway in Astwood & it was agreed that Lathbury would be a suitable location for an ASC if the trial proves successful. There are procurement issues, so there is no guarantee that the scheme will be rolled out. While this is probably the only realistic deterrent for speeding vehicles through Lathbury, it won't be agreed or installed in the short term.

However, Nigel reported some success which he reported in four sections of the road:

B526 SID to SID:

We're delighted to have a new pair of Speed Indication Devices (SIDs). Having them purchased, installed & maintained by MKCC is a huge bonus, saving us somewhere between £7,000 and £10,000. The overhanging branches that initially partially obstructed the view of the SID entering Lathbury from Newport Pagnell have been removed.

To obtain pre-SID baseline data we had a 7-day speed survey in September which monitored the speeds at two points. The first was approx. 50m before the bend northbound/just after the bend southbound. It revealed the following:

> 75% of traffic was within the 40mph limit. 8,500 vehicles, however, were not, which is one every minute.
>
> Of the remaining 25%, 24% were travelling between 40 - 50mph, therefore, 99% were below 50mph. Approximately 1% of traffic was between 50 and 60mph.
>
> 17 vehicles were recorded in excess of 60mph. With 34,000 vehicular movements per week, this equates to one vehicle in 2,000.

Hopefully, the SIDs will help reduce the current 8,500 vehicles per week **not** complying with the limit. With access to the data from the SIDs, we will provide an update at the next meeting.

B526 from the SID north of Lathbury:

Following the 2024 speed survey, we requested MKCC relocate the NSL sign approximately 100m further north, making it invisible to drivers until they've left the village. The survey revealed multiple daily instances of speeds exceeding 80mph.The NSL sign's visibility clearly encourages impatient drivers to overtake & exceed the speed limit. While MKCC supported our request at the time, Thames Valley Police (TVP) rejected it, based on the overall pattern of the data.

The pre-SID September 2026 survey also had a sensor just north of Lathbury Shaw within the 40mph limit. Only 12% of traffic passed the sensor within the speed limit; nearly 1,100 vehicles per week exceeded 60mph, 160 per week were in excess of 70mph & 30 per week were in excess of 80mph. These excesses are evenly distributed northbound & southbound. One vehicle every 10 minutes is more than 50% above the speed limit.

Our proposed solution is to approach TVP again to move the NSL sign further north round the bend, making it less visible to northbound traffic departing Lathbury. As a consequence this will also push the 40mph sign further north giving a greater lead in before Lathbury Shaw and Red Brick Cottages, which might help reduce southbound vehicle speeds past these houses.

B526 from the Sherington turn to the SID entering Lathbury:

The signage at the Sherington turn is potentially confusing & leads to drivers believing that the B526 has a 60mph NSL. On leaving the bridge towards Lathbury there is a NSL sign directly in front of drivers - this is actually the left hand side of a pair of signs for the Sherington road. However, the trees & hedging on the right-hand side means the sign isn't visible until the driver is almost abeam it. It's not unreasonable for drivers to assume that this is actually the right-hand NSL sign for the B526.

With only a pair of small 40mph repeaters & no roundel on the road, this might be why vehicles are seen driving well above the 40mph speed limit until they see the roundels & the signage at the Lathbury village sign & are now alerted by the SID. This is the section of road where a resident sadly lost his life almost a year ago. Photographs of the signage have been sent to Phil Jeffs for him to consider:

Moving the NSL signs further along the Sherington Road so they cannot be seen by traffic on the B526.

Painting a 40mph roundel on the road just after the Sherington turn.

Replacing the small 40mph repeaters with larger signs.

An additional 7 day speed survey on this section of the road to confirm if speeding is an issue.

We await the response to our requests & will keep residents updated.

Church Lane:

An initial poll on the village WhatsApp group was undertaken to gauge support for reducing the speed limit on Church Lane from 30mph to 20mph. The poll received 29 votes in favour & none against. Despite the window for such applications being closed (it reopens on 1 April 2027), MKCC agreed to accept our request if a formal petition from the village, together with the support from two ward councillors was submitted. 36 signatures were obtained, which MKCC deemed sufficient for an application. A request has also been made to MKCC to repair the damaged 30mph post & to clear away the roadworks signs left behind after the road resurfacing.

Q - Who decided where to place the SIDs?
A - MKCC

Q - Can the September data differentiate between vehicles & motorbikes?
A - Yes, it's determined by axle spacing & axle count.

6 - Lathbury Manor

The latest communication from Walker Singleton, the estate agents for the property, was received on 26 October. It indicates continuing interest in the property & that they are expecting an offer will be accepted in the near future.

The previous Chair had already asked our ward councillors to ensure that any application for change of use would not be delegated to planning officers. However, the new National Scheme of Delegation for planning applications comes into force at the end of October. This is part of the government's planning reforms designed to speed up planning decisions. Under it, the great majority of planning applications must be decided by officers, **not** by a committee.

There are exceptions. In certain cases the application is considered by a panel of two people: an officer & a councillor. They decide whether an application should be decided by officers or the Planning Committee. To go to a Planning Committee, the application must fall into one of a number of limited categories & it must raise either:

a) one or more issues of economic, social or environmental significance to the local area, or
b) one or more significant planning matters.

One of the limited categories that can lead to an application going to the Planning Committee is listed building consent. Lathbury Manor is a Grade 2 listed building (under the name *Inn Farmhouse*).

7 - Newport Pagnell Beach

At the meeting on 30 June we passed a resolution which led to two actions:

a) we asked Newport Pagnell Town Council (NPTC) to reduce the risk of further death & injury by making alterations to the area such as to make it unviable as a site from which the public can enter the water;
b) we submitted evidence to the Coroner in respect of the inquest into the death of Mr Rushabh Patel, who died after getting into difficulties in the water at the Beach.

The resolution was passed to NPTC. We have not received a response.

The evidence was submitted in which we identified eight factors which increase the risk of further deaths at The Beach. We asked the Coroner to consider issuing a Prevention of Future Deaths report. The inquest resulted in a finding of Accidental Death & the Coroner did **not** issue a Prevention of Future Deaths report. This means that further requests to NPTC to remove The Beach on safety grounds are very unlikely to have any effect. Our next steps need to concentrate on the risk of anti-social behaviour next Spring & Summer.

The Chair had met PCSOs Arlene Phillips & Lesley Rogers to discuss this & a plan of action has been agreed:

In April our PCSOs will ask their Newport Pagnell colleagues to add The Beach to their patrol plan, to spread the message that the police do visit.

Our PCSOs will also raise the issue with NPTC to encourage them to visit more often.

Arlene will ask the police control room to record The Beach as a specific what3words location.

We will use the same what3words location when reporting any incidents.

8 - Minerals: the next Minerals & Waste Local Plan (see Paper 2 on village website)

a) Extensions of the existing quarry

The application to extend Lathbury Quarry to two new areas to the south-east & north-west of the existing site was approved in November 2025, subject to a number of conditions. A number of documents designed to

satisfy the planning conditions have now been submitted for approval by MKCC. These are now out for consultation, with comments required by 14 November. The two of particular interest cover noise monitoring & dust management.

Concern 1: How often is noise monitored?
Under the existing scheme, noise monitoring takes place annually or following receipt of a justified complaint, unless otherwise agreed with the Mineral Planning Authority. Under the new proposed scheme, noise monitoring would be carried out within 3 months of normal operations beginning. If noise is within limits set by the planning permission, no further monitoring would take place unless there is a justified complaint.

Concern 2: Who decides if a complaint about noise is justified?
The existing & new proposed schemes say the same thing: If a complaint is made, the quarry manager or representative visits the complainant's house to make a 'subjective assessment of noise'. The quarry manager then decides if the complaint is justified. We propose there should be an independent assessment of the complaint.

Q - Are we actually sure they are doing the annual noise review?
A - No

Peter Geary suggested LPM request a Black Box recording device from the Environmental Health team.

The Chair invited a show of hands to support the submission of Concerns 1 & 2 to MKCC, which was passed unanimously.

b) Next Minerals & Waste Local Plan (see Paper 3 on village website)
MKCC has announced that work has started on the next Minerals & Waste Local Plan, which will replace the plan adopted in 2017. This plan will identify sites from which gravel & sand will be extracted up to 2050. It will also cover aggregate recycling, including the site on Sherington Road. The Parish Meeting put a great deal of work into responding to the existing plan, which is the basis for the existing quarry.

There are three stages of consultation:

Stage 1 involves responses to three questions:

What do we think of the proposed objectives of the plan?
What do we think of the communications plan?
What do we think of the proposed scope of the Strategic Environmental Assessment?

This is out for consultation now until 4 December. The Chair invited discussion:

Q - Is the site at Quarry Hall Farm that was considered in the preparation of the existing plan viable?
A – Ed Shires reported that we are unlikely to see any site at Quarry Hall Farm submitted.

Q - The recycling site is noisy. What is the legal basis for operation?
A - There is no evidence of noise or dust monitoring at that site. MKCC have been unable to find the planning permission under which it operates. There is no time limit of operation.

Q - How long is permission for the existing quarry and the extension?
A - The permission for the existing quarry was initially for ten years. The permission for the extension is for six years after starting works, which must happen before 1 October 2029. The operators can't afford to have it last for years & the land condition dictates work will be undertaken mostly in April - September.

Certain residents were impacted more by the processing plant rather than the recycling plant, and the impact extended to their business operations. The view was expressed that of the five 'noise receptors' identified in the planning condition on noise, those sited at Home Farm & Red Brick Cottages were likely to have found the road noise higher than that of the plant.

The Chair highlighted two issues:

a) Stages 2 and 3 consultations are in July & August 2027 & 2028 when many people will be on holiday.

b) There is no reference anywhere to a review of the effectiveness of the existing plan. Did the plan deliver its objectives, especially:

   Ensure minerals-related development does not have unacceptable adverse impacts on human health & minimise adverse effects on residential amenity .

   Support the provision of green infrastructure & recreational opportunities to promote healthy communities & quality of life.

   Ensure progressive restoration of mineral extraction sites & maximise environmental gains & benefits to local communities through appropriate after-uses.

How many of the promises & commitments have actually been delivered & how does MKCC know?

To prepare a response at Stage 1, the Chair invited people to join a working group to prepare a draft. He will circulate a draft response by email for comment to anyone who wishes to see it & then submit the response on behalf of the Parish Meeting.

9 - Budget Report

a) Parish Meeting - Since our last Parish Meeting on 30 June:
Previous bank balance: **£10,812**
We have received £500 from MKCC (the second half of our annual Precept)
Spent £201 on electricity
Spent £179 on water.
Spent £1,300 on fixing the water leak between the mains & the Hut
Spent £1,074 on the Hut Condition survey
Spent £134 on the annual website charges
Spent £207 on items arising from the Hut fire survey
Spent £70 on various smaller items
Current bank balance: **£8,146**

b) Village Fund - Tom gave a brief history of how the Village Fund came into being & how its purpose is to provide funds for projects to benefit the village. The Fund's current projects are:

An offer by the Puddefoots to tidy up the piece of land at the end of the Close where the Fund has agreed to reimburse the cost. Unfortunately they have not been able to undertake the work this year (as a result of the hot weather), but Gill has assured us that this will be done in 2027.

The second project is to provide a defibrillator for the village which the Andersons have kindly offered to have installed on their wall in Inn Farm Court. Negotiations are continuing to see if the defibrillator within Lathbury Manor could be made available.

There have been no recent movements on the bank account which stands at **£2,240.03**.

10 - Precept 2027/28 (see Paper 3 on village website)

The Treasurer, Tom Hart, presented the case for an increase in the parish precept from £1,000 in the current financial year, to £2,000 in 2027/28. The current precept does not cover the annual running costs of the village hut and other essential recurrent outgoings, which are estimated to be £1,850 in 2027/28. Reserves are required to fund essential repairs and maintenance on the hut.

In the current year, the parish precept represents 0.77% of each household's total Council Tax bill. Out of the 48 Milton Keynes parishes, leaving aside three very small parishes that have set no precept, Lathbury's precept is the second cheapest after Tyringham and Filgrave.

The proposal was put to the vote, and approved unanimously.

11 - Reports from associated meetings

a) Neighbourhood Watch (presented by Sue Ashworth, NHW Coordinator)

Welcome to Rod & Bea Pavey (our newest residents who've moved into 1, Church Lane. They have already joined the Lathbury NHW/village WhatsApp group. If anyone is not currently included but would like to be, please let Sue have your mobile no. asap. The other useful source of important local information is the electronic TVP Alerts which offer crime prevention advice, cyber security advice, request for info on crimes & updates on the outcome of incidents.

We've had several 'Have Your Say' & 'Coffee with a Cop' events advertised since our last meeting in June & the dates/venues that are relevant to us have been shared with the village.

The disposal of the old SIDs has resulted in us losing our NHW signs at the north & south ends of the village. New ones will be acquired & erected.

It's reassuring that Lesley Rogers, our new PCSO, is keen to engage with the village & she will provide a poster for the village noticeboard so that those not in attendance at the meeting will know who she is & how to contact her.

Having taken on the role of NHW Coordinator in 2014, Sue's commitments in other areas have increased considerably over the years & she is looking to handover the NHW responsibilities to another willing volunteer. The role is neither arduous nor time-consuming as the scheme database is already set-up. Please reach out direct to Sue if you're interested in finding out more.

b) North East Rural Community Forum (a police organised meeting) held on 7 October at Lavendon.

There has been no progress on plans for modifying Chicheley Hill roundabout.

A number of villages are applying for 20 mph speed limits, including Emberton, Clifton Reynes, Newton Blossomville, Lavendon & North Crawley

Moulsoe is facing problems with car racing on the new road system. Police are actively addressing his.

A rumour was mentioned that Newport Pagnell Tip would close early next year. *Cllr. Geary confirmed it was scheduled to close in January 2027 but the new site at Wolverton & near Bletchley were yet to be confirmed.*

Q - Will MKCC keep the NP tip open until the Wolverton site is ready to avoid a potential increase in fly-tipping?
A – Unknown, although New Bradwell could be a site option meantime. It is likely the Wolverton site will utilise a booking system.

12 - Village events

a) Social events
Thanks to Gill Lee & Anya Mitchell for hosting the coffee morning on 10 October, and to PJ Mitchell and Imogen Anderson for their support. The event raised £405 for Willen Hospice.

Gill invited further social event suggestions & willing volunteers to please get in touch with her directly.

b) Christmas Quiz

The quiz is on December 5th from 7pm, organized by Chris and Ruth Holmwood. The theme is 'A Christmas Carol'.

13 - Any other Business

A request for information re the closure of Newport Pagnell tip was received ahead of the meeting - see Item 11b) in italics.

James Fishwick thanked the village for the generous leaving gift received from the village as he retired as LPM Chair.

Sue Carson asked when the swings in the village play area would be replaced.
Post-meeting note: a basket style swing is now in situ courtesy of MKCC.

14 - Date of Next Meeting: Monday 17 May at 7.30pm

The Chair closed the meeting at 9.07pm.