

Minutes of Tunstall Parish Council Meeting

Held on 16th August 2016 ~ 7.21pm

Present

Cllr. Julian Hill (Chair)

Cllr. Kevin Ross

Cllr. John Hazelton

Cllr. Lucy Silovsky

Cllr. Oliver Morgan

Judi Hallett (Clerk)

Three Members of the Public: Steven Smith, Tom Herring and Steve Friend

1. To receive Apologies for absence and any applications for dispensation:

Apologies were received from Cllr. Stephen Saunders (previous commitment).

2. To receive any Declarations of Interest and any Applications for Dispensation on Agenda Items (either pecuniary or non-pecuniary):

There were no declarations of interest and no applications for dispensation.

3. Public Participation - To receive:

- a. Reports or comment from any member of the public – There were no comments from the members of the public present.

4. To agree minutes of meetings dated 13th July 2016

All Councillors were in agreement that these were an accurate record of the meeting. Cllr. Hazelton proposed and Cllr. Hill seconded that they should be signed.

5. Planning:

a) To discuss and agree response to the following Applications received:

- i. DC/16/3047/ARM - Submission of reserved matters for 33 dwellings at land off Street Farm, School Road, Tunstall – The meeting was preceded by an exhibition of the plans and approximately 70 residents attended. The Clerk had compiled a list of questions raised by Councillors and members of the public before the meeting (see appendix A) and a 'Questions/Issues' sheet was completed by attendees to the exhibition (see appendix B). The Chairman ran through the elements on the 'questions raised' sheet and then those on the 'Questions/Issues' sheet form the evening. The Clerk noted all issues/questions and was asked to produce two letters, one for SCDC Planning and the other for Hopkins Homes. The Clerk also agreed to request a 1-day extension of SCDC Planning. The overall comment from Tunstall Parish Council was agreed to be **no objection, as long as each of the individual concerns raised by us were clarified by SCDC/Hopkins Home or controlled by Planning conditions.**
- ii. DC/16/2893/FUL – First Floor Extension at Trail Cottage 2 Mill Lane Tunstall – Councillors had **no objection** to this development and the Clerk was requested to notify this to SCDC.

Chairman's initials:

- iii. DC/16/3159/FUL - Improvements to existing flood defences at Snape Maltings, Snape Bridge, Tunstall - Councillors **supported** this development and the Clerk was requested to notify this to SCDC
- iv. DC/16/3160/LBC - Improvements to existing flood defences at Snape Maltings, Snape Bridge, Tunstall – *as above*

Action: Clerk/All Councillors

6. Finance Matters:

- a. To discuss supporting the Mini Family Fun Afternoon with a suggested maximum budget of £100.00:

Cllr. Morgan proposed that this budget be agreed. This was seconded by Cllr. Silovsky and all Councillors were in agreement

- b. To discuss sponsorship of prizes for Village Fun Race – Maximum of £25.00:

The Clerk confirmed the final expenditure was £22.63. Cllr. Silovsky proposed that this be refunded to the organisers. This was seconded by Cllr. Morgan and all Councillors were in agreement

- c. Invoices for Payment:

i. J Hallett (Clerk) – Salary for June, July and August	£870.24
ii. A Durham (Village Race prizes)	£22.63

The above payments were proposed by Cllr. Hazelton, seconded by Cllr. Ross, all Councillors in favour; cheques were signed by Cllr. Hazleton and Cllr. Morgan.

7. Highways – To discuss the ‘Tunstall Common’ signs and the increase in cost from £831.00 to £1,523.00:

After discussion the clerk agreed to write to SCC Highways (with a map), requesting that the new signs be moved to include both Mill Lane (from the Wantisden direction) and Wantisden Road (from the Orford direction) and that they showed by ‘Tunstall Common’ and ‘30’ at the same time.

Action: Clerk

8. To receive agenda items for next meeting and agree date of Next Meeting

The Clerk requested all new agenda items should be passed to her within seven working days of the next meeting.

The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday 7th September 2016. The meeting closed at 8.32pm.

Signed:
Chairman

Date:

Judi Hallett
Clerk to Tunstall Parish Council

Chairman’s initials:

Appendix A

Questions Raised regarding 33 dwellings at Street Farm (before meeting)

1. Play Equipment:

- It is suggested a larger open space should be incorporated and that the Developers should consult with the PC with regard to the provision of play equipment. Are the Developers aware that we already have a play park in the village?
- In my view we do not need another [Play Park] although the Developers may (or may not) think this may be a selling point.

2. Highways:

- The Planners appear to reject the idea of security gates for plots 1 and 2 and are in favour of a link footpath between the main site and plots 1 and 2. I agree entirely.
- I would like to have the final status of the private drive/entrance in School Road clarified. On the original plans I don't remember access from this side. I would like assurance that this will not (in any modified plans) connect with the rest of the estate and produce a 'rat run' between School Road and Ashe Road
- Could the PC ask planners to confirm that they have visited the four-way junction with dangerous bend that is just yards from the exit to this development and that they are satisfied that the extra traffic from 33 households during the school run and rush hour will not pose a threat of accident. Speeding around a blind bend is already an issue
- If there are roads in the development that are not adopted who will maintain these?
- Will there be any street lights and who will maintain these and pay for the electricity?
- From a purely personal point of view, I do not want more street lights in the village causing more "Light pollution".
- I would hope that there are no provisions for any street lighting, as this goes against what we currently experience in the village and there is also then the question of future maintenance if lighting is included
- Could we use this opportunity to get Hopkins to provide and pay for the speed repeaters either side of the village (the cost of which has now risen to £1500 apparently), as the new development will be affected by traffic in both Ashe Road and School Road

3. Issue with Plans:

- Planners noted that the orientation of the houses along Ashe Road (paragraph 7) may give an oppressive look from the road and refer to plots 2 – 8, however these plots are to the north (along the back of the development edging fields) so may be incorrectly identified?

4. Trees and Open Spaces:

- The plans show trees along Ashe Road and I would like to ensure Planners stipulate planting of trees which will not grow above say 2-3 metres and do not have a wide spread. Who will be responsible for the upkeep as they age?
- Who will be responsible for the cutting and maintenance of the 'open space'?

Chairman's initials:

5. Broadband:

- Broadband supply **MUST** be addressed without further reducing the poor speeds already available in most parts of the village. How is it proposed to provide this essential service into the new houses?
- If significant engineering is required, is there an opportunity to work with the local community to enhance the provision in the immediate surrounding area?
- This could be a great opportunity to "persuade" Hopkins to invest in high speed/fibre broadband for their development and for the village as a whole, as the current arrangements are pretty dire. Alternatively, and probably a cheaper option could be to expansion of the existing wireless system provided by County Broadband, which is currently full to capacity but with the injection of additional funding, they could expand their provision to cover the proposed development and the wider village. This could be a selling point for Hopkins

6. Surface Water/Sewers/Water:

- Run off water from the development **MUST** be assessed and suitable drainage provided (this may be accounted for in the planning application?). I suspect existing drainage will not cope with more water being fed into what seems an inadequate system
- Tunstall's flooding issues are well-documented, and though there are those who say there is no longer a problem, I remain unconvinced by the developer's plans or lack thereof to mitigate a 1/100-year event taking into account climate change. I note that the SCC flooding authority is of the same mind. Can the developers confirm they are drawing up plans for a surface water drainage system? This was something I remember raising in 2012 or 2013, when I was assured the developers were doing something about it
- Having looked at the plans again, I see there is provision for an "Attenuation pond" – I think that is the term used from memory. I understand this is designed to hold back run off water if the main drainage into a drainage facility in a field behind Street Farm should become full
- Can Hopkins confirm that the existing foul sewers are adequate to cater for this new development
- What is the likely impact on water pressure and has the existing infrastructure provision been reviewed?

7. Affordable Houses:

- Which company will be offered management of the 'Affordable houses' and will priority be given to Tunstall residents (past or present) to rent these? Also, do we have guarantees that these will not be swapped for 'Open Market' houses as the rules for the provision of these has changed since the Outline application was granted

8. S106/CIL Payment:

- Is this application subject to a S106 payment or CIL and what is the likely amount of income likely to be to Tunstall PC?
- When do we get our community infrastructure levy, what kind of money are we looking at and what are we allowed to spend it on?

9. Housing Allocation:

- According to the LDF document, Tunstall as a local service centre is due to have more than ten but no more than twenty houses built between now and 2027. I am inferring that this is due to infrastructure issues. With the developments at Snape Bridge also in our village, could the PC please ask for clarification from SCDC that Tunstall will have more than met its quota with this development and will not be subject to more development unless village infrastructure is radically improved to cope

10. Great Crested Newts:

- Because of the population of Great Crested Newts on the site, the developers will not, I believe, be able to start work without a mitigation licence as the plans indicate removal of one or more ponds with a population of GCNs. Their plan in order to get this involves protection work beginning at least six months prior to the development beginning. Can they confirm, therefore, that no development work will take place for at least six months after the mitigation licence has been granted to give the newts resettlement time

Appendix B

Comments received at public exhibition:

- Drainage? Including natural run off?
- Broadband upgrade?
- Public Open Space – Area maintenance responsibility
- Public Open Space – Area Pond – Will it dry up if the storm water is diverted?
- How long will it take to complete?
- When is the anticipated start date?
- Plot 31 and 32 overlooks my glass room – can there be a guarantee that trees planted will be maintained?
- Traffic – School Road – Management of Traffic
- Sewage
- Jobs – 2nd homes
- Extra noise
- Will the houses be all electric, on oil heating or will gas be brought to the village?
- No jobs, no shops, no schools, no buses or public transport, no entertainment

Chairman's initials: