

Minutes of Tunstall Parish Council Meeting
Held on 10th July 2019 ~ 7.00pm
Tunstall Community Hall, Ashe Road, Tunstall

Present

Cllr. Steve Smith (Chair) Cllr. Katherine Barton Cllr. John Hazelton
Cllr. Niels Petersen Cllr. Kevin Ross Cllr. Lucy Silovsky
Cllr. Sophy Yeoman (*after item 3*)

Judi Hallett (Clerk)

5 members of the public were present

1. To receive Apologies for absence:

Apologies were received from Cllr. Oliver Morgan (previous commitment) and Cllr. Philip Noakes (unwell). These apologies were accepted.

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

There were none.

3. Co-option of 1 Councillor and the signing of the Declaration of Acceptance of Office

There was one candidate for the position of Councillor: Ms Sophy Yeoman. Ms Yeoman explained that she had recently moved to the village and wished to play a part in the Parish Council if possible. Cllr. Barton proposed Ms Yeoman be co-opted on to the Council. This was seconded by Cllr. Ross and all Councillors were in agreement.

Cllr. Yeoman joined the table and signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office.

4. Public Participation - To receive:

a. Reports from County and District Councillors:

- Cllr. Andrew Reid – Cllr. Reid’s report had been circulated and he expanded on the following items:
 - Foster Carers – more urgently needed as older carers retire and more children are in need of support
 - Drainage work carried out by Kier MG – Concern raised that work carried out by Kier to the drainage system was only a fraction of the job (1.7m of the 46m scheduled); we have been told by Amanda Mays that Kier were not paid but is that correct [Clerk to put request for info in a mail to Cllr. Reid]

Chair’s initials:

- Buses – Review of subsidies currently underway, cross party group looking at all options, £13m of savings need to be found (in a budget of £520m), #62 and #71 buses (run by P&F Travel) have an average of just 18 movements a day, it is a 16 seater bus, services are heavily subsidised and most passengers have travel cards and therefore do not pay, bus company would be willing to come to speak to the Council . Q – *Could school buses be used?* Possibly but there would be safeguarding issues to overcome. Q. – *Could there be a link to the 800 bus (at Rendlesham)?* Yes – perhaps the CATS (on demand) service could be used [see 7. d) for Council debate]
 - Health Visitor Review – Q. I am very concerned that the plans for changes to the Health Care Visitor appointments would mean under-trained staff visiting patients and possibly not spotting issues. [Concerns to be put in writing to Cllr. Reid, through Clerk]
 - Cllr Ray Herring – No report had been received
- b. Reports or comment from any member of the public – The following comments were made:
- Improvements to Drainage System – Good to see the pipes will be replaced but when? Why has it taken 5 years to get this acknowledged? Kier only replaced 1.7m of the 46m they had to do. We have been told they didn’t get paid but they must have been paid something. Why did they dig over 25m of the trench and then fill it in again (without laying any pipe)? There have not been any issues ONLY because we have not had the volume of rain. Perhaps the Council should put in a FOI request for full detail of what Kier did and what they were paid?
 - Sewage Issue – Comment was made that there had been a short-term sewage issue in the village earlier in the day, but it seemed to have been resolved.
 - S106 Funds – The Clerk read three letters from residents concerned at the item on the agenda to discuss the possibility of splitting the S106 funds proportionately between the three projects.
 - S106 Funds – I echo the previous comments read out, the MUGA was voted for overwhelmingly, the other two areas have merit but those were not voted for, a MUGA is essential for all ages, especially the young as there is not much in the village for them, money might be tight but we must try, I am really upset by the proposed changes, the decision was one way but now it looks like it might change.

Action: Clerk and Cllr. Silovsky

5. To agree minutes of meetings dated 8th May and 28th May 2019:

The Clerk apologised that the Minutes of the meeting dated 28th May were not mentioned on the agenda. All Councillors agreed that both sets of minutes were an accurate record of the meetings. Cllr. Smith proposed and Cllr. Hazelton seconded the minutes should be signed and all Councillors agreed. The Clerk agreed to publish these on the Web Site.

Action: Clerk

6. Planning:

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

- i. DC/19/2580/FUL – Proposed detached Garage at Blythe Barn, 23 Kings Arms Yard, Orford Road, Tunstall – Councillors made the following comments:
 - This application was almost identical to DC/18/4957/FUL (withdrawn) – the Clerk had been unable to see any difference in the two applications
 - Pervious concerns had been 1) Plans seemed to show incorrect height of new gates (when compared to existing wall), 2) Height of the garage was not shown on plans and 3) There was concern over access to the roads in the area form neighbours
 - The plans were viewed, and it was proposed by Cllr. Smith that the Council should ‘object’ on the same grounds as before (above). This was seconded by Cllr, Hazleton and all Councillors were in agreement

Action: Clerk

7. Highways/Flooding:

a) To discuss forthcoming drainage work in Tunstall:

The Clerk confirmed that a statement had previously been received from Amanda Mays (SCC Highways) assuring the Parish Council that Kier MG had not been paid for the previous work as it had not been completed. Councillors asked to see evidence as to why the original plan was not completed. A member of the public confirmed that Kier MG had previously refused to provide SCC with a drawing as to why the project could not be completed, unless they were paid to provide it. The Clerk was asked to write to Cllr. Reid to ask for details of what Kier were paid for, why they did not do some of the job whilst they had over 25m of trench dug and expressing concerns that Kier staff work alongside SCC staff, seemingly assessing and pricing work that they themselves will complete.

b) To discuss lorries coming through the village and whether to speak to SCC Highways about recent incidents:

The following comments were made:

- The road through the village to Snape (and beyond) is a designated lorry route and it probably comes up on many sat/navs
- If Bentwaters continues to develop the numbers of lorries will increase
- The bend, as Woodbridge Road turns in to Orford Road and the junction with Orford Road and Snape Road, are both very narrow and need to be approached and taken slowly, especially by large or long vehicles
- Recently a tractor and trailer pushed over the wall outside 1 Corner House; the vehicle was completely over the pavement and could have caused major injury or death, had a pedestrian been on the pavement. Another accident had also occurred at the junction 4 days ago
- The vision as you pull out of Ashe Road is very poor and often you have to ‘go for it’ and hope no one is approaching at speed
- Bollards on the inside of the corner may help; signage in the area is very poor
- We need to ask SCC Highways to look into the whole area, especially at signage
- We could do a traffic survey ourselves and the SCC Self Help Scheme may be used in the future
- Perhaps a 20 MPH Speed limit could be imposed (like through Coddendam)

Chair’s initials:

In conclusion the Clerk was asked to write to SCC Highways, sending photographs where appropriate, to ask if anything could be done to improve safety in the area.

With reference to the SID Statistics, the Clerk confirmed she would download the data on the device and train others to do so.

c) To discuss any possible improvements to the Ashe Road/Woodbridge Road junction:

[Discussed with item b) above]

d) To discuss possible changes to the 62 bus through the villages:

Following on from discussions during the 'Public Session', the Clerk read comments received from three residents. After discussion it was agreed that the Clerk should draft a letter for review.

e) Community Speedwatch:

- i. To receive an update following advertisement – Mr Lowne advised Council that three new volunteers had stepped forward. The Clerk agreed to investigate the DBS process for each.
- ii. To receive an update on borrowing the equipment from Snape PC – Confirmation had been received from TPC's insurers that the Snape PC equipment would be insured when it was in our possession (as long as it was used in the correct manner). Mr Lowne reported that Tunstall had now been taken off the Rendlesham Rota so he would speak to Tim Beech (Snape PC) to arrange for their equipment to be borrowed.
- iii. To discuss purchase of our own equipment – Councillors felt this might be a good move but were concerned that the expense was not in the 2019/20 budget. The Clerk agreed to look at the budget and report back to the September meeting.

Action: Clerk

8. Recreation Ground:

a) To discuss the suggestion that the S106 funds should be proportionately split between the three projects originally suggested:

The Chair recalled the stages this subject had progressed through for the benefit of the new Councillors and gave assurances that SALC had assured him that he did not have a conflict of interest. The following comments were noted:

- Advise from SALC sought and they had confirmed the Council *could* split the funds if they wished
- There was a clear winner of the vote and that is where residents will expect the money to be spent
- The MUGA will go ahead however much of the S106 funds are allocated to it
- The MUGA will need a great deal of extra funding and it may take years to amass; if we apportion the funds some projects could be completed much sooner
- It would be fair to split the funds, that way different sections of the community receive assistance
- The MUGA is mainly for the young people
- I disagree, the MUGA will be used by all ages

Chair's initials:

- 28% of residents may feel they have been ignored
- There are other funding sources, and anyone can apply for them
- Perhaps we should try to allocate TPC funds to the other two projects to help them
- Any applications for funding could include changing room facilities in the hall as well
- Is this how we want to represent ourselves?
- The Bowls Club needs funds soon or it may close but the Community Centre has sufficient funds behind it
- The crux of the matter was how the original statement was worded and perhaps we have learnt a lesson to ensure it is watertight a next time

In conclusion the following was proposed by Cllr. Barton, seconded by Cllr. Yeoman and all Councillors were in agreement:

- i. All S106 funds available would be allocated to the MUGA
- ii. The Council, through the Clerk, would offer assistance to the Bowls Club and Community Centre to help them find other funding streams available to them
- iii. The September agenda would include an item to discuss how the Parish Council can assist both the Bowls Club and Community Centre with fund raising

b) To receive and discuss the first quote for the MUGA and discuss size, position, cost, etc:

The Clerk had displayed the first quotation for the MUGA. Discussion over size, sports covered, position and orientation followed, and it was apparent that many questions needed discussion and agreement. It was agreed that the item would be on the September agenda and the Clerk was asked to obtain 2 further quotes.

Action: Clerk

It was agreed to suspend Standing Orders and allow the meeting to run another 20 minutes

9. Tunstall Common – To discuss provision of Dog and Litter Bins:

Cllr. Petersen reported that the car park on the Forestry Commission land did not have a dog or litter bin and that rubbish was being left. Cllrs Peterson and Smith agreed to investigate the situation further and report exact locations to the Clerk, in order that she could ask the FC to install suitable bins.

Action: Cllrs Petersen and Smith and the Clerk

10. Finance Matters:

a) To review accounts for April, May and June 2019:

The Clerk had distributed the accounts and there were no questions. The Bank Statements and B/S Books were examined by Cllr. Hazelton.

b) To discuss request for £40 from the Village Events Fund to fund prizes and refreshments for the Annual Village Race:

Cllr. Silovsky proposed this grant be awarded. This was seconded by Cllr. Smith and all Councillors were in agreement. The Clerk was asked to advise the organisers.

Chair's initials:

c) To authorise the following Invoices for Payment:

i. J Hallett (Clerk) – Office + mileage expenses	£257.60
ii. HMRC Cumbernauld (Clerk’s PAYE)	£188.40
iii. SALC (Councillor Training)	£82.80
iv. SC Norse (Grass Cutting)	£166.50
v. N Petersen (Mileage to SALC)	£16.20
vi. T Pollock (Netball Expenses)	£19.16

The above payments were proposed by Cllr. Smith, seconded by Cllr. Hazelton and all Councillors were in favour that they be paid. The cheques were signed by Cllr. Silovsky and Cllr. Smith.

f) To note Payments made since last meeting:

i. LCPAS (Subscription)	£120.00
ii. J Hallett (Three months’ Salary)	£754.08

g) To note Payments received since last meeting:

i. RPA (High Level Stewardship Payment)	£5,052.00
ii. Interest (IBS Savings)	£21.05

h) To note Bank Balances as at 30th June 2019:

i. Barclays Bank (Current Account)	£2,141.61
ii. IBS (Tunstall Parish Council)	£10,900.77
iii. IBS (Tunstall Common Fund)	£39,557.28

Action: Clerk

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

Items to add to the next agenda:

- Street Farm Close – The Clerk was asked to look up the original plans to establish if the pond along School Lane was due to be re-established once the building work had finished.
- A Remembrance Day Event
- Items carried forward from this meeting

The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday 11th September 2019.

The meeting closed at 9.20pm.

Signed:
Cllr. Steve Smith, Chair

Date:

Judi Hallett
Clerk to Tunstall Parish Council

Chair’s initials: