

GREAT CHESTERFORD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF GREAT CHESTERFORD PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY JUNE 8TH 2016 AT 7:30PM IN THE COMMUNITY CENTRE, GREAT CHESTERFORD

Present: Neil Gregory
Collette Altaparmakova
Gareth Bevens

Sharon Tricerri
David Hall

Alan Cattley – Clerk

8 members of the public.

16/088. Apologies for Absence

Tom Newcombe, Matt Rowan, Simon Witney, Julie Redfern.

16/089. Declarations of Interest

Cllr. Bevens declared himself as an allotment holder; Cllr. Altaparmakova declared herself as a member of the Bowls Club.

16/090. Minutes of the Last Meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on May 5th 2016 were signed as a correct record of events.

16/091 Public Forum

There will time available for Public Forum, if required, and the opportunity for members of the public to register with the Chairman should they wish to speak to speak on a particular agenda item.

A group of residents expressed thanks to the Council for its support of their objections to a proposed development at Dabbs House.

A resident of Rookery Close informed the meeting that he had submitted an objection to UDC in respect of planning application UTT/16/1247/DFO and had sent the PC a copy.

The following points were raised:

- Essex Highways may have changed their opinion of the proposed access.
- The perceived overdevelopment of the site was exacerbated by the shortcomings of the access roads.
- It was believed that drainage of the site was being examined.
- Measurement of the access width indicated 4.72m where Essex Design Standards stipulated a minimum of 4.8m with extra width on bends.
- The submission was also being sent to UDC Cllrs Chambers and Redfern and ECC Cllr. Lodge.

Mr. LeClerq indicated an intention to register to speak at the UDC Planning Committee meeting.

Another resident expressed concerns with some of the PC's processes.

These included:

- Availability of documents within the required notice period for meetings.
- Timing of budget decisions and setting of precept.
- Availability of supporting financial information.
- Items included in the PC budget which were not explicitly mentioned as agenda items; this meant comments by the public could only be made by those present at meetings.

Cllr. Gregory commented that he believed the agenda was agreed and circulated within the required time, but sometimes amplifying documents were not available until late in the process and, in his view, timely consideration of the matters would be prejudiced by deferring them.

He apologised if requested material had not been supplied in good time.

Cllr. Gregory also explained that the PC's policy was to hold reserves against the possibility that the Neighbourhood Plan and controversial planning applications could require professional advice and it was not always possible to quantify requirements in advance. It was hoped that this would not be necessary, but the PC needed to be in a position to do this for essential matters.

In response to a question about where in the process provision for the community orchard had been made, it was stated that this was a contingency and had not been agreed yet.

In reply to a question about the relationship was between the PC and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, it was stated that the NPSG covered two parishes and was independent of both PCs, although there were some members in common. The agendas and minutes of the NPSG were freely available to anyone who asked, although they were routinely circulated only to the members of the groups. Expenditure was proposed by the NPSG and ratified by the PC. External contractors had been appointed after a bidding and tender process, and the PC was content that proper process had been followed.

It was suggested that there was little transparency of the NPSG's working to anyone who did not attend the meetings and that the minutes should be circulated to the village Google group.

Cllr. Gregory commented that the members were doing their best to manage a heavy workload and sometimes formal procedures were limited to the minimum appropriate. The conclusions of the group would be subject to approval or otherwise by referendum, and if not in accordance with residents' wishes would be voted down. No decisions would be possible without the approval of the voters and the inspector.

16/092 Planning

To consider any comments to be returned to Uttlesford District Council (UDC) on the following application:

UTT/16/1239/HHF Increase the height of existing fence to rear from 95cm to 170cm

Location: - Chestnut View Carmel Street Great Chesterford CB10 1PH

Resolved: No Objection

UTT/16/1247/DFO The reserved matters application, following outline application UTT/14/0425/OP for the construction of 12 new dwellings, covering access, layout, scale, landscaping and appearance.

Location: - Land North Of Bartholomew Close Great Chesterford

Resolved: Strong Objection and to delegate a PC member to speak at committee.

The PC endorsed the detailed submission already made by local residents.

The PC's grounds for objection included:

Inappropriately high density

Inadequate parking provision

Insufficient width and capacity of access via Rookery Close

Danger to children and other residents due to increased traffic flow in an already congested area, particularly at the point at which Rookery Close joins Spencer Road.

UTT/16/1510/HHF Enclosure of side veranda to form part of dwelling

Location: - South Cottage South Street Great Chesterford CB10 1NW

Resolved: No Comment

UTT/16/1511/LB Enclosure of side veranda to form part of dwelling. Exposure of stud work, relocation of pipe work and water cylinder. Formation of shower room in first floor bedroom and increase in height of existing bathroom ceiling. Insertion of new roof light and new window..

Location: - South Cottage South Street Great Chesterford CB10 1NW

Resolved: No Comment

16/093 Neighbourhood Plan.

There had been no further meeting since the Annual Village Meeting. The planning consultants has visited the village and taken photographs as part of report preparation.

16/094 Finance

The receipts and payments made since last meeting were approved without comment.

With respect to the request for funding from the Community Centre, it was agreed that the Centre was of enormous value to the community and that the PC had a responsibility to support it. The current request was for just one year, but it was expected that there was a likelihood of similar calls being necessary in future years. The PC was supportive of the CC's plans to cater for a wider base of users. It was resolved to grant the request for £6,000.

The bowls club had made a request for financial assistance towards provision of a mains electricity supply to their club house.

It was resolved to make a donation of £400 from the S.137 donations budget.

The Allotment Association had requested £500 toward provision of water troughs.

It was resolved to grant the request, funded from the residue of grant monies already allocated to the allotment project.

16/095 Risk Assessment Review

Cllr. Bevens agreed to review the existing Risk Assessment and recommend revisions if necessary. The Clerk was asked to ascertain the recommended review period for future assessments.

16/096 Removal of traffic signs

It was agreed to defer this item to next month's meeting.

16/097 Allotments

It was reported that there was one plot remaining. The water supply and access was now in place and all as up and running. Delivery of the shed was still awaited. It was agreed that fund raising for the project had been "superb"

16/098 New Website

Progress by the developers had been disappointingly slow. It was suggested that the developers be given a deadline of August 1st for the system to be up-and-running on the Village Website.

16/099 Outdoor Gym

Cllr. Redfern had sought advice about selection of suitable equipment from Clare Thompson who was a professional fitness trainer. Quotes had been requested from a number of suppliers and would be passed to Ms. Thompson for comment.

It was understood that RoSPA preferred equipment to be of metal construction rather than wood which had a tendency to deteriorate.

The clerk was asked to contact our insurance company to ascertain whether any changes to our policy would be required.

It was agreed that existing users of the recreation ground would be consulted to ensure that the sites chosen would not conflict with existing pitch use.

16/100 Community Orchard

It was reported that the Allotment Association had offered help with planting.
The PC was generally in favour of the project, but would defer final approval until drawings of the proposal became available following guidance to be obtained from appropriate advisers to be consulted, and account taken of the likely location of the proposed pre-school.

16/101 Matters for further discussion.

Preparation of invitations to tender for the Preschool provision.

16/102 Date of Next Meeting.

The next meeting of the Parish Council is to be held on Wednesday 13th July 2016 at 7:30 in the Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 9:20pm

Signed (Chairman).....

Date: 13th July 2016