**Peterston-super-Ely Community Council**

***Cyngor Cymuned a Llanbedr-y-Fro***

**Minutes of the remote Ordinary Meeting held at 7.30pm on 9th November, 2020 held on Zoom**

**Present:** Councillors: David Moody-Jones, David Field, Abigail Phillips, Diana Powell, John Drysdale, Huw Potter & David Jaques

**Also Present:** Tor Trundle (Clerk to the Council), C Cllr Michael Morgan

**Apologies :** Cllr Kate Hurley

**92 Declarations of interest**

Cllr Field raised one declaration of interest in relation to the discussion of the J34/A48 being a member of Cottrell Park Golf Club and Cllr Drysdale regarding the street lighting at Le Sor Hill

**93 Police Matters**

An email had been received from PCSO Richard Davies confirming the figures for October:

One anti-social behaviour: one unnamed farm, Peterston Super Ely – COVID-19 breach, pumpkin picking

Two burglary: one caravan burglary - Drope Terrace, Drope – tools stolen, no suspects identified; One shed burglary – Station Road, Peterston Super Ely – no items taken but damage caused

One fraud: One business fraud – Station Road, Peterston Super Ely – enquiries still ongoing

One theft: One attempted theft of mini digger – Lane of Pendoylan Road – person arrested

PCSO Richard Davies confirmed that he would not be attending future Community Council meetings due to current police practice.

**94 County Council Matters**

**J34/A48 Consultation**

C Cllr Morgan confirmed that he had arranged a ZOOM meeting on 3rd November between Emma Reed, Head of Neighbourhood & Transport along with a number of our Community Councillors and Councilors from Pendoylan, Welsh St Donat’s, St Georges and St Brides . The Councillors were given an update on the Consultation and there was opportunity to raise questions. Councillor Morgan was concerned that clear answers were not given to some questions and had raised the following matters by way of an email to the Vale Council:

* The question was asked whether “do minimum” effectively means “do nothing”. The reply was that “do minimum” means maintenance of the existing roadway with possibly no improvement. Most people that contact C Clr Morgan locally do object to the two road schemes and to the scale of the proposed alternative “improvements”. Is it not possible to include consideration of more modest improvements to the existing road - addressing visibility issues and pinch points?
* In response to a question about the “human cost “of the proposals, attendees were referred to data in the consultation. It would be helpful to have a clear answer on how many houses would be demolished or blighted as a result of either of the proposals and how many families would be displaced.
* There is concern about the proposed closure of the lanes leading to Peterston from Pendoylan via Clawdd Coch and Gwern-y-Steeple. C Cllr Morgan confirmed they were told that these were matters of detail that would be resolved later in the process. He felt that these questions are addressed now. These lanes are vital to our local communities (particularly the farmers). Closing these lanes would isolate homes, divide the two villages and would drive all traffic up and down the Logwood hill - this roadway is already a rat run, unsuitable for the existing level of traffic and would not cope with the increased traffic flow caused by the lane closures and indeed those taking shortcuts through Peterston to gain access to Junction 34.
* The Climate emergency and the environmental considerations should be a priority in this consultation. In particular, there is concern that the earthworks contemplated by these proposals will affect the water table and the surface water from any new road will need to drain somewhere. The data provided by National Resources Wales is from 2006 and does anticipate increased flooding in the future (albeit a 1000-year period.) The village of Peterston has previously been affected by flooding perhaps every three years or so but in recent years this has been more frequent and severe. Between Autumn 2019 and Spring 2020 there were three severe floods in Peterston - cutting off the roads and causing damage to property. The problem is getting worse and we need clear and specific advice on the likely effect of these road works on future flooding.
* Have the National Trust been consulted on these proposals?  Lanlay Meadows, a 24-acre block of land adjoining the River Ely from Peterston to Pendoylan moors is the only freehold property owned by the Trust in the Vale of Glamorgan and is a haven of peace and tranquillity.  C Cllr Morgan knows this land better than most - it was acquired from his family by the trust some years ago as it was untouched by modern farming methods and is rich in biodiversity. The meadows are less than a mile across country from Pendoylan and will be adversely affected by sound pollution if vehicles are expected to travel at 60 mph through the valley. In addition, the river banks have been eroded during recent years by high river levels and debris and there is concern that this could be exacerbated by the run off of water from any new construction. It would be helpful to know whether the National Trust have addressed these issues.

A discussion followed between Councillor Morgan and Peterston Community Councilors:

The blocking of roads at Gwern Y Steepl and Clawdd Coch were highlighted as potential issues, together with the possibility that if these proposals fail, would the Vale Council do any improvements at pinch points on some of the rural lanes within the ward? It may be residents’ opinion that they do not want a 60mph road but a better flow of traffic would be welcomed. Cllr Phillips pointed out that this solution had been discounted as it did not reach the required level of improvement. Cllr Drysdale pointed out that many Local Authorities in other areas have been introducing calming measures such as pinch points to increase safety. He further felt that the argument, not being considered was having a road with natural pinch points being an advantage and that better passing points seemed a more sensible option. C Cllr Morgan urged residents to respond to the consultation and to confirm exactly why they may not want any of the particular proposals but also to offer solutions to the current issues looking at how to balance convenience whilst understanding the environmental impact. C Cllr Morgan confirmed that he would be engaging with the community over the coming month and holding individual together with group zoom sessions.

Cllr Jaques wondered what the residents of Pendoylan felt about the current proposal. C Cllr Morgan confirmed that some of the Councillors on the Pendoylan Community Council were individually impacted and therefore had to declare an interest in relation to the consultation. A separate group - Vale Communities for Future Generations were the steering group and have posted a form on their Facebook feed which can be accessed and is linked to the Vale Council’s page. Cllr Phillips felt it was hard for residents of Pendoylan and the community at large who want a traffic solution but possibly not this particular type of trunk road. Proportionate traffic management would be encouraged but not this commuter route with increased traffic.

Cllr Drysdale referred to the consultation document and felt that it was full of bold statements on areas such as reduction in anticipated accidents yet there was no background information as to how these figures had been reached.

A further discussion was held on the impact of the road on flooding which was obviously a key fact that needed to be addressed, especially, in light of recent years where flooding had increased dramatically. C Cllr Morgan felt that a Flood Risk Assessment was required at this stage and not later down the line as was implied by the consultants.

Cllr Drysdale felt that this consultation seemed to be in conflict with Welsh Government policy and he wondered if there were grounds for a judicial review. He had been given a report which he was willing to pass over to members of the Community Council which may be of interest.

C Cllr Morgan referred to the report on the railway station and that this had been kept separate to this consultation and not linked. Cllr Drysdale felt that it would be more pertinent to have an integrated transport policy and it did not make any sense to have this as an independent consideration and this should be reviewed in conjunction with the Active Travel Bill. He also pointed out that after the money spent last year on the improvements at Sycamore Junction, how would it make sense for this to be taken away and replaced by a roundabout.

Cllr Jaques felt that the consultation should also be reviewed in conjunction with Cardiff City Region deal. Cllr Field wondered under the current circumstance of the pandemic and the inability to hold consultations, should this consultation be delayed. However, C Cllr Morgan felt that this would only delay the inevitable and that it would be good to see this consultation run a natural course and for the project to be placed on hold for possibly another 15 years. Cllr Field pointed out that the consultation needed to be finalised by the end of March and this in itself seemed a hard task,

A further discussion would be held under Agenda Item 10 in relation to the Community Council’s approach to the dissemination of the consultation to residents.

* **Lighting at Le Sor Hill –** C Cllr Morgan had been approached in relation to street lighting on Le Sor Hill which was not currently working. The Clerk confirmed that this had already been reported to Contact One Vale at the Council.

**C Cllr Morgan asked if any local residents have any matters to raise, they can contact him by phone on 07771-803639 or email** [**mjmorgan@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk**](mailto:mjmorgan@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)

***Action: Cllr Drysdale to forward above mentioned report for Councillors’ consideration.***

**95 Public Session and Matters arising from Public Session**

There were no members of public present.

**96 To receive the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 12th October, 2020**

The minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting had been previously circulated by the Clerk and were accepted unanimously as a true and accurate record. Proposed by Cllr Drysdale and Cllr Jaques that the minutes be accepted.

**97 To consider matters arising from these minutes.**

Cllr Moody-Jones reviewed the minutes and it was noted that most items would be covered in the current agenda.

**98 To receive an update in relation to the MUGA**

'The Councillors of the MUGA Sub-committee and Clerk met on 19th October, 2020 to discuss a number of items in relation to the facility. A further meeting was hoped for on the 2nd November but had not been possible.   The CC had sent an email to TaSC in relation to a number of items but had not had a response to date. These issues now needed urgent attention, especially around necessary insurance provisions. In terms of other actions outstanding, Cllr Phillips confirmed that the PSECC / TaSC roles and responsibilities document currently under review would be finalised shortly and then incorporated into the draft Management Arrangement which had been drafted by Cllr Drysdale. It was agreed that this document should be shared with full Council and TaSC before both parties signed up to them. This was even more pertinent considering the fact that the facility had re- opened on 9th November.

Cllr Jaques wondered if the MUGA was still available for children to use during the day, considering the track and trace requirements. It was confirmed that this was still allowed - albeit that sessions would need to be pre booked. A discussion was held over the request for the club-house to be opened for users to be able to use the toilet. It was generally felt that this might mean higher risks in terms of COVID-19, as it would be much harder to ensure the necessary cleaning and other precautions were in place and it was noted that a lot of equipment was stored inside and there were many possible touch points.

Cllr Field pointed out that contact had been made by one of our previous Councillors regarding the required annual surface maintenance. The Clerk would need to check the schedule which was provided by SWSG after the completion of the project to determine when this was required. Cllr Field noted that the court had received this type of maintenance in May 2020 when SWSG re-visited as part of their original contract. Cllr Field also mentioned that he had been advised this would normally cost around £1600.

Cllr Jaques asked what would happen if TaSC ever disbanded and it was noted that the Community Council would be required to manage the facility. Cllr Drysdale pointed out that the draft Management Arrangement asked for bi-annual meetings with TaSC to ensure that communication was ongoing between both parties. It was also a requirement for TaSC to share the financial health of the organisation with the Community Council. By ensuring these lines of communication were ongoing, it was hoped to eliminate any unforeseen events,

***Action: Roles and Responsibilities document to be finalised by Cllr Phillips. Clerk to circulate this document together with draft Management Arrangement to Community Council. Sub-Committee to be arranged with TaSC***. ***Clerk to re-circulate maintenance schedule and contact SWSG regarding recent visit in May 2020 to determine if surface has received required treatment.***

**99 To receive a report from Cllr Jaques on the Plas Dwr development**

Cllr Jaques shared a plan of the Plas Dwr development with the Community Council and highlighted the relevant sections, providing an overview of the development and how it may impact on Peterston. He confirmed that the overall development was progressing really well and that his team were in charge of the Local Centre element, which included a Health Centre, retail, affordable housing and primary school. Cllr Jaques confirmed that this section of the plan would not be executed for at least another 18 months. He mentioned that it involved the closure of Pentrebane road which would become a walking and cycling route. Cllr Potter wondered when this would happen and Cllr Jaques confirmed it would be closed once the Centre was built. Cllr Jaques confirmed that he would circulate the plan for further consideration and if the Community Council wished to discuss any section in detail then he would be happy to do this. Cllr Jaques pointed out that improvements were scheduled for Llantrisant Road but there were no current plans to improve the lanes surrounding St Fagans. Cllr Field had brought this development to the attention of Arcadis, the consultants dealing with J34 who seemed unaware, which was in itself worrying. A discussion was held regarding the potential problems of commuters cutting through the lanes and it was recognised that there needed to be a balance. Cllr Field pointed out that residents had been concerned regarding the Medical Centre at Fairwater but Cllr Jaques confirmed that a new medical centre would be built at a certain point. Cllr Drysdale noted that this was a news item on the current Fairwater Medical centre website. It was confirmed that the development was around 4 years away from completion. Many of the Councillors wanted to determine how they could influence potential future developments and that Peterston as a whole always seemed to be on the wrong side of any development especially in relation to Section 106 investment. Previously a report had been circulated into the distribution of these moneys and it was agreed that the Clerk would re-circulate and a meeting would be arranged with Charlotte Pugh, Section 106 Officer at the Vale Council to look at potential projects and how Peterston could utilise said funds.

***Action: Clerk to re-circulate Section 106 report and set up meeting with two Councillors and Charlotte Pugh, Vale Council Section 106 Officer***.

**100 To receive a report from Cllr Field on the M4 Junction A48 Link – 3rd November, 2020 & proposed dissemination actions.**

Cllr Field, Potter and Moody-Jones attended the meeting held by the Vale Council on 3rd November, 2020 and Cllr Field had previously circulated a report to the Community Council. A general discussion was held to determine the best approach to encourage residents to respond to all of the proposals. It had been noted that the Vale Council had sent out letters and that notices had been erected around the village. Cllr Drysdale felt it was important to canvas as many residents as possible. Responses to consultations held more weight if it could refer to the number of people from whom responses had been received. It was agreed that the best course of action would be to draft a leaflet which covered the main points of the consultation and which gave responders the chance to tick a checklist, whilst urging people to get in touch. It would encourage people to respond and also gauge the type of responses. An email had been received from a member of the public who had stated that the online form available on the Council website was flawed and as a result it did not give the required options that would assist in a more detailed response. It was agreed that Cllr Drysdale and Cllr Field would draft a leaflet and the Community Council would arrange delivery. Cllr Phillips pointed out the Vale Communities for Future Generations have their own form on their Facebook page which is user friendly and which links in to the Vale Council.

***Action: Cllr Drysdale & Field to draft a leaflet encompassing all elements of the consultation. Once drafted Community Council to deliver to residents.***

**101 To receive an update from the Website working group**

Cllr Drysdale and Jaques had circulated a report on their findings in relation to their review of the current website. A recommendation had been made for the Community Council to have an independent website, which was separate to the Village Hall. The Clerk noted that historically the Community Council had been responsible for the payment of the domain fee and the annual subscription. Cllr Drysdale confirmed he would contact the Village Hall Administrators and determine best course of action. It was also noted that the Clerk would need to contact the current provider – Wix and determine when the contract was due for renewal and if it was possible to terminate the contract and take the domain name to a new provider.

***Action: Clerk to forward contact details for Hall Administrators and contact current provider Wix to ascertain if and when the contract could be terminated.***

**102 To consider the Clerk’s report including matters of a financial nature.**

All bank reconciliations have been forwarded to Cllr Field for review. I have ensured that the carry forward figure that was on the end of March 2020 in respect of £15 VAT amount for one of the playing fields cuts was noted in accordance with a chat with the internal auditor. It has resulted in a reduction in VAT received for this year by £15. All bank reconciliation reflect these carried forward figures for payments and receipts.

The bank balance for the end of October was £20,253 and there are no payments or receipts outstanding for that month.

All cheques for October have been passed to the bank signatories for signing.

**Payments/Receipts since last meeting (incl cheques raised but not yet signed)**

**RECEIPTS**

**There were no receipts**

**Payments and Authority for expenditure needed**

The following expenditure needs authorising by the Council: -

**Darren Meir (playing field cut-October) Cheque 1104 £ 90.00**

**Clerk Salary plus arears & expenses Cheque 1105 £ 432.07**

**HMRC PAYE (October 20) Cheque 1106 £ 96.80**

**Huw Moody Jones (cutting around signs) Cheque 1107 £ 40.00**

**One Voice Wales (Advanced finance course) Cheque 1108 £ 30.00**

**Kersh Grinnell (churchyard cuts -Sept&Oct Cheque 1109 £ 1686.66**

**VOID Cheque 1110 £ NIL**

**The Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal Cheque 1111 £ 25.00**

**St Peter’s Church (Ty Hafan donation) Cheque 1112 £ 50.00**

**Welsh Water (MUGA clubhouse) Cheque 1113 £ 5.25**

Cllr Drysdale asked if all payments and receipts need to be notified to the Community Council. The Clerk felt that this was a legal requirement but would double check.

***Action: Clerk to contact OVW and determine if reporting all payments and receipt is a legal requirement for each meeting.***

**Vale of Glamorgan Council -** a meeting with Emma Reed, Head of Neighbourhood & Transport in relation to the M4 J34 to A48 had been scheduled for 3rd November, 2020. Cllr Field, Moody-Jones & Potter were attending. Hard copy documents had been received from the Vale and given to the Clerk and Cllr Phillips. The presentation given at the meeting on the 3rd had been sent to Council for consideration.

**MUGA-** A meeting was held between Cllr Phillips, Field, Hurley & Drysdale and the Clerk to discuss emails received from TaSC and any other relevant items on 19th October, 2020. An email had been sent to TaSC on 24th October, 2020 but no response has been received from any of the trustees. As no response had been received, Sub-Committee had not been scheduled.

Hywel Thomas contacted the Clerk on Tuesday, 3rd November, 2020 regarding the required annual surface maintenance. The point had been discussed under point 98 of the minutes.

Cllr Drysdale had sourced one quote for the cutting back of weeds and laying of patio by the MUGA in the sum of £2000. The Clerk was sourcing like for like quote from at least one other supplier.

**Village Walkabout-** This has been scheduled for 16th November at 12:00. The Clerk suggests we meet at a central point and we will refer to the Fixed Asset register to determine our path.

**OVW**- November training sessions had been circulated and Code of conduct is available. Although Code of Conduct is not compulsory. It is felt appropriate training for Councillors.

**WCAG Deadline** Cllr Drysdale & Jaques met and discussed the current website. Report has been sent to Council for consideration.

**Playground-** The Clerk has received an email from Jerry Widdas regarding the TRIM TRAIL He has confirmed he will investigate the problem.

**Parish News -** A notice was placed in the November magazine in relation to the consultation on the road and it was confirmed that a December edition will also be produced. The Clerk has already submitted a Christmas greeting to be included.

**Churchyard -**A cheque was received from one resident in relation to a memorial plaque but the payee details were incorrect. The cheque has been returned. I am also currently in correspondence with two residents regarding purchase of a plot at St Peter’s Churchyard

**Donation to Ty Hafan**- donation was agreed for £50 and cheque has been made payable to St Peter’s Church who are coordinating donations

**Invoice from Huw Moody-Jones**-invoice received for £40 for clearing around the signs for April to October.

**General matters to bring to Council attention**

**Remembrance Guidance -**Guidance has been circulated for Remembrance Day. A donation was suggested for £25. Cllr Powell & Moody-Jones ratified this payment.

**Defibrillator pads -**currently sourcing quotes for replacement pads from Welsh Hearts and St Johns

**Hall HMRC -**working with the new Trustee on an ongoing basis to sort these issues.

**103 To consider any planning matters**

There were no new planning applications this month; two approved:

**2020/01084/FUL (WG) – 3 Dyffryn Crescent, Peterston Super Ely-** Proposed s ingle storey rear extension and associated landscaping – 29.9.20 – **Approved – 4.11.20**

**2020/01069/FUL (HUD) – Tegfan, Peterston Super Ely –** New application for the scheme to include rear elevation and dormer amendments following historical applications to the property – 23.9.20 – **Approved 4.11.20**

And two withdrawn:

**2020/00770/FUL (JK) – 22 Main Avenue, Peterston Super Ely –** Demolition of existing rear single storey extension and replacement with a 1 and 2 storey extension and external alterations. – 23.7.20 – **Withdrawn 20/10/20**

**2020/00652/FUL (JK) – Y Berllan, Peterston Super Ely**-Proposed construction of pool house – 2.7.20 – **withdrawn 19/10/20**

**104** **To consider any correspondence.**

A list of all correspondence received by the Clerk had been circulated previously to the Community Council. Any items that the Clerk felt needed Councillors’ attention had been forwarded. Cllr Drysdale wondered if there was a legal requirement for the logging of all correspondence.

***Action: Clerk to contact OVW and ask for advice in relation to the logging of correspondence.***

**105** **To consider any reports of Councillors**

Two reports had been made over the month of October

* Fly-tipping – near Bosch factory which had been reported and Enforcement were investigating.
* Street lighting not working on Le Sor Hill

A further report had been made a few days prior to the meeting:

* Items which suggest drug use at the pull in by the White Bridge - reported to the PCSO.

**106 To consider any Health & Safety matters, to include playground maintenance/checking**

Jerry Widdas had contacted the Clerk to confirm he would attend the items pointed out in the playground on the TRIM TRAIL but nothing had been received to date. Cllr Jaques and Drysdale pointed out that a number of stiles were increasingly hard to use and would forward the information to the Clerk. It prompted a discussion around the PROW meetings and the fact that a meeting was due with the Vale’s PROW Officer and PROW working group.

***Action: Clerk to contact Jerry Widdas and organise PROW meeting with Gwyn Teague and the working group.***

Cllr Drysdale informed the Community Council that a resident at Ael Y Bryn had kindly undertaken a task to clean up some of the unkempt allotments.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9:45pm. The next ordinary meeting will be held remotely on Zoom on Monday, January, 11th,2021 at 7.30pm.

Chair \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_