**Peterston-super-Ely Community Council**

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

**Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held at 7.30pm on 11th July 2016 at the Church & Community Hall, Peterston-super-Ely**

**Present:** Councillors:Cllr Jan Parry (Chairman), Ian Pearson (Vice-Chair), Cllrs Pat Cadwalladr, Bill Budd, David Jaques, Cllr Ray Petre, David Moody-Jones, & Michael Morgan.

**Also Present:** Joanna Howell (Clerk to the Council), CC Rhodri Traherne and Inspector Gary Smart (South Wales Police)

**Apologies:**  PCSO Kieron Byrne

Cllr Parry welcomed everyone to the meeting. She explained that before the Council meeting there would be an open session with Inspector Gary Smart, in order for those members of the public present to express their views and concerns to Inspector Smart.

The session was well attended by the public and the main themes of the issues raised were:-

* The lack of police presence during the recent crime spate which many residents felt would have reduced the number of crimes
* In some instances the time it took for the police to respond to crime reports
* The crimes occurring on the land at Station Terrace.
* The Inspector was also given a number of complaints to take away and look into regarding road safety in particular those provided by the School Crossing Patrol Officer.

Inspector Smart wished to stress to residents the importance of the following:-

* Reporting every single crime or Anti –Social behaviour in order that the Police have a clear and accurate picture of what is occurring in the village.
* The importance of calling 999 if a crime is currently being committed even if you are not certain or it does not appear to be an emergency.
* The importance of reporting on the 101 number any intelligence that may be of use e.g. suspicious items found, suspicious vehicles etc.
* Any unusual or anti-social behaviour in the village e.g. graffiti, fly tipping – if you have any questions on this or whether something has been reported by the CC, contact the Clerk.

Neighbourhood Watch – A number of people also volunteered to help with Neighbourhood Watch schemes.

Cllr Parry thanked Inspector Smart for giving up his valuable time and for all the residents who attended the meeting and expressed their views. At this point Cllr Parry declared the ordinary meeting of the Council open.

1. **Police Matters**

*AP Clerk to continue to gather volunteers and information about Neighbourhood Watch programme*

1. **County Council Matters**

Cllr Parry welcomed CC Rhodri Traherne to the meeting. CC Traherne had a number of issues to update the Council on:-

* Merger with Cardiff- The VoG Council leader Neil Moore believes that now Leighton Andrews has been replaced there is opportunism that a different approach will be taken, and that the merger with Cardiff may well not happen.
* Creative Rural Communities – It is likely that the CRC team will be merged with the regeneration teams. This is fine but CC Traherne will be keeping an eye on services provided. CC Traherne also ran through some of the themes that will be looked at in terms of project funding.
* Planning Office – They will not be sending through planning papers for each application, however if there is a specific one of interest the Clerk can request the papers. The Chair queried whether this Council should now be commenting on every planning application even if they had no comments, CC Traherne did not believe that was the case but would check.
*AP CC Traherne to check and report back to Clerk*
* Community Asset Transfers – Although this will not affect the transfer of the playing fields in PsE, in the future there is a very detailed protocol to follow in terms of completing asset transfers. On this matter CC Traherne wanted to stress to the Council that they should not feel any pressure to take on new services/assets from the VoG Council.
* Car Parking Charges in local town car parks – They are still awaiting the Cabinet Report on this.
* The Chair asked CC Traherne to attempt to speed up the issue of the playing field lease to this Council.
1. **Public Session**

There were three members of the public present.

One member of the public wished to raise a number of serious concerns he had about the MUGA project after attending the recent public meeting:-

Appropriateness:

* After speaking to a number of people in the village there was some concern over the appropriateness of the MUGA in such a small village especially considering its impact in terms of size and lighting.
* A standard MUGA would be around 680 sqm - and a small MUGA village MUGA would be 450 sqm. The MUGA proposed will be 1500 sqm. MUGAs of this size are normally aligned with schools or sports centres
* Conservation areas in the Vale - very few with MUGAS - not aware of any with lights
* Colwinston and Wenvoe have MUGAs but not within the Conservation Area - and the Colwinston one doesn't have floodlights
* This is a very large project for the village/ PCC with bigger than normal risks - as it will need to be run on a more commercial basis.
* Proper due-diligence needs be undertaken by the PCC - it needs to be right.

Floodlighting

* This is the biggest area of concern for most people together with the attendant risks/ issues of light pollution
* The columns are planned to be between 6 - 8 metres high
* There will be an impact on wildlife - bats, birds, rabbits etc. A full assessment needs to be undertaken.
* Currently during the winter evening there is total darkness after sunset. With the floodlights there will be a block of white light within the Conservation Area - which can be seen from the Church, Le Sor Hill, the houses around the playing field, The Stone Bridge, along the road by the river and elements of Wyndham Park
* Will be more obvious in the Winter when the leaves are off the trees
* These could be on 7 days a week (in the Winter) and late into the evening

Noise Pollution

* Noise is a common problem/ concern with MUGAs
* Currently, after dark, there is no noise emanating from this area - and little or no background noise. The new noise will be very obvious after say 6.00pm when the noise will carry even further.
* Two types of noise will arise from the MUGA:the ball hitting the MUGA's steel cage, Even with dampeners the noise is excessive and shouting/ noise from participants (some of which could be from outside the village
* Again this could be 7 days a week and late into the evening

Parking

* This is already a problem by the Church
* Cars will park on the pavement - thus forcing people, including young children, to walk on the main road up to the junction. There have already been narrow escapes with people walking on the road in the dark up to the main junction. Parking on the pavement etc. will also cause problems with disabled access, including wheelchairs.
* When cars are parked on both sides of the road then emergency vehicles - ambulances, fire engines cannot get through.
* With increased activity with the MUGA then consideration will need to be given to double yellow lines, a one way system and appropriate no entry signs

Anti -Social Behaviour

* Not much recently - but there is history of such activity. The level of litter is bound to increase with plastic bottles/ rubbish being left on the field or thrown into the bushes when people walk to/ from the MUGA.
* Lack of toilet facilities - people will do their business out in the open under the cover of darkness
* Due to the commercial nature of the MUGA it is likely that people outside the village will participate in the evening. This may increase the risk of burglaries by bringing more people into the village during darkness - to add to the recent problems with break-ins in the village.
* Nightime use of the MUGA will exacerbate the problem.
* There will also be noise when people leave the facility late in the evening.

Finances/ Business Plan

* Currently there is a lack of detailed understanding of the costs and income involved in the project - save some high level generic figures produced by a third party
* This is a large capital project with big risks for the residents of Peterston as shown by what has happened to the tennis club, when they couldn't afford to replace the playing surface.
* There are questions to be answered over who will own the asset? Who will be responsible for the maintenance? What happens when key people lose interest and leave? Cost of replacing the surface in 10/12 years’ time.
* Colwinston Village Hall refused to pick up the maintenance costs and required formal undertakings and assurances from the groups involved.
* A proper business plan is required - which will need to be stress tested.

Governance

* This is a large project for the village
* We need robust governance procedures to protect the interests of the residents. We need check and balances to ensure things are done properly
* Councillors have already raised concerns, in the sub-committee meetings, regarding the level of communication with the residents
* I have spoken to a range of people in the village and it is clear that people do not fully understand what's involved. Some are aware of the MUGA but they are unaware of the floodlighting the extended evening use and the attendant issues/ problems arising.
* This project is big enough and important enough to be discussed at the PCC level so all of the councillors can contribute rather than being left to a sub-committee when sometimes only one councillor is present and therefore not quorate.

All of the risks and issues (as detailed above) need to fully considered and debated by the council and all options considered. For example, would a village type MUGA in the primary school be more appropriate so children can use it on a daily basis.

Two members of the public working on the MUGA project were also present and wished to comment on some of the previous comments/questions.

* There is definitely awareness, understanding and appreciation for the concerns around this project. The project started in 2012 and at numerous points through the process the public have been consulted using a wide method of communication. The project itself stemmed from the fact that if nothing was done, basically the area would become derelict.
* There are a lot of specialists involved in the project group including planners, architects, landscape planners, project managers etc.
* The planning has not yet been submitted and in the drafting the concerns are being taken into account.
* The reason for the floodlighting is without increasing the usage of the facility e.g. in winter months in the late afternoon/evening then the facility would not be financially viable. 8m-6m is the height recommended by different specialists and the light ‘leakage’ has been analysed. The current proposal is that the floodlighting will automatically switch off at 9pm.
* Parking Issues – The Sportsman’s Pub already has an agreement with the PsE football team for parking in their car park and a similar idea would be broached with them. As most people using the MUGA would be local hopefully a lot will walk/cycle. It is not anticipated that the facility will be used a lot by outside group other than away teams.
* There was a reminder that the Community Council does not have the authority to give consent for the MUGA but have the authority to ask the VoG Council to give the consent. It is the VoG Council who will take the final decision and will request all of the appropriate information and consultations to make that decision.
* The VoG Ecologist has indicated that there is no need for an ecological report at this point and the VoG will determine the effect on the conservation area. Photos will be taken from the key overlooking sites and close residential properties to submit with the planning.

At this point it was indicated that the issues/ concerns previously raised by the member of the public should be fully considered and debated by the PCC - not by the MUGA project representative.

The Chair thanked everyone for their comments and closed the public session

1. **Matters arising from Public Session**

The Chair wished to confirm that all matters discussed in the subcommittee meetings were brought to the attention of the full Community Council and all decisions were made at full Community Council meetings.

As the next agenda item was in relation to the MUGA, she proposed they moved onto this point.

1. **Consideration of MUGA Planning**

Cllr Budd had concerns over the financial control of the project and proposed that no planning application could be submitted until a business plan had been drafted and assessed by the Council. This plan must include how ongoing maintenance costs are going to be paid for. He felt it was a very high risk project so the financials must be sound. After a detailed discussion Cllr Morgan counter proposed that the planning application could be submitted without the full financials as a successful planning application does not mean you have to go ahead with the project. He did believe that it was important for the Councils when considering the planning take into account the observations of the Community both from previous meetings and from tonight.

The Chair believed that as the Council had not yet seen the planning application it would not be possible to confirm any planning anyway tonight and so these motions did not have to be considered. It was felt it would not be a problem to develop the business plan and consider it at the same time as the planning application.

The Chair confirmed that the MUGA group should put together the planning with their preferred options for the pathway and storage, and then the Council could comment on it as the whole package. The Chair therefore proposed that the Council hold an extraordinary meeting during the summer in order to approve the planning application and business plan.

*AP Clerk to arrange extraordinary meeting and ensure planning application submitted for review in plenty of time before this meeting*

1. **Consideration of effects of electrification of the railway – See Cllrs Reports**

It was agreed to defer this matter to the September meeting.

1. **To receive the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting and AGM held on 14th May**

**2016**

The minutes of the meeting had been previously circulated by the Clerk and were accepted unanimously as a true and accurate record. It was proposed by Cllr Pearson and seconded by Cllr Morgan that they be accepted. The Minutes were then signed as a true and accurate record by the Chair.

1. **Matters Arising from these minutes**

AGM Minutes

Paragraph 16.1

It was agreed to defer the decision on the work to the white steps until the September meeting

Paragraph 17

In the absence of any other Councillors able to do the Governors Role, Cllr Parry had agreed to be the Council’s representative on the School Governing Body until May 2017.

Ordinary Meeting Minutes

Paragraph 31.3

Fencing of Playing Fields – The Clerk explained that despite asking for quotes from five companies only one company NP Landscaping had actually come back with a quote. The details of the quote were discussed and it was proposed by Cllr Pearson that the NP Landscaping quote be accepted, this was seconded by Cllr Budd and agreed by all.

It was RESOLVED that NP Landscaping be contracted to replace the playground fencing.

*AP Clerk to arrange for work to be completed*

Paragraph 31.6

Weed Killer on the Playground - *AP Clerk Jaques to do*

Paragraph 36

Tennis Club fencing – The Clerk confirmed that the tennis club had had this replaced.

1. **Clerk’s Report**

The clerk’s report was reviewed; the majority of items had already been discussed.

Permission requested from the ‘raise the roof’ fundraising committee for Churchyard Fundraising Thermometer and the use of the playing fields for a pet show – At this point Cllr Parry and Cllr Moody Jones wished to declare their interest as members of the fundraising committee and PCC respectively. They did not take part in the further discussion or vote. Cllr Budd proposed that permission was granted for both; this was seconded by Cllr Jaques and agreed by all.
It was RESOLVED to provide permission for the use of the Churchyard and the Playing fields for the charity thermometer and the playing fields respectively.

*AP Clerk to inform fundraising committee*

Authority for expenditure

The following expenditure was agreed and cheques were signed by two councillors.

04-Jul J Shapland - plants and materials for troughs 728 84.97

27-May Jo Howell - may salary and expenses 729 317.89

04-Jul Jo Howell June salary and expenses 729 82.13

04-Jul Arborwood Tree Care 730 600.00

The receipts for the month were reviewed.

Current balance as at 06/07/2016 of CB= £15,618 (incl playstation reserve £744)

Balance of MUGA sub account - £2,591

The bank reconciliations for May and June had been produced and reviewed by Cllr Pearson – Cllr Pearson formally approved and signed the bank reconciliations.

The Quarterly Budget analysis for June has been completed and previously circulated. There were no questions on the budget analysis. The Clerk wished to suggest the following changes to the budget:-

• Need additional budget for phone box painting £250 and bus shelter painting £300 (for both). The Clerk proposed the Council remove £1000 from Salt Bin line which was no longer needed and insert a Maintenance of Village Line for these items and similar?

• Need additional budget of £1,500 on the riverbank work line for the additional cost of the bollard replacement work propose that this comes from road safety budget

•A Discussion needed on £7k in budget for Road Safety and whether that should stay for now or be reallocated.

It was proposed by Cllr Cadwalladr and seconded by Cllr Jaques that the budget changes as suggested by done, and that in the September meeting what to do with the remaining road safety budget be considered.

It was RESOLVED to take £1,000 from the Salt Bin budget and change to a Maintenance of Village Budge and to take £1,500 from the road safety budget to the riverbank work budget.

*AP Clerk to make budget changes*

1. **Planning Matters**

 2016/00782/FUL (HD)- Three Horse Shoes, Peterston Super Ely. A pergola, decking area, ramp and double doors

 2016/00527/LBC (PDJT)- 16, Cory Crescent, Peterston Super Ely. Various works are required due to the ingress of (non-rising) damp in several rooms

 There were no comments from the Council on these applications.

1. **Correspondence**

These were reviewed and acknowledged, there was no additional correspondence to add.

1. **Councillors Reports**

The previously circulated Councillors reports were reviewed. The report re the lack of vision for drivers due to the overgrown riverbank at Wyndham Park was discussed.

*AP Clerk to contact landowner and ask for it to be cut back.*

There being no further business the meeting closed at 10.15pm.

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

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