

REEPHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting

Methodist Schoolroom on Tuesday 28th March 2017 at 7.30pm.

Present: Cllr D Perkins, who presided. Cllrs P Stuffins, B Tebbs, N Ward, A Clay and S Crease with the Clerk, Mr B Wharton.

C/Cllr I Fleetwood and D/Cllrs M Palmer and C Darcel also attended.

28 Residents attended following the 'drop-in' that had been organised by Globe Consultants representing Good's farm development. Representations of many and varied points of view were made: these were noted and summarised. This summary has been forwarded to Globe Consultants and is included in the Parish Council report in the Reepham News. A copy is attached to these minutes and is intended to continue the free flow of information between all the interested parties so that decisions may be made on all available information and feelings.

It had been intended that Luke Brown, who presented 'Neighbourhood Plans' at the last meeting, would again present to the residents to convey the importance of pre-deciding the wishes of the Parish to guide subsequent planning applications. Sadly, Mr Brown has now left WLDC and did not attend. 5 residents did, however, show an interest and examples of existing neighbourhood plans were requested for them to peruse.

7 residents stayed to observe the remainder of the meeting.

MATTERS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A resident of Station Road reiterated their request for the reinstatement of the kissing gate on the footpath between Station Road and Mellows Close. This is covered under item 7 of the agenda.

1. Apologies.

Cllrs D World (holiday) and A Brammer (via Cllr Crease at the meeting). D/Cllr Welburn, sent apologies.

2. Minutes of the Meeting held on 28th February 2017.

At the proposal by Cllr N Ward, seconded by Cllr P Stuffins, it was resolved that the minutes be accepted.

3. Clerk's Report

The Play Park Inspection has been completed. A copy of the report to be circulated for perusal and decisions on action.

LALC membership renewal was received. At the proposal of Cllr S Crease, seconded by Cllr A Clay it was resolved that this be renewed (see section 5).

The Spring Litter Pick is logged for 9th April at 10.00am. It was suggested that we cater for 40 people – clerk to obtain from WLDC.

REEPHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting

There is a problem with the Hawthorn Road notice board which blew down during Storm Doris. Although the notice board has been repaired, there is an objection to replacing it in its earlier location. LCC confirm that the surface rights to all the land from the kerb edge to the hedge (or wall) in front of the properties belongs to LCC and that the board could be replaced. It is intended, however, to investigate an alternative location.

The Manor Rise Play Park notice board is still awaited.

LCC Highways confirmed that the railings on Kennel Lane bridge are not dangerous and still rescheduled for replacement in 2018/19.

4. Correspondence

LCR – Magazine.

LALC – Magazine.

Glasdon – Magazine.

D/Cllrs Welburn and Palmer – report for March.

C/Cllr Fleetwood – report for March.

LCC Highways – re Kennel Lane bridge.

Cllr World – concerns (in his absence) re Goods farm development.

Grant Thornton – advance information on the Annual Audit.

WLDC – Survey for Broadband provision.

LCC – information on Greetwell Road improvements.

E.ON – contract rates.

KnowHow Plan – the warranty expires on the office laptop on 28th April – cover would be £181 for 4 years covers. At the proposal of Cllr P Stuffins, seconded by Cllr S Crease it was resolved that this warranty not be taken up.

5. Financial Matters

Presentation of Accounts:

Glendale – Ivy spray and removal, railway side spray.	£ 186.00
E.ON – Christmas tree lights	£ 4.11
Play Inspection Company (cross - ref to item 3)	£ 78.00
LALC – subscription (cross – ref to item 3)	<u>£ 257.59</u>
	£ 525.70

At the proposal of Cllr A Clay, seconded by Cllr B Tebbs, it was carried that these cheques be signed.

Glendale – the quote was received for the contract for various hedge cutting and spraying activities for the coming year. Chairman queried whether this company had reached the 5-year limit and would need to compete with other companies. It was affirmed that these activities had not yet reached 5 years though the grass cutting would require competitive quotes for next year. At the proposal of Cllr N Ward, seconded by Cllr B Tebbs it was resolved that these quotes be accepted.

REEPHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting

6. Planning Matters

There are no applications outstanding at present and a decision has been received on the application for Vicarage Cottage.

Good's Farm Development:

There were no specific discussions nor specifics on the earlier presentations. Chairman did précis his understanding of the events to assist the clerk in the summary that was to be prepared. Some general discussions followed but no resolves.

Neighbourhood Plans: As it appears that the WLDC officer who is now responsible for liaising with Parish Councils is a resident of Reepham, it was suggested that he be invited to attend the Annual Parish Meeting along with those who have shown an interest to investigate ways forward.

7. Roads and Footways

LCC Grass cutting policies: The latest information had been circulated partially retracting the cessation of the grant but reducing it to 20%. LCC Highways required confirmation that Parish Councils wished to continue to cut their village verges. At the proposal of Cllr P Stuffins, seconded by Cllr B Tebbs, it was resolved that this confirmation be sent. Noted that the crossing lights at the railway crossing were still not replaced – C/Cllr Fleetwood to investigate.

8. Field Footpaths and Bridleways

Kissing gate; further to the earlier presentation by a resident and confirmation from LCC, it was confirmed that the replacement of the gate was resolved at the February meeting LCC also confirmed that the original style of gate was acceptable. It was left to the clerk to seek out alternatives, obtain costs and re-present the findings. A site visit was suggested during the 'litter pick' day to check measurements and ascertain the possibility of surface paving, etc.

9. Conservation Areas

Pothole damage along Smooting Lane has been reported to LCC Highways

10. Amenity Areas

It was proposed by Cllr B Tebbs, seconded by Cllr S Crease, it was resolved that the metal sign having the information of the postcode for Manor Rise and the request of 'No Dogs' be purchased from Signs of the Times as in their recent quotation.

REEPHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting

11. Business for the Next Agenda

Nil.

Meeting ends....2124.

Summary of the residents' comments at the 28th March meeting.

The Parish Council have asked me to write and summarise the views of the residents that were expressed at the Parish Meeting on Tuesday 28th March as they wish to ensure that the views of the whole community are accurately presented at this stage, supporters and objectors alike. Philip and Joe Good also attended and no doubt they will have already updated you on what they heard. Thank you also for providing the opportunity for the residents to 'drop-in' and view the concept proposals on the 23rd March, to question and to develop their initial thoughts. It was most helpful in ensuring that the residents were speaking at the Council meeting after considering the details and having had the opportunity to reflect on matters.

28 residents (including the Goods) attended the meeting to present their individual cases, though this was a meeting only to first assess the general feeling within the community: the fact that many were absent does not infer that their, perhaps not yet formed, ideas can be ignored. Of the 28, 16 individuals spoke, some with a repeated input at a later stage. Individual comments of husband and wife on different occasions were treated as separate inputs.

There were no objections to the development of the farmyard in principle although there were comments that any development should respect the character of the village.

However, almost everyone had concerns about one aspect or another, with some disagreement between parties.

Scale and Traffic were concerns that were most often expressed and were shared by the majority of those present, each aspect would adversely affect the character of the village both in the immediate neighbourhood and, following traffic increases, in other areas. There were also many comments about the merits of an alternative access from Wragby Road or Kennel Lane.

Scale: A need for affordable housing was identified by a number of speakers but it was felt that, despite this and the extended period over which it was proposed to build the houses, the whole project would be more in keeping with the village if the size of the development was scaled down. There were comments on changes to the demographic affecting the size of the intake at the school. Some residents commented that the reduction in scale would then require other sites to be developed to reach the 15% requirement and this they considered to be a preferable form of development. Conversely, there was also limited support for the project to proceed as it stands. It was also suggested that the whole build would disproportionately increase the housing stock in the 'ancient core' between the Church Lane/High Street junction through to Smooting Lane.

Traffic: The scale of the present proposal immediately leads to concerns over traffic, those with children in the immediate area being worried especially and there was a strong opinion by many that the present and projected traffic movements that were quoted are far from realistic. There was disagreement over exactly which areas would become more under stress should traffic all traverse the Church Lane-The Green-Smooting Lane routes: a point being made that Chapel Close junction with the High Street would see virtually every one of the increase passing by. In general,

the junctions would have an increased load and two-way traffic, riding up onto the verges along narrow kerb-free roads would inevitably reduce their picturesque qualities. A problem that already exists on Smooting Lane and The Green

Alternative Access: The alternative of a separate access road, earlier presented by a resident, though considered for its merits did not receive total agreement. There was no consensus as to whether a route to Wragby Road or the Kennel Lane would be preferable. The option of pedestrian access/egress only led to argument over whether the new residents would feel themselves more integrated or not. The majority present appeared to favour either a more modest development accessing onto the village roads or a separate vehicular access road to cater for the traffic from a development of the size presently being proposed. There was also comment regarding the possibility of unwelcome large scale development occurring in the future once an access road to the north had been constructed. Increased heavy traffic during the build brought a suggestion of the possibility of a hard-core access road being built for the duration with later disposal.

At the conclusion, Philip addressed the meeting thanking the Parish Council for giving him the opportunity to hear the comments and concerns of the residents. He declined from making a detailed response to the issues raised but did make the point that the heavy construction would be built in the early days so that there would not be any need to return with the heavy equipment. He also confirmed that a further round of consultations would be made before any planning application was submitted to West Lindsey.