

GREAT LONGSTONE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL PARISH MEETING ON THURSDAY 25TH APRIL 2013

Present: Cllr Simon Headington (Chair), Cllr Peter Thompson, Cllr Wendy Long, Cllr Hugh Wright, Cllr James Cox and Sarah Stokes (Clerk).

Approx 60 parishioners at the meeting, including one youth.

The Chair opened the meeting at 7.30pm

1. Apologies for absence.

There were no apologies received.

2. Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting 29th March 2012.

The minutes were proposed by Cllr Headington and seconded by Catherine Wright, with all in favour.

3. Chairmans report.

The Chair submitted a written report to the meeting, a copy of which is retained in the Council minute book. The Chair reported on the small number of Cllrs on the PC, with the addition of two co opted members during the year, being Lorna Cooper and Godfrey Frankland. Following the departure of Lorna and Godfrey, the PC co opted James Cox. The Chair highlighted that the PC have continued to maintain the greens, sorting out new tenders, dealing with moles, moving dog poo bins etc. A big thank you went to the Clerk for her efforts, covering anything from land registration to the ever increasing correspondence. The parishioners applauded the Clerk for her efforts. The Chair highlighted that the latest project being the proposed MUSA, is being taken very slowly, following the concerns after the play equipment was put in place. New members to join the PC were also invited, with 3 vacancies. It was also highlighted that without a PC, the offices down at Matlock would be running things.

4. Slide show by History group.

Frank Parker showed the village Jubilee video. The video covered the bunting, scarecrows (King prawn being the winner), afternoon teas (Radio Derby appearing in the Village hall for the footage of the 1953 celebrations), Church production of Royalty through the ages, timeball played on the rec, bonfire and firework displays. With the final jubilee event being the planting/blessing of the jubilee tree and the mosaic (with Father Benson), in the snow March 2013. A thank you went to the history group.

5. Presentation by Neil Moulden, Chief Executive, Derbyshire Dales Council for Voluntary Service.

Neil highlighted that DDCVS, covers the whole of Derbyshire Dales and support local community groups, they also work with the disadvantaged. DDCVS have worked with organisations such as Hathersage pool, creating a new business plan and the takeover of Wirksworth pool, helped set up a post natal group, which started out small and was then seen on Coronation Street recently. Advice is given on areas such as setting up a Charity to a brand new project.

6. Matters raised by persons on electoral roll.

This whole section of the meeting entailed the subject of the proposed MUSA. To note the working party/PC had put a detailed display of the proposed MUSA, from photos of the proposed lighting system to drawings of the specific location. Areas discussed:

6.1 **Survey (by local residents opposed to the siting of the MUSA).** Out of 361 people spoken to in a door to door survey, 261 were against the siting on the rec. 81% against the proposed siting, 9% in favour, 10% undecided. It was noted that not all houses were covered, as some people were not in. Two maps of the rec were offered for viewing by two residents whom had conducted the survey. One gave an overview of the rec in relation to the village, the other a more specific look at those in favour/against, who live around the rec. From those properties surveyed around the rec 31 said they wouldn't like the MUSA in the proposed location, 2 households were for it and 1 with no opinion. It was highlighted that in their opinion it is not appropriate to use the green space and they believed that the figures are a good indication of the feeling around the village.

It was noted that the **original survey** gave the opportunity to respond anonymously. When one votes in an election it is done privately where people put what they really think. It was discussed how the survey by the local residents had incorporated a lot of misinformation, in particular in relation to the sizing of the proposed MUSA and user groups. It was also highlighted that the original survey had a 50% response rate. This survey had 321 people in support of a sports facility. The main problem raised was with the proposed location.

6.2 **Location.** Is it fair to the residents living near to the site, was discussed. Access for children was discussed. It was expressed that an edge of village location is not as easy for children to access, has been demonstrated at Baslow, where children crossing roads is an issue. The rec is in the heart of the community, with easy access. In Bradwell the distance from school is not seen as an issue.

6.3 **Noise.** The noise from the proposed location was seen as a problem. Bradwell was referred to where there is a lot of noise. It was seen that one can hear the noise of children playing on the playground from the Monsal trail. What noise impact details are available. The steel used on the proposed Lightmain 'wall' is aimed to reduce noise 'ball on wall' The proposed steel used is designed to absorb sound. Tests have been carried out in other locations on the type of structure proposed. People complaining about noise from children playing on the rec was challenged.

6.4 **Site selection process.** Has another site been looked into. It was stated that no land owner had come forward to offer a site as a gift or for funds, in the last 18 months. Affordable housing was mentioned. This project was not organised by the PC. The increased costs of another site were highlighted. Has someone got a plot of land suitable. It was noted that Sports England specifies a minimum of 12 metres, preferring 30 metres from residential properties. Lowering of the site was highlighted.

6.5 Toilet and changing facilities. The project group has been advised by the planning authority that it was unlikely that permission for toilets and changing facilities would be given as facilities already existed on the recreation ground. A member of GL Cricket Club highlighted that facilities would not be available for such use by users of the MUSA.

6.6. Parking. A local business expressed concern in the potential increase in cars parking on the pub car park. It was noted that the facility was aimed at the village not league football type activities.

The Chair thanked the White Lion for the use of their car park in general, helping ease the car parking situation in the village.

6.7 Financial matters. Cost to purchase and maintain the facility was raised. Schools rent per year currently was discussed. Fundraising for a piece of land was discussed. It was also highlighted that the MUSA would not go ahead without a grant/s anyway. What money had been spent on the project to date was discussed, where the proposed planning application would be funded by the Bridge Clubs donation.

6.8 A MUSA without sides. No sides to the MUSA was proposed to reduce noise. Photos of the Bradwell MUSA showing heights with a person next to it, were discussed.

6.9 History repeating it's self. A former Parish Councillor reported that a similar proposal had been raised some 8 to 10 years ago. At the time they looked at a range of alternative sites, including the Willows, but no sites outside of the recreation ground could be found that would be suitable.

The Chair made two proposals and votes were taken.

1. To allow a person who is not a resident or on the electoral roll to speak on the subject of the proposed MUSA.

This was passed with no objections.

2. To allow a resident of the village who is under 18, and therefore not eligible to be on the electoral roll, to be permitted to speak on the subject of the proposed MUSA.

This was passed with no objections.

7.0 Light. The impact of the lights was discussed. Who has designed the proposed lights? It was stated that a full lighting calculation has been provided by Lightmain. Restrictions on times for lights can be put in place.

7.1 Consultation with PDNPA. It was reported that PDNPA have been consulted on every stage of the project to date. Where the site has been visited on a number of occasions to both look at the MUSA and its surroundings, incorporating tree and hedge planting to soften noise and looks. PDNPA have stressed that to position a MUSA on the proposed site would not be change of use. It was questioned whether the PC would actually get planning granted.

7.2 Users of the tennis court. There was much discussion on who uses the tennis court at present. It was seen that tennis football is played. This was challenged. The court being used for bikes and skating was noted. The school used to pay the tennis club to coach pupils in years past (funds from this went towards the upkeep).

Other areas discussed.

7.3 Local needs Housing. Glebe Court was highlighted as being built for Local needs housing.

7.4 Crisis management. Cllr Thompson asked for people to come forward to look into training for the village installing a *defibrillation* unit. Instructions are given on a computer control. Access to the rec via the gates was discussed, for emergency vehicles. A list of Key holders on the gate was requested. Possible use of the White Lion car park in an emergency.

The Chair thanked everyone for coming and closed the meeting at 9.15pm.

Sarah Stokes, Clerk to Great Longstone Parish Council, Longstone Byre, Little Longstone, Bakewell, DE45 1NN. Tel: 01629 640851 Email: parishcouncil@greatlongstone.net