

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CAMELEY PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT 7.30pm 16th JULY 2014 IN TEMPLE CLOUD VILLAGE HALL

Templecloud.org.uk

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

A member of the Temple Cloud W.I. told the meeting that the W.I. was responsible for the planters on the Green but not the border that had been cut into the turf in front of the bench. Several residents complained that at the recent election for a Parish Councillor, they had no idea who the two candidates were so felt unable to vote. A resident had heard that the election had cost in the region of £7000 but one of the two candidates told the meeting it was a fraction of this. She queried the figure quoted in the Chew Valley Gazette of £4/5,000. She told the meeting the actual figure was a lot lower. A resident asked what were the village orderly's duties and he also commented on the state of the Bus Shelter on the Green. The issue of parking at the Green was brought up since it was increasingly difficult to park for the doctor's surgery. Parishioners complained that commuters often parked there and caught the bus into town and another resident pointed out that some householders who lived on the main road had to park their cars on the Green and they were inconvenienced every day. The Chair pointed out that she had raised the issue of parking at the Police Forum and was told that the Police would only get involved if vehicles were causing an obstruction. A resident in Perrin Close asked if double yellow lines could be painted on one side of the Close. The Chair of the Residents Association asked if the Annual Governance statement and Annual Return once passed by the external Auditor could be placed on the website. This was agreed. The Clerk pointed out that every year he displays a notice for three weeks asking if any resident wishes to view the accounts. A resident asked if more signs asking dog owners to clear up their dog's mess could be put up around the Playing Field. The Clerk would ask the Dog Warden. A resident complimented the Planter Group for what they had done for Temple Cloud. She went on to ask whether there were "travellers" in the quarry. It was confirmed that there are caravans in the Old Quarry site and that they are very close together - those residents who had seen the caravans felt that there were people living there. They were asked to provide photographic evidence so that B&NES could be approached with such evidence and asked to investigate .

The business meeting opened at 7.55pm.

PRESENT: Cllrs Mrs Atkinson, Mr Cockerham, Mr Dando, Mrs Harvey, Mr Hemmings, Mr Hooper, Mr Hutchinson, Mr Welsford, and the Clerk, Mr Scutt.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Cllr Mrs Parfitt was unable to attend because of work commitments. Ward Councillor Mr Warren also sent his apologies.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Parish Clerk: Nigel Scutt, Laburnum Cottage, Temple Cloud, BS39 5BH
01761 452162 07812 541194 cameleypc@btinternet.com

The Clerk made a statement as follows:-

Along with other Parish Clerks in B&NES he has in the past few months been receiving information from ALCA on Councillors personal interests and whether Councillors know what constitutes an interest be it pecuniary or not and whether they should declare it. He pointed out that it is up to individual Councillors to declare an interest and not the Clerk. It is up to Councillors to read the literature on the subject which is why the Clerk had circulated some information including the Good Councillors guide before the meeting. New rules were introduced by The Localism Act 2011 which are based on the seven Nolan Principles of:-

- **Selflessness** Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family or their friends.
- **Integrity** Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties.
- **Objectivity** In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.
- **Accountability** Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.
- **Openness** Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands it.
- **Honesty** Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.
- **Leadership** Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

All Declarable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) plus personal interests that arise from councillor's duty to act in accordance with the Nolan principles should be declared to the Clerk, who will keep a register and pass the information to the District Council's monitoring officer. These interests include those of one's spouse (or equivalent).

If a Councillor has a DPI, then that Councillor MUST NOT participate in any discussion or vote where their DPI may be affected. This includes speaking as a member of the public.

Ownership of land is a DPI but **for the purposes of setting the precept only** this is not a DPI in that council tax or precept does not materially affect the value of your home, selling prospects or use or enjoyment of that land. It is a decision affecting all parishioners rather than any individual(s).

It follows that there is a DPI if the matter under discussion may affect the value of any councillor's home, the prospects of selling that home or the ability to use or enjoyment of his or her land and/or home.

It is a **criminal offence**

- a) Not to register DPIs.
- b) To knowingly or recklessly provide false/misleading information.
- c) To participate in the business of the council where that business involves a DPI.

Maximum fine is £5k and disqualification for 5 years.

The Clerk explained that his sole reason for going through this is for the protection of Councillors and asked each Councillor to take some time to read the information provided.

In response to a question from the chair all councillors present confirmed no personal interest in any item on the agenda.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING were only approved and signed after one amendment. The draft minutes showed a Councillor had told the June meeting the election had cost tax payers £4 – £5,000. The Councillor stated that he had told the meeting that the cost was £3 - £4,000. The amendment was agreed.

4. UPDATE ON MATTERS OUTSTANDING.

The Chair reported to the meeting that the Parish Ranger pilot had proved to be too expensive and was withdrawn. B&NES stated that they will review the Parish Sweeping Scheme in 2015. Correspondence had been received to that effect.

5. VILLAGE HALL AND PLAYING FIELD

There was nothing to report on the Village Hall itself. The Clerk reported that he had received two quotes for the replacement of the fence around the play area and rewiring an area behind the tractor shed. He awaited a third quote. He would add these quotes to the Agenda for the September meeting.

5. HIGHWAYS, FOOTPATHS AND ROADSWEEEPING

It was agreed that the Clerk would ask Highways about yellow lines in Perrin Close and moving the 30mph signs on A37 south of Peterside further away from the village. The Clerk reported that the Speedwatch team had run three sessions on successive Saturdays – on each session roughly 6% of motorists entering the village exceeded 37mph. He reiterated his appeal for more volunteers. The Planter group reported that they had some concerns about the village orderly's work and the Clerk would discuss these concerns with the leader of the Planter Group. The suggestion that B&NES were going to review the Parish Agency Sweeper agreement might mean that the Council would look at outsourcing the work. It was agreed that the Clerk would ask Hallatrow and High Littleton Councils of their experiences outsourcing street cleaning.

6. FINANCE:

It was proposed and agreed to pay the following:-

A) Payments	£	Vat
(1) Clerks wages	269.53	
(2) Sweeper wages	474.62	
(3) Garage rent	37.97	7.59
(4) Printer Inks	29.17	5.83
(5) Payroll fees J/A/S	30.00	6.00
(6) HMRC Tax A/M/J	202.20	
(7) Cllr expenses	25.30	

B) Payments received

(1) Parish Sweeper	292.17
--------------------	--------

7. PLANNING; The Parish Council discussed the following:-

Applications

14/02671/FUL application to erect extension to existing garage with dormer windows to front and rear of form open garage with room above for a gym at 25 Paulmont Rise.

Several Councillors had visited the site and agreed that the proposed alterations were a mirror image of what the neighbours had already done. There was no objection and the Parish Council agreed unanimously to support the application.

14/02155/FUL retrospective application for change of use from B1/B2 to B1/B3 at The Quarry Eastcourt Road.

After a discussion on the above, Cameley Parish Council unanimously confirmed that the Parish Council's views had not changed since their response to the original application 12/03092/FUL. The Council objected on the following grounds:-

- There was no objection to the building itself, the objection was to the method its use as a residence had been made.
- The view was that this application was an attempt to regularise a blatant breach of planning.
- Approval would create a precedent
- The building is outside the Housing Development Boundary
- It is contrary to the Cameley Parish Survey
- It does not comply with the Core Strategy
- The site is unsuitable for residential use
- Road access is limited
- The removal of trees and the installation of security lights creates light pollution and is a nuisance to neighbours.
- Water run off is still a problem

OUTCOMES

Exception Site Proposal 14/00725/OUT (former market garden site on A37);
REFUSED

14/02075/FUL application to erect extension to garage for motor home at 11 Meadway.
WITHDRAWN

14/02070/FUL application to erect first floor side extension at 9 Meadway.
PERMIT

8. TO CONSIDER PARTICIPATING IN THE BANES REVIEW OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES.

Each member of the Council had received documents concerning the above and were asked “does Cameley Parish Council wish to be involved in this?” After a discussion it was unanimously agreed to inform B&NES that the Council would help review boundaries. The Clerk will E mail Julie O’Rourke at Planning and request she e mails all the information to the Clerk for the Councillors to review and to report back.

9. TO CONSIDER SETTING UP SUB COMMITTEES TO CONSIDER

A) Housing Development Boundary review and the Community Consultation of the Placemaking Plan

B) Planning issues and/or applications during Summer break.

The meeting discussed the proposal and decided instead to have a Parish Council meeting on August 6th when the above issues could be discussed. It was suggested that in terms of the Housing Development Boundary, those Councillors who live on the boundary should not be involved in the discussion. The Clerk would circulate an agenda in due course.

In terms of the Community Consultation of Placemaking Plan, the Parish Council discussed what to say. It was agreed that the following two statements would be considered as a formal position at the August meeting..

- There are no further development sites available in Temple Cloud as the Temple Inn Lane Development more than meets the new Core Strategy numbers. .
- There are no assets that need protecting.

10. INAUGRAL MEETING OF THE CHEW VALLEY PARTNERSHIP

The final meeting of the old group would be held on 24th July where the group would wound up. It would be immediately followed by the inaugural meeting of the new group. Tony Hooper had already volunteered to go and Clive Welsford would accompany him if able.

11. PARISH VIEWS SOUGHT ON RURAL HOUSING

The Parish Council discussed a questionnaire produced by a Housing Association that required the Parishes views on rural houses. After a discussion, the Council agreed that in response two statements were sufficient as follows:-

- Any affordable houses would be sold and then become unaffordable
- We cannot be sure that people who are connected to the village would live in these homes.

12. INFORMATION EXCHANGE

A councillor had attended a meeting in Wells where Sajid Javed promised Superfast Broadband to the region by 2015.

It was reported that there were speed cameras mounted on motorbikes patrolling the area. The operators are civilians.

The Chair had received an e mail from Andrew Smith who is representing Barretts who will contact the Clerk in due course to book a time to brief the Parish Council on the detailed plans for the Temple Inn Lane site. There is as yet no timetable so he was unable to suggest when this might be.

Thanks were extended to the Parish Council for cutting the hedge next to the bus stop. The meeting was informed that the Planter Group had done some more cutting back later as part of their operation.

Cllr John Cockerham wanted to dispel the rumour that the Councillor election had cost up the £7000 rumoured – it was a fraction of the cost. It was agreed that the Clerk would ask B&NES the exact cost.

He had also talked with Ward Councillor Warren about the lack of bins in the village and he offered get two sited. Cllr Cockerham asked whether the Parish Council would match this. The Clerk would add to the next agenda. He would ask Cllr Warren who would fund their emptying.

Councillor Hemmings mentioned that the piece of Astroturf to the left hand side of the village hall – should it be removed?

Sandra Blair showed the meeting the presentation boards that the Planter Group had made up for the inspection by the Britain in Bloom team.

11. NEXT MEETING will be at 7.30 pm on 6th August in the village hall.

The meeting closed at 9.40pm

Appendix B

The Standards Committee has carefully considered the complaints, the Investigating Officer's report, the evidence presented and the statements made at this meeting. The Committee accepts that the discussion at the Parish Council meeting was robust, but does not find that this was sufficient to amount to a breach of the Code. The Committee reminds parish councillors that training on the Code of Conduct is readily available.