

MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING OF NEWTON & NOSS PARISH COUNCIL

Held on 13 November 2014

PRESENT Cllr. Cooper Mr. Cooper Mr. Taylor Mr. Lyndon Miss Cove Mr. Hussell

ALSO PRESENT Mr. Matthews Mr. Tubb Mrs. Ansell
54 Parishioners Mrs. McDonough (Clerk)

COLLATON DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The planning agent, Mrs. Deborah McCann gave a presentation in respect of planning applications 37/2547/14/F (proposed employment Units at SX5729 4982 adjacent to Collaton Cross) and 37/2548/14/O (SX5670, 4944, West of Collaton Park,) on behalf of the applicants using the masterplan as a point of reference.

She advised that the applicants wished to leave a legacy of high quality affordable houses and to make housing provision for the “forgotten middle” with opportunities for self-build affordable/intermediate. The applicants had had regard to the needs outlined in the Parish Plan with respect to employment and recreation. The applicants wanted space- space both within the houses and around them. The application had been shaped by the Yonges and feedback from public consultation. The scale of the application was to enable 40% affordable housing.

Provision was made for 4000 square metres of land for community use secured through a Section 106 agreement. The agreement would also make provision for foul drainage, highways, public transport, education, the method of provision of affordable housing and how it would stay local, with triggers for other community events with definite timescales being provided for. The nature of the buildings themselves were a blank canvas. Full details of all the buildings and their uses would come at the reserved matters stage of the application.

It was accepted that an error had been made with the visual impact statement, incorrect distances having been marked. It had now been corrected. A hard copy would be provided to the Parish Council and would be placed on the SHDC website.

Mrs. McCann talked through the masterplan which was described as a very low density/high quality scheme of mixed open market, affordable and affordable self-build. The form and tenure of the affordable housing would be developed in negotiation with SHDC. A question was raised, having looked at the masterplan, as to the location of the other 30 houses as there appeared to be only 40 on the plan. Mrs. McCann said there were 70 houses on the masterplan, some of which may be semidetached. There would be parking on the individual plots.

Mrs. McCann was asked where provision for the swimming pool and sports centre had gone. She advised that there was provision for land to be gifted and used by the community under a S.106 agreement. Projects could be developed over time. She advised that it had been made clear in the public consultation that the applicants would provide the land but would not undertake the actual community projects.

Mrs. McCann confirmed that the industrial units would be seen from the road in a rural area and that there was no screening. She suggested it was an opportunity to provide employment opportunity for local people. The employment units would be leased for light industrial/office use.

Mrs. McCann confirmed the existing barn would go. Upon being asked about the Barn Owls, she advised that the Yonge family had had a long relationship with the Barn Owl Trust. A new home had been found- correspondence was available on the SHDC website. Mr. Richard Yonge advised of discussions with the Barn Owl Trust and that he would not put the Barn Owls under threat. They would be safe. He indicated on the masterplan where a tower would be built to accommodate them which had been chosen by the Barn Owl Trust. No work would be started until the tower was built. Some concern had been expressed that the Barn Owls had not nested this year nor raised a brood. He pointed out the female was five years old. The fact no brood had been produced was nothing to do with the applicants.

A parishioner commented that the plans did not show 70 houses and therefore did not show the density of the houses. He felt it misrepresented the “open space” of the development. Mrs. McCann advised that the plans did show 70 units. Mrs. McCann confirmed that 40% of the 70 dwellings would be affordable- the number and how they would be delivered would be fixed. The tenure and location had not been fixed and would be the subject of a future application. The location of the community land, woodland, allotments and green would be fixed.

A parishioner raised concerns about the dangerous nature of the existing road junction and the speed of traffic along B3186. Mrs. McCann advised that they had had their own transport statement prepared by a Highways Consultant. Devon County Council had raised objections. Their concerns would be addressed. DCC had given an indication as to amendments and as to how the plans could be approved. A parishioner suggested there should be no approval given to the plans until concerns regarding the junction were addressed.

A resident referred to the fact there were currently 8 houses in the area. The plans provided for another 70. There was a probability that there would be 70 families each with at least 2 cars with the resultant traffic increase in Newton & Noss and through Yealmpton. Mrs. McCann advised that they had instructed a traffic consultant who had considered that, in transport terms, there wouldn't be much increase in traffic. A resident told the meeting about the straw poll undertaken by Collaton residents of traffic movements of 40 households over 1 week. The total journeys had

amounted to 1800 pw. With the proposed increase in housing this could add another 4000 journeys through that one junction. Mrs. McCann said that in highways terms that was judged acceptable.

Foul drainage –a report had been commissioned from South West Water to investigate capacity. Having said an upgrade would be necessary, SWW had now advised that it would be unnecessary. Their report advised that 80 houses could be connected to mains drainage.

Schools- there was capacity in the primary school. Mrs. McCann suggested it was important for the school to thrive and to be kept at capacity.

Local people would have employment opportunities. An office hub was a possibility. The public consultation had demonstrated that there were many people who worked from home. A parishioner suggested there were already office facilities in the Parish and the potential startup of a hub resource in Noss Mayo was in advanced stages of discussion. Mrs. McCann reiterated the provision of 40 % affordable housing for local people in perpetuity. Public consultation had demonstrated the need for affordable housing and there had been high support for affordable self-build. Mrs. McCann confirmed the types of affordable housing- social housing for rent at 80% of open market rent, intermediate housing-shared/discounted open market in perpetuity, with self-build now falling within that definition. A parishioner pointed out that house prices were already very high so even “affordable” on that basis would be unaffordable. Mrs. McCann suggested that some elements could be pegged by the Local Council. The definition of what constituted affordable was prescribed by government.

The affordable housing could be provided by a social landlord or organisation provided the rent was set below market rent. Affordable could be a mixture of different tenures- some rent, some shared, some below market value. Anyone could self-build as long as they met the requirements. The self-build would have to remain affordable in perpetuity. The definition of Local was prescribed by the Local council and then cascaded out. Mrs. McCann confirmed that 8 out of the affordable housing provision would be social housing for those who demonstrated a local connection and housing need.

The isolation of the location was referred to by a resident. Mrs. McCann referred to the bus stop. Part of the S.106 agreement would be supporting the local bus service through a voucher system. A parishioner advised that this was unlikely to improve frequency of the service which was once every 2 hours. There would be provision for contribution to transport to Ivybridge Community College under S.106 contributions to education as required by DCC.

Mrs. McCann was asked about what sort of prices the affordable housing would be sold at-developers would have to factor in the price when looking at their budget to build the development. Mrs. McCann advised that the affordable housing could be pegged at 20-30% below market value. The Local Council would set the figure. The value could be capped at a certain figure. It was confirmed that a property developer would not be building the affordable housing. The self-build would give the opportunity to employ local contractors and make use of local skills. Mr. Tim Yonge confirmed that in effect the land value for plots for self-build would be zero rated.

A parishioner referred to the importance of the design of the houses with continuity rather than being haphazard. It was confirmed the design of the buildings would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage when proposals would be put forward to the Parish and District Councils. The Yonges were keen for high quality cohesive design regime. A parishioner made reference to the sensitive area and the site being on the brow of a hill in an AONB- top class design for the site was required. Mrs. McCann agreed.

A parishioner asked if the Yonges were just obtaining the planning permission with a view to then passing the scheme on to a developer. Mrs. McCann confirmed that the Yonges wished to keep control. The self-build would enable them to keep control of the site for as long as possible and that they wished to protect the property from speculation. Reference was made by a parishioner to the application being pursued before the Newton & Noss Neighbourhood Plan was produced particularly given the scale of the development.

A parishioner referred to photographs in the application showing long distance shots. It would have been better if the shots could have been taken from where the site could be seen. Mrs. McCann advised that such shots were very difficult to take given the topography of the site.

A parishioner expressed sadness that the development was next to an existing development but there was no agreement for integration.

Parishioners made further comments about the distance from the village and that the communal areas should be more joined up. Mrs. McCann pointed out that they were linked.

Reference was made to the existing permissive footpath disappearing under a building according to the plans. Mrs. McCann confirmed the footpath would be maintained and that there was an intention to make the 15 year permissive footpath agreement permanent.

A question was raised about the contribution to site clearance for self-build. Mrs. McCann said the cost of concrete removal had been factored in. Those who undertook a self-build would have a serviced plot. The concrete would be taken up and reused on site.

OPEN FORUM

Collaton Development proposals

i) A parishioner referred to the mistakes in scale on the visual impact statement and that it was not a true representation of the proposals. The parishioner had drawn up his own map with corrected scales. There would be more communities affected by the visual impact than reflected on the statement prepared by the applicants. Many residents in Brixton would see the development. Collaton could be seen from Derriford- there were 250,000 residents in Plymouth. The parishioner had taken a photograph of the site from Brixton imposing his own rough sketch of how the buildings would appear from there (which the applicants pointed out was not to scale). The parishioner pointed out that most development in the AONB area took place in valleys and not on top of a hill. The parishioner suggested that those Councillors who could financially gain as a result of the proposals should not be permitted to vote. Mr. Matthews advised the parishioner that that was a matter for each Parish Council Member to decide. If the parishioner had concerns about that he should refer to South Hams District Council.

ii) The Chairman of the RYDA had sent apologies. A representative from The RYDA read out a written statement approved by the RYDA Committee. The RYDA had commissioned the preparation of an intervisibility map from a cartographer a copy of which would be provided to the Parish Council once received. The map would show where the site would be visible from. A RYDA written brief containing the objections in respect of the development proposals had been circulated to Parish Council Members in advance of the Meeting. Sixteen District and National planning policies could be infringed by the proposals. He wished to pick up on two issues- damage to the AONB and affordable housing.

With respect to damaging the AONB he advised that the applicant did not appear to deny this but rather suggested that the circumstances were exceptional within SHDC at the moment as the District Council had failed to meet its housing targets. If the applicants' interpretation of the Planning Inspector's ruling over the estate in Totnes were to be right, this would amount to an effective suspension of much of the planning process throughout the South Hams and the abandonment of both national and district planning policies regarding the location of developments.

The AONB was bounded on the north by A379 and on the south by the sea stretching from Brixton in the west to Kingsbridge in the east standing mainly at 100m above sea level- with the exception of one hill to the south of Modbury. The proposed development on top of the plateau would be clearly visible from many vantage points for miles around.

Within the area there were 35 communities of significant size. Very few were on top of hills. Standing a development on top of a plateau would be out of character with the AONB.

The visual impact on Collaton Cross- at the moment when passing the junction and bus shelter heading towards Newton & Noss there was a long vista on the right across farmland and a wooded river valley towards Spriddlestone. On the left was hedgerow and a brick entrance. In the future there could be 8 meter high commercial buildings which, with 70 additional houses, would put a blight on the area.

With respect to affordable housing it was suggested this was in the wrong location; excessive costs of site clearance, lack of services, isolation, lack of meeting halls and infrastructure and educational services. There had been a well researched plan for affordable housing within the parish based on progressive development on small sites. A Neighbourhood Plan was imminent. In the last housing survey 11 sites had been identified- Collaton being considered as one of the least suitable. It was not envisaged there would be 28 affordable homes on the site. It was not believed 40% would end up as affordable houses. Experience from other developments demonstrated this. The draft S.106 agreement from the applicant stated up to 40% would be affordable. The RYDA was in favour of affordable homes in principle. Collaton was not a good site for open market housing.

The impact on the people at Collaton needed to be considered. It was not a brownfield site- it could revert to green field. There would be delivery lorries and commercial traffic for the employment units which was not addressed by the Collaton residents' straw poll of traffic increase.

On the SHDC website there were 54 comments in respect of the applications, all but 7 were against. Therefore 80% were against.

The proposals could divert development from the villages creating a precedent for planners encouraging development.

iii) A resident of Livingstone Avenue referred to his letter of objection addressing aesthetics, practicality and need. Development should only be allowed in an AONB in exceptional circumstances. The proposals for 70 houses and employment units would be elevated and not hidden in the AONB and visible for many miles being a blot on the landscape. The land had been described as brownfield but much was in agricultural uses. Employment units were planned for fields where sheep grazed. The B3186 was a B road. Developments in Brixton and Yealmpton fed onto an A road. The route through Puslinch was already showing evidence of excessive use. Site preparation had to be factored in together with school transport, sewage, utilities and education. Yealm Medical Centre was already stretched- a waiting time of 3-4 weeks for an appointment. Car transport would be essential with more than 2 cars needed. This would be beyond the means of many for whom the affordable Housing was intended. If there was a need for additional housing it should be supported by infrastructure and transport. Collaton was not. A requirement for Affordable Housing had been established by the Parish Council but not on that scale. The proposals were not needed or wanted and would cause damage to the neighbourhood.

Newton Ferrers and Noss Mayo Parish Council Police Report October 2014

PCSO 30540 Andy Potter had sent apologies.

Newton Ferrers

1st- criminal damage to a motor vehicle. Minor damage to a car had been caused after an altercation between two drivers. It had been dealt with by way of restorative justice [CR/114513/14]
12th -minor assault [Collaton Cross]. Enquiries were ongoing [CR/114045/14]
Noss Mayo-no reported crime

Cherry Trees, 58 Yealm Road- the architect gave a brief outline of the proposals. He advised both neighbours had been consulted, both supporting the proposals.

246/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE- there were apologies for absence from Mr. Carter, Mr. Stitson and Mrs. Evans

247/14 MINUTES –the Minutes of the 9 and 23 October Meetings were confirmed and signed as a correct record save for an amendment to the minutes for 9 October meeting providing for Mr. Matthews return to the Meeting following consideration of the planning application in respect of 29 Yealm Road.

248/14 INTERESTS TO BE DECLARED - members were invited to declare interests in the items for discussion during the course of the Meeting. Mr. Tubb advised that in view of his ownership of the pharmacy, and the impact of development proposals for Collaton on his business, he would abstain from taking part in the debate or vote.

249/14 DISPENSATION REQUESTS- Miss Cove had submitted a dispensation request to both take part in the debate and vote on the development proposals for Collaton despite being a resident of Fell Close. The grounds submitted were
1. That the Council considered that the dispensation was in the interests of persons living in the Council's area.
2. That the Council considered that it was otherwise appropriate to grant the dispensation.

The reason given was to represent the views of Collaton residents

RESOLVED: that a dispensation to take part in the debate in respect of proposed employment units at SX5729 4982 adjacent to Collaton Cross 37/2547/14/F and SX5670, 4944, west of Collaton Park, 37/2548/14/O be granted to Miss Cove. (*Vote 6 in favour, 2 abstentions.*) Mr. Tubb and Miss Cove took no part in the vote.

Mr. Matthews advised Miss Cove to give consideration as to whether to take part in the vote regarding the development proposals at Collaton given her personal involvement.

RESOLVED: that a dispensation to take part in the vote, being her own decision as to whether to take part in the vote, in respect of proposed employment units at SX5729 4982 adjacent to Collaton Cross 37/2547/14/F and SX5670, 4944, West of Collaton Park, 37/2548/14/O be granted to Miss Cove. (*Vote 6 in favour, 2 abstention.*) Mr. Tubb and Miss Cove took no part in the vote.

Mr. Tubb left the meeting.

250/14. PLANNING

Planning applications received

250.1 Proposed Employment Units at SX5729 4982 Adjacent to Collaton Cross 37/2547/14/F - construction of employment units for B1 (a) (b) (c) and B8 use and community boat storage. Miss Cove thanked the Council for the dispensation to speak for the Collaton residents. She had moved to Collaton 18 months previously as a first time buyer. She did not feel it was part of the village. She had joined the Parish Council to promote and motivate what was going on in the village. Collaton had been described as a Brownfield site and in an AONB. She had been to workshops with other parishes when they were told central government was saying that housing had to be built. In the parish there were 1814 people in 853 households. She posed the question whether the Parish could sustain an 8.2% increase. Twenty of the houses had been described as "affordable" but she doubted they would be priced under £200,000 and therefore would not be affordable. She anticipated that in reality the level of affordable housing to be built would drop when planning was granted giving Sherford as an example. The plans for phase 1 had been outlined in red. There was provision for a second phase outlined in blue which could lead on to ribbon development. She posed the question as to whether it was benefiting the community or the landowner.

Mr. Matthews advised that the Yonge family had been benefactors to the community in the past. However he questioned whether it was right to develop a new village between Yealmpton and Newton & Noss. The only self-sufficient community would be Sherford. Within not many kilometers of the Parish there was planning approval for 7700 houses. This provided all the housing which could be needed in the area. Unless the scheme was exceptional, it would not be appropriate for an AONB. He saw no such exceptional circumstances.

Mr. Hussell referred to consultation correspondence advising that the Primary School would have capacity. NHS had made no comment, South West Water would not require a contribution but Ivybridge Community College would require a contribution in addition to a contribution for school transport.

Decision; objection (*Vote; 5 in favour of objecting, 3 abstentions*)

1. The proposed development lay within an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There were no exceptional circumstances that justified development.

2. The Parish Council supported the objections raised by the River Yealm District Association included in the RYDA Brief for Newton & Noss Parish Council a copy of which was to be attached.

250.2 SX5670, 4944, West of Collaton Park, 37/2548/14/O -outline application (with some matters reserved) for mixed use development of 70 dwellings, allotments, community facility, recreation and employment land. Decision; objection (*Vote; 5 in favour of objecting, 3 abstentions*)

1. The proposed development lay within an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There were no exceptional circumstances that justified development.

2. The Parish Council supported the objections raised by the River Yealm District Association included in the RYDA Brief for Newton & Noss Parish Council a copy of which was to be attached.

The Chairman left the Meeting as a result of her interest in the applications for Yealm Reach, 97 Court Road 37/2601/14/F and The Cottage, 97 Court Road 37/2600/14/F by virtue of owning land bordering the site. The Vice Chairman chaired the Meeting in her absence.

250.3 Yealm Reach, 97 Court Road 37/2601/14/F -erection of dwelling and garage with associated access. Affected a public footpath or right of way and **The Cottage, 97 Court Road 37/2600/14/F**. Several objections had been received both in respect of 37/2601/14/F and 37/2600/14/F which the Council felt should be considered together. It was anticipated that the landowner was looking to develop 4 properties on the site with the main house being knocked down and the garage being rebuilt and redeveloped. It was thought development would be proposed for the orchard area. Some Parish Council Members had attended a site meeting in the summer. There had been objections from the neighbours. Concern was expressed regarding overdevelopment of the site, the significant increase in the density of the buildings and that it would break up the belt of green leading from the Life Boat House up through the Yealm Hotel to Court Road, being the view from across the water. DECISION; objection on the basis of visual impact, loss of privacy, access, traffic and highway safety, overbearing impact on adjoining properties, cumulative impact, overdevelopment and support for the objections of neighbours. (*Vote; 6 in favour, 1 abstention*)

Mr. Tubb and the Chairman returned to the meeting.

250.4 Wood Cottage, Widey Hill 37/2598/14/F-householder application for new balcony from dormer to second floor. Decision; No objection (*Vote; unanimous*)

250.7 Anchor Cottage, Riverside Road West 37/2569/14/F-householder application for replacement of existing timber canoe store in garden with timber shed. Application affected a Conservation Area. Decision; No objection (*Vote; unanimous*)

250.8 Cherry Trees, 58 Yealm Road 37/2749/14/F-householder application for proposed rear extension, conversion of roof space and construction of garage. Decision; No objection (*Vote; unanimous*)

250.9 Residential Development- there was no update on potential development proposals for Hannaford Lane. With respect to the land at the end of The Fairway, the Chairman advised that she had attended a meeting at South Hams District Council with Mrs. Iles and her son when they had been advised to "try a bit harder".

251/14. COUNTY and DISTRICT COUNCILS

251.1 County Councillors Report- there was no report.

251.2 Electoral Review of Devon-the Local Government Boundary Commission for England had commenced an electoral review of Devon County Council. The Commission was carrying out a review to deliver electoral equality for voters across the county. The electoral review would recommend new electoral arrangements for Devon County Council. In particular it would propose; the total number of councillors elected to the council in the future, the number of divisions, the number of councillors representing each division, division boundaries and names of divisions. The twelve week public consultation would close on 19 January 2015. The Commission was minded to recommend that 60 councillors should be elected to Devon Council in the future. The Parish Council had no comment.

251.3 Highways/Transport including;

i) Widey Lane- a parishioner had raised concern about the use of Widey Hill as a short cut by large commercial vehicles. The Parish Council noted the concerns. It was agreed the parishioner should be referred to Devon County Council Highways Department.

ii) Community Self- help/Community Road Warden scheme- details had been circulated to members. Devon County Council was encouraging communities to come together and help each other to deliver minor maintenance works occurring due to service reductions as a result of declining local maintenance budgets. The Road Warden Scheme was being put forward to Parish Councils who would like to undertake minor road maintenance on a voluntary basis. This maintenance would be delivered through a formal community self-help arrangement, overseen by a locally appointed Road Warden. The Road Warden would be the primary point of contact between the local community and Devon County Council and would be responsible for working with the community to identify minor works that could be undertaken by community self-help volunteers. The Road Warden must be nominated by the Parish Council. It was agreed expressions of interest for the position would be sought in the Parish magazine and via the Parish email circulation list.

ii) Temporary prohibition of through traffic and parking- the temporary prohibition of waiting/loading or unloading at Riverside Road East had been extended to 5 July 2015. A Temporary Prohibition of Through Traffic and Parking had been issued for Bridgend Hill, Post Office Farm to Membland House and Puslinch Bridge to Underhay for dates to be confirmed between 24 November and 31 March. Road closure notices would be put up at least 7 days before the works started.

iii) Tough Choices public consultation- it was agreed to delegate the completion of the Highways Tough Choices consultation to the Vice Chairman.

251.3 Locality Budget proposals- a request to the County Councillor for funding to assist with the TAP funding project 2013/2014 was awaiting determination. Miss Cove suggested an application could be made for funding for the website set up costs for the Sustainable Market.

251.4 District Councillor's Report- Cllr. Cooper had no report.

251.5 SHDC Asset Transfer/Parish Asset Land Registration- the Agreement for Sale had been reviewed by Mr. Matthews. RESOLVED; to authorise the Chairman and Vice Chairman to sign the Agreement for Sale in respect of the transfer of land assets held by South Hams District Council to Newton & Noss Parish Council. *(Vote; Unanimous)*

The Clerk had obtained an update on insurance costs to insure the play park equipment at Noss Mayo against accidental damage. If the replacement costs of £45,092.56 remained the same, the annual additional premium payable would remain the same at £205.53. Mr. Matthews advised that he would circulate a note to the Council suggesting that those Councillors responsible for overseeing the proposed assets in the respective working groups meet.

251.6 SHDC Local Homes for Local People- a letter had been received from Mrs. Debbie Holloway, SHDC Senior Housing Strategy & Enabling Officer, with an update on communications with the landowner at Parsonage Road regarding the Village Housing Initiative. It was agreed the Clerk should contact Mrs. Holloway and ask if a time limit had been put down within which the landowner should respond. An offer from SHDC Environmental Health & Housing to attend a Parish Council Meeting to discuss local homes for local people was considered. It was agreed that the matter should be put on the agenda for June/July 2015 following election of the new Parish Council.

251.7 SHDC TAP funding 2013/2014 and 2014/2015- Wembury Parish Council had confirmed invitations to tender had been submitted to four contractors for the drainage project. Wembury Council was pleased Newton & Noss would be joining in with Wembury and Brixton with the 2014/2015 TAP Funding proposal for "Lengthsman" services. Mr. Hussell advised he would be happy to meet with the drainage contractors.

251.8 Super Cluster meeting- the Vice Chairman advised that he should be able to attend the meeting on 26 November 2014 circumstances permitting.

252/14. ADMINISTRATION

252.1 Budget 2015/2016- draft budget papers had been circulated to the Parish Council Members before the Meeting. The budget working group had met and discussed the possibility Parish Precept increases could be capped at 2%.

Nothing however had been confirmed. There had been no information on potential Council Tax increase from SHDC. A reduction in Council Tax Support Grant year on year was likely with the subsequent effect on Precept increases. Some parishes had been advised by their auditors to have reserves anywhere between 50-150% of Precept. Newton & Noss Parish Council, historically, had liked to keep minimum reserves of 100% of Precept figure. Spending on halls had decreased reserves by approximately £14,000. Figures used for calculations assumed the Council Tax Support Grant would be £1383. The working group were reluctant to suggest increasing the Precept by more than 2% or the sum by which SHDC increase Council Tax- whichever was the greater. Mr. Matthews advised that the Council would shortly be taking on additional land assets. It also appeared the government was shifting spending to Parish Councils. The Parish Council presently held a reserve greater than the Parish Precept made up by contingencies. RESOLVED: To agree in principle to a Precept increase of 2% or the percentage by which South Hams District Council increased Council Tax for 2015/2016, whichever was the greater, the figure to be confirmed in December 2014/January 2015. *(Vote; Unanimous)*

252.2 Community Orchard Apple Day- had taken place on 2 November and had been attended by 40-50 adults and around 15 children. Mr. David Craig was thanked for the loan of his Cider Press and guidance. The apple trees had been pruned and weeded. The story teller and crepe making had been popular. Donations for cakes and tea amounted to £85.30 which was held by Newton & Noss Network.

251.3 WIC Hall Hire fees- the Vice Chairman expressed disappointment that the Parish Council had requested a reduction in the new hire fees due to be introduced in January 2015. Fees had not been increased for four years. He had reluctantly agreed to accept the Council's proposal of £25 per meeting for 2.5 hours, but the Parish Council would be billed if the meetings went on for longer, not including setting up. Members suggested that there was a duty to safeguard public expenditure. Reference was made to statutory authority whereby if there was no suitable room in the parish, vested in the Parish Council, which could be used free of charge, a suitable room in a school maintained by the local education authority could be used free of charge. Members felt there would be costs to the school involved together with the issue of access and suitability. Members therefore noted that the WI Hall Committee had agreed to the Parish Council's proposal of £25 per Parish Council Meeting.

251.3 WIC Hall Hire fees- the Vice Chairman expressed disappointment that the Parish Council had requested a reduction in the new hire fees due to be introduced in January 2015. Fees had not been increased for four years. He had reluctantly agreed to accept the Council's proposal of £25 per meeting for 2.5 hours, but the Parish Council would be billed if the meetings went on for longer, not including setting up. Members suggested that there was a duty to safeguard public expenditure. Reference was made to statutory authority whereby if there was no suitable room in the parish, vested in the Parish Council, which could be used free of charge, a suitable room in a school maintained by the local education authority could be used free of charge. Members felt there would be costs to the school involved together with the issue of access and suitability. Members therefore noted that the WI Hall Committee had agreed to the Parish Council's proposal of £25 per Parish Council Meeting.

251.3 WIC Hall Hire fees- the Vice Chairman expressed disappointment that the Parish Council had requested a reduction in the new hire fees due to be introduced in January 2015. Fees had not been increased for four years. He had reluctantly agreed to accept the Council's proposal of £25 per meeting for 2.5 hours, but the Parish Council would be billed if the meetings went on for longer, not including setting up. Members suggested that there was a duty to safeguard public expenditure. Reference was made to statutory authority whereby if there was no suitable room in the parish, vested in the Parish Council, which could be used free of charge, a suitable room in a school maintained by the local education authority could be used free of charge. Members felt there would be costs to the school involved together with the issue of access and suitability. Members therefore noted that the WI Hall Committee had agreed to the Parish Council's proposal of £25 per Parish Council Meeting.

253/14 CONSULTATION/CORRESPONDENCE

Sky Lanterns- a parishioner had expressed concern regarding the risks associated with sky lanterns. The NFU's "Love your Countryside" campaign had highlighted the issue of how dangerous they could be. A local farmer at the meeting confirmed he had had experience of the frames of the lanterns harming farm animals if they were ingested, while fields of standing crops and buildings were also at significant risk of being set alight. It was agreed an article would be included in the Parish Magazine.

254/14 AUTHORISATION OF PAYMENTS – Cheque payments were authorised and signed in accordance with the schedule prepared by the Clerk, checked by Mr. Lyndon and listed in Minute 255/14.

6/13 November 2014.....Chairman

255/14 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Santander Current Account :	Total balance at 1.11.14	£63304.91
The balance includes: Hedge Cutting Bond		£3000
Locality Budget funding for Sports Pavilion improvements		£937.92
Monies held on completion of Newton & Noss Play Park Improvement Project		£36.02
Monies held in respect of the maintenance of the Revington Memorial Seat		£500

The following cheques were authorised totalling: £2195.81

Chq No	PAYEE		AMOUNT
1875	WI Community Hall	Hire fee NNPC Meeting 13 November	£22.00
1876	Newton & Noss Village Hall	Hire fee NNPC Meeting 27 November	£20.00
1877	S. McDonough	Net salary-October	£1,184.08
1878	HM Revenue & Customs	Clerks monthly Tax & National Insurance	£293.73
1879	RYHA	Cleaning Public W.C's 1/7/14-31/12/14	£400.00
1880	M. Hingston	Newton Voss & steps cleaning October	£124.00
1881	D. Goodchild	Grass cutting -The Green 16 & 30 October 2014	£32.00
1882	L. Finch	Noss Voss cleaning August and October 2014	£120.00
		Total	£2,195.81
SO	Spectrum Housing Group Ltd	Bishops Court rent November 2014	£342.93

*Section 137 Local Government Act 1972 payments:£0 total to date;£332

256/14. MEETINGS ATTENDED:

256.1 Harbour Authority- there was nothing to report

256.2 Halls- Mrs. Ansell advised there had been no meeting of the Newton & Noss Village Hall Committee. The Vice Chairman had nothing further to report regarding the WI Hall.

256.3 Yealm Estuary Management Forum- Mr. Taylor advised that a new Chairman and Vice Chairman had been elected. Progress was being made with respect to the tertiary treatment system being introduced at the local treatment works (reed beds).

257/14. MAINTENANCE

257.1 Sports Pavilion- Mrs. Barbara Fear was retiring as secretary for the Sports Pavilion. Mr. Tubb and Mr. Stitson had agreed to take over responsibility. In the longer term it was hoped responsibility for the management for the Sports Pavilion would be taken over under the terms of a Licence by the Football/Cricket Club.

257.2 Life ring- the Coastguard had made contact regarding the condition of the life ring at Wide Slip. The matter had been referred to SHDC. Mr. Matthews asked the Clerk to make contact with the Harbour Office and ask that the matter be added to the next RYHA meeting agenda.

257.3 Other areas for consideration-

i) Public WC's- Mr. Tubb suggested SHDC should be asked to turn off the lights in the public WC's in Newton Ferrers to avoid giving the impression that they were still open. He also suggested that a notice be posted on the door giving directions to the nearest WC's available to the public.

ii) Footpaths- the National Trust had advised they had had to close the permissive path which ran below Cellar's Field at Noss Mayo as the cliff edges were unstable and the bridge was no longer safe. Signage was up to state the path was closed. Mr. Taylor confirmed the area around the Greenwood seat had been cleared by the National Trust and thanked Mr. Philip Rogers for liaising with the National Trust who had cleared the vegetation at the Piece plantation the bench now having a view down to the River Yealm again.

iii) Sheep worrying- the National Trust wished the Parish Council to be aware of the persistent problem their tenant Mr. Philip Rogers was having with stock worrying out on Revelstoke Drive. Over the last 6 months he had lost over 30 sheep to dog attacks. The police had been informed (as well as the dog warden) and had attended the site. The National Trust had signage up all along the walk and had written articles for the press and for local parish magazines. All his sheep out on site now were pregnant and so must not be chased as this greatly increased the risk of miscarriage. The sheep and cattle needed to graze this Special site of scientific interest for maritime grassland and scrub in order to maintain the diversity and keep the open structure. The Parish Council was invited for any other thoughts on getting the message across to locals and visitors. It was agreed to circulate a note to the Parish database. Mr. Philip Rogers confirmed that many owners whose dogs had worried his sheep were local and asked that people keep their dogs on leads.

The Meeting closed at 9.30pm

7/13 November 2014.....Chairman

