

## **FULL COUNCIL**

**24 FEBRUARY 2020**

**Present:**

Councillors Austen, Bradford, Bullivant, Clearance, Connett, Cook, D Cox, H Cox, Daws, Dewhirst, Eden, Evans, Foden, Goodman-Bradbury, Gribble, Haines, Hayes, Hocking, G Hook, J Hook, Jeffery, Jeffries, Jenks, Keeling (Chairman), Kerswell, MacGregor, Morgan, Mullone, Nutley, Nuttall, Orme, Parker-Khan, Parker, Patch, Peart, J Petherick (Vice-Chairman), L Petherick, Phipps, Purser, Rollason, Russell, Swain, Taylor, Thorne and Wrigley

**Apologies:**

Councillors Colclough and Tume

**Officers in Attendance:**

Christopher Morgan, Trainee Democratic Services Officer

Sarah Selway, Democratic Services Team Leader & Deputy Monitoring Officer

Phil Shears, Managing Director

Simon Thornley, Business Manager - Spatial Planning

Karen Trickey, Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer

### **11. MINUTES**

The Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture, seconded by Councillor Nutley proposed that the Minutes of the Full Council on 14 January 2020 were approved as correct and signed by the Chairman.

### **12. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Portfolio Holder for Climate Change, Coastal Protection, and Flooding thanked the Teignbridge Council staff who had responded to the repercussions of Storm Dennis.

### **13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor D Cox declared an interest as an employee of Teignbridge CVS, the Secretary and a Trustee of HITS Foodbank and a Trustee of Coastal Action Youth.

Councillors Dewhirst, G Hook and J Hook declared an interest in respect of minute no. 17 – Notice of Motion regarding the Local Electricity Bill - as members of Teign Energy Company.

Councillor Bullivant declared an interest in respect of minute no. 17 - Notice of Motion regarding Langford Bridge Planning Decision and left the room during consideration of the motion.

## **14. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The public questions and members responses are attached to minutes.

Members of the Public asked the following supplementary questions, the answer to which some would be provided in writing later in the week. [For ease of reference these answers are set out in square brackets below]:-

*In response to the supplementary question regarding the Environment – coastline dynamic* [response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism - further detail and/or effects (in regard to sediment movement, beaches and coastal defences) will be only be available to be assessed after publication of modelling as highlighted in the original response. The Council in conjunction with the Environment Agency have committed to commission an independent peer group review of Network Rail's modelling output when this is made available].

*In response to the supplementary question regarding a Statutory Objection* [response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism - the Council would need more detail regarding the proposal (including but not limited to the publication of the Environmental Statement and modelling results) but it would be likely be a statutory objector.]

*In response to the supplementary question of the case of non-designated heritage: the Department of Culture Media & Sport has stated that Network Rail is still required to take advice regarding asset value. Will the council work proactively with Historic England and Devon Archaeology Service to raise statutory objection ?* [response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism - the Council will work with Historic England and Devon Archaeology Service to assess the impact of the proposed development on the non-designated historic asset. Until we have more details about what the proposed development will look like and technical advice from both the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England we are unable to confirm that we would raise a statutory objection on this ground.]

*In response to the supplementary question of would the council negotiate a financial contribution from Network Rail so that Teignmouth can develop improvements to offset amenity asset restrictions during the lengthy construction years?* [response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism - the Council is negotiating with Network Rail but at this stage in the process it is not possible to confirm whether any offset if agreed would be financial or physical in nature or a combination of both.]

## **15. COUNCILLOR QUESTION**

The member question and response is attached to minutes.

In response to the supplementary question the Leader he confirmed he would let Councillor Clearance know of any decisions as soon as they were made.

## **16. FINAL BUDGET PROPOSALS 2020/21**

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Resources proposed that the Executive Budget as set out in the agenda papers and that the recommendations as per the circulated report be approved.

In presenting the budget, the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Resources thanked officers for their preparation of the budget and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their work and input into the budget proposals.

He stated that the budget addressed the councils funding shortfall whilst delivering its commitment to addressing climate change, increase planning enforcement and affordable housing and continuing to provide a capital programme which met the requirements in the Council Strategy. He was grateful to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the review of the rural aid which would continue with a budget of £26,000 and a revised criteria. He commented that the criteria would not include the reserves that the smaller parishes had set aside for Elections. With the changes to business rates, new homes bonus and the ceasing of right to buy payments from Teign Housing the Council had to look to become more commercial going forward.

This was seconded by the Leader.

Councillor Clearance as budget spokesperson for the opposition commented that the unpalatable cuts that were being proposed could be avoided if less funds were transferred from the revenue account to the capital account and the reduction in funding from the capital account be made up by increasing borrowing.

Some Members who objected to the proposed budget raised concerns regarding the negative impact of charging for Sunday parking; the cuts in the councillor's community funds and rural aid and the charge for parish/towns to empty dog bins.

Members in support of the budget commented that this was a balanced budget to bridge the funding gap that had to be addressed by the reduction in central government funding.

### **RESOLVED:-**

- a That the Teignbridge band D council tax for 2020/21 is increased by 2.94% or £5 to £175.17 per annum
- b That general reserves are increased to 12.3% of the net revenue budget for 2020/21 or just under £2.0 million

- c That £100,000 of the general reserve balance in any one year continues to be available to the Executive to meet unexpected expenditure in addition to the agreed revenue budget
- d That all other decisions with regard to budgetary change will be approved by reference to virement rules in the financial instructions
- e That the summary revenue budget for 2020/21 is £16.1 million as shown at appendix 4. In particular the revenue budget includes:
  - Assumptions of a 2% pay deal with higher increases for those on lower grades from 1 April 2020
  - Revenue contributions to fund capital at £0.6 million in 2020/21 and increasing slightly thereafter
  - Rural aid reducing to £26,000 from 1 April 2020
  - A reduction in the councillors community fund grant to £1,000 each
- f That fees and charges are approved as shown summarised at appendix 6. This includes an increase in parking income of £185,000 from last years base budget
- g That the capital programme as shown at appendix 7 is approved. In particular this includes:
  - Increasing jobs and homes through continuing support for housing whilst backing business and encouraging community-led planning
  - Infrastructure delivery plan investment contributing to improving education, transport links, sports and open spaces

Three major town centre investments will be funded mainly from prudential borrowing. There is also a provision for potential Future High Street fund projects. These would be funded from a combination of government grant and other co-funding, including CIL, grant and prudential borrowing. There are also provisions for employment site investment to be funded through prudential borrowing. Both the Future High Street fund and employment site projects are indicative projects only. They are described as provisions and are not being approved in this budget. Individual business cases will be brought to members for consideration as they are
- h That the prudential indicators are noted and the prudential limits approved all as set out in appendix 11
- i That the updated treasury management strategy statement and authorised lending list as set out in appendix 12 is approved together with the capital strategy in appendix 12a

- j That each scheme will be considered on its merits as explained at the end of appendix 12 to decide the calculation of minimum revenue provision for capital expenditure in 2020/21
- k That the treasury management mid-year review for 2019/20 as taken to Executive on 28 November and shown in appendix 13 is noted
- l That the council tax resolutions as recommended in appendix 16 are approved
- m That the Commercial Strategy in appendix 8 is approved and authority is delegated to the Chief Finance Officer to approve the purchase of assets meeting the criteria in section 6 of the Strategy.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 the recorded vote was as follows:-

Voting for:-

Councillors Austin, Connett, Cook, (D) Cox, (H) Cox, Dewhirst, Eden, Evans, Foden, Goodman-Bradbury, Hayes, (G) Hook, (J) Hook, Jefferies, Jenks, MacGregor, Keeling, Morgan, Nutley, Nuttall, Parker, (J) Petherick, (L) Petherick, Purser, Rollason, Swain, Taylor and Wrigley.

(28 Members)

Voting against:-

Councillors Bradford, Bullivant, Clarence, Daws, Gribble, Haines, Hocking, Jeffrey, Kerswell, Mullone, Orme, Parker-Khan, Patch, Peart, Phipps, Russell and Thorne.

(17 Members)

Absent:-

Councillors Colclough and Tume

(2 Members)

**17. NOTICES OF MOTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 4.5(L)**

**Notice of Motion for Local Electricity Bill**

Councillors Dewhirst, G Hook and J Hook declared an interest as members of Teign Energy Company.

Members considered a Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Jenks and supported by Councillors H Cox, Hayes, G Hook, J Hook, Keeling, MacGregor, Morgan, Nutley and Wrigley.

Councillor Jenks in presenting his Notice of Motion stated that the bill's purpose was to enable local electricity generators to become local electricity suppliers. This bill would make a huge difference to the increase in renewable energy and support councils and communities to become renewable generators.

This was seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change, Coastal Protection, and Flooding and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that Teignbridge District Council:-

- (i) Acknowledges the efforts that this council is making to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote renewable energy;
- (ii) Recognises that councils can play a central role in creating sustainable communities, particularly through the provision of locally generated renewable electricity;
- (iii) Further recognises,
  - That very large financial setup and running costs involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers result in it being impossible for local renewable electricity generators to do so,
  - That making these financial costs proportionate to the scale of a renewable electricity suppliers operation would create significant opportunities for councils to be providers of locally generated renewable electricity directly to local people, business and organisations, and
  - That the revenues received by councils that become local renewable electricity providers could be used to help fund local greenhouse gas emissions reductions measures and to help improve local services and facilities;
- (iv) Accordingly resolves to support the Local Electricity Bill, currently supported by a cross-party group of MPs (including our local MP), and which, if made by law, would make the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate by establishing a Right to Local Supply; and
- (v) Further resolves to inform the local media of this decision, Write to local MPs, asking them to support the Bill, and Write to the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, Power for People, (at 8 Delancey Passage, Camden, London, NW1 7NN or [info@powerforpeople.org.uk](mailto:info@powerforpeople.org.uk)) expressing its support.

The meeting recessed from 11.50am until 12.50pm.

Councillors Hayes, Hocking, Orme and Parker left the meeting at this point.

### **Notice of Motion regarding Facilitating Open and Accountable Decision Making**

Members Considered a Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Patch and supported by Councillors Bradford, Daws, Jenks and Mullone.

Councillor Patch in presenting his Notice of Motion, stated that the reasons for the proposals were to increase accountability and transparency in decision making and voting in particular at Planning Committee.

This was seconded by Councillor Mullone.

The Portfolio for Planning whilst being supportive of the need for the council to be transparent and open in its decision making process proposed an amendment to read as follows:-

- (a) *this Council is committed to the principles of open and accountable decision making;*
- (b) *The council's electronic voting system is used for all votes on planning applications taken during meetings of the Planning Committee and the record of how each councillor voted is recorded with the minutes of the meeting.*
- (c) *The right of every councillor to ask for their own personal vote to be recorded in the minutes after a vote has been taken and before the meeting moves to the next business, as has been the case for many years, is enshrined within the Teignbridge constitution.*
- (d) *Arrangements for voting/recorded voting at all other council and committee meetings are referred for urgent review to the Constitutional Review Group and to report back to the next meeting of Council on 21 April.*

This was seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture.

During debate the Members raised the following points:-

- Number of members required for a recorded vote
- Use of the electronic voting system
- The Constitution Review Working Group to look at recorded voting and report back to full Council.

The amendment was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

The amendment being the substantive motion, this was put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (a) this Council is committed to the principles of open and accountable decision making;

- (b) The council's electronic voting system is used for all votes on planning applications taken during meetings of the Planning Committee and the record of how each councillor voted is recorded with the minutes of the meeting.
- (c) The right of every councillor to ask for their own personal vote to be recorded in the minutes after a vote has been taken and before the meeting moves to the next business, as has been the case for many years, is enshrined within the Teignbridge constitution.
- (d) Arrangements for voting/recorded voting at all other council and committee meetings are referred for urgent review to the Constitutional Review Group and to report back to the next meeting of Council on 21 April.

### **Notice of Motion regarding Langford Bridge Planning Decision**

Councillor Parker-Khan left the meeting before consideration of this item.

Councillor Bullivant declared a personal interest in light of the proposals of this notice of motion and he left the room during consideration of the item.

Members considered a Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Daws and supported by Councillors Bradford, D Cox, Mullone and Patch.

Councillor Daws in presenting his Notice of Motion stated that this motion was put forward to ensure that all the correct due processes were undertaken with the planning application for Langford Bridge Farm. The processes should be scrutinised to ensure that there was no conflict of interest and that the application had been dealt with in the proper manner.

This was seconded by Councillor Mullone.

Councillor D Cox whilst supportive of the tenor of the motion proposed an amendment to the motion for an external outside body that would be totally independent of the council to review the matter.

The Portfolio for Corporate Services in seconding the amendment stated that to have the Local Government Association undertake a review with independent an officer and councillor would ensure there was impartiality.

Councillor Haines clarified that he was a past board member of the Independent Planning Advisory Service and had undertaken work for them.

The amendment was put the vote and carried.

### **RESOLVED**

To reassure elected members and the general public, the independent Planning Advisory Service is invited by Teignbridge Council to review all relevant matters and processes relating to the granting of application 19/00238/MAJ Langford Bridge Farm, Kingskerswell Road, Newton Abbot, Devon, TQ12 5LA at the Planning Committee meeting of the 21st January and to report its conclusions to the Council.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.5 (q) (vi) Councillor Haines asked that his abstention from voting be recorded.

## **18. COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME 2020/21**

Councillor D Cox, Jenks and Gribble left the meeting before the vote was taken on this item.

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Resources presented the report to seek Council's approval of the proposal to introduce a new Council Tax Reduction Scheme for working age claimants for the year 2020-21.

The recommendation was proposed by the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services, seconded by Councillor D Cox and carried.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (1) The new income-banded Council Tax Reduction Scheme for the year 2020-21 be adopted; and
- (2) The revised Discretionary Discount and Exceptional Hardship Policy for the year 2020-21 be adopted.

## **19. NETWORK RAIL TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT ORDER CONSULTATION & NETWORK RAIL PRESENTATION**

Network rail gave a presentation (attached to minutes)

In response to Members questions the Network Rail representatives clarified the following:-

- The proposals incorporate a prediction that there would be one meter rise in sea level in the next 100 years
- Information on sea levels has been incorporated during consultation
- It was anticipated that there would be a public inquiry for the scheme
- There could be another cliff collapse or threat in the future, such as in 2014, so it was important that the work was undertaken
- There were multiple types of defences such as nets, nails and buttresses, the aim of the project was to reinforce the cliff line for up to a 100 years
- The scheme allows for built up water to be diverted under the tracks
- It would take approximately three years to divert the tracks and five years to buttress the cliff
- An environmental statement would be produced
- Information regarding the tide spread would be added to the consultation web page and
- The addition of groynes would be discussed with the Environment Agency and the Council

The Chairman thanked Network Rail for their presentation.

The Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism presented the report to update Members regarding progress by Network Rail in developing rail resilience proposals for the section between Parson's Tunnel, Holcombe and Teignmouth, and associated Transport and Work Act Order (TWAO) consenting processes and timeframes.

The recommendation was proposed by the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism and seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change, Coastal Protection & Flooding.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (1) Progress to date be noted; and
- (2) The relevant Portfolio Holders and Coastal Officer submit a consultation response on behalf of the Council.

## **20. WOLBOROUGH DPD**

The Portfolio Holder for Planning presented the report to recommend that work on the Wolborough Masterplan DPD ceases. Since the decision was taken to prepare a DPD this administration had committed to fast-track a partial update of the Local Plan for the benefit of better development for the whole of the district. This partial update would include many of the issues within the scope of the DPD and in addition matters such as climate change were not due to be incorporated in the Wolborough DPD. Therefore to prepare both the DPD and the Local Plan would duplicate unnecessary work. To cease work on the DPD would provide a saving of £122,000.

A Member commented that local ward members and other interested parties had not been consulted on this proposal and they had serious concerns regarding the cessation of this work. He asked for clarification on the budget spent to date.

The Business Manager Spatial Planning clarified that the budget spent to date was £53,140 for the Bat Survey, £122 Devon Biodiversity Records and £32,960 for a secondment of a Senior Planning Officer from Devon County Council. The DPD had limited remit and the Local Plan Policies Part 1, which Executive would consider for consultation at its next meeting, would have more comprehensive set of policies including those to mitigate climate change.

The recommendation was proposed by the Portfolio Holder for Planning seconded by the Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture and carried.

**RESOLVED** that work on the Wolborough Masterplan DPD be ceased and it be removed from the published Local Development Scheme.

**21. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 - EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The Leader proposed, seconded by Councillor Haines, that because of financial sensitivity the Council go into Part II session and exclude the press and public.

**RESOLVED** that under Section 100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 that press and public be excluded from the meeting of the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of part 1 of schedule 12 A of the Act.

**22. DECOY COUNTRY PARK PLAY AREA REFURBISHMENTS**

Councillors Morgan and Mullone left the meeting before consideration of this item.

The Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture presented the report to recommend investment of capital expenditure of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)/Section 106 funding to refurbish play provision at Decoy Countryside Park.

The recommendation was proposed by Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture proposed, seconded by Councillor Bradford and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (1) Capital expenditure be approved, to be funded from CIL and S106 contributions, for refurbishment works as outlined for Decoy Country Park; and
- (2) The Head of Operational Services be given delegated authority, in conjunction with the Section 151 Officer and Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Recreation to accept the most economically advantageous tender for the works.

The meeting started at 10.0am and finished at 3.10pm.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL MEETING**

**24 February 2020**

**Public Questions under Council Procedure Rules**

**1. Member of Public on behalf of Save the beach**

**Question 1: Environment – coastline dynamics**

*Considering the impact of such a dramatic change to the coastline, there is great local concern regarding the short and long-term impacts that this proposal will have on the local sediment cycle, including the effects on the immediate areas of Holcombe, Teignmouth, the harbour entrance and Shaldon, sustainability of connected coastline beaches, viability of fishing, operation of the port and resilience of coastal flood defence infrastructure.*

*What assurances will TDC seek to protect those affected parties?*

**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

We understand the Network Rail have engaged consultants to undertake modelling as part of the resilience project. Results have as yet not been made available and we would expect these to be published as part of either the Draft Environmental Statement scheduled for June 2020 or final versions as part of the TWAO submission in October 2020 as detailed in the consultation document.

**Question 2: Economic impact.**

*With initial estimates of a minimum 8-year construction period, operations involving mass transportation of materials and plant by land and sea, erection of semi-permanent jetties, closure of coastal access, and possible consequences for the coveted blue flag water quality status of the town's beaches, Teignmouth and its reputation will be blighted by the noise and pollution of a vast construction site. Estate agents are already predicting housing values to fall and the tourism trade, worth £185m per year to Teignbridge's economy, will inevitably be affected, resulting in financial hardship for many local businesses.*

*What relief and support will TDC seek to protect local businesses both during construction and afterwards?*

**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

We recognise that finding an effective and deliverable solution is not an easy task for Network Rail. If any local businesses find themselves in financial hardship as a result of the works they would need to pursue civil action against Network Rail, providing evidence that the hardship is directly attributable to the works. This would also be the case should a business suffer as a consequence of the works not being carried out, and the rail line being damaged or destroyed as a result of landslip.

The economic and environmental appraisal of these works will need to take account of the local as well as the regional impact of the works to protect the rail line.

I am sure that Network Rail appreciate the genuine concerns of local communities and we will be pressing Network Rail to address these issues and to set out how they propose to mitigate any knock on effects, whatever the solution to safeguarding the railway line.

**Question 3: Statutory Objection:**

*Following the public statement by TDC leadership of 17 January 2020 and given the high level of public objection does TDC, as a statutory consultee, intend to challenge and negotiate with Network Rail in preparation for making a statutory objection during the application process for a Transport Works Act Order?*

**Response from the Portfolio Holder from Business, Economy & Tourism**

It is likely that the Council may wish to be represented at the expected Public Inquiry – however this can only be confirmed at the appropriate opportunity, namely the formal Objection Period which is expected run from October to December 2020. Within our role as a consultee we will take into consideration the varied views of the general public to ensure the process is as balanced as possible.

**2. Public – Save Teignmouth Beach Committee**

**Question 1**

*Will the Council ask Network Rail to undertake a cost benefit analysis for the main options they have considered, because their preferred option is detrimental to the Town's beaches?*

**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

Network Rail are due to present information which includes Socio Economics as part of the Environment Statement which is scheduled to be published in June 2020. At that point the Council will be able to take a view whether sufficient detail has been provided or if further analysis is required.

**Question 2**

*Will the Council please consider this section of Brunel's Sea wall for listing as 'of historical and cultural importance' please?*

**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

Network Rail has previously applied for and secured a Certificate of Immunity from Heritage England which would prevent an application for listing being progressed.

### **3. Member of Public**

#### **Question 1: Heritage: Planning**

*The combination of Brunel's iconic sea wall set against the backdrop of our red cliffs is recognised as the national heritage, irreplaceable image and unique identity of Teignmouth's coastal landscape.*

*Would Teignbridge Council be willing and able to designate Brunel's heritage rail coastline as a Conservation Area and use its powers to fast track that designation to enforce stringent planning conditions to protect the aesthetic and heritage value of our famous coastline?*

#### **Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

Network Rail has previously applied for and secured a Certificate of Immunity from Heritage England which would prevent an application for listing being progressed.

#### **Question 2: Amenity**

*Local residents, neighbouring communities and visitors from afar have expressed with passion the unparalleled amenity value of this unique natural beach environment and its iconic heritage setting with regard to leisure, physical health and mental wellbeing.*

*Will TDC actively participate in consultation with Network Rail to ensure that project revisions contribute to amenity value and negotiate with Network Rail to identify added amenity asset input for the town with a view to offsetting the negative impact on our crucial tourism economy?*

#### **Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

The Council will continue to participate in consultation with Network Rail with a view to enhancing amenity assets within the scope of the TWAO processes and attributable impacts.

#### **Question 3: Environmental damage**

*The scale of this project will result in extensive land, shoreline and marine habitat destruction and substantial ecological damage in addition to the incalculable harmful carbon footprint of the construction process and materials. Conversely Network Rail promote their design parameters of this rail resilience scheme to provide resilience against climate change, yet it is questionable whether moving the line out to sea will be effective against the unpredictable force of the elements.*

*Will TDC uphold their environmental policies and climate change agenda to oppose the environmental impact of this design?*

## **Response from the Portfolio Holder for Business, Economy & Tourism**

Network Rail are due to present detailed information regarding impacts as part of the Environment Statement which is scheduled to be published in June 2020. At that point the Council will be able to take a view whether sufficient detail has been provided to appraise proposals against existing policies.

24 February 2020

**Member Questions under Council Procedure Rule 4.5 (K)****1. The following question has been asked by Cllr Clearance****Question**

*Shaldon Parish Council has currently a half container used as an emergency store mainly for use of storing sandbags, situated in Teignbridge's Short Stay 49 space, KG5 Car Park, Shaldon.*

*In the drive to pass more and more responsibilities from the likes of DCC and TDC to the parish, which we seem as a parish to be in the vanguard, we are becoming stuck for space so to speak.*

*In that container we also now house, not only many badly needed sandbags, but also two salt grit spreaders, countless bags of salt, flags to decorate the village in summer, a tent for village events, street weeding equipment tools for that job, highway cones and signs, collecting buckets, fluorescent jackets for marshalling village events/activities, plus now another 30, 25kg tubs of cold tarmac to fill potholes and associated tools to do this. Therefore it was disappointing to learn that TDC would not grant us an additional parking space to house yet another half container in this car park?*

*Would the leader therefore agree to reversing TDCs position, granting such a concession for SPC to have a further space in the KG5 Car Park for the above reasons of having another half container for badly needed storage? If not, would the leader allow SPC a concession in the larger Long Stay 450 space Ness Car Park for such a half container ?*

**Response from the Leader**

In thanking Cllr Clearance for his question, and appreciating the problem associated with storage space, it is a problem faced by just about each and every Town and Parish Council in the District. In that respect, Shaldon appears to be no different from any other equivalent local council, all of whom appear to solve their own storage problems without resorting to the use of scarce parking spaces within their Parishes.

His proposal may well cost this authority precious income as a consequence of a lost parking space, which I know full well are at a premium in the delightful and popular village of Shaldon. In popular destinations such as Shaldon it is important that visitors have maximum access to parking opportunities and I would be reluctant to reduce spaces. Local businesses would not welcome reduced parking for potential customers.

However, that said I will undertake to speak with our car parking officers, without promising anything more than that at this stage.

This page is intentionally left blank