**Broughton Parish Council:**

**Clerk’s Report to the meeting held on Tuesday 19th January 2021**

**Correspondence received since last meeting for information.**

1. Update on Local Government Reorganisation -*Circulated to all via email*
2. CALC Nov/Dec Newsletter- *Circulated to all via email*
3. NALC Legal Topic Note on easements over Common Land & Village Greens
4. Allerdale Three Tier Meeting Date (20th January 2021)
5. Allerdale Borough Council Budget Consultation 21/22 -*Circulated to all via email*
6. Letter from Robert Jenrick re Covid Response
7. Covid 19 Correspondence (Various)
8. Open Spaces Society welcome pack
9. Clerks & Councils Direct Jan 2021

**Actions from previous meeting:**

109/2020 File minutes when received from Mary- *Done*

109/2020 Upload minutes to website -*Done*

110/2020 Send round details of Ponderosa licensing panel to all councillors-*Done*

112/2020 Clerk to send Council papers to the three CCC who have volunteered to attend the meetings in Hugo's absence -*Ongoing*

113/2020 Clerk to raise query with ABC/CCC regarding the traffic flows described in the CCC report-*Done*

Response 1:

The TS states traffic generation of 34 in the AM peak and 37 in the PM peak.

With a split of 60/40 that will mean that 14 cars will be traveling towards Little Broughton and 20 towards Seaton / Broughton Moor ( both directions ) in the AM.

The applicant states that this “split” was derived from census data.

Trip distribution is , as you are aware, very subjective. But it is our view that even if the split is reversed with a bias towards Great Broughton that it will not have a material impact.

The TS stated as follows :

… cumulatively the sites will generate an additional 14 two-way trips through Great Broughton in each peak hour. This equates to roughly 1 extra car every 4 minutes over the peak hour. Through Broughton Moor the PM peak hour sees the highest increase, which equates to approx. 1 extra car every 2.5 minutes over the peak hour.

If it is considered that Moor Road currently has a daily flow of approximately 1230 vehicles per day ( am peak 84 and pm 110 vehicles ) then the increase in traffic these 2 application will engender will be marginal at most.

As you are aware, we have to take into account the wording of the NPPF that states  in par 109 – “*Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”. I cannot state that the impact of the additional traffic will be severe, neither can I state that the impact will be unactable as I have no knowledge of intrinsically unsafe sections of the highway that this application could impact on ( due to the reported accident stats over the past 5 years) .*

If I may then respond to the highway points raised by the PC –

* Access from the A66 – This is not within my remit , but I have noticed that Highway England offered no objection to the increased use of this junction.
* I did try and touch on the traffic distribution above.
* Concerns over the access road to the site, - I can see no evidence of an accident cluster at this location over the resent past ( 5 years ). Whilst all accidents are tragic and regrettable this network does not constitute an accident cluster.
* Construction traffic  - We have sought to impose a condition requiring the applicant to submit a Construction management plan , which will include routing for HGV’s
* Additional 300plus car movements per day, and the impacts of this have neither been addressed nor considered. – As I tried to show above ,this has been considered and was found not to be severe.

I agree with the PC that  an agreed master plan , with set phasing, should be submitted and potentially even escalated to a SPD to ensure that this overall scheme is not jeopardised by piecemeal developments.

Response 2:

I must admit I can see why the PC would be slightly confused by my email I jumped between daily flow and peak flows.

The Pc stated *“71 houses with 2.5 cars equates to 175 vehicles. It is likely that these are all going to move at least once each day (one in and one out movement per day).. If Moor Road has a flow of approximately 1230 vehicles per day and we are talking about (175 \*2=350) movements a day even at the 60/40 split is either 210 or 140 a day. Both of which are over 10% of the existing traffic, surely that is material? “*

I do not disagree with the statement . I can but only point out that only a proportion of the flow will be towards Broughton ( lets say 210 – 60% split). This is then 17% over the whole day.

When we consider capacity assessments then we tend to only consider the Peak Times . This is normally between 8 – 9 am and 4-5 pm, unless there is site specific reasons to change this .

My apology for indicating that the increase will be marginal as if this would not have an impact on the surrounding villages . As you are aware , all development ( be that for a house extension, single dwelling , or a big strategic application ) will have an impact on the village / town. The Local highway Authority can only state that this impact is unacceptable if it is considered severe.

In our response we considered the Transport Statement, the location and the impact and the corollary was that the impact will not be severe.

If I may at this stage import a well-known aphorism : context is everything. I am aware of the development on the neighbouring site . This together with the 2 applications now being considered will need to be highlighted and their impact though the surrounding village scrutinised  without any equivocation when a subsequent application is submitted.

113/2020 Clerk to convene a single item PC meeting regarding Derwent Forest as soon as the Masterplan is received-*Done*

113/2020 Contact Clerks for Broughton Moor, Seaton, Camerton, Brigham to ask them if they are considering the Derwent Forest issue-*Ongoing*

113/2020 Clerk to contact MP regarding Derwent Forest-*Done*

113/2020 Confirm interest in Community Mobility Project to ACT-*Done*

115/2020 Clerk to get quotes for patching and resurfacing for the playarea-*Ongoing*

116/2020 Agenda Plot Clearance Nook 32 for Jan 2021 agenda-*Done*

117/2020 Clerk to confirm outcome of the Bus Shelter discussions to Steve Hannah for progression-*Done*

117/2020 Clerk to get quote for Jackson's time for refurbishment of benches (subject to materials being confirmed)-*Ongoing- Awaiting confirmation from Steve on the appropriate type of materials to be used.*

119/2020 Submit comments on VAR/2020/0025-*Done*

119/2020 Submit comments on HOU/2020/0178-*Done*

119/2020 Submit comments on ADD/2020/0001-*Done*

119/2020 Submit comments on HOU/2020/0183-*Done*

119/2020 Submit comments on FUL/2020/0221-*Done*

119/2020 Submit comments on VAR/2020/0027-*Done*

121/2020 Pay Accounts-*Done*

121/2020 Update budget with band D figures-*Done*

121/2020 Note accrual of reserves for the Playarea funds-*Will be noted in the minutes of the Jan 2021 meeting*

121/2020 Clerk to ensure there is sufficient funding in the budget for tree surveying and tree works-*Done*

121/2020 Pay donation to Cockermouth Mechanics Brass Band-*Done*

121/2020 Commence movement of Broughton PC Bank Account-*Ongoing*

121/2020 Process donation to Quaker Burial ground-*Ongoing- Can’t pay direct to the organisation, as they are not constituted. The proposal suggested by the Clerk was rejected by the applicant*

122/2020 Agenda Street naming for Jan 2021 meeting-*Done*

122/2020 Circulate street naming guidance to all for information -*Done*

126/2020 Upload minutes to website-*Done*

127/2020 Contact the developers in Jan 2021 regarding the provision of information related to transport links which was promised during the presentation on the 14th December 2020, it is crucial to know this information -*Done- Information not yet received*

127/2020 Contact Cumbria Wildlife Trust to ask if they have ever been involved in a wildlife survey on this site- *Ongoing*

127/2020 Contact the developers and ask for copies of relevant surveys (wild life & ecology)- *Done- Information not yet received*

127/2020 Raise concerns with developers regarding the safety of the site in terms of water run off/site stability etc and impact on the River Derwent SAC *Done- Information not yet received*

127/2020 Clerk to seek clarity on if a tree survey of the site as it currently is (baseline) has been prepared *Done- Information not yet received*

127/2020 Clerk to request a copy of any archaeological surveys that have been conducted on the site *Done- Information not yet received*

127/2020 Seek clarity from ABC on the requirement for an EIA- *Ongoing*

127/2020 Clerk to circulate details of 12th Jan 2021 meeting to all -*Done*

129/2020 Submit comments on VAR/2020/0030- *N/A No formal comments made due to the lack of functionality of ABC website*

130/2020 Pay accounts- *Done*

**On-going Matters- *Matters which the Council & Clerk is continuing to work on but which have no updates so don’t require formal agenda space***

1. Walls & the lack of protection for them under Planning law -*Awaiting an update from A/BC Cllr N Cockburn. Matter to be agenda’d in future when decision are required*
2. Bulling Meadow Registration of Fishing Rights- *Awaiting confirmation from the Councils solicitor on how to proceed with a profit a prednre registration.*
3. Brigham/Broughton Junction Roundabout- *Ongoing- Most recent update (2nd October 2020) Highways England are continuing to make steady progress with the proposed scheme which at this stage is focused on searching the required land. There are three landowners involved and Highways England have reached agreement with each of them to acquire the land. The ongoing legal processes are likely to take several months to complete from this point. However a time scale for deliver of this proposed scheme has yet to be fixed. This is because it is subject to a national prioritisation process to ensure the available funding is used as effectively as possible.*

Becx Carter

Clerk to Broughton Parish Council

broughtonparishclerk@hotmail.com