**Stoke by Nayland Lighting Working Party – Open meeting, 17.02.2015**

Viv Klimowicz opened the meeting (as Sue Longhurst, Babergh's Community Officer was unable to attend to Chair the meeting) and told us that this open meeting was convened so that all interested parties could be informed about the parish lighting and express their interest in participating in a new Street Lighting Working Party that would consider the future of the parish lighting. This is to be a fresh start.

Jeremy Bloomfield then presented a Power-point (PP) providing information about the lights we have in the parish, their condition and a wide range of issues concerning their future. A map of the lights in the village was provided for all participants. (The PP will be available on the Parish Council website)

He explained about the history of the ownership of the lights, their supports, who is responsible for their maintenance and who is required to carry out this maintenance. He referred to the Parish Council, Suffolk County Council, UK Power Networks and an EEC Directive during his explanations.

He talked of types of lighting systems, cost, risk, contractors and the effects of having no lights.

Many parishioners wanted to view the current lights and Jeremy offered to take people around on several different dates. It was then suggested that we also visit other nearby villages (Nayland, Assington and Bures) at night so we can see how their lighting systems are working. Several parishioners offered transport to facilitate this.

It was agreed that those interested would meet on 18th, 23rd and 24th at 7.30pm at the Crossfield Garages.

Those interested in being on the working party registered their details.

The next meeting to be arranged when dates are agreed with Sue Longhurst.

Questions raised in the meeting

1. What are the significant running costs for the present lights?
2. What is abnormal work and how is it costed?
3. Could we change the timing on the lights as they are
	1. with equipment we have
	2. with new equipment
	3. what are the associated costs?
4. What happens if a light fails and is not replaced?
5. What is the charge for a new connection or to put lights back?
6. Are there lights that are specially designated for conservation areas - bulbs or posts?
7. How many of our poles are likely to need replacing if the equipment on them is changed or removed?
8. Could we put lights on properties?
9. Why does this have to be one big project?
10. What / where are the four lights that are not mercury vapour?

Questions left after the meeting

1. How does the Assington layout compare with that of Stoke - particularly the spacing? *Adam Sedgwick*
2. "The tone of this meeting seemed to indicate a foregone decision to install and/or replace lighting. I would like assurance that this is not the case and that proper consideration of a "zero" solution will form an equivalent part of deliberations." *John Prescott*
3. Can we adopt as part of an overall plan the retention of safe (not too close to live wires) mercury vapour lamps? Pros? Cons? *Betsy and Michael Cordingly*
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