

BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minute of the meeting of Brandeston Parish Council held on Tuesday 11th September 2018 at 7.30pm in the Committee Room of the Village Hall.

Present: *Councillors Buckingham, Churchill, Elson (in the Chair), Kirton, Mitson-Woods, Norman and Duffy. Also, present Mary Mitson-Woods, Clerk and 18 electors.*

3-1819/1 Councillor Elson welcomed councillors and members of the public to the meeting

3-1819/2 There were no apologies for absence

3-1819/3 – There were no Declarations of interest

3-1819/4 It was resolved that the Minute of the meeting of 10th July 2018 should be signed by the Chairman as a true and accurate record of the Meeting.

3-1819/5 Public Forum

Issues raised by electors:

- People cannot comment until they know the Council's view.
- Without knowing the views of the PC is it likely that the PC will prevent any affordable houses?
- There is no employment, transport etc. and no work for the sort of people who live in social housing.
- What would prevent someone getting permission on the land in question and then putting in a completely different application?

Chairman responded the Council would hope that Councillor Tony Fryatt's assurance is reliable. Additionally there is no definition of affordable housing.

- One day someone will build on that land, the housing market has fallen in London and the effect will ripple outwards to Suffolk. In the future someone will apply on that land and the matter will be decided by planners. We may get something much worse than what we are discussing.

Chairman explained land outside the Plan will be classified as countryside and permission will be much more difficult to acquire.

- PC should press hard for the Settlement Boundary to remain where it is.
- A villager had submitted his objections and hopes Council will be mindful of them. Brandeston is not a small village, it is countryside and should be classified as such. Felt affordable houses not appropriate to Brandeston

The Chairman outcome of the Parish Meeting explained that the points system used by SCDC meant Brandeston is unlikely to be classified as countryside.

- Enquiry whether the PC had any further communication from Ian Harvey.
- Only an informal email after WE had informed him of the decision.

In response to a question the Chairman told the meeting he had contacted the Harvey's in an informal email to tell them the

- Will the PC reject the scheme in its entirety?

Chairman we have to have sound reasons for rejection.

- Which 2 sites were rejected?

Chairman responded those in Mill Lane.

- It will be the thin end of the wedge and that is why the Settlement Boundary is critical. People already owning a house cannot apply for an affordable unit. Once planning permission is given developers will change plans to build bigger houses and make more money.

The Chairman stated that the Mutton Lane development went ahead because SCDC had no plan in place at that time and had no grounds to refuse.

- If the Settlement Boundary remains the same everything else will fall.

3 -1819/6 Suffolk Coastal Local Plan – 1st Draft. Following a Parish Meeting to consult with villagers Councillors began the process of preparing a response to the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan -1st Draft. The wish of the Parish Meeting held on 30th August was that the proposal for development on SCLP 12.40 should be rejected and the Settlement Boundary remain in its current position. The Chairman started the debate by asking each Councillor in turn for a point of view.

Councillor Mitson-Woods

- Concerned about the misinformation that was circulated in the village which had created an atmosphere of distrust and rumour. One concern was speeding through the village but since the installation of the Speed Indicator Display traffic was averaging just under 30mph; this discounts the danger of speeding vehicles. Councillor Kirton confirmed this as the data feedback proves. The smaller semi-detached house in Mutton Lane was taken out of the affordable designation and sold as a buy to let. Both sets of occupants would like to buy them as they wish to stay in the village.
- The site put forward is not amenity land, it is used with the landowners' permission.
- Of those who voted against the scheme some were not electors.
- The village has missed a once in a lifetime opportunity to plan for its future and be involved in development for local need.
- Once the present owner sells the land it will go to the highest bidder and the village will have no control over its development.

Councillor Churchill

- Agreed. Unfortunately the Parish Meeting did not want 30 houses and nobody suggested a lower number.
- There are few sites available in the village and if we reject this a future buyer may apply for consent and the resulting development may be far worse than the proposal under discussion.
- There is no easy answer, we must listen to the view of the Parish Meeting and we are aware that it did not include all of the village. We should go through this item by item to prepare our response.
- We need the village to grow but we do not need 30 houses at once. The problem is the Parish Meeting would not discuss any other option.

Councillor Kirton

- Endorsed everything Councillor Mitson-Woods had said. He expressed his sadness that there has been so much unpleasantness.
- His first reaction was that 30 houses is disproportionate and there is no doubt that we are mandated to reject this proposal in the strongest terms.

Councillor Norman

- Thought 30 houses is too many.
- His biggest regret is the negativity about the issue, despite this he felt the Parish Council needs to reflect the village opinion.
- Different people are needed to stand for the 2019 election because he felt his views are not in line with the village in general.

- Questioned how affordable housing is being viewed. People say there is no employment but there are the Earl Soham Business Parks, Bridge Farm workshops, Brandeston Hall School, the Queen and people are needed to work in Framlingham, Wickham Market and the surrounding area. The way industry and business is changing to working online brings employment and there are lots of tiny businesses around that need employees and we need to house them.
- The village demographics need to be expanded. The village has always embraced new people e.g. Darryl Morgan, if he hadn't been able to bring his skills from BT where would we be? The pure negativity is troubling.

Councillor Buckingham

- Cllr Buckingham found Councillor Fryatt's assurances to be misplaced and improbable, in her view (given her 20 year background in local government). Policies and governments (national and local) are frequently changing. Councillor Fryatt's assurances changed the tone of the meeting and led to a binary yes/no vote. Without his input, a third option may have been part of the vote and this would have potentially drawn considerable support from those who abstained and those who remained silent.
- Villagers cannot correctly predict the requirements of anyone seeking affordable housing in our village (i.e. whether they will need a car or a shop) and therefore should not make a decision about whether affordable housing is needed on this basis.
- Rejecting the scheme outright was a poor outcome – Brandeston has a shared responsibility to enable additional housing, including affordable housing.
- It would have been better to work together to agree a more acceptable, perhaps smaller number of dwellings.

The Chairman summed up the debate by saying he believed that 30 houses was just a figure arrived at by planners. He acknowledged that the Parish Council should do what electors wish it to do and Councillors will take everything into account in the response. He felt nobody knows what the future holds. In the past we have been anti the planning department but this has been improved since 2015. He made reference to the SCDC Draft Strategic , Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment July 2018 which marked criteria for suitable development sites on a red, amber and green assessment.

Councillors must now make a response and all the points villagers have raised will be put forward. Councillor Churchill regretted that there was not a third option for us to consider. Councillor Elson stated that Councillor Fryatt had confidentially stated that SCDC doesn't need our site and we are free to reject it. There seems no other way to go forward but in the future we may be asked to consider further development. We have to reject this package as there is no alternative. Mr Harvey will eventually sell and we do not know what a future owner will do.

Councillor Buckingham felt that if there had been a third option the people who didn't vote may have given their opinion. Councillor Norman remarked that the even though the Meeting was pressurised into a single issue vote the Council has to be bound by it.

Resolved that Brandeston Parish Council will respond to the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan -1st Draft by rejecting the inclusion of LP12.40 for 30 houses and demand that the Settlement Boundary should remain in its present location.

Resolved that Councillors Elson and Kirton should work with the clerk to prepare the response to be delivered to SCDC by 5pm on Friday 14th September 2018.

3-1819/7 Finance

a) The Clerk presented the bank reconciliation for Barclays Account Parish Council Account at 31st August 2018 which has a balance of £2201.75. £1000.00 from the Manse Hill Project had been

Brandeston PC Minute 11/09/2018

Meetings dates: 2018 Nov 13th; 2019 Jan 8th; Mar 12th; May 14th; July 9th; Sept 10th; Nov 12th; 2020: Jan 14th; Mar 10th.

used to pay for groundwork for the zipwire while the grant for £1000.00 from Councillor Vickery's Locality Budget is awaited.

b) The bank reconciliation for Barclays 100+ Account at 31st August 2018 showed a balance of £595.53, this is yet to be verified by a statement from the bank. A cheque for £1500.00 has been cashed by Play and Leisure for the groundwork for the zipwire.

c) Discussion on authorising an application to Barclays bank for a Simple Servicing Authority consent to enable the clerk to access both accounts online for statements. Councillor Buckingham proposed that with appropriate checks and balances both accounts should be operated online.

Resolved that this should be organised.

d) To note pre-authorised payments to Action Play and Leisure. 100+ Account 30469599 £1500.00, Parish Council Account £1000.00 + £500.00 VAT (reclaimable). **Resolved that as this had already been authorised Council notes and approves this item.**

3-1819/8 Items presented for payment: -

a) Clerk's salary 6th July to 7th September 2018 9 weeks – £180.00 – **resolved to pay.**

b) **It was resolved that Council should reimburse the Clerk £40.00 for annual registration with the Information Commissioner's Office.**

c) Councillors discussed renewal of the Council's insurance. Community Action Suffolk is offering a Long Term Undertaking scheme to reduce insurance from 1st October 2018 – 30th September 2019. Three choices were presented by the Clerk: Single year £270.33. Three years £256.81 fixed per year. Five years £243.30 fixed per year. Clerk recommends five-year Long Term Undertaking at £243.30 which is less than the 2017/18 year policy as the premium was £271.51 + Insurance Premium Tax £32.56 amounted to £304.07. **Resolved that the CAS 5 year Long Term Undertaking be accepted at £243.30 per annum (inclusive of Insurance Premium Tax).**

3-1819/9 Standing Items

9.1 GDPR update - clerk/Councillor Duffy. The Clerk reported that another Parish Council had experienced a data breach by copying 3 addresses into the To: section of an outgoing email, therefore exposing the addresses to each recipient. A telephone call had been made to the ICO who advised that the breach was so minor that it did not require reporting. The Clerk reminded Councillors to be aware of this. GDPR and information sharing

It was resolved that, in view of the fact not all villagers were able to access Minutes published on the website, the draft Minutes should be placed in a folder in the lobby of the village hall to make it easier to know what actions the PC was taking. Minutes would not include names other than those of Councillors.

9.2 Roads/Traffic Safety including winter gritting – Councillor Kirton outlined the latest advice from SCC on providing winter grit. This would no longer be delivered unless a grit bin was supplied. He had inspected both bins, one outside the Queen and the other in Mill Lane. The one at the Queen needs replacing. **Resolved that at the November meeting Councillors would study performance against budget and see if funds were available to replace this bin at a cost of c. £600.00.** SID report. Core time records show that speeds are just below 30mph. At the November meeting Councillors will be given an update on SID data.

9.3 Village Triangle acquisition – Cllr Buckingham confirmed that the complex paperwork, including a specific map from Ordnance Survey edged in red, which collectively seeks legal acquisition of the two triangles of land, is almost complete. It will be sent to HM Land Registry once final statements from villagers have been legally 'sworn', this is at a cost of £5.00 for each swearing. The fee for processing by HM Land Registry is £70. Cllr Buckingham thanked Hollie Norman (daughter of Cllr Daniel Norman), for her legal expertise and support during the process and Councillors agreed that

the Clerk should write a letter of thanks to Hollie. **Resolved a cheque for £70.00 and £10.00 in cash should be authorised to enable this.**

9.4 Superfast Broadband – Cllr Buckingham reported that despite Brandeston being in the initial plan for activation by Aug 2018, it appears that this is no longer the case. The required infrastructure was installed in the village in early 2018 (Jan/Feb) and the time period between this and commissioning is usually 8 weeks. However, this is now 7 months later and there has been no contact from BT or Openreach about commissioning or ‘go live’ dates. It was pointed out by a village observer at the meeting that 2 new telegraph poles with super fast technology have this week been erected in Mill Lane. Cllr Buckingham also mentioned that the website for Better Broadband Suffolk has changed and Openreach now handles the search engine for progress <https://www.betterbroadbandsuffolk.com/>

Cllr Buckingham's postcode IP137AE currently shows ‘in scope,’ but does not acknowledge that the design, field survey and build stages have actually been completed. Cllr Buckingham remains in contact with relevant people at Better Broadband Suffolk and will continue to provide regular updates.

9.5 Footpaths/Litter –Obstruction on Footpath 4. A complaint from villager refers to FP 42. A report has been sent by the Clerk to SCC and Councillor Churchill is to walk the path next weekend to see exactly what the problem is.

9.6 To appoint a tree officer. It was agreed that Councillor Norman would undertake this role.

9.7 Police Liaison – Councillor Duffy Safer Neighbourhood teams to be beefed up by about 104 officers. Crime Commissioner Passmore is trying to recruit horseriders and individuals to walk around the village to be ‘eyes and ears’.

3-1819/10 Date of next meeting: 13th November 2018.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.10pm.

Items for the November Agenda by 5pm on Saturday 4th November