

## BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

The Minute of the meeting held on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2019 at 7.30pm in the Committee Room of the Village Hall.

**Present:** Councillors Buckingham (acting chair) Fletcher, Baker, Williams, Summers, Clerk Catherine Bacon and four members of the public.

### **6/1920/1 Welcome from the Chairman**

The Chair welcomed Councillors and the members of the public to the meeting. She outlined that the members of the public would have an opportunity to raise issues during the Public Forum.

**6/1920/2 To receive and accept apologies for absence** from Councillors M Mitson-Woods (personal), R Mitson-Woods (personal) and East Suffolk Councillor Cooke (personal). They were accepted.

### **6/1920/3 Declarations of interest**

None

### **6/1920/4 Public Forum**

A member of the public asked why names of members of the public attending the parish council meetings are not recorded in the minutes. The Chair stated that the parish council's standing orders did not require names to be taken or published and indeed to do so might have the opposite effect of discouraging contributions. The Chair also re-iterated that from today, all new Planning Applications received by the Parish Clerk would be circulated to the village via the Brandeston email group and posted in the noticeboard.

A member of the public raised the point that there were four villagers at the parish council meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019, all of whom raised objections to the planning application DC/19/2465/FUL (Creation of field access, Os 228 Land East Of, Mill Lane, Brandeston), yet the parish council granted consent. The member of the public was concerned that the parish council did not properly take on board these objections nor concur with them when making its formal response to the application, even those which were believed to be 'material grounds.' The chair responded that the parish council was obliged to consider only material considerations when responding to planning applications (e.g. highway safety, loss of views etc). Further that four views which concur did not necessarily reflect the greater village point of view. The role of the parish council was to act on behalf of the community. Further information on the role of the parish council in this respect would be provided to a future meeting for minuting.

A member of the public asked whether the council would be consulting the village regarding the Neighbourhood Plan topic included on the agenda for the 9<sup>th</sup> September 2019 meeting. The Chair confirmed that the parish council would be hearing from Cllr Summers on the topic later in the meeting and had not yet made a decision about any further steps.

A member of the public enquired about the status of the piece of land associated with the Revett Trust and the Trust itself, particularly in relation to the income generated by the land being made available in the form of a grant to support the purchase of books, available to students residing in the village. Councillor Baker informed the public that he had had a conversation with David Risk (previous parish council Chair) who believed that the account was now closed. **It was resolved that**

**this would be referred to Councillor M Mitson-Woods who had previously agreed to investigate this.**

The Chair made a further response to members of the public, reminding them that the Parish Council was predominantly a newly elected and co-opted group, which will inevitably become more familiar with its responsibilities and its rules as time goes on. Training materials had been purchased to help Cllrs get up to speed and training courses were also being provided.

In the meantime, the Chair agreed to provide a short note of some of the key functions/limitations of the parish council, as governed by its Standing Orders, to the next meeting, as she believed that this would be helpful to the Council and also of interest to residents. In particular, declaration of interests, material considerations and speaking rights.

**5/1920/5 It was resolved that the Chair should sign the Minute of the meetings held on 9<sup>th</sup> July and 20<sup>th</sup> August as a true and accurate record. (Circulated and on website)**

**2/1920/6 No report received from County Councillor Vickery**

**2/1920/7** The Chair summarised the report from East Suffolk Councillor Cooke (attached).

**2/1920/8 Financial Matters – Clerk/RFO**

- a) Bank reconciliation for the Parish Council Account was circulated and subsequently signed off by Councillor Buckingham.
- b) Bank reconciliation for the 100+ Account was circulated and subsequently signed off by Councillor Buckingham.

**2/1920/9** The Clerk informed the council that the HSBC account had been delayed by HSBC closing the initial application as it expired during the application time frame. Having submitted a formal complaint to the bank the application was re-opened but this has created its own delays in submitting fresh mandates and obtaining new passwords and internet banking materials. Transferring money and closing the Barclays bank account will have to be done manually within the near future.

**5/1920/10** Councillor Summers provided an oral report from the Ipswich Northern Bypass consultation (attached). Councillor Buckingham invited views as to whether the council needed to formally respond to the plans, given Brandeston's location some distance from any of the proposed routes. Councillors agreed that at this stage there was no need for the council to comment and instead should wait to see whether the bypass is approved in principle and if so, keep a watching brief as to what happens next, particularly with regard to the route it might take.

**2/1920/11(a)** Councillor Summers provided a brief synopsis on Neighbourhood Development Plans; procedure, pros and cons. Her summary will be circulated along with the Minute of this meeting. It is clear that a lot of work is required to get the plan into place; that it cannot be used simply to state what the village will not accept, in planning terms, but instead must be a full and transparent examination of all economic, social and environmental issues and a full community engagement exercise. Once agreed, the plan effectively forms part of the Local Plan and the policies contained within it is then used by the local planning authority when determining planning applications.

The councillors were conscious of the amount of work involved in undertaking a Neighbourhood Development Plan and the likelihood of needing to engage a planning consultant for this purpose.

Also that it was possibly the case that Neighbourhood Development Plans were more appropriate for larger, more urban councils. Nevertheless, Cllrs were keen to hear views of the villagers on the matter and would discuss again at the next meeting. Members of the public are therefore invited to share their views at the next meeting or in writing, beforehand.

**2/1920/11(b) In relation to this matter (creation of a Delivery Plan by the parish council), it was agreed to defer this item until Councillor M Mitson-Woods is present, as this was her original suggestion.**

**2/1920/12** The Chair provided a brief background regarding the village 'triangles' (two small, triangular parcels of land) for the benefit of those present. Councillor Summers had drafted a provisional parish council policy relating to the use of this land for advertising, which she shared. Cllrs were in agreement with the draft as proposed and Councillor Summers will work on a final draft with Mary Kettley and submit to the next meeting for adoption. Cllr Fletcher suggested erecting one 'no parking' sign on each triangle to compensate for the lack of wooden posts along the perimeter which would have provided a physical barrier. This was supported by the Council.

**2/1920/13** Cllr M Mitson-Woods to report on her progress with this at the next meeting.

**2/1920/14** Councillor Baker reported that at the Brandeston Village Hall committee meeting, reaction to the introduction of a TerraCycle scheme had been positive. He had subsequently researched the scheme further, investigating the items that were free to setup initially. Councillor Baker will return to the village hall committee to enquire whether this is something they are willing to take on, as guardians of the village hall.

**2/1920/15** Councillor Fletcher reported his recommendations for a new laptop for the parish council that he felt was suitable both in functionality and price. The alternative option to clean/better maintain the existing laptop was also discussed, but the benefit of doing this is likely to depend on the age of the existing equipment (to be clarified). East Suffolk Councillor Cooke may have funds available for new equipment (as mentioned at a previous meeting). It was agreed that if the existing laptop is less than 5 years old then an application for new equipment will be made via Cllr Cook.

**2/1920/16** Councillor R Mitson-Woods provided written information regarding the Sizewell C consultations – see item 5/1920/19

#### **2/1920/17 Planning**

- a) DC/19/3384/TCA: T1 – Blue Cedar; carry out a crown reduction and shape the tree by reducing over-bearing/extended limbs after storm damage and bough drop due to split union. T2 – Silver Birch; reduce whole tree size by 25% as this has become a very over-bearing tree in its location. No adverse comment to make; recommend consent be granted.

**2/1920/18 In response to a written question from a member of the public about preparedness following Brexit**, the Chair had looked into advisory information provided by both local and national government. Much of it related to civil unrest, community engagement and the role of local government in offering assurances to communities, especially more vulnerable groups. Guidance for EU citizens and for local businesses has also been published. Brandeston PC will 'do its bit' and look to SALC (Suffolk Association of Local Councils) and NALC (National Association) for guidance and direction and also to East Suffolk DC and Suffolk County Council, as regular stakeholders. More information can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/how-to-prepare-if-the-uk-leaves-the-eu-with-no-deal>

**2/1920/19** Councillor R Mitson-Woods had obtained an information pack at the most recent round of consultation regarding Sizewell C which has now been circulated. **It was resolved that the link to the Sizewell C information will be put up on the website.**

**2/1920/20** Discussion regarding ideas for the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of WW2 was deferred until the next meeting at which point Councillor Baker will also be able to report back the thoughts of the Village Hall Committee and the Parochial Church Council on the same.

**2/1920/21 Date of Next Meeting Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> November 2019, 7.30pm, Brandeston Village Hall**  
Councillors to submit items to the Clerk by Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> October 2019.

DRAFT

## Summary to Guide to Neighbourhood Planning

- Community led approach
- Vision & policies for future development
  - o Robust evidence base
  - o Effective community engagement
  - o Plan owned by local community

### Stage 1

- Usually PC establish a working group or steering committee
  - o Community led
  - o A PC may chair
  - o PC accountable for formal stages
  - o Establish neighbourhood area, Parish boundary or smaller
  - o LA has duty to support and provide resources

### Stage 2

- Preparing the Plan
  - o Evidenced based
  - o Rational, proper, relate to the place, understanding of realistic, local, relevant issues
  - o Community engagement & consultation, community take ownership
  - o Economic, social, community, environment, infrastructure
  - o Identify local partners & stakeholders
  - o Community engagement programme – Brandeston could be face to face, larger communities need websites etc. Must engage with all groups including the hard to reach
  - o Plan to be in line with ‘key strategic local policies’ & National Policy Framework
  - o Development, vision & aims
  - o Development, planning policies, site allocation & housing, employment, community facilities

### Stage 3

- Bring Plan into Force
  - o Independent examination then referendum
  - o When confirmed it becomes a statutory plan
  - o Now for the delivery

### Role of Parish Councillors

- Two-way engagement
- Enhance role of individual PC
- PC can act as a community Champion and advocate for the project
- Two-way reporting, facilitate, dialogue with stakeholders, business, developers and landowners
- Leader or Chair of the committee/steering group

### Neighbourhood Plan Must Be

- Community owned
- Transparent
- Public audit trail
- PC declarations
- PC / individual PCs must have PI
- Can commission consultants
- Councillors monitor & implement plan. Annual assessment of delivery, update plan every 5 years

### **Councillor Summers**

**10 September 2019**

**2/1920/11(a)**

DRAFT

**Brandeston Parish Council Policy for Advertisement Consent on Parish Council Owned Land September 2019**

Temporary notices up to 0.6 square metres relating to local events, such as street parties, village hall events and productions, may be displayed for a short period.

All other notices will be removed and disposed of.

All temporary notices must:

- be kept clean and tidy;
- be kept in a safe condition;
- not obscure, or hinder the interpretation of, official roads, byways or footpaths, or otherwise make hazardous the use of them;
- be removed carefully within 48 hours after the date of the event.

The Parish Council will not grant permission for larger professional adverts, for signs for businesses and commercial events, on Parish Council owned land.

The Parish Council reserve their right to erect signs on Parish Council owned land.

**Brandeston Parish Council Policy for Use of Parish Council Owned Land.**

At all times there is strictly no parking, waiting or loading permitted on Parish Council owned land. (This includes; residents, visitors, service and other maintenance vehicles.)

**Cllr Summers**  
**10 September 2019**  
**2/1920/12**

## **Sizewell Summary**

There appears to be little change as far as Brandeston is concerned. I discussed in detail at the consultation meetings about the Wickham Market situation. They still intend using the Valley Farm route and will be creating passing places p to the drift road point. The bridge will have a 3 tonne limit imposed. Perhaps the parish council can look at the consultation document and let Councillor R Mitson-Woods their comments, after which he will complete and return the questionnaire supplied by Sizewell C consultation.

**Councillor R Mitson-Woods**  
**10 September 2019**  
**2/1920/16**

DRAFT

## **Ipswich Northern Route (INR) Report**

There are three initial route options presented for consultation, although the exact alignment of each option could yet change within defined corridor constraints.

The scheme seeks to provide greater travel options for road users.

It is commonly thought that much of the focus is on transport security to Felixstowe (as in high winds the Orwell Bridge closes to high sided traffic and Ipswich turns into grid-lock).

The INR intends to also remove a proportion of traffic from Ipswich (inside the new 'ring') with the potential to optimise traffic flows within the current road system and reduce the impact of vehicle emissions by creating more one-way roads and closing other roads as dedicated cycle routes.

Much work has been done on 'saturation points', the junctions where traffic backs-up and brings the road network to a standstill (worst in school term).

The funding for the scheme will be reliant upon political support at National level and dependent upon a competitive business case being made. The business case is not focussed solely on the generation of new housing (as many believe) but the opportunity to improve the existing housing stock within Ipswich by making it more accessible and desirable as well as opening-up new opportunities for employment growth.

After the end of the initial consultation period on 13<sup>th</sup> September, Suffolk County Council will need to decide whether or not to commit a further £0.5m to working-up an outline business case in support of an identified route option. It is not yet certain that SCC will commit this level of expenditure without some indication from MP's and central Government that the scheme will be seen as presenting greater benefit than other competing schemes in other parts of the Country.

It is likely that if a scheme is selected, the government will fund a long-term loan. with repayments made from the monies raised in and around the Ipswich area from business and housing development.

In summary; the initial three route options have caused panic amongst property owners, having a blighting effect on their main/only investment. If the scheme is to go ahead, it would be preferable to identify the route as soon as possible, in order for people to come to terms with it and know where they stand. If the scheme is left in limbo, the property near and within the corridors of the three routes could potentially be 'effectively blighted' for years to come.

**Cllr Summers**  
**10 September 2019**  
**5/1920/10**

DRAFT