

## **Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.15pm on Monday 19 August 2019**

**Present:** Mr I Ransome (Chairman), Mr M Garnham, Ms D Head, Dr Hopkins, Mr D Hunter, Ms H Saagi and Mrs M Wilson

**In attendance:** Mrs C Ramsden, Clerk to the Council

**Also present:** County Councillor Robin Vickery, District Councillor Colin Hedgley and eight members of the public for part of the meeting

### **1. Apologies, Declarations of Interest and Dispensation Requests**

There were no apologies, declarations of interest or dispensation requests.

### **2. Public Participation Session**

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

A resident stated that he wanted to know the views of the local District and County Councillors in relation to the INR proposals, how they had formed them and were they canvassing the views of their electorate.

In response District Councillor Hedgley stated:

- He had received an apology from SCC as District Councillors had received details of the consultation after it was released to parish councils. He had no additional information and he and District Councillor Tony Fryatt were visiting every one of the 19 parish councils in their ward and attending public meetings to gather views
- He was aware that around 95% of those he had spoken to were against, with only two for a route, but there were many more to hear from. However, on the basis of the information available and, unless an extraordinary option such as an INR tunnel was proposed, he was against it.
- The inner route would destroy the Fynn Valley. This was not nimbyism; it is a special area. He was also morally against a scheme which affected so many people's homes and required some to be demolished, as the middle route did at Grundisburgh. The outer route would have no impact on Ipswich traffic congestion.
- He had not responded to the consultation as, if the matter proceeded beyond the current consultation, he did not want to preclude his participation as a member of the ESC Planning Committee which will determine ESC's view on the matter. He does however have a Stop! banner at his property.
- He advised that ESC has not debated the principle of an INR. The previous Council, SCDC, agreed at a meeting of the Suffolk Leaders' Group, to the consultation being carried out, as SCC wished to pursue it. ESC has therefore agreed to the consultation; it has not agreed to support an INR.
- He advised that while he would be influenced by the views of the electorate, he would vote on the matter in accordance with his conscience if it came before the E.S.C. Planning Committee.

In response County Councillor Robin Vickery stated:

- He had had over 100 emails and letters on the subject and had responded to most and passed views to the consultation team.
- He was in favour of an INR in principle but had not finally made up his mind. He was attending many parish council meetings and public meetings. He wanted to hear from the parish councils before deciding which route to favour. The only submitted response he had to date is from Playford Parish Council.
- He stressed the importance of responding to the consultation and putting views forward. The next decision would be whether to pursue the matter further, with a lot of 'process' and consultation before an earliest implementation date of 2027. It was also uncertain that an INR would get government funding; it had been refused twice in the last 40 years.
- He agreed that most of the opinion he had received was against an INR. He had kept a low profile as he understood how residents feel, but he was thinking of the bigger picture of what was best for Suffolk. He considered that people against would make the loudest noise and the outcome of the consultation should be awaited. He will submit his own views nearer the consultation deadline once the parish councils' views are known.
- In respect of the Council's resolution at its meeting on 22 July he did not accept that he had been promoting the benefits of an INR to Ipswich.

Other points made to Councillor Vickery related to:

- Only one submission from a home computer being possible; this deprived multi occupancy homes of a say
- If the consultation was forwarded to another computer, completion still was not possible
- One household had been unable to make any online submission; was data secure?
- If the consultation was printed for posting, there was no address provided
- Councillors had been refused hard copies of the consultation and the freepost envelopes at SCC consultation events • How could the freepost envelope be obtained for residents who were not online?
- It was not possible to respond to the consultation and say 'No route'
- Officers manning the consultation events had little knowledge and did not engage or answer questions

Councillor Vickery agreed to pursue the non-availability of hard copies of the consultation and the freepost envelopes.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Vickery for attending the meeting.

### **3. Planning Applications**

**3.1 DC/19/2899/FUL:** Extension of the external toilet in order to accommodate a new boiler to heat the Church. The existing shed will be replaced with a new one to provide storage for the Church: All Saints Church, The Street

It was RESOLVED that:

- There was no objection to the development.

### 3.2. Update on Applications

#### ENV/2019/0255/DEV: 1 Holly Lane

ESC had advised that no development in respect of the refused application at this property was being carried out.

## 4. Ipswich Northern Route

The Council had attended two Stop! Meetings, held on 25 July and 14 August and notes had been circulated to Councillors. Analysis of 114 returns to the Council's residents' survey had resulted in District Councillor Hedgley being advised of three points to raise with the leader of ESC, which related to the destruction of the village community, the impact on access for properties and the impact on Bealings School children walking along The Street.

Councillor Hedgley advised that he had visited The Street with the leader of ESC, who agreed that the lack of a pavement between the Village Hall car park and the School was a major issue – although a County Council responsibility to resolve. He and District Councillor Tony Fryatt had impressed upon the leader the strength of feeling and that proposing a 20mph zone as a key feeder route was 'madness'.

It was noted that:

- four more Stop! Banners had been purchased by residents
- Daniel Poulter MP would be visiting The Street on 6 September, with the EADT (and local radio/tv?) to highlight the impact
- Over 100 volunteers had attended a Stop! volunteers event and the parish had been very well represented, with Mr Hunter joining the Research group and other residents joining the Door-to-Door and Fundraising groups
- Kesgrave Town Council had resolved to oppose an IRN
- Woodbridge Town Council had arranged a public meeting for 22 August to debate the matter
- Melton Parish Council was opposing all three routes
- SCC did not appear to have considered recent research on CO2 emissions, the impact of building new roads, or to have researched the impact of the route, eg on non motorised users such as pedestrians using The Street
- There was no provision for pedestrian safety or a pavement/refuge points for the length of the 'key connecting route' from the parish boundary in Playford Road to the parish boundary with Great Bealings in The Street.
- There seemed to be no logic in which property owners affected by the proposed routes had been contacted directly by SCC, and SCC had advised that no dialogue on compensation was possible until a route had been chosen.

#### It was RESOLVED that:

- the Chairman and Dr Hopkins would represent the Council at the Stop! PC meeting to be held at 7.30pm on 5 September

- the Council supported the following statement proposed by Grundisburgh Parish Council to be submitted jointly: “The above Town/Parish Councils and Parish Meetings object in the strongest terms to all the routes put forward by Suffolk County Council in the document Ipswich Northern Route consultation. The case for the need of a Northern Route has not been made and the environmental damage would be immense”.
- Mr Hunter would draft a response to the INR consultation to be considered at the Council’s meeting on 9 September
- That a flyer, jointly funded with Gt Bealings Parish Council, would be included in the next edition of the Fynn Lark News, to encourage completion of the INR survey and signing up to the local enewsgroup.

**The next part of the minutes of the meeting are exempt from publication in accordance with Standing Order 3(b) and S1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960 on the grounds that publicity of the Council’s consideration of a community bid for the property would be prejudicial to the public interest due to its commercial sensitivity.**

**5.**

## **6. Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council would be on 9 September 2019.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.25pm.