

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at  
7.15pm on Monday 9 September 2019**

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

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

**Also present:** District Councillor Colin Hedgley (for part of the meeting) and fifteen members of the public (for all/part of the meeting)

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

There were no apologies, declarations of interest or requests for dispensations.

County Councillor Robin Vickery had sent apologies as he was on holiday.

**2 Public Participation Session**

**Ipswich Northern Route**

Members of the public asked the following questions/made the following points:

- Had the Stop! petition reached the 5,000 signatures which would enable Dr Poulter MP to raise the matter in parliament?
- Is there a process for removing a County Councillor who does not “obey the rules”?
- A representative of Save Our Country Spaces advised of the impact of the routes on the public rights of way network and ‘well-being’ and drew attention to the SCC Green Access Strategy consultation.

In response the Chairman advised:

- The current number of petition signatures was around 3,200, and more may be collected at the Stop! march to Endeavour House on 13 September
- A vote of no confidence was on the Agenda for consideration by Councillors during the meeting. He had discussed the matter with both Dr Poulter and District Councillor Hedgley and had consulted the Local Government Association’s Guidance for Councillors

**3 Minutes of the Meetings Held on 1 and 22 July and 19 August 2019**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To approve the minutes of these meetings.

**4 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

**SALC Area Forum on 2 September**

The Chairman reported on the Forum, the notes of which had been distributed to Councillors, as follows:

- The SALC DCEO had advised that he had confirmed to many parish councils that they were able to make a S137 donation to the Stop! campaign
- One parish council chairman had thought that an INR had already been approved.

- Only 20 out of 92 parish councils had attended and SALC was working to improve attendance, especially from the former Waveney area.

### **The Admiral's Head**

ESC had acknowledged receipt of the Council's letter advising of difficulty in obtaining access to the pub, and FoTAH would be informed.

The Agenda was re-ordered to enable District Councillor Hedgley to give his report as he had other council meetings to attend.

## **5 Reports from Local County and District Councillors**

There was no report from Mr Vickery.

Mr Hedgley's report had been circulated to Councillors, and included a statement from the leader of ESC regarding the INR consultation. He also commented:

- He had attended seven public and seven parish council meetings since the INR consultation had been launched. The leader of ESC had said that he would not attend any meetings while the consultation was running.
- £292,000 government funding had been allocated to deal with rough sleepers, this being an issue in the former Waveney area
- ESC Benefit Fraud Team had prevented fraud totalling £1,823,000 in the last year
- He still had some money in his locality budget if anyone had a project which needed funding.
- He was available to residents should they wish to raise any matter with him.

## **6 Planning**

### **6.1 DC/19/2900: Listed Building Consent – 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.

### **6.2 Response to Sizewell C Stage 4 Consultation**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that there was no comment to be added to previous submissions.

### **6.3 Response to Ipswich Northern Route Consultation**

A draft consultation response had been circulated to Councillors. Councillors made the following points:

- ESC had not approved the principle of any INR and the consultation documentation was misleading in implying that it had
- the consultation process was flawed, for example only one submission could be made per computer, not per person, and even that had not always been possible

- there would be an adverse impact on traffic at the Woodbridge and Martlesham A12 roundabouts, which were already congested
- the Options Appraisal Report Summary was illogical, giving an INR a high score for 'well-being' and concluding 'do nothing' represented greater financial risk than building an INR. It contained no basis for the scoring system used and did not include a consideration of combining delivery of some of the 31 options listed.
- it was beyond careless that SCC had not visited The Street before publishing the route options, given the severe impact on the village and on access to facilities at Martlesham
- there was no proposal for the future of the Martlesham Park and Ride facility
- Suffolk Chamber of Commerce did not support an INR
- SCC had not followed NPPF guidance and produced a plan-led proposal, instead it proposed house building to fund the project
- there was no evidence base or traffic modelling basis for the assumptions made
- despite a request, SCC had refused to release any GDP projections to support its claims that economic growth would result.

The Chairman advised that, in preparing its response the Council had met four times since the launch of the INR consultation and had been one of the first parish councils to arrange a public meeting. It had invited both SCC and Stop! to present at its meeting on 22 July, although only Stop! had accepted the invitation. The Council had also surveyed all households with a questionnaire and approximately 120 had been returned. It had sent representatives to every Stop! parish council meeting and had arranged for posters and banners to be displayed in the village. It had also donated 20% of its reserves to the Stop! campaign. It was publicising the Stop! March on Endeavour House on 13 September via enews.

The members of the public present applauded the Council for its work.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that the Council submit its response to the consultation, maintaining its objection to any INR, specifically opposing the Inner and Middle Route options in view of their impact on the parish, and rejecting the consultation as flawed in both content and process
- to thank Dr Poulter for visiting the village and arranging for press coverage to highlight the impact of proposing The Street as a key connecting road.

#### **6.4 Vote of No Confidence in County Councillor Robin Vickery**

The Chairman advised that Councillor Vickery had attended the Council meeting held on 1 July, the day the INR consultation was launched and advised that he was in favour of an INR. He had not attended the Council meeting on 22 July. He had attended the meeting on 19 August. The Chairman had emailed to ask for his comments and assistance on four aspects relating to the mechanics of the consultation – eg that only one response per computer was possible. The Chairman had also emailed Mr Vickery asking him to put his reasons for supporting an INR in writing, to inform the Council's full and fair consideration of the consultation and his position at this meeting. No replies had been received by the Chairman to the emails, or to hard copies of the emails delivered to him by hand. A chase email concerning his attendance at this meeting had established that he was on holiday until 16 September.

The Council was aware:

- of Local Government Association guidance to Councillors which stated that a Councillor's primary role was to represent their electorate
- that Mr Vickery was also an Ipswich Borough Councillor which could present a conflict of interest in the INR matter
- it was not known when SCC would consider the outcome of the INR consultation, and in consequence there was no certainty of a date by which it would be known if Mr Vickery maintained his stance to support an INR
- it was not for the Council to determine Mr Vickery's views for him

After due consideration it was **RESOLVED**:

- that Mr Vickery be advised:
  - of the Council's response to the INR consultation and its wish for him to represent its view, and the views of the other parishes in the Carlford ward in respect of the INR, to SCC in his capacity as elected County Councillor
  - that the Council wish to be informed of his final decision in respect of whether to support an INR, and if so, which route(s), after the end of the public consultation process on 13 September and by the end of September 2019
  - that, if no response was received to the above request by the end of September 2019, or if a response was received which confirmed his support for any INR route, that the Council had no confidence in his ability to represent them as their elected County Councillor

## 6.5 Update on Applications/Enforcement

### **DC/19/0309/FUL: Proposed Residential Development: Land east of Beacon Oaks, Martlesham Road**

The Planning Inspectorate had refused the appeal against the decision of ESC not to grant permission for this development.

ESC had approved the following applications:

#### **DC/19/2704/TPO – Holly Lodge, Martlesham Road**

#### **DC/19/2349/FUL – Alternations and Extensions: The Chestnuts, Martlesham Road**

### **Sinks Pit Liaison Meetings**

Mr Hunter and Ms Saagi reported that a meeting had been planned for 5 September, but had been rearranged for 19 September. As Mr Hunter was unavailable it was **RESOLVED**:

- that Ms Saagi and Mr Garnham would attend on behalf of the Council.

## 7 Highways

### 7.1 Grit Bins

The Chairman reported that the three grit bins were in reasonable condition, although a hinge on the one between Holly Lane and the Church needed repair. No new supply of grit was required. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to ask a volunteer to repair the hinge.

## **SAVID**

**7.2** It was **RESOLVED**:

- that Mr Garnham would represent the Council at the next meeting of SAVID on 24 September.

## **8 Police/ESC Liaison Meeting**

The Chairman had attended and notes had been circulated to Councillors; matters raised had included early morning TRU traffic through Grundisburgh. The meeting had been attended by Andrew Joliffe, Communities Officer at ESC, whose role was to support local communities, including identifying funding sources. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to invite Mr Joliffe to attend a future meeting of the Council
- that Mr Hopkins would attend the next Liaison Meeting, on 3 October.

## **9 Finance**

### **9.1 Adoption of New Financial Regulations**

The new Regulations had been circulated to Councillors and it was **RESOLVED**:

- to adopt new Financial Regulations as issued by NALC in July 2019.

### **9.2 Income and Authorisation of Expenditure**

There was income of £29.50 from Great Bealings Parish Council, a share of printing costs for a leaflet to residents of both parishes in respect of the INR consultation and promoting the enewsgroup. It was **RESOLVED** that the following expenditure be incurred:

- ThomsonPage – leaflet printing: £59.00
- Suffolk Preservation Society Annual Subscription: £30.00
- Clerk's net salary for September and expenses: £341.18
- PAYE for September: £68.20
- Clerk's net salary for October: £273.70
- PAYE for October: £68.20
- LCPAS: DPA Contract: £50.00
- Payment of the premium for the Council's insurance policy, once received.

A schedule of the above payments (excluding the insurance premium payment) was signed by the Chairman and cheques were signed by Ms Head and Dr Hopkins.

## **10 Circulated Items and Correspondence**

**10.1 Matters Arising**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to establish whether the Council's website complied with legislation in respect of 'ease of access'.

**10.2 Items to Circulate**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that Clerks and Councils Direct Issue No 125 be circulated to Councillors.

**11 Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council would be on 4 November 2019, when the Council would set its budget for 2020/21. The Chairman requested that any proposals for projects to be considered at the meeting be given to the Clerk by 1 October.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.45pm.