

Minutes of the Annual meeting of Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council held on 7th May 2024 commencing at 7.30pm at the village hall.

Present: Mr W Pipe, Mr D Lugo, Mr J Bird, Mrs K Lindsay, Mr H Brightwell and Mrs C Frost (Clerk). There were 15 members of the public present.

1. Election of Chairman, other office holders and sub-committees.

- (a) Mr Pipe was nominated as Chair by Mr Brightwell. This was seconded by Mr Lugo and unanimously agreed. Mr Pipe signed his Declaration of Acceptance of Office witnessed by the Clerk.
- (b) Mr Brightwell was nominated as Vice Chair by Mr Pipe. This was seconded by Mr Bird and unanimously agreed.
- (c) The role of Clerk was nominated to continue as RFO by Mr Pipe. This was seconded by Mrs Lindsay and unanimously agreed.
- (d) Mr T Wright had been contacted prior to the meeting and had agreed to continue to act as Tree Warden. This was unanimously agreed.
- (e) Mr Lugo and Mr Bird were proposed to remain the representatives of the Parish Council on the playground and playing field issues, with the power to co-opt from outside of the Parish Council if and as required. This was unanimously agreed.
- (f) Ms Procter was proposed to remain the representative of Parish Council on highway and traffic issues. This was unanimously agreed. Ms Procter was absent from the meeting and it was agreed the Clerk would check Ms Procter after the meeting.
- (g) Mr Brightwell was proposed as the representative of the Parish Council on Community police matters. This was unanimously agreed.
- (h) Mrs Lindsay agreed to represent the Parish Council on Planning matters, with additional representation from Parish Councillors available at the time. This was unanimously agreed.
- (i) Mrs Lindsay agreed to remain the representative of the Parish Council on the Community Partnership programme. This was unanimously agreed.
- (j) Mr Bird agreed to represent the Parish Council for ESPA meetings. This was unanimously agreed.

2. Chairman's Welcome and Apologies. Mr Pipe welcomed every one present to the meeting and commented that it was encouraging to have so many people present. Apologies were received from Ms Procter (Parish Councillor). These were approved. Apologies were received from Cllr Bryce (County Councillor). Apologies were also received from Cllr Hedgley (District Councillor) who would arrive later in the meeting as he was also attending other Annual Parish meetings on the same evening.

3. To receive declarations of interest. Mr Pipe and Mr Brightwell re Item 10(b). Mrs Lindsay, as a neighbour re Item 10(c).

4. Public Forum A resident commented that 6 months ago she had put forward a question for the Parish Council to investigate the possibility of pursuing a speed reduction from 30mph to 20mph in the village (in particular of the most congested/narrow through road - between the bridge in The Street to the other side of the S-Bend) and possibly raise the matter with the County and District Councillors, but had received no answer. The Clerk had replied the following day to the initial enquiry that traffic issues and speeding is always on the meeting Agendas and that the email would be forwarded to the Parish Council to consider. It was reported at the meeting that it was still an on-going matter being investigated and was included in the Highways report provided by Ms Procter, and which would be presented to the meeting later that evening.

Another resident wanted to know about the traffic calming measures proposed by Suffolk County Council Highways, which would be considered under Item 11(a), and asked that residents whether would be able to put forward their views on the matter later in the meeting. Mr Pipe agreed that the meeting would be flexible, within reason, to take resident views in to account when the Item was discussed later.

5. Minutes of the Parish Council Meetings held on 5th March 2024 and 15th April 2024 These were approved.

6. Matters arising. The Clerk reported that no reply had yet been received by the Parish Council to the email sent to Matthew Hicks on 24th April, which requested that the bus timetable is reviewed, in the hope that the County Council (SCC) would be able to reinstate a service around the original times. Parish Councillors had been emailed with the follow up email from a resident to their reply received from Matthew Hicks about the reduced bus service. The resident has suggested to Matthew Hicks that any input from SCC Highways to the Local Planning Authority should take into account the specific bus service provided for that village, and comments from SCC Highways should be adapted if the bus service for a specific village is reduced as it definitely results in more car journeys and the need for more parking spaces.

7. To consider the completed Internal audit report The completed report had been emailed to Parish Councillors the day before to consider. The Report had been noted and there were the following Recommendations, including the comments response:

A. Recommendation: To sequentially number loose leaf pages or minute items. The Clerk reported that the Minutes from now on would have sequentially numbered pages.

8. Clerk's Report, Financial Report, and Authorisation of payments and correspondence

- A. The Clerk advised that the hours worked since 1st March 2024 to 1st May 2024 were 190 (of which 28 hours were paid).
- B. **The Clerk requested approval, and it was agreed**, for the following payments (inclusive of VAT where appropriate) which had been made on behalf of the Parish Council:
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| (1) Annual street lighting maintenance and electricity | £133.33 |
| (2) Replacement Speed Indicator Device (SID) | £4,108.80 |
- C. **The Clerk requested approval, and it was agreed**, for the following payments (inclusive of VAT where appropriate) which were still to be made:
- | | |
|---|---------|
| (1) Annual subscription for SALC membership | £211.50 |
| (2) Clerk's salary from 1 st March 2024 to 1 st May 2024 (28 hours) | £391.00 |
- D. As required by the Financial Regulations, the approved schedule of payments had been ruled off and were initialled by the Chair.
- E. As required by the Financial Regulations, the bank reconciliations were verified at the financial year end. This had been completed by Mrs Lindsay and the signed documents were returned to the Clerk. This was required to be reported, including any exceptions, of which there were none.
- F. The Parish Council had been emailed details, prior to the meeting, of the auditing regulations and completion of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return for 2023 2024. **The Annual Governance Statement was agreed and approved unanimously.** The relevant page of the AGAR was signed by the Chairman and the Clerk.
- G. The Clerk reported that the amounts held by the Parish Council accounts to date were £1,595.49 (Current Account) and £26,498.32 (Savings Account). The Final accounts, and Accounting Statements for the year 2023–2024 and the financial accounts for the period 1st April 2024 to date were submitted, **accepted and unanimously approved.** The relevant page of the AGAR was signed by the Chairman. The same page had been signed by the Clerk prior to the meeting.

- H. **It was agreed, and a resolution was made,** that the Parish Council met the criteria to be an exempt authority and approved the completion of a Certificate of Exemption from a Limited Assurance Review for 2023 2024. The Document was signed by the Chairman and the Clerk.
- I. The Parish Council were asked to approve, **and it was agreed,** to receive the accounts in future via email before a meeting, ready for their approval at that meeting, instead of individual copies being printed and presented to each Councillor by the Clerk as they would also be viewable at the meeting via the Parish Council projector.
- J. The Clerk reported that the above total charge for the replacement SID was £494 below the budget amount. It should be noted that grants totalling £3,000 had been used to purchase the above replacement SID, and these were detailed on the Accounts. Reserves had been used for the cost in excess of the grant amounts, and the difference in the budgeted and spent amounts would be noted in the Accounts.
- K. Approval was requested, **and it was agreed,** for the purchase of a laptop bag for the new Clerk. Funding for the bag would be from the Enabling Communities Budget which was granted for the purchase of the Parish Council owned laptop and projector. The cost was expected to be in the region of £30 to £45.00. The Parish Council were also asked to consider approval, **and it was agreed,** for the suspension of Regulation 6.20 of the Financial Regulations to allow for this purchase.
- L. As part of the Street Trading Policy, East Suffolk Council had invited Parish Councils to suggest streets that should become prohibited from trading taking place. There were no comments.
- M. East Suffolk Council had emailed a link to an important mental health signposting document that is now available for communities – Well Minds East Suffolk, and have asked for help to share the information. **There was agreement** for the link to be put on the Parish Council website to the booklet, for the Clerk to ask if the village Community facebook page and villager email contact list holder (both independent of the Parish Council) would like to consider for publication. Also, for the Clerk to approach local businesses (such as the coffee shop owner and The Fountain) to see if they were interested in holding hard copies as there was no local shop in the village. Mrs Lindsay kindly offered to pick up a few copies at the 10th June Community Partnership meeting.
- N. **There was agreement** for Parish Councillors to continue receiving the Suffolk Trading Standards bulletins via email.
- O. The Clerk reported that an accessibility check had been completed on the Parish Council website and the website had been updated accordingly.

9. Report on Community Policing

Mr Brightwell had emailed his report to Parish Councillors earlier in the day and read his report to the meeting. For a copy of the report, please see the Additional Notes on Minutes of this meeting, which are viewable on the Parish Council website

www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net

Mr Brightwell also referred to the Suffolk Police website which provides advice about local police matters and information on reporting crimes, issues and incidents.

10. Planning Matters including:

(a) To note East Suffolk Council decisions on planning applications since the meeting of 5th March 2024

1. DC/24/0592/TCA – 1 Pine – Crown raise to 3.5 metres above ground and prune. The Street. **Responded** (no objection).

2. DC/243/0840/FUL – Ground & first floor rear extensions. Keightley Way. **Awaiting decision.**

Mr Pipe and Mr Brightwell left the meeting.

- (b) Update on Planning Application DC/22/3748/FUL/ Residential Development for 25 new dwellings in Keightley Way. Mrs Lindsay proposed Mr Bird as Chair for the purpose of this Item. This was seconded by Mr Lugo and unanimously approved. The meeting was temporarily adjourned to receive public comments. A resident asked what was the outcome of the complaint the Parish Council had made to East Suffolk Council (ESC) Chief Executive, Chris Bally, about the conduct and protocols followed at the ESC Planning Committee (South) in February. It was reported that a reply had been received which the Parish Council had responded to, but the latest outcome was that the Chief Executive had interpreted that the correct protocols had been followed and that local democracy is being respected. There was a discussion about the possible outcome of the application if the complaint was taken further. The resident reported that they had taken their complaint to the Ombudsman as they felt the matter had been swept under the carpet. They also felt the Parish Council should do the same. It had been felt by the Parish Council that the latest response from the Chief Executive was an unsatisfactory outcome but that time was limited and it was best to concentrate efforts on other aspects of the application, such as the highway safety issues, rather than the politics of what had happened. The Parish Council had been robustly working on the technical aspects of the application. It was commented that the resident's tenacity was admired but it was uncertain if the Committee meeting complaint would come to anything.

Parish Councillors had been emailed earlier in the day with a link to the documents for the application on the ESC website, as the Terms of Reference for the Highways consultation, which had been submitted by the Parish Council, Representative of the Objectors, the Applicant, and a consultant on behalf of the applicant, were now viewable. The Terms of Reference submitted were discussed.

A resident commented that the Local Plan was due to be reviewed in the following year and they felt that the Parish Council needed to be ahead of the review in order to remove the Keightley Way allocated land from the Local Plan for development.

Mr Hedgley arrived at the meeting.

In answer to a question from the Parish Council, Mr Hedgley reported that he has also raised his concerns at the protocol of the Planning Committee meeting and had chased up his questions raised. He had been informed that the meeting had not been illegal and he considered it was now better to concentrate time and effort on areas where results could be achieved. A short discussion followed about the similarities of the Keightley Way application with that of the Grundisburgh Vale application, including the protocols followed at the Committee meetings.

A discussion followed about the likelihood of when the next Planning Committee meeting would be held, following completion of the Highways Consultation. It was not expected to be until June, as the Highways Consultation was expected to be completed within 3 weeks from being commissioned. It was understood that the Parish Council and Objectors could be able to request an extension in order for their comments to be taken into account following completion of the report in the event of it being completed close to the Committee meeting at the end of May.

The meeting was reconvened.

It was reported that a reply had at last been received, via Cllr Bryce (County Councillor), to the questions the Parish Council had raised with SCC Highways about their £100,000 CIL contribution request and the highways safety concerns of the site. It was frustrating as the outcome of their response to the Parish Council was that; the Local Highway Authority did not consider the trip generation associated with the proposed development to contravene the NPPF and so did not recommend that the development was refused, that general accessibility to the site for all users would have been considered by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), to recommend discussing CIL consideration with the Local Planning Authority, and that there has been no detailed assessment of how much money would be spent as CIL money is not guaranteed. The ESC Report for the 27th February 2024 Planning Committee meeting (South) states however *'The Highways Authority has not raised any*

objection to the application in terms of the impact on highway safety or the wider network. The Highways Authority were also consulted during the preparation of the Local Plan and raised no objections to the proposed site allocation at this time either. Given the site has been considered for this scale of development during the development of the Local Plan and access and highway matters were also considered by the Inspector prior to adoption of the Local Plan, without any specific concerns raised by the Highways Authority at this stage, a potential reason for refusal on highway safety grounds cannot be substantiated.'

It was commented that the answer now provided differed from the comments previously submitted by SCC Highways about this application. SCC Highways had previously recommended that a holding objection be maintained until clarification of outstanding points had been received and approved by the Local Highways Authority on the grounds of sustainable transport and highway safety. They had also stated in their November 2023 comments the Note 'In line with SCLP policy 12.66 Appendix B, page 471, we request either £100,000 for pedestrian facilities from the site to local amenities, including local bus stops, or drawings showing proposed works for the same reasons that can be conditioned and undertaken through the section 278 process.' It seemed that the LPA and Local Highways Authority were pointing towards each other about the assessment of the safety accessibility of the site. After consideration **it was unanimously agreed** to await the outcome of the Highway consultation before making a decision about the reply from SCC Highways about the £100,000 CIL contribution question.

It was reported that the response from the LPA about the questions raised by the Parish Council about the additional access to the play area from the allocated site was that the LPA would be expecting that access to the play area would be secured (prior to occupation of any property). More questions had been asked following this response which, due to time constraints the LPA had not been able to answer in full, but in short, they had replied that the Parish Council, as land owner, would be able to control any works to access the play area i.e. whether this would be permitted or not. Also, that if it was, the developer should enable this and provide access. The Case Officer had explained that they could look into details of how to secure this prior to the next Committee meeting. Also, that it may be useful to come to a position on whether or not the Parish Council would be amenable to details of how to secure this and then any revised recommendation can take this position into account. A resident commented that it was crucial for a decision to be made about the public access to the play area before the planning decision is determined. A discussion followed about the public rights of way issue at the play area and how it differed from being solely access to play facilities from the allocated site. There had been different opinions expressed by Parish Councillors about additional access to the play area. Some views were not opposed to access from the allocated site for the sole purpose of using the play facilities. Some were opposed to any additional access to the play area. There was however a general consensus of opposition for access to the play area for the means of becoming a PRoW (pedestrian, cyclists, etc.). Permission had not yet been sought from the Parish Council for any access to the play area from the allocated site. **It was unanimously agreed** that the Clerk should confirm this again to the Case Officer with the additional information that nothing could be decided until it was known what was being proposed, and that it may be refused.

It was reported that in regard to the communication about remediation to the collapsed water pipe on Bridleway No.10, the SCC Flood and Water Engineer had not had an update from the PRoW Team about whether they were responsible for it and he had offered to meet on site next week and proceed from there. **It was agreed** that Mr Bird or Mr Lugo would meet with the Engineer. The Clerk would email details after the meeting for a site visit to be arranged.

It was reported that Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council (G&CPC) had submitted objections to ESC about the application and their objections were viewable on the documents page for the application on the ESC website. There was a general consensus of opinion that the letter of objection was impressive. **It was unanimously agreed** that the Clerk should send thanks to G&CPC for their objection submitted to ESC.

Mr Brightwell and Mr Pipe were invited back to the meeting which reconvened with Mr Pipe as Chair.

Mrs Lindsay recused herself from the Parish Council consideration and decision on the next Item.

- (c) Planning Application DC/24/0988/FUL & DC/24/0989/LBC – Conversion, extension, change of use and replacement of agricultural buildings to create 5 new dwellings, with associated access, car parking, amenity space and landscaping. The Street. There was a general consensus that this was a good project to be supported. There was however concern at the current speed limit on the Clopton Rd with a view that it should be reduced from 60mph to 30mph. It was commented that a speed limit reduction on this road had been pursued before but had got nowhere. In view of this application however, it gave another opportunity to press for 30mph on Clopton Rd and this should be included in the representation. Residents were invited to make comments. They included:

- Welcome the development but reduced speed (to 30mph) on Clopton Rd should be pursued.
 - Don't know if the location of the bin servicing will be looked at but this had been covered by the applicant during the pre-application and application process (it had been changed from the original proposed location (on Clopton Rd further away from junction with Grundisburgh Rd) following comments from ESC in the pre-application advice).
 - Concerned at the volume of traffic.
 - Visibility to and from the site should be improved.
 - Reduce speed on Clopton Rd.
 - The pedestrian access (close to junction of Clopton Rd & Grundisburgh Rd) should be constructed so that it cannot be converted to vehicle access at a later date. It must be restricted to pedestrian access only.
 - Good parking provision.
 - It is a positive development that will lift that area of the village.
 - Good that redundant buildings are being made use of.
- Comments from the Parish Council included:
- Generally, a good project and suggest support.
 - Will be an improvement on what is there at the moment.
 - Worried about highway problems.
 - There will be a lot of works associated with the development on the entrance and exit.
 - Do not know if the bin serving area will be a problem but it has been looked at by the LPA and Highways.
 - Welcome development but pursue 30mph on Clopton Rd.

It was unanimously approved to welcome and support the application but raise the main concern of visibility to access on the Clopton Rd which should be made sufficient and the Parish Council would wish to see the speed limit reduced to 30mph from the junction of Clopton Rd & Grundisburgh Rd to the junction of Clopton Rd & Witnesham Lane/Sandy Lane. The wording was approved to be submitted to the LPA. **It was also unanimously approved** to pursue the speed limit reduction request with SCC Highways in view of the application. Wording would be to 'urge SCC Highways to introduce a 30mph speed limit from the junction of Clopton Rd & Grundisburgh Rd to the junction of Clopton Rd & Witnesham Lane/Sandy Lane.

- (d) Planning Application IP/23/00977/REM (Ipswich Borough Council) re Land to South of Railway Line Westerfield Rd Ipswich There were no comments.

- (e) An update on the East Suffolk Planning Alliance The latest newsletter had been emailed to Parish Councillors. Mr Bird would attend future meetings.

11. Highway Matters including:

- (a) an update on outstanding highways issues, including 'SLOW' road markings and to consider contribution towards highway improvements proposed by Suffolk County Council Highways Parish Councillors

had been emailed prior to the meeting with details from SCC Highways about the suggested improvements following the October 2023 site meeting. The cost would be approximately £1,400 and a 25%-50% contribution from the Parish Council had been suggested. The draft sketch of suggested improvements was displayed via the projector for everyone to see. The suggested traffic calming measures, and the need for HGV signage, were discussed at length. After much consideration, Mr Bird proposed 25% contribution towards the completion of all of the suggestions in the sketch, plus the vegetation cut back, and that the HGV signage would be revisited at a later date. This was seconded by Mr Brightwell and **unanimously approved**.

Mr Brightwell gave his apologies and left the meeting.

(b) an update on the SAVID, Speedwatch, and Quiet Lane schemes, and the ANPR initiative and

(c) to consider volume and speed measures on the village highway

It was reported that a resident had raised concern HGVs connected with the Ipswich Garden suburb development had been using High St/The Hill/Westerfield Lane as a cut through. The resident had contacted the HGV company owners but had been told that the route is not restricted from HGV use and is the best route on google maps.

After consideration it was agreed that a link would be put on the Parish Council website to the dedicated SCC webpage to report online a problem or incident with lorries and their drivers including if they've used unsuitable or narrow roads, routes or villages in Suffolk. The link, via the Highways Reporting Tool, leads to an online form to complete which includes incidents being reported of HGVs travelling on an unsuitable minor road.

The blocked drain reported on the Highways Reporting Tool by Mr Bird had been cleared. The blocked drain at the junction of Clopton Rd and Grundisburgh Rd was due to be cleared within 20 working days of the report on 18th April 2024. Mrs Lindsay kindly agreed to report the blocked drain by the entrance to The Granaries.

Ms Procter had provided a report, including reference to the 20's plenty initiative, to Parish Councillors prior to the meeting and it was noted. For a copy of the report, please see the Additional Notes on Minutes of this meeting, which are viewable on the Parish Council website www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net Volume and speed measures on the village highway was deferred to the next meeting.

12. Report on the Community Partnership

An overview of the Community Partnership for this area may be viewed via <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/community/community-partnerships/kesgrave-rushmere-st-andrew-martlesham-carlford-and-fynn-valley-community-partnership/> Litter pickers and hoops were on offer for the Parish Council via the scheme, and the Parish Council were asked to consider the surplus equipment being offered to Farlingaye High School. Mr Bird proposed to accept 4 sets and agreed to take delivery on behalf of the village. This was unanimously approved, also with surplus being offered to Farlingaye High School. Mrs Lindsay kindly agreed to confirm this to the Community Officer. Mrs Lindsay would be attending the next Community Partnership meeting.

13. Management of the playing field and playground, and any update on the playing field garden project

It was reported that the Saxon Keep at the play area needs replacement and is under review.

The East Suffolk Blooms scheme was open again and details had been emailed to Parish Councillors prior to the meeting. Ms Procter had suggested that the Parish Council bid for the latest scheme and was happy to put in the application upon her return. **It was unanimously approved** to apply to the scheme and her kind offer was accepted. The suggested locations for the bulbs was the same as before, plus the church yard, but would be discussed by Parish Councillors after the meeting.

Mr Hedgley gave his apologies and left the meeting.

14. Management of Parish Council land

Parish Councillors had been emailed prior to the meeting with the suggested wording from the solicitor to the Village Hall insurers to clarify ownership of the village hall and land. Representatives of the Village Hall Committee had agreed the wording prior to the meeting. **It was unanimously approved** to agree the wording from the solicitor on behalf of the Parish Council.

It was reported that the barrier at the small piece of Parish Council land adjacent to the Old Stores car park had been removed. The historical background to the matter was discussed. After much consideration it was unanimously approved for Ms Procter to explore the possibility, upon her return, of approaching the owner of The Old Stores to use the Parish Council land to alleviate some of the parking issues on The Hill.

15. Update on Parish Clerk replacement and to consider payroll services for the new Clerk The Chair proposed the appointment of Matilda Rampley as the new Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer as from 01 May 2024. **It was unanimously approved.** The current Clerk would provide support for the time being. Matilda Rampley was welcomed to the Parish Council.

The Parish Council were asked to consider, and **it was unanimously agreed**, for the following:

- SALC payroll service – the bi-monthly or quarterly service would be decided after the meeting between the new Clerk and Parish Councillors (costs - Quarterly per year = minimum annual charge of £38.00. Bi-monthly per year would be £45 w/o pension & £48 with pension).
- SALC Clerk training (3 sessions at £30 per session plus VAT). Dates to be agreed.
- Website training with Community Action Suffolk (£60 plus VAT) Date for 2 hour session to be agreed.

Details of the payroll service and all of the training sessions would be emailed to the new Clerk.

16. To consider Co-option of Parish Councillors to fill 2 vacancies No-one had so far stepped forward to take up either of the vacancies and members of public were no longer at the meeting. The Clerk had emailed Parish Councillors prior to the meeting with draft wording for possible adverts in the Grundisburgh News. Mrs Lindsay kindly offered to finalise the text and take this forward. After consideration **it was unanimously agreed** to proceed with the vacancy adverts in the Grundisburgh News. Mrs Lindsay would email fellow Councillors with the finalised text after the meeting for approval.

17. To consider the Parish Council website and communication with village residents The Parish Council were asked to consider and **it was approved** for the purchase of a secure certificate for the Parish Council website at a cost of £39.00. The Clerk would action. Communication was deferred to a future meeting.

18. Governance documentation review, including Standing Orders, Financial Standing Orders and Risk Register Parish Councillors had been emailed prior to the meeting with draft governance documents to be reviewed. The following documents were unanimously approved:

- **Standing Orders** – only change is Section 18 re procurement threshold.
- **Risk Register** – No change.
- **Health and Safety Policy** – No change.
- **Safeguarding Policy** – No change.
- **Equal Opportunities Policy** – No change.

Internal Control Report and Statement – The Statement and Report were emailed to Parish Councillors prior to the meeting and it was noted.

Asset Register – Revised Draft figures had been emailed to Parish Councillors prior to the meeting. This was deferred to the next meeting to consider.

Financial Standing Orders – Deferred to a future meeting as awaiting the revised model Financial Regulations.

19. Items for next agenda

- Communication with village residents.
- Asset Register
- To consider amplification for meetings.

20. Dates of scheduled meetings for 2024 - 2025
2024 and 4th March 2025.

2nd July 2024, 3rd September 2024, 3rd December

The Meeting closed at 10.35pm.

Mrs C Frost
Parish Clerk. Tuddenham St Martin

DRAFT