

Shottisham Parish Council
Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 10th September 2024

Present: CH R Kay (RK), Cll P Bouscarle (PB), Cll P Widdup (PW) and Cll J Campbell (JC), Cll D.Wass (DW), (SCC) Cll A Reid (AR), (ESC) Cll J Mallinder (JM)

Attendees: Proposed Councillors N.Brett (NB), C.Darby (CD). 3 Residents

1-10/09/24 Chairman's Welcome and Apologies for Absence:

Apologies received from Clerk L Roberts (LR).

2-10/09//24 Open Forum:

No comments.

3-10/09/24 Receive any Declarations of Interest:

There were no declarations of interest.

4-10/09/24 Co-option of New Councillors

The Chairman announced the Co-Option of Natalie Brett and Chrissie Darby onto the Council, this was agreed by all Parish Councillors present. Cll NB and Cll AD were then invited to join the PC table. They were asked to complete an acceptance of their appointment to be returned to the Chairman RK. *(For the first time in many years these appointments mean that the PC is at full strength.)*

5-10/09/24 Signing of AGM Minutes:

The minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on the 9th July 2024 were duly signed off by Chairman RK as an accurate record.

6-10/09/24 SCC and ESC Reports:

a) SCC Report

- Cll AR commented on items in his report specifically:
- The problems of fires caused by battery disposals at Sackers which when crushed caused spontaneous combustion which required 14 fire units to extinguish it. (Cll DW interjected that there had been a similar incident at Boltons across the road from Sackers today)
- The objection to National Grid's Sea link Connector Project to build a bridge to service their operations across the river Fromus, planned to be up to six metres high with a 150-foot span. The scale is considered to be disproportionate and would involve unreasonable working hours.
- The success of Trading Standards particularly in respect of activities at Felixstowe Port. A number of major convictions have been made as a result incl. the requirement to repay their "ill-gotten gains" and to complete many hours of Community Service.
- The recent opening of the Gull Wing bridge in Lowestoft although somewhat delayed, originally mooted in 1919, at a cost of 145 million of which some £75 million was provided by SCC. It is considered that this will be of considerable economic benefit to Lowestoft and the surrounding area.

Other items included in Cll AR's written report included:

- Trial of community electric vehicles available to residents for short-term hire
- Clampdown on Rogue Traders, Rogue Builder Jack Doran prosecuted
- New Solar Together scheme for Suffolk Residents
- Suffolk Children's Services require small improvements in Ofsted Report

b) ESC Report

East Suffolk Councillor JM presented items from his monthly report specifically:

- DCll JM stated that he can only do his work if he receives feedback from the villagers on areas they needed him to address.
- He has experienced some disappointment in the new District Councils attitude to the Environment, a number of projects he supported such as his feed the “bees campaign” and there seems to be a reluctance to supporting the annual litter pick. In his opinion the green Party were going backwards. He will continue to push the agenda forward.
- He has written to the new local MP twice in an attempt to get her to engage with the Rural community but so far had not received a reply. He has offered to meet Jane in London if required but it would be good to at least have some acknowledgement. He cited particular problems such as excessively heavy rainfall where groups like local famers need to engage with the community.
- James was pleased to see our dialogue over the 20mph limit and felt we should get the Press involved and make some noise as it could very well be an election issue next year.
- He has been working on some local issues such as problems with the camp site at Sutton Heath and the re-siting of appropriate signage, also liaising with Eyke regarding the proposal to build 65 properties there,
- CH RK questioned James on the receipt of a reply from Teresa Coffey last year, not that helpful but a reply. Cll NB understood that it was to do with Digital Connection, that was part of it but mainly the problem of communication such as mobile and the lack of a facility making it very difficult, if not impossible, to contact vulnerable people in the village.
- Cll JM addressed the subject of potential changes to refuse collection including the collection of glass, tetra packs and the potential for sorting re-cyclable waste at home rather than at the plant. He felt that the introduction of more bins//containers may encourage waste collection rather than trying to reduce waste. He quoted the problem of unsightly bins outside terraced properties as in Lowestoft and there may be better ways to deal with it, he was not sure that pushing the responsibility onto the householder was the best way. He will keep pushing for us.

Other items included in Cll AR’s written report included:

- Regular attendance/assistance at most Fetes
- Broken sign in Hollesley
- Green party adopt Cll JM’s policies and vision
- Advising caution on Tree Planting
- Regular communication/presentations to Full Cabinet

A copy of both the full reports can be seen at www.shottisham-pc.gov.uk

7-10/09/24 Update on Highways Issues

• **Application for Change of Speed from 30mph -20mph**

The interest in the move to a 20mph limit arose because of communication between Cll AR and Cll PW over concerns of speeding in The Street. Cll PW felt that there had been some welcome changes to the process and a clearer set of criteria. Cll PW felt that even if we did not meet all the criteria there were other factors such as no pavements, blind bends and other problems that may help. He felt that the first stage was to get village support by organising a petition in the village to register support for the proposal, a draft of the petition was circulated for review by Cll PW. Councillors NB and CD have agreed to visit all residents with a view to getting as many agreements as possible. Cll PW recognised that it is a small village but hoped that he could get 100% from the villagers and their children. The petition would then be passed to Cll AR to be passed to SCC Cll West (Highways) for review. Cll PW felt that the village should make a loud noise about the proposal and possibly introduce bin stickers, banners etc to publicise the scheme. He realised that it would take some time and money and had already approached Cll JM and was looking for some help from Cll AR. Evidence will need to be gathered on existing speeding patterns, to this end Cll AR has

offered to fund up to three speed surveys at a cost of approx. £1200. Chairman RK commented that we have had surveys before, Cll CD interjected that in her opinion the traffic in the centre of the village was speeding up. Cll AR commented that such an observation will need to be addressed by the engineers to establish whether it made sense or not. Cll AR concurred that this was a major project, but he felt it was worth doing. Cll AR advised that the move to a 20mph limit would involve the creation of a Traffic Regulation Order and the Legal process of establishing this would take up a large proportion of the estimated cost (Circa £15K) This would not necessarily cover the cost of engineer surveys etc, and police would visit if they felt there was a sufficient case to be met. If the police do not sanction the scheme, it will not be able to proceed.

Cll AR described some situations where he had succeeded in funding 20mph limits as an example in Bromeswell where the limit only applied to a certain area. However, the aim was to ensure people were aware that speed control was a priority and there were regulated areas. Cll NB said that they were realists in terms of their expectations but were trying to pull together something that may work. Cll AR did say that research may take some time to reach the police.

There was some discussion on recent experiences of tractor and trailers speeding in the centre of the village. Cll DW stated that the perceived speed is sometimes incorrect with most vehicle doing under 30mph. Cll NB said that 30mph was too high, but Cll DW stated that it was however the limit. Cll CD said there was some recent research that suggested vehicles should not engage with pedestrians at speeds in excess of 15mph.

Cll PW asked if there was any local precedence in respect of the 20mph other than Bromeswell, Eyke was mentioned by the CH RK but it appears to be an unenforceable limit (20's Plenty) There was some discussion on similar projects with successful implementation in Coddensham (Cll PW) and Lavenham (Cll CD). Cll AR commented that if you spread the net further other successful schemes could be found, Wales was also mentioned. A lot depends on the willingness of the police to visit the location with a Van to carry out a speed check.

The project in order to come to fruition will need to meet defined criteria including a review by Suffolk Police who will be responsible for enforcement. If successful, the cost of implementation will be £10-15000. Cll PW accepted that the PC could not raise this even by raising the precept. Cll AR was in principle in favour of the proposal. Cll AR concluded that he is willing to help starting with the money for speed checks and see where that goes.

- **Agreement to a Village Petition**

CH RK commented that the personal visit approach was much better as the referendum we had on the Pub land produced less than a 50% response despite the provision of sae's for responses. The Petition should be completed in time for a discussion at the next meeting. **ACTION Clls PW, NB and CD**

- **Other Highways Issues**

Cll PW said the results of the misplaced ANPR camera should be with us in a couple of weeks.

Cll DW felt that there should be some dialogue over the state of the edges of the roads, it will need to be placed on the agenda next time. CH RK also commented on the state of the signage which is very bad even on the major roads.

CH RK was still communicating with his contact on the windfarm project regarding traffic calming. Internal communication is not very good, but he was assured that there would be proper communication with the public in future.

08-10/09/24 Update on Playground Issues

- **Ongoing Maintenance Issues**

Cll JM said he had removed the last of the wobbly posts on the way to the slide, despite the absence of rails his 3-year-old son managed to climb up okay. As the posts had been removed there was nothing to hang onto and he felt it was a “catch 22” situation. Do we replace the posts? Alternatively, should we rebuild the steps which could be very costly. CH RK asked if the provision of steps at the side of the fort but it was generally felt that the gradient was too steep. Cll JM said he felt the solution was either the front or back. Perhaps we should replace the posts, but Cll DW felt that the ground was so loose it would be difficult to re-seat them, he felt they should be removed completely. The question asked as to when the next ROSPA inspection was, the Chair replied soon but he was unsure of the exact date (It did take place on the 13th of September) Cll PW expressed concern that if there were posts there, he may ask what happened to the remainder. Cll JM suggested he monitored the remaining posts and would remove them over time when loose enough. Cll JM did suggest that as the rope and posts at the top were secure and prevented children falling off, they should remain. If there is a future deterioration CH RK suggested that we should wait for the result of the inspection.

- **Review of Quotes**

Cll JM met with play equipment suppliers on 15th August to discuss replacements for the failing Trim Trail. Two Companies were consulted, Sovereign and Playdale who came up with proposals ranging from £5K to £12K dependent on the configuration. Playdale presented a solution within our remaining Big Lottery Fund resources and the Council agreed to that proposal. Cll NT questioned whether 3 quotes may be necessary. CH RK was unsure and promised to check the Financial Regulations and consult the Clerk. The representatives of Playdale have suggested a visit to the Play Area with other Councillors to further discuss the project and if required to make a presentation at our next PC meeting.

(Subsequent to the meeting the consultation took place, the Financial Regulations require three quotes for purchases over £3000 so Cll JM has been requested to obtain a third) **ACTION Cll JC**

09-10/09/24 Proposal to move over to Unity Trust Bank.

CH RK said that the clerk (LR) has been investigating for some time a possible move to Internet Banking as the existing process of most payments being processed at the PC meetings is less than ideal. LR has come up with a proposal to move to Unity Trust bank as they have a very good system with a built-in dual authority system. They are linked to a number of larger banks. It was agreed by the PC that LR should progress this on her return.

Cll PW suggested we should have more signatories as there are only two at the moment, CH RK said he would take this up with LR. (Subsequent to the meeting CH RK has discussed the signatory concerns and they can be solved by the new system.) **ACTION LR**

10-10/09/24 Planning Application DC/24/2489/FUL single story extension to Corner Cottage

Cll DW said he had been to see the site and could not see a planning reason for this not to take place. Cll PB mentioned the subject of the effect on a parishioner's light. Cll DW said that the legislation had changed and does not cover the right to direct sunlight, and he felt looking at the proposed roofline it was unlikely, in his opinion, that any objection would succeed. Cll PW said that the planning documentation contained flash photographs that did not reveal the property was part of a terrace which he felt was outrageous. Cll PH said that one of the issues for the parishioner, was the colour of the roof, which was a dark grey on a metal roof. He was unclear whether this was a planning issue or not. Cll DW said that Bob Kendrick the Conservation Officer did not seem to have a problem with it. CH RK stated that in the past unless there was a planning objection it would go ahead. Cll NB asked to speak. She asked if it was on the back of the property, it was unlikely to be a problem. She also agreed with Cll DW that the light objection was unlikely to be accepted. Cll PH said that if the parishioner went to the top of the garden, he was presented with this unsightly grey metal construction. Prior to the current

extension he could see the fields and the erection of the first extension cut out that view. This proposal makes that worse which is obtrusive. Cll JM questioned whether there was a limit on adding to a property, in planning terms and Cll DW thought it was 30%. Cll PB said that Saxon Cottage near them had virtually doubled in size and CH RK stated that his own property was the same. Cll CD asked if the extension was metal and if that was alright under conservation rules. It was generally felt that it was not. against conservation area rules. Cll DW was of the opinion that there clearly was no planning reason for not going ahead as Bob Kendrick was not that enthusiastic about it but had no real objection. Cll PW suggested that the parishioner should put an objection on the planning portal, but it needed to be done soon. There was some discussion as to when the deadline was which was confirmed by a member of the public as 24th September. Cll NB asked if the parish council could put in an objection, CH RK said they could but unless it was a genuine planning reason it was unlikely to be accepted. There had been many occasions previous where parish council objections had not been accepted. There were examples proffered on previous instances such as window colours and materials etc. where although the parish council was against them, they were still carried through by the planners It was felt that the best way forward was for Cll PB to assist the parishioner with the objection and to consult clerk LR on the format and process. **ACTION Cll PB**

11-10/09/24 Review of the Insurance quote.

LR had prepared the paperwork which had been reviewed by CH RK and the parish council decided we should go ahead with the renewal of the policy. **ACTION CH RK.**

12-10/09/24 Clerk's report and Finance Update:

This and all other documentation relating to the Parish Council can be seen on the Shottisham Village website in accordance with Transparency Laws. (See www.shottisham-pc.gov.uk)

- a) At the close of business on 31st August the current account stood at £15,149,22 which includes £5,000 ring-fenced for playground expenses.
- b) The Clerk's Wages for the month were £350 which included £70 which will be paid to HMRC for income tax accrued.
- c) An invoice for £40 has been received from the WI for September's meeting.
- d) Invoices for July and August (£149.76 each) had been received from Nurture Landscapes in respect of Grass Cutting.
- e) Signing of cheques at meeting
 - a. Clerk's wages £280.00
 - b. HMRC £70.00
 - c. Shottisham WI £40.00
 - d. Nurture Landscapes £299.52

12-10/09/24 Updates on actions from the parish council meeting in July

There were no action points arising.

13-10/09/24 Matters to be brought to the attention of the council:

No Matters arising

14-10/09/24 Action Points arising from the September meeting

07-10/09/24	Complete Petition data collection	PW/CD/NB
08-10/09/24	Obtain additional quote/progress Playdale	JM
09-10/09/24	Progress switch to Unity Trust Bank	LR
10-10/09/24	Progress planning objection	PB
11-10/09/24	Pay Insurance	RK

46-100924

Date and Time of next meeting: 12th November 2024 at 7.30 pm in the Trust Hall

Chairman:

Date: 12th November 2024

DRAFT