

CHATTISHAM & HINTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Parish Council Meeting held in the Meeting Room of the Community Hall
On Thursday 10th February 2022 at 7.30pm

PRESENT:

Les Cole (Chair)	Ian Bryce
Diane Chase	Chris Leney
Stephanie Coupland	Ben Cox
John Whyman	Peter Eaton

APOLOGIES:

Jim Hammond	Jim Murphy
Debbie Archer	Jamie Bostock
Tamsin Pearce (Parish Clerk)	

IN ATTENDANCE:

Cllr David Busby
5 members of the public were present

The Chairman announced that the meeting was being recorded and welcomed everyone. He confirmed Cllr Whyman was taking notes in the absence of the Parish Clerk. He also reminded the members of the public they may only speak in the Public Section of the meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 13th January 2022, having been circulated to all councillors prior to the meeting were proposed as a true record by Stephanie Coupland and seconded by John Whyman, subject to two agreed amendments (CHPC311/22 Line 4 & CHPC308/22 Line 3). The minutes were approved to be signed, following amendment, by Chair, Les Cole as a true record of proceedings. The Chair reminded members to properly scrutinise the draft minutes prior to the meeting.

CHPC317/22 – DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The Chair asked if there were any declarations of interest for any items on the agenda. None were recorded.

CHPC318/22 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES DATED 13th JANUARY 2022

The Chair asked council members if they had any matters arising from the minutes. No items were raised.

CHPC319/22 – COUNTY & DISTRICT COUNCILLOR'S REPORTS

Cllr Busby gave the council the following update:

- New 'low carbon' Homes – BMSDC have recently supported a pilot project of 80 new build low carbon homes.
- UK Gov Planning Pilot – BMSDC has been selected as one of eleven district authorities to lead on a pilot project and received £45k to support its activity. Some discussion took place between councillors and Cllr Busby on this point.
- Bramford Twinstead – Cllr Busby advised members that the submission on the consultation from BMSDC has not yet been fully informed or submitted as yet due to splits in opinion by ward member councillors. Some members consider 'undergrounding' cables

to be too disruptive and feel 'Overground' cabling to be preferable. Councillor Loney clarified the impact of 'undergrounding' cables and suggested to DB that some of his colleagues may hold uninformed views on this subject matter. Cllr Bryce reminded members and Cllr Busby that sufficient consideration needs to be given on the potential impact upon Hintlesham Hall which is a grade 1 listed building of significant architectural merit. Cllr Loney went on to confirm the route through the village should be 'undergrounded'. Cllr Eaton advised members that the plan within the document pack from National Grid is far from clear and doesn't clearly identify the existing pylon track leading to members of the public not being able to adequately scrutinise the potential impact of the track change options.

- Infrastructure Projects (Solar) – Cllr Busby updated members on the various solar projects that are currently seeking planning approval in and around Flowton, Bramford & Burstall. Cllr Busby confirmed to members that BMSDC planning did not yet hold a consensus of view on this subject. Cllr Busby also alluded to the matter that it may be more helpful for local consideration if these projects are dealt with individually rather than at UK Gov level as a major infrastructure project. Cllr Cole commented on the cumulative impact of these projects for the various communities they impact upon. He also raised the potential longer term impact of air source heating and its excessive use of power to gain advantage from its process of heating relative to EPC's.

Cllr Hudson – No report was given by County Councillor Hudson as he wasn't present at the meeting

CHPC320/22 – COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chair closed the meeting and invited members of the public to speak to any items on the meeting agenda. There were 5 members of the public present.

Several members of the public took this opportunity to speak. Details as follows:

- A parish resident (Peter) questioned the debate at the previous meeting concerning the council's agreement to set the parish precept. A concern was articulated around the size of the increase and the general use of monies raised and coming into the parish via S106 and CIL monies. Cllr Cole assuaged the concerns of the member of the public, confirming all financial transactions into and out of the PC's accounts are appropriately audited. In order to provide complete clarity Cllr Cole agreed to provide a written answer dealing with the issues raised to the member.
- A parish resident (Ian) again questioned the precept and its increase suggesting that such an increase requires a parish referendum. Cllr Cole, following the previous PC meeting, had researched this point along with consulting SALC and had satisfied himself and the parish clerk that this was no longer a requirement.
- A parish resident (Richard) who was submitting planning application ref: DC/22/0037 made himself available to answer or clarify any points arising from this application to members. Councillors thanked him for the offer.
- A parish resident (Richard) Asked if the PC's e mail domain is working properly. Cllr Cole confirmed there had been issues around its operation and the resilience of the 'One Suffolk' domain management. Cllr Eaton suggested this matter ought to be reconsidered and suggested this become an agenda item at the next PC meeting. Cllr Cole agreed.

The Chair thanked the members of the Public for their full contribution to the meeting and closed the public session.

CHPC321/22 – PLANNING

DC/22/00366 | Householder Application – Erection of Two Storey Extension – 2 Northlands Cottages, Priory Road, Hintlesham IP8 3NX

The Chair summarised the application details and confirmed the locus to members. Cllr Coupland

Clerk
&Chairman

<p>confirmed, having read the application and with her knowledge of the site, had no objections other than she was concerned that the development is likely to impact upon the public right of way which is alongside the property and may likely be disrupted during construction. Cllr Leney and Cllr Eaton raised concerns regarding the residential mobile home which is present on the site. Both councillors expressed their desire that the mobile home be removed from the site once the development was completed. Other than these two points no other issues were raised and members confirmed they had no objections to the application.</p> <p>DC/22/00444 Householder Application – Erection of a single storey, timber-framed two bay cart lodge and lean to store. Corner Farmhouse, Mill Lane, Chattisham IP8 3PY The Chair summarised the application details and confirmed the locus to members. Cllr Chase opened the discussion indicating she knew and understood this site within Chattisham and had no objection to the development. There were no further comments and members went on to unanimously confirm that there were no objections to this application.</p> <p>DC/22/0037 & DC/18/05372 & DC/19/03467 Full Planning Application – Creation of new vehicular access to serve dwelling approved under previous applications (detailed above) Glenhaven, Silver Hill, Hintlesham IP8 3NJ The Chair referred members to the application details and contextualised this application. Cllr’s Bryce & Eaton both indicated the new entrance being applied for was better positioned than the existing permission and had no objections. Cllr Cole offered to make traffic data available to the applicant which would better inform BMSDC planning department should it be required. The Chair brought the discussion to a conclusion and asked members for a proposal. Members proposed that they had no objection to the application.</p>	
<p>Charity Farm – The Chair allowed Cllr Chase, at this point, to read from correspondence that she had received from a resident of Chattisham Street. The content of this letter relates to the motor trade business known a ‘Neil’s Garage’. The resident had written to BMSDC (Paul Scarff) concerning both the legitimate approved planning use of this unit at Charity Farm and the hours of business. In summary the response from BMSDC (Paul Scarff) confirmed that a planning approval for use as a garage has never been made. As the building has been used for this purpose for over 10 years, it is not possible for BMSDC to take action to challenge its use and, furthermore, as the unit has never received a legitimate planning consent, BMSDC are unable to intervene in relation to the hours of business operation. A full copy of the note read to the PC meeting is on file. Cllr Eaton was concerned that the PC and, presumably, Cllr Busby, not been copied into this correspondence thread as it relates to ongoing breaches in building permissions at this location and their use particularly as the investigating officer is Paul Scarff. Members concurred that the ongoing situation and use of this ‘commercial’ site remains far from satisfactory and continues to create issues with residents both adjacent to the site but in the village of Chattisham generally. Cllr Cole agreed to write to BMSDC to confirm the PC’s ongoing concern with the use and ‘anti-social’ business behaviour of several site occupants.</p>	Chairman
<p>Planning Decisions – Cllr’s Leney, Eaton & Bryce requested the reinstatement, within the meeting agenda content, of all planning decisions for Chattisham & Hintlesham made during the preceding period. The Chair agreed to discuss this with the Parish Clerk.</p>	Clerk
<p>CHPC322/22 – NS&I INVESTMENT ACCOUNT The Chair informed members of the newly found existence of a NS&I Investment Account. The Chair and Parish Clerk would establish the contents of the account and normalise its use within the financial framework of the PC. Members unanimously agreed to empower the Clerk & Cllr Cole to continue with getting signatories on to the NS&I account.</p>	Clerk & Chairman

CHPC323/22 – NATIONAL GRID – BRAMFORD TO TWINSTEAD UPDATE

The Chair introduced this item and briefly updated councillors on our continued approach and asked Cllr Eaton to bring members up to date with the latest position. Cllr Eaton, who is leading on this subject, confirmed two meetings are to be held shortly – ‘Ask the Expert’ (appointments only) and a general meeting open to the public without appointment. Cllr Leney indicated it may be worth the PC’s while to book an appointment for the ‘PC’ to ‘Ask the Expert’ meeting. Cllr Cole agreed to explore this possibility. A long discussion took place concerning the potential new pylon track, particularly around its potential deviation from its current track through Hintlesham Great Wood and a ‘long way around’ leg over ‘Ian’s Field’. A consequence of such a deviation would impact on many other residents along with the significant additional cost of such re-routing. Cllr Eaton reinforced his earlier comments that all residents should respond to the questionnaire that has been distributed. Cllr Busby reaffirmed his support to push for both undergrounding, but also looking at the potential ‘undersea’ alternatives much favoured by many in Suffolk. Cllr Eaton stressed the importance of ensuring the support of our local MP along with SCC. Cllr Eaton agreed to prepare a draft response which will be made available at the next PC meeting and prior to the 11th March.

Peter Eaton &
Chairman

CHPC324/22 – PARISH COUNCIL POLICIES

The Chair introduced and explained the context of this matter to councillors. The Chair then referred to documents, previously circulated to members for their consideration.

Chairman

- Rear Garden Development – The Chair explained the source of material and content on this draft paper to members. The Chair, having considered the purpose and implications of creating a policy on this subject questioned the usefulness and validity of such a document. His concern centred upon removing the council’s ability to look at different situations and circumstances as they arose and how such a policy document could and would prevent members from exercising adequate debate on such matters. The Chair then opened the subject up to discussion and members views. Cllr Leney noted and understood Cllr Cole’s view on this and the creation of a specific policy document. Cllr Leney suggested a document be prepared to contain and hold the aspirations of the community for future development akin to a ‘Neighbourhood Plan’. Cllr Eaton suggested this document could be designated a ‘Design Statement for Residential Housing Development for Chattisham & Hintlesham’ as opposed to creating a policy on the matter. Cllr Eaton was also concerned at the use of certain terms such as ‘isolated’ and their implication and interpretation. Cllr Cole agreed to reconsider the proposed framework of this matter and bring a revision to a future council meeting for consideration.
- Community Infrastructure Best Practice - The Chair explained the source of material and content on this draft paper to members. Members discussed and agreed the document format was acceptable. The Chair asked for a proposition to move which was proposed by Cllr Leney & seconded by Cllr Coupland. All members voted in favour of acceptance.

CHPC325/22 – PCC – St NICHOLAS CHURCH

The Chair introduced this matter and explained the context of the request to increase the PC’s grant from £360 to £400. Members were content to make this change. The Chair asked for a proposition to move which was proposed by Cllr Bryce & seconded by Cllr Leney. All members voted in favour of acceptance.

CHPC326/22 – HYBRID MEETINGS

The Chair introduced this matter and explained the context of the request to consider the utilisation of ‘Hybrid Meetings’. SCC Cllr Hudson had requested, on several occasions, that the PC consider him joining the PC meeting in an online format video and or audio only. Members

<p>understood the current personal circumstances were difficult for Cllr Hudson and also appreciated he faced a long journey from his home near Framlingham. Members felt it would be acceptable for Cllr Hudson to join the PC meeting from time to time, but considered it was unreasonable for this to be the 'norm'. Whilst understanding the personal difficulties Cllr Hudson faced, members considered that meeting with C&HPC was an integral part of Cllr Hudson's role as our elected County Councillor. Sadly, members felt this wasn't an option the PC could agree to. Cllr Cole would advise Cllr Hudson accordingly.</p>	<p>Chairman</p>
<p>CHPC327/22 – CHATTISHAM PLAYING FIELD UPDATE</p> <p>The Chair introduced this matter and explained the work he had been undertaking, in conjunction with HCCC, to establish the position regarding the ownership of the Chattisham playing field. Cllr Cole explained he had now located the documents relating to the 'gift' of the Chattisham playing field from the late Douglas Bostock to the Parish Council by freehold conveyance. Cllr Cole also confirmed (validated by Malcom Rogerson) that, at the same time as the gift was created, a 'Bare Trust' was also enacted which gave complete and absolute control of the gift to HCCC. Cllr Cole has also established this was most likely done as HCCC were not a registered charity until 1978 and the gift was made in November 1977. The current likely trajectory of the matter, following Cllr Cole & Whyman's last meeting with HCCC & Malcolm Rogerson, is a recommendation from Malcolm Rogerson for the 'asset' to remain under the control of HCCC and the 'asset' registered with the Land Registry. Malcolm Rogerson is also taking informal advice from a colleague to understand if the Parish Council, at that time, acted illegally, under the prevailing Local Government Act, in allowing a 'public asset' (with potential value) be devolved, by absolute control, to a non-governmental body. Cllr Cole, having summarised the position and detail thus far asked for members views.</p> <p>Cllr Leney explained his understanding of this transaction and commented on the very few Bare Trusts that are created due to the absolute control over the asset given to the trust beneficiaries. Cllr Eaton asked the question: 'If the asset were sold away from the community, who would be the beneficiary of the sale and what, if any, control did the Parish Council have in this event'</p> <p>Members were both surprised at developments and concerned at the apparent commitment the Parish Council had to respond, without question, to HCCC through the creation of the Bare Trust. Members left matters with the Chair to continue with his discussions with HCCC and report back to Council at the next meeting.</p>	<p>John Whyman & Chairman</p>
<p>CHPC328/22 – FINANCE</p> <p>Clerk Salary & Expenses - £191.01</p> <p>PCC St Nicholas Church, Hintlesham – Annual Grant 2021/2022 £360.00</p> <p>The Chair took a proposal from Cllr Bryce to accept the expenditure items, in all, which was seconded by Cllr Leney. Members were unanimously in favour of the motion.</p>	
<p>CHPC329/22 – REPORTS FROM PARISH COUNCILLORS</p> <p>The Chair asked each councillor, in turn, if they wished to make a report to the council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Leney confirmed he had received notification of 2 RTA's in the preceding month. • Cllr Coupland reported on FP13 (Adjacent to Elder House, Chattisham) had been reported by users, to SCC, as being unfit to use. Cllr Coupland had been in touch with the residents of Elder House, who had apologised for the issue which had been created by having their pond cleared. They had voluntarily agreed to take remedial action to improve access. Cllr Coupland also reported repairs had been completed to the 'Boardwalk' and passed on her thanks to local resident Norman Davey for undertaking the work. • Cllr Cole updated members concerning the late arrival of the new defibrillator due to a parts shortage with our suppliers – St Johns. 	

CHPC330/22 – CORRESPONDENCE

All correspondence received by the council had been circulated to members prior to this meeting. Nothing further was introduced for discussion.

CHPC331/22 – ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

- Parish Council – E Mails & Domain Performance – Sponsor Cllr Cole
- Community Hall – Disability Parking/CIL Funding – Sponsor Cllr Bryce
- Planning – A discussion to clarify what is meant by the term ‘Community Gains’ vizaviz planning application ‘incentivisation’ offers – Sponsor Cllr Eaton
- Bramford Twinstead – Draft Response to National Grid – Sponsor Cllr Eaton

CHPC332/22 – DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 10th March 2022 – Community Hall Meeting Room 7.30pm

Meeting closed at 9.45pm