

Minutes of the Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council virtual meeting held on 7th July 2020 commencing at 7.45pm on the Zoom platform.

Present: Mr W Pipe, Mr D Lugo, Ms P Procter, Mr J Bird, Mr H Brightwell, Mrs T Weller, Mrs H Hollier, Mr T Fryatt (District Councillor), Mr M Hicks (County Councillor) and Mrs C Frost (Clerk). There were no members of the public present. The meeting was quorate throughout but there was a slight absence by Councillors due to technical difficulties. There were also pauses in order to allow time for participants to leave and join again on the Zoom platform.

1. Chairman's Welcome and Apologies Apologies were received from Mrs Ellinor and Mr Hedgley (District Councillor). The Chairman welcomed every one present to the meeting and let them know that the meeting was being recorded. This was for Minute taking purposes and the recording would be deleted immediately after the Minutes were written. He also reported that following government advice, the Annual Parish meeting and Annual meeting of the Parish Council did not take place in May this year. In accordance with the regulations, any appointments which would have usually been made at the Annual meeting will continue until the next Annual meeting in 2021 or until the council decides otherwise, whichever is the earlier. Mr Wright had kindly agreed that he was happy to continue as Tree Warden.

2. Public Forum There were no members of the public present.

3. To receive declarations of interest Mr Pipe and Mr Brightwell declared interests in Item 14 and would remove themselves from the meeting during this Item.

4. Minutes of Meetings held on 3rd March 2020 and 22nd May 2020 These were approved.

5. Matters arising There were none.

6. Reports of County Council and District Council Representatives Mr Hedgley and Mr Fryatt had emailed Parish Councillors with their District Council reports and a Brief prior to the meeting, and copies are available on the Parish Council website www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net Mr Fryatt highlighted some of the topics in his Brief and these included:

- A significant update on the Local Plan – major modifications were being covered at the moment. The deadline for this consultation was 10th July 2020 and this was purely on the modifications following the examination by the Independent Planning Inspector. It was not an opportunity to re-state previous representations, as these have already been considered as part of the examination. It was also not an opportunity to raise new objections to the submitted Local Plan. There is however a Residential Development Briefs informal consultation, with a deadline of 24th July, to look at proposals for each site and to tell the District Council what participants want to see on each site allocation document.
- Community Partnerships – 4 priorities have come to the top which are: 1. Reducing social isolation and loneliness 2. Environmental care and sustainable transport 3. Helping people to age well 4. Traffic and road safety. Mr Fryatt invited the Parish Council to give him ideas on how improvements could be made on these four topics.
- Planning Committees are now operating again, via Zoom.
- Civil parking has now transferred to East Suffolk Council.
- Suffolk funds in relation to Coronavirus lockdown – as a consequence of funding support provided lockdown, we are now desperately short of money. Across Suffolk our Councils will have lost an estimated £35 million in income alone. This is in addition to the net £22m of direct COVID-19 costs. As a result of this shortage, the Leaders of Suffolk Councils have written a joint letter to all local MPs detailing the predicament and asking for help to carry on doing business. A copy of this letter has been emailed to the Parish Council.

Questions and comments put to Mr Fryatt were:

- Regarding the amendment to the Local Plan for the Humber Doucy Lane allocation – for criteria d), the word rim had been changed to trail. What does this mean? It wasn't known as Ipswich Borough Council are predominantly in charge of this allocation.
- Disappointment was expressed that none of the issues challenged in the Local Plan by the Parish Council were regarded as valid by the Inspector, and that the allocation in Tuddenham was left with issues which had been highlighted by the Parish Council but were not addressed. Mr Fryatt understood the disappointment and

reiterated that the informal consultation, with a deadline of 24th July 2020, on the Residential Development Briefs still gave an opportunity to put forward ideas on what should be taken into account on each site allocation.

- As the Inspector ignored the issues raised about the Tuddenham allocations, what reassurance is there that East Suffolk Council will take on the ideas put forward for the Residential Development Briefs? This is not the planning application stage. It's a way of gathering ideas to have a good body of information to set in place the requirements for any future applications if they come forward on allocated land.
- The Local Plan belongs to the District Council. As the Inspector ignored the issues raised with the Tuddenham allocation, can the District Council now make changes to the Local Plan? No; the District Council have followed government guidelines in producing the Local Plan. The Inspector rejected some proposals from the District Council, but accepted others and made some major modifications. The Inspector has followed the rules in applying his judgement to the soundness of the Local Plan put forward.

Mr Hicks had emailed Parish Councillors with his County Council reports prior to the meeting, and copies are available on the Parish Council website www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net Mr Hicks commented that the majority of his latest report is still Covid related and he highlighted some of the topics which included:

- Suffolk's Local Outbreak Control Plan
- Suffolk's given out over 2.2 million items of PPE to the care market across Suffolk, and Suffolk has never run out of PPE.
- Concessionary travel – the rules for this were temporarily relaxed and this was one of the first things done to allow anyone to travel on buses at any time. The problem now with social distancing is that people will need to travel at the correct times, so the rules for concessionary travel are reintroduced for when buses are less busy. From Monday 6th July, concessionary bus passes in Suffolk will only be valid Monday to Fridays 9.30am to 11pm, and all day on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- Broadband – the current total superfast broadband coverage in Suffolk stands at more than 96 per cent, with plans currently in place to reach 98 per cent coverage before the end of the year.

Additionally, Mr Hicks thanked Ms Procter for getting in touch to highlight a highways issue concerning a sunken drainage cover in The Street. This had been picked up by the Highways Dept and they had assured Mr Hicks that the work had been added to their list to be actioned.

Mr Hicks gave his apologies and left the meeting in order to attend another Parish Council meeting.

The meeting was temporarily suspended, due to time constraints, to allow participants to exit and re-join via the Zoom platform. The meeting re-commenced after technical difficulties.

Mr Fryatt gave his apologies and left the meeting.

7. Report on Community Policing Ms Procter and Mrs Hollier reported that the next Woodbridge ASB meeting would be held via Skype on Thursday, 16th July 2020.

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

- A. The Clerk reported that the hours worked since the meeting of 3rd March 2020 were as follows:
3rd March 2020 to 5th May 2020 – 67 (of which 25 hours are paid)
5th May 2020 to 1st July 2020 – 80 (of which 28 hours are paid).
- B. The Clerk requested approval, **and it was agreed**, for the following payments which had been made on behalf of the Parish Council:
- | | |
|---|--------|
| (1) Heelis & Lodge – 2019-2020 Internal audit | £80.00 |
|---|--------|
- C. The Clerk requested approval, **and it was agreed**, for the following payment which was still to be made:
- | | |
|---|---------|
| (1) Clerk's salary from 5 th May to 1 st July 2020 (28 hours) | £295.00 |
|---|---------|
- D. The Parish Council had been emailed details of the auditing regulations for the completion of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return for 2019 2020. **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 2019 – 2020. The Document was signed by the Chairman.
- E. The Annual governance statement **was agreed and approved unanimously**. The relevant page was signed by the Chairman.

- F. The Clerk reported that the amounts held by the Parish Council accounts as at 1st July 2020 were £3711.03 (Current Account) and £18,400.51 (Savings Account). There were however also unrepresented cheques amounting to £200.00 which should be deducted from the amount of £3711.03. The Final accounts, and Accounting Statements, for the year 2019–2020 and the financial accounts for the period 1st April 2020 to 1st July 2020 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.
- G. The payment of half of the precept for this year has been credited by the District Council to the Parish Council Current Account. The Clerk had queried this and had received confirmation from the District Council that future precept payments will revert to the Savings account. The Clerk had not arranged a transfer of the payment from the Current Account to the Savings Account in view of the impending invoice for the replacement safety surface in the swing area.
- H. The internal audit had been completed and had been emailed by the Clerk to Parish Councillors to consider. There was the following comment about the Payroll controls:

Recommendation () It is a requirement to operate a PAYE scheme. The council has received advice from HMRC (Minutes of 3rd March 2020 - Ref: 8G) that "if none of the conditions apply you do not need a PAYE Scheme.

The Clerk wrote again to HMRC on 20th April 2020 for 2019–2020 guidance, and disclosed full salary/ income details, as the conditions stated for PAYE enrolment do not apply. **The reply from HMRC will be reported to the Parish Council when received.**

- I. Parish Councillors were emailed on 19th June with details of the Local Government Association consultation on a new model member code of conduct. There were no comments to put forward.
- J. In April, a villager had reported that the No Smoking sign in the bus shelter had been removed. The 2 fixings (with remnants of the sign) were still there but there was no evidence of the broken removed sign anywhere around the bus shelter. **There was agreement** for the sign to be replaced now lockdown was easing. **The Clerk would action.**

9. Planning Matters including:

a) **To consider online planning applications, with the possible acquisition of associated technical equipment**
It was agreed the Clerk would report back to the Parish Council after enquiring about borrowing the existing WI projector and carrying out tests over the summer. This would be used in combination with a personal existing laptop and the existing village hall screen.

b) **To consider the village environment with special interest in relation to the Conservation Area** A villager had raised concern to the Parish Council of alterations taking place on homes in the Conservation Area that may not be appropriate and had asked what controls or consent are required for architectural changes. There had also been a suggestion of advisory letters put through doors in the Conservation Area, which would include the relevant section from the Conservation Area Appraisal Report for each property. There followed a lot of deliberation about the information already available on the District Council website for the Conservation Area, the past action and experience by the Parish Council, the advantages and disadvantages of advisory letters, how the street scene in the Conservation Area has changed, how to address the issues raised by the villager concerned, and how to encourage new and existing home owners in the Conservation Area in seeing the benefits of retaining the current architectural features.

The meeting was temporarily suspended, due to time constraints, to allow participants to exit and re-join via the Zoom platform. The meeting re-commenced after a few technical difficulties.

Mr Brightwell gave apologies as he needed to temporarily leave the meeting.

Mrs Hollier suggested that, rather than put advisory letters through doors in the Conservation Area, the Parish Council should hold a Conservation Area evening for villagers at the village hall, when it is possible to hold such events there again. It was also suggested that a representative from the District Council Conservation Team should be invited to the event. This was seen as an interesting way to take this issue forward and there followed further deliberation about the issue. **It was agreed to pursue the suggestion from Mrs Hollier** and invite a Conservation Officer to give a talk to villagers about the Conservation Area, rather than advisory letters being posted to villagers.

Mrs Hollier agreed to take this suggestion forward and work with the Conservation Team to get them to attend such an event. There was also a suggestion that past photographs and historical information about the village should be available at such an event. Ms Procter had some historical photographs which could be forwarded to Mrs Hollier and Mrs Hollier would check with the editor of The Tuddenham Tattler to see if there was any additional historical information available from their archives.

10. Highway Matters including:

a) an update on the SAVID and Speedwatch schemes and the Speedwatch signs Ms Procter had emailed a highway report to Parish Councillors earlier in the day. The report also included feedback in relation to Item 10 b) and other highway related issues. 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

Ms Procter highlighted the following:

- Ms Procter had intended to stand down from the Parish Council at this meeting, but would instead continue with Parish Council duties for the time being in order to settle outstanding matters such as ongoing highway issues.
- There will be a virtual SAVID meeting at the end of this month.
- The £100 contribution to SAVID from the Parish Council is appreciated.
- The SAVID SID, currently with Grundisburgh, will be in Tuddenham soon.

b) To consider village traffic and the possible purchase of an additional village owned Speed Indicator Device Mrs Hollier and Mr Brightwell had emailed a draft report to Parish Councillors earlier in the day. Unfortunately, the draft had been delayed as they were awaiting information. For a copy of the Draft Report, please see the Additional Notes on Minutes of this meeting, which are viewable on the Parish Council website

www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net

Highlighted and additional comments were as follows:

- Only data gathered by the village owned SID in the 3 months for 2020 had been used for the report, but Mr Bird was also thanked for the speed statistic data gathered from the shared SID for November 2019 to February 2020. This was referenced in the draft report.
- Clarification is needed of the requirement for police to send an Enforcement Team. Ms Procter reported that there had been a disappointing reply received that morning from the Enforcement Team. An enforcement visit had been made to the location in the village identified as a problem area. SID information was however of no interest to them. They had their own data gathering and they would be doing another measure in due course to determine if they needed to alter their practice. They also did not intend to share their data information gathered. This did raise questions about the amount to be spent if the Parish Council intended to purchase an additional SID as there was not a lot of point in spending funds on a data gathering device if the Enforcement Team ignored the data gathered.
- Mrs Hollier was happy to give a fresh voice to following this up with Ms Procter as the police are supposed to be sharing the gathered information with at least Suffolk County Council Highways.
- Reports from London Transport and other local authorities across the country show there is usually a 5% reduction in traffic slowing where there is a 200m clear line of sight of a SID.
- There is evidence from personal experience with the current village owned SID that brake lights come on when drivers see the SID grim face for exceeding 30mph.
- An additional SID would be to encourage speed behaviour through the village and SIDs across the country have proved this.
- Mrs Weller asked what is the best way of reducing speed? This is dependent on the location but the SID had proven to be quite successful.
- The benefits of the SIDs looked at by Mrs Hollier and Mr Brightwell were that they were moveable.
- The village has the possible full time use of 1 SID, although this has recently been reported as having been unreliable lately. The other SID is shared with another village and has not been in use in Tuddenham recently. Ms Procter and Mr Bird reported that the shared SID had only been set up recently. It had been tested in Grundisburgh, and in operation in Tuddenham from December 2019 through to February 2020. Mrs Hollier summarised that on a good day the village has 1.5 kits over the 3 sites allocated in the village, although there was also a potential 4th additional site.
- Ms Procter added that in response to Mrs Wellers earlier question, the Report for Item 10 a) had been written in the way it had as there are a number of different ways that speed awareness and speed reduction can be raised such as the Community Speedwatch scheme (which has a direct link to the police) and a

method used in some other villages such as a gated village sign to highlight to drivers that they are entering a village and to take care.

- Mr Bird reported that the 4th potential site for a SID pole did not proceed so there are only 3 sites in the village. One of these, which is in Westerfield Lane is of limited use, if of any, due to the traffic calming nature of the road at that location. Mr Bird considered that speeding was not the issue by the Westerfield Lane SID location following a check of the statistics and this location would not warrant the regular use of a SID, or the associated cost for an additional device.
- Mr Bird did not dispute that SIDs slow traffic down, but personal experience had shown that traffic speeds increase when a SID is moved to a different location. Mr Bird did dispute however the follow-on action that police would take upon receiving SID data.
- Mrs Hollier reported that Suffolk Police had confirmed they would take enforcement action if there was sufficient SID data.
- The outlay of £4500 from the budget was queried for 1 device. Mr Bird disagreed that a SID which analysed data was needed and that a much preferable option is a basic model which displayed a positive or negative face dependant of the speed of the traffic. He also felt that 2 SIDs in the village, positioned on Main Road and Clopton Road, was sufficient. He added that the village now has the use of 2 SIDs for 6 months of the year (1 village owned SID and 1 SID shared with Grundisburgh). Perhaps a solution was to approach Grundisburgh to share the purchase of another SID?
- Mrs Hollier considered that a device which gathered data would be useful to obtain police enforcement, and reported that the figures provided in the Draft Report had been obtained from the purchase of the SAVID SID. These prices may have changed, but if so, it would not be by much. Mrs Hollier stressed that the information provided to Councillors, including the figures, were in a draft document only for the purposes of opening a discussion and that it was doubtful that the maximum outlay of £4500 would be needed for an additional SID. Typically, the prices seen for devices had been in the region of £3600.

Mr Brightwell re-joined the meeting.

- Mrs Hollier put forward different options regarding possible funding as follows: Fully funded by the Parish Council? What additional funding is there from Suffolk County Council? Private donations, or, fund raising initiatives similar to that for the village hall defibrillator?
- Ms Procter replied to earlier questions: the SID shared with Grundisburgh must remain shared as it was a SAVID purchase. The price for the SAVID SID remained unchanged for that model.
- There was further debate about the type of SID preferred and Mr Pipe expressed that he was reluctant for the purchase of an additional SID. If, however there were a majority decision to purchase an additional SID, he would prefer the more basic model such as suggested by Mr Bird.

The meeting was temporarily suspended, due to time constraints, to allow participants to exit and re-join via the Zoom platform. The meeting re-commenced after a few technical difficulties.

- There was further debate about the benefit of a SID obtaining data and the possible follow-up by police enforcement.
- Mr Brightwell expressed his concern of health and safety for volunteers if the device needs to be moved and his preference for a device which gives an immediate reaction to speeding traffic.
- The Clerk requested Parish Councillors digest the information in the Draft Report and comments expressed at the meeting. This should be followed up by Councillors putting forward their ideas, if they had preferences, comments or objections in readiness before the next meeting and before any decision is made. The Clerk also reported that it was most likely that any SID purchase would come under Section137 of the LGA. The power to spend and figures would be checked with SALC and emailed to Parish Councillors. An indication in the meantime was a limit of £2446 to spend in total in this current financial year under Section137. Last year the Section137 payments amounted to £1781 which included the £1000 to the Stop! INR donation. The Clerk also expressed caution on spending in light of the likely tightening of budgets due to COVID19.
- Mr Brightwell thought it was good to know what the financial position was but the Parish Council had built up reserves for highway contributions such as this. It would be useful to get a guide at the meeting from Councillors as to whether an additional SID is a good idea or not. Mr Brightwell stressed this would not be a vote but would be useful in deciding whether to proceed with any further investigation as Mrs Hollier had already spent a lot of time putting together information for the Draft Report. Debate followed about how to best proceed.
- Mrs Weller expressed thanks for the Draft Report being put together and said it was helpful to have the information in it. Mrs Weller was also aware however that there might be a lot of other issues throughout the

year which would impact upon the Parish Council funds and the figures in the Draft Report for the SID device amounted to a large portion of an annual budget. Mrs Weller considered it would be better to consider the purchase of a SID alongside other pressing matters and contributions that would call upon Parish Council funds when considering the annual budget later in the year. There was a lot to consider from the Draft Report. It gave an aspiration but there needed to be a decision of how it would be funded and if there were other bids to the Parish Council budget for the amount being indicated to be spent on a SID.

- Mrs Hollier stressed that this was only a Draft of a Report. As for costs, it had stated that further research is required into current models and 2020 prices. Mrs Hollier had not expected a vote for approval at the meeting and the document had been put together for the purposes of discussion. It had only been possible to forward it to Councillors that day due to waiting for data that had only arrived the day before. Mrs Hollier was aware that there was only one model that had been described in the Draft Report but from the Wescotec website alone, there were all sorts of devices to use for speed management. Mrs Hollier also agreed with Ms Procter's comment that it has to be looked at in a wider context of speed management programmes in the village, but added that the Agenda Item was specifically about a SID so costings had been put forward about a SID.
- Mrs Hollier agreed whole-heartedly with Mr Brightwell's point which was to get an indication of whether there was interest to pursue this any further as there was a lot of work involved in getting information and prices together for the Parish Council to consider.
- Alternative options such as 30mph speed roundels marked on the highway were suggested as a possibility.
- Mr Lugo expressed preference, when asked by Mr Brightwell, of a more basic model of SID such as that suggested by Mr Bird, and which should not cost as much as a data gathering model but still achieve the required speed calming result.

The matter was left in order to give Councillors the opportunity to put forward their ideas, suggestions, preferences and objections in readiness for the next meeting.

11. Management of the playing field and playground Following the agreement at the last meeting, Mr Lugo and the Clerk had met up with the Norse Group and Matta Playground Safety Surfacing Representatives on 23rd June at the swing area. It was agreed that a mixed blue combination (a variety of 3 shades) would fit in well at the site rather than also including green tiles. They had answered questions about the work to be carried out (including how the new tiles would be fitted securely over the existing ones and that they are not easily vandalised). They confirmed that the work should take place mid to late August if they got the go ahead following this meeting.

At the 23rd June meeting, it has been suggested that the swing frame is refurbished before the new safety surface is installed. The existing blue metal paint is peeling and in need of sanding and repainting. A question had also arisen about the replacement or refurbishment of the swing seats and indicative prices had been quoted for replacements. It had been agreed however that both existing seats were good sturdy models and a good scrub down of both seats might be all that is needed. Following the site visit, the price of £1204.54 plus VAT had been confirmed for the 3 shades of blue matta. The Clerk had also emailed Councillors prior to the meeting with guidance from East Suffolk Council and other organisations to users of playgrounds following the easing of lockdown measures. **The following was agreed:**

- A) To proceed with the £1204.54 (plus VAT) quote.**
- B) To proceed with the 3 shades of blue** rather than a mixture of blue and green tiles.
- C) Enthusiasm for a working party to refurbish the swing frame. The Clerk would email volunteers after the meeting.**
- D) Enthusiasm for a working party to refurbish the swing seats. The Clerk would email volunteers after the meeting.**
- E) For a laminated guidance note, similar to the one produced by East Suffolk Council, to be attached to the playground gate.** A guidance note had been put in place pending the final decision.

12. To consider the frequency of Parish Council meetings **It was agreed** to continue with the current meeting schedule.

13. To consider the Approval of the Parish Council Safeguarding Policy A draft had been circulated via email prior to the meeting **and it was approved.**

Mr Pipe and Mr Brightwell left the meeting in view of their interests in the next Item. Mr Bird nominated Ms Procter to Chair the remainder of the meeting and it was agreed.

14.

a) Comments on the Modifications to the District Council Local Plan following the Public Hearings held in 2019.

Objections and Comments had been made to the First Draft and Final Draft of the Local Plan by the Parish Council. Representations had been made to the Local Plan Hearings and Mrs Ellinor had attended, and made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council at the Local Hearings. The District Council had pointed out that this consultation was purely on the modifications to the District Council Local Plan following the Public Hearings in 2019 and it was only these which were available for comment. The District Council had also pointed out that this consultation was not an opportunity to re-state previous representations, as these had already been considered as part of the examination. It was also not an opportunity to raise new objections to the submitted Local Plan.

It was noted that Policy 12.215 of Policy SCLP12.24 for the allocation of Land at Humber Doucy Lane, Rushmere St Andrew had been modified to add 'Development should also seek to preserve the significance of the Listed Buildings to the north and east of the site. These are Allens House, Laceys Farmhouse, and the Garden Store north of Villa Farmhouse.' There were no additional comments to put forward to this consultation.

b) Comments on the informal consultation of the Residential Development Briefs Draft Template

It was agreed the comments should include the need for the following provisions:

- adequate parking and service vehicle access
- school provision, and the 4 priorities that have been approved by the Communities Partnership for the focus of funding allocation which are:
 - Reducing social isolation and loneliness
 - Environmental care and sustainable transport
 - Helping people to age well
 - Traffic and road safety

It was agreed the Clerk would draft an email for the comments on this basis which would be agreed by Parish Councillors before being submitted by the deadline of 24th July 2020.

15. Items for next agenda To be agreed.

16. Date of next meeting. 1st September 2020.

The Meeting closed at 10pm.

Mrs C Frost
Parish Clerk. Tuddenham St Martin