



Waldringfield Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Rebecca Todd
5 St George's Terrace, Church Road,
Felixstowe, Suffolk IP11 9ND
Email: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
Telephone: 01394 271551
Website: www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parish-council

1802 Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 14th July 2020

In attendance (via video conferencing): Councillors Kay, Elliot, Lyon, Gold, Reid and Archer
SCC Cllr O'Brien, 9 members of the public
Clerk: Rebecca Todd

1. To **RECEIVE** apologies for absence – none.

2. To **RECEIVE** declarations of interest – none.

To **RECEIVE** delegated Declaration of Interest Dispensation decisions or **APPROVE** non-delegated DPI dispensations requested by a councillor – none.

Parish Issues – An opportunity for parishioners to bring matters to the attention of the Parish Council and for parishioners to seek guidance from the Council.

A member of the public asked if progress had been made on the cutting of gorse on the river wall footpath. Cllr Kay outlined the current status and said that the earliest the cutting could take place would be September, due to nesting birds. The Clerk clarified that the trustees of Dairy Marsh had approached the Environment Agency, who had given the 'go-ahead', but are now consulting with Natural England before arranging any cutting. The member of the public said that they had been misquoted on information they had provided about the construction of the river wall; the whole of the river wall, not just the footpath, was constructed using extracted material from Dairy Marsh. Another member of the public wanted to share news of two known swift nesting sites at the lower end of Cliff Road and Deben Lane; nest boxes have been erected to encourage the birds. This person would like the PC to support this initiative.

3. To **RECEIVE** reports from SCC Cllr Patricia O'Brien, ESC Cllrs Melissa Allen & Richard Kerry and Suffolk Police. SCC Cllr O'Brien highlighted information from her report (see supporting documents), including the amount of PPE (personal protective equipment) provided by SCC. Cllr O'Brien has concerns about traffic produced by the construction of Sizewell C and questions if the workforce will include local people. There will be a meeting on 24th July and she hopes EDF will provide further clarification. Better broadband has now reached over 100,000 homes. Superfast broadband now has 96% coverage, with 98% expected by the end of the year. There will be a crime panel meeting on 17th July, during which there will be discussions on how to work with young people. There is £600 grant money available to the PC (to be claimed by 31st March 2021).

Cllr Reid asked Cllr O'Brien if SCC is confident they are in a position to effectively handle local lockdowns due to Covid-19. Cllr O'Brien said there was initially no proper guidance and no processes in place, however, lessons have been learnt and SCC are now confident they can deal with the situation. Cllr Reid asked if SCC had enough information about the number of cases, to which Cllr O'Brien replied they do.

The Clerk clarified that no report is sent by the Police; what is provided in the supporting documents is found by her. Cllr Kay said police have been proactive in (hopefully) resolving the problems of motorcyclists noisily using the Brightwell Lakes area, which has led to a number of complaints from residents. There was a brief mention of the graffiti that had been daubed in the village, but it is not known if the culprit(s) has been caught.

4. To **APPROVE** the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on **9th June 2020**. Cllr Elliot asked for a minor amendment – a reference to Manor End should be Manor House. With this changed, Cllr Reid proposed acceptance, which was seconded by Cllr Elliot and approved by all councillors.

5. **MATTERS for REPORT** from minutes of previous meetings and to **REVIEW ACTION POINTS** from the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on **9th June 2020**. See supporting documents. The Clerk gave an update. Cllr Lyon reported that Tony Lyon had now painted the village sign; he will forward receipts for the paint. Councillors thanked Tony; Cllr Kay will purchase two bottles of wine for him.

6. To **CONSIDER** Planning Applications for **COMMENTS**.

DC/20/2358/FUL 19 Village Way – further to application DC/19/1588/FUL, the applicant would like to change the exterior material of the property to cement board cladding rather than traditional render as applied for. Consultation expiry date 21st July. Case Officer Danielle Miller.

1803

Cllr Elliot proposed that, as the change is minor, no comment should be made which was agreed by all councillors.

DC/20/2355/FUL Quayside, The Quay – the proposal is to demolish the existing part two-storey and part single-storey house and construct a new house which is also part two-storey and part single-storey but with a larger two-storey element. The footprint of the new house is predominantly within the footprint of the existing dwelling. Consultation expiry date 22nd July. Case Officer Danielle Miller. Cllr Elliot highlighted the details of this application and spoke through the draft comments of the Planning Group. Councillors looked at images of the existing building and the new proposed house. Cllr Elliot thought there should be no objection made to the principle of demolishing the existing building or the proposed new materials. However, the Planning Group is concerned by the new ridge height – at 11.2 metres, it will be higher than properties on either side and within the curtilage. The roofline proposed is higher than the boatyard, which most closely resembles the new house with its semi-industrial metal cladding. Cllr Elliot proposed that the applicant could look again at the roof; could the rake be reduced? Cllr Elliot also proposed that lighting should be kept to a minimal level as a condition.

Members of the public present expressed some concerns, including: traffic and potential access issues during construction (both for residents and emergency vehicles); dust created by demolition; damage to the road; and light pollution (it was suggested that lighting should be 'dulled' to maintain the special character of the waterfront area of the quay). There was some discussion about the perspective of the image used on the planning application, which some members of the public were concerned didn't correctly show the proportion of neighbouring properties. A member of the public asked if swift bricks could be integrated into the new building.

At this point, Quayside's owners spoke. They said that they had noted comments; the building will be a challenge but it will be an improvement and more practical. Construction vehicles will be as small as possible. The architect has already reduced the proposed ridgeline. The flood risk brings building constraints – the lower floor is in line with the height of the flood wall. The applicant will ask the architect to re-look at the plans, however, they believe the design and height of the boathouse should not dictate the design of the new property; other properties further along have a higher roof. The applicant said there had been no artistic licence used on the application image. Cllr Kay questioned the flood risk. The applicant said a completed flood risk assessment highlights the possibility of future flooding, even with the flood wall. The fire service had provided a report, recommending sprinklers. Cllr Lyon was keen to stress that lighting should be kept to a minimum; the harbourmaster has said that strong light would be distracting for boats on the river. Cllr Gold highlighted the public footpath right beside the house. Several complaints had been received about cycling in the area; how will construction traffic be received? Cllr Reid suggested that, as the footpath is extensively used, it needs protection throughout the construction period. Cllr Reid said other than an addition of a proposed construction plan, he would support all draft comments made by the Planning Group. Cllr Gold questioned whether WPC should ask the applicant to reduce the ridge height, especially as neighbours do not object to the design. Cllr Reid supported this view, as there are restrictions due to flood risk. Cllr Elliot suggested the applicant could ask, which councillors considered was not unreasonable. Cllr Elliot proposed that she amends the draft comments of the Planning Group and circulates for approval, which was seconded by Cllr Reid and agreed by all councillors.

To **MAKE ARRANGEMENTS** to deal with applications received after publication of this agenda. None received.

To **NOTE** any application decisions received – none.

To **RECEIVE** any other planning information. Councillors agreed that no response is necessary to the Rural Housing Strategy survey, however, Cllr Reid said the pandemic has highlighted problems of rural isolation, for example, relying on deliveries.

7. To **RECEIVE** updates/reports on public rights of way, verges and road safety matters. This will include **DISCUSSING** the ongoing issue of cyclists on the river wall footpath and **CONSIDERING** signage. The Clerk said she had not had a response from PROW to her request for customised signage and larger bridleway signs. Cllr Elliot said she felt that signage needs to explain the reason for no cycling, which was supported by Cllr Lyon. Cllr Kay said explanatory text is shown. Cllr Elliot thought this should be more official looking. Cllr Reid had spoken to a family of cyclists on the river wall footpath, who said they would respond better to an explanation. A member of the public spoke (who owns some of the land the footpath passes

1804

through). They have spoken to several cyclists, advising that the river wall is a footpath; some had been abusive, some were adamant they had right of way, and some were open to education. One group of cyclists didn't understand that the no cycling signs meant no cycling on the whole footpath, rather than just in front of the properties, and commented that the current signs were amateurish. The resident suggested larger signage at Manor House end and said that pushing or carrying a cycle could still be considered trespass. Cllr Elliot believed that the law may not support this view. The resident, as a landowner, would be prepared to erect a gate; a Pembroke Country Swing Gate was suggested. Cllr Kay voiced his concern about allowing easy access for wheelchairs, prams etc. Cllr Elliot said determined cyclists would lift their bike and thought that improved signage would be a starting point in improving the situation. Cllr Kay was interested in the point made about signage inferring an end to no cycling restrictions, and suggested another sign be erected after the houses; Cllr Elliot supported a repeater sign. Cllr Gold believed challenging cyclists would be easier with supportive signage, although the current sign on Fishpond Road directs cyclists away from the bridleway. A member of the public present said the law is clear but a sign should explain and educate. Another resident thought the current signage was perfectly good but people ignore it. Cllr Reid suggested 'fragile flood defence' would add emphasis. The Clerk will chase PROW but has found a company who can supply customised metal signs at a reasonable price. Councillors agreed for the Clerk to forward details of the custom signs, to agree wording, and to then ask PROW for agreement.

8. To **RECEIVE** updates on the playing field. This will include **APPROVING** the quotation of £1,591 (plus VAT) to install steel feet on the replacement parallel bars and resurfacing the area under the equipment (including associated works). Cllrs Archer and Reid believe the safety surface to be necessary, to prevent a trench occurring under the equipment, however, they questioned the need for the steel shoes. The Fenland representative had assured them that the wood resistance to rot had been improved. Cllr Archer proposed the Clerk accepts the in-warranty replacement of the equipment and the quote for the safety surfacing, seconded by Cllr Reid and approved by all councillors. Cllrs Archer and Reid had conducted a risk assessment before the re-opening of the playing field. The only area of concern was the sandpit, which was short of sand and dirty with cat faeces. Cllr Archer suggested the sandpit could be filled. Cllr Lyon said if it was a safety risk, it should be closed. Cllr Archer questioned if residents should be consulted first. Cllr Gold suggested that even if residents wished to keep it, WPC wouldn't be in a position to maintain it. Cllr Archer suggested the sandpit be filled, which was agreed by all councillors. The Clerk will ask Norse for a quotation for the work. When agreed, the Clerk will advise residents of the reasoning behind the sandpit closure and ask for engagement with future plans.
9. To **CONSIDER** signage for the beach. This follows reports of dangerous behaviour in the river. Cllr Elliot questioned if there had been reports of further incidents, to which Cllr Lyon replied that Tony Lyon (Harbourmaster) was not aware of any. Tony said that people were not aware of the tide and fast water. Cllr Gold proposed a sign could read 'beware strong tides' and be attached to one of the scrubbing posts (well above the waterline). Councillors agreed with this suggestion and all approved for the Clerk to get a quotation and forward for approval by email, after first asking for permission from the Fairway Committee. When contacting the Fairway Committee, the Clerk will also advise them that Cllr Reid is the replacement for Cllr Matheson on this committee.
10. To **DISCUSS** the ongoing issue of rubbish build-up and **CONSIDER** signage. The Clerk advised that the grey (general rubbish) bins will now be collected every week until the first week of September. Councillors were hopeful this would improve the situation. The Clerk suggested another sign could be placed on the outside of the bin compound; she will resend examples.
11. To **CONSIDER** matters relevant to Sizewell C:
To **CONSIDER** becoming an interested party in the pre-examination stage of the Sizewell C Development Consent Order (DCO) application. This will require WPC registering an interest on the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) website and providing a short written summary of WPC's views on the DCO application. This is not a public consultation. The process concludes 30th September, before the examination period. Cllr Kay suggested this could be deferred to the next meeting; all councillors agreed.
To **CONSIDER** becoming a signatory to the Anglian Energy Planning Alliance's letter to the Secretary of State, and to **CONSIDER** becoming part of a working group. All councillors agreed to be a signatory to the letter.

1805

To **CONSIDER** attending the Joint Local Authorities Group's virtual engagement event on 29th July (confirmations by 22nd July, maximum of two councillors). Cllr Kay offered to attend the event, to inform any decision about becoming an interested party.

12. To **CONSIDER** a response to the Local Government Association's consultation on a new model member code of conduct. Consultation ends 17th August. Cllr Reid had studied the new model code of conduct and highlighted that it includes more stringent declarations of interest, for example, withdrawing even if a councillor has a non-pecuniary interest. This could pose a problem for a small council, such as WPC, if a quorum could not be achieved. Cllr Elliot thought that WPC councillors declare non-pecuniary interests when probably not necessary. Cllr Kay proposed that discussion be deferred to the next meeting, which was agreed by all councillors.

13. To **CONSIDER** a response to the pre-planning application consultation on changes to the Foxhall Road recycling centre. Comments by 20th July. Cllr Elliot proposed that WPC responds positively – the changes are welcomed – which was agreed by all councillors.

14. To **CONSIDER** a response to Groundwork East's survey to ascertain interest in establishing a Climate Community Support Initiative. Comments by 16th July. Cllr Reid volunteered to complete the document and was granted permission from the other councillors to respond on behalf of WPC.

15. **CLERK AND RFO REPORT**

To **CONSIDER** and **APPROVE** applications for community grants, if any – Suffolk Friends of the Earth appealing for funds to engage expert scientific witnesses to assist with responding to the Sizewell C application. At this point, Cllr Reid declared a non-pecuniary interest, as his wife is a member of Friends of the Earth. Cllr Elliot proposed that, as the request does not fulfil the criteria of the WPC grant-awarding policy, a grant could not be given; this was agreed by all councillors, with the exception of Cllr Reid, who abstained.

To **CONSIDER** and **APPROVE** items of expenditure, and sign cheques and arrange for approval of BACS accordingly – see separate list. Approval was proposed by Cllr Elliot, seconded by Cllr Reid and agreed by all councillors, with the exception of Cllr Kay (who abstained as a beneficiary). The councillors who will approve the BACS payments will be Cllrs Reid and Archer. It was noted that a cheque for £10,000 had been sent to Cllr Kay for signing – to transfer funds from Barclays to the new Unity Trust Bank account (as agreed at the June meeting); Cllr Reid will also sign the cheque and post to Unity Trust Bank.

To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the Financial Reports and **UNDERTAKE** the independent Bank Reconciliation. The documents were examined by councillors, with Cllr Archer proposing approval, seconded by Cllr Reid and agreed by all councillors.

To **CONSIDER** any quotations received for the replacement Cliff Road bench. Councillors looked at suggestions and quotations emailed by the Clerk. Cllr Reid said that the Cyan Teak Furniture company had been used by the Village Hall to purchase a bench two years ago and the committee was pleased with it. Cllr Elliot proposed that the 'Braemar' bench, from Cyan Teal Furniture (priced at £365), be purchased, which was seconded by Cllr Lyon and approved by all councillors. Cllr Reid highlighted that the new bench would require a solid foundation and base and would require treating. Cllr Kay asked if the bench would need fixing, to which Cllr Reid confirmed that it would. Cllr Lyon proposed that John Nunn be asked to provide a quote; all councillors agreed. The Clerk will liaise with ESC Cllrs Kerry and Allen, who had previously agreed to part-fund a bench in this location, albeit a cheaper specification.

16. To **REVIEW** and **UPDATE**, as appropriate, the policies of the Parish Council and the Parish Plan (including the Emergency Plan). This will include approving the Complaints Procedure. Cllr Kay proposed acceptance of the modified Complaints Procedure, which was seconded by Cllr Lyon and approved by all councillors. Cllrs Kay and Lyon will liaise to complete the Emergency Plan.

17. To **CONSIDER** any correspondence received before the meeting – see separate list. Cllr Reid advised councillors that the Village Hall would be re-opening on 1st August for low-risk activities, including meetings of the Parish Council. The Clerk advised that NALC still recommends virtual meetings and all councillors were happy to continue this practice.

18. **PARISH MATTERS** for the next meeting. Website accessibility – the Clerk will liaise with Alyson Videlo.

The Chair closed the meeting at 22.04pm

1806

REVIEW OF ACTION POINTS FROM THE MEETING

Minutes of 9th June – The Clerk to amend reference to Manor End (changing to Manor House) and email to Cllr Kay for signing.

Village Sign – Cllr Kay to purchase two bottles of wine as a thank you for Tony Lyon. The Clerk to organise payment of receipts for paint.

DC/20/2355/FUL Quayside, The Quay – Cllr Elliot to amend comments of the Planning Group and circulate to councillors for approval; the Clerk to sent to ESC Planning.

River Wall Footpath – The Clerk to chase PROW and forward details of the custom signs to councillors (to agree wording) then ask PROW for agreement.

Playing Field – the Clerk to accept the in-warranty replacement of the parallel bars and the quote for the safety surfacing. The Clerk to ask Norse for a quotation to fill in the sandpit.

River Signage – the Clerk to get a quotation for a sign to read 'beware strong tides' and to ask the Fairway Committee for permission to attach to a scrubbing post. The Clerk also to advise the Fairway Committee that Cllr Reid will be replacing Cllr Matheson as WPC representative on the committee.

Rubbish – the Clerk to resend examples of additional signage for the bin compound.

Sizewell C – the Clerk to confirm WPC as a signatory to the Anglian Energy Planning Alliance's letter to the Secretary of State. Cllr Kay to 'attend' the Joint Local Authorities Group's virtual engagement event on 29th July.

LGA's Consultation on a New Model Code of Conduct – councillors to consider the new suggested document for discussion at the August WPC meeting.

Foxhall Road Recycling Centre – the Clerk to send a positive response to the pre-planning application.

Groundwork East Survey – Cllr Reid to complete on behalf of WPC.

Suffolk Friends of the Earth – the Clerk to advise that this grant request does not fulfil the criteria of the WPC policy.

BACS Payments – Cllrs Reid and Archer to approve, once the Barclays cheque has cleared.

Cliff Road Bench – the Clerk to order the Braemar bench from Cyan Teak Furniture, ask ESC Cllrs Kerry & Allen for confirmation of funding, and ask John Nunn for a quotation for installation work.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

ITEM 3

To **RECEIVE** reports from SCC Cllr Patricia O'Brien, ESC Cllrs Melissa Allen & Richard Kerry and Suffolk Police.

Suffolk County Council - July Report 2020

Lockdown is beginning to ease, and like all of you, I am looking forward to meeting normally. Answering phone calls, emails – my everyday chores – haven't let up, although there have been fewer.

I have copied info from SCC that relates to services and issues carried out during lockdown. A plan, published June 30th, sets out how Suffolk would prevent and respond to a localised outbreak of COVID-19. The Suffolk Control Plan will be triggered where there are suspected or confirmed COVID-19 outbreaks in any setting or community within the county. It outlines measures to prevent, manage, and contain outbreaks of Coronavirus and protect the public's health. It builds on existing relationships and processes in place with partner agencies across Suffolk. Suffolk has received £2.79million from a £300million Government fund to support delivery of the Local Outbreak Control Plan.

As Suffolk's response to the Covid-19 pandemic enters its fourth month, the team set up in March to source and distribute personal protective equipment (PPE), to support service providers across the county, continues to operate from Suffolk County Council's offices in Ipswich. So far over 2.3 million items of PPE across Suffolk has been delivered.

Both SCC and East Suffolk Council have serious concerns regarding the Sizewell C proposals forwarded by EDF Energy. Although EDF complied with the legal requirements they have fallen considerably short in information. Town and parish councils have raised the same concerns, that substantive information is missing, and therefore the proposals are inadequate. It is hoped that SCC and East Suffolk can have constructive discussions to address the unresolved issues.

SCC-led Better Broadband programme has reached more than 100,000 households. The partnership – between Suffolk County Council, Openreach, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and local councils – has made faster broadband available to around 150,000 premises since being launched in 2010. It means 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.

A positive result of the lockdown has been that the police have seen fewer crimes and they have had success in catching several of the 'county lines' distributors with the help of the Metropolitan Police. County lines are a network of drug distribution from centres such as London, Birmingham etc. Very often children are used in this crime.

SCC are planning to expand and improve Foxhall Recycling Centre. The planning application will be submitted by the end of July.

At last I am pleased to see partnership working within different organisations. It makes so much sense for district councils, county, police, fire to work together to reduce overheads and co-operate. Locality grant available

PATRICIA O'BRIEN

Suffolk Police

The interactive crime map for May shows no reported crimes in Waldringfield.

Link to the latest newsletter (June):

https://www.suffolk.police.uk/sites/suffolk/files/ceo_constables_county_june_-_online.pdf

Waldringfield Parish Council

'Despite Covid19 the SNT have continued to provide core duties. During regular foot patrols the public have positively received our encouragement to stay safe and adhere to guidelines. Elsewhere, warrants have been conducted alongside regular checks at addresses where the occupants are at risk of being used in the commission of drug offences. As part of our Easter campaign I was able to visit many children who had made heartfelt posters to brighten the streets. I have taken time to speak to some of our more senior residents, therefore providing a new face (from afar) to talk to when isolation has been hard.

SNT officers have been conducting speed checks, particularly in areas where residents raised concerns and this has resulted in a number of tickets being issued. As Community Engagement Officer for Felixstowe and Woodbridge I have been out in the community on my bike speaking to members of the public. I have continued to spread crime prevention messages and community crime updates via local radio and social media. I have been working closely with Felixstowe Safer Neighbourhood Team to provide high visibility patrols.

There were a number of thefts from motor vehicles in the Trimley St Mary area and following patrols and social media posts to highlight these offences there have been no further reports to date. Officers have been tackling drug offences and a number of stop searches have been carried out with quantities of Class A and B drugs recovered together with drugs paraphernalia linked to the supply of drugs. Anyone concerned about drug related activity in their neighbourhood should contact police on 101 or anonymously to Crimestoppers 0800 55 11 or www.crimestoppers-uk.org

The Woodbridge Safer Neighbourhood Team with response officers have been patrolling the area to prevent further thefts from sheds and burglaries from out buildings. Social media and Police Connect have been used to make residents aware of what is happening in Woodbridge and surrounding villages and to prevent rural crime.'

ITEM 5

MATTERS for REPORT from minutes of previous meetings and to **REVIEW ACTION POINTS** from the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on **9th June 2020**.

Cllr Matheson Resignation – Cllr Matheson to write a resignation letter addressed to the Clerk; the Clerk will then advise the Monitoring Officer. DONE Cllr Gold to arrange a meeting with Cllr Matheson, to put together some reminiscences for the September newsletter.

Playing Field – the Clerk to ascertain the spec for the replacement parallel bars. If no metal shoes, the Clerk will ask for a quotation to upgrade the equipment. DONE, SEE ITEM 8.

Replacement Mill Road/Cliff Road Bench – Cllr Reid to forward details of a wooden bench supplier to the Clerk. The Clerk to collate some quotations. SEE ITEM 15.

Village Sign – Cllr Kay to purchase two bottles of wine for Tony Lyon.

Local Plan Modifications – Cllr Kay to draft a response letter for agreement; the Clerk to send off by 10th July. DONE

River Wall – the Clerk to send suggested wording for the warning sign to be erected by trustees. Cllr Kay to install 2 further signs advising against cycling. DONE

Unity Trust – the Clerk to send off signatures. DONE When the account is set up, £10,000 will be transferred from the Barclays account.

Rubbish – councillors to investigate if space allows for another bin in the beach compound. DONE – NO SPACE. If there is, the Clerk will ask Norse for a quotation. The Clerk will forward details of the 'butt bins' to the Maybush. TO DO

Policies – the following to be included on the July agenda: Disciplinary and Grievance Policies, Data Protection & Information Management Policy, Model Publication Scheme, Complaints Procedure, Reserves Policy and Website Accessibility Policy. DEFERRED DUE TO LENGTHY AGENDA.

ITEM 6

To RECEIVE any other planning information.

Waldringfield Parish Council

The Rural Services Network have a consultation open (see email below) to encourage the government to publish a national Rural Strategy. It covers many topics including digital connectivity, transport, renewable energy, jobs, health, town centres, parish and community action, a UK shared prosperity fund, managing farming land, supporting older people and affordable housing.

My response will be focusing on affordable housing need, issues and benefits and meeting the needs of older people with regard to health, housing and wellbeing. I would like to encourage you to let me know what issues the Covid 19 pandemic has raised for your communities in regard to these topics and what policy suggestions you might have. Alternatively, you can respond directly to the consultation, please see links and info below.

<https://www.rsnonline.org.uk/revitalising-rural>

I will need your response by 9am Monday 27th July 2020.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Stephanie Baxter MA, CIHCM| Housing Enabling Officer
East Suffolk Council

ITEM 7

To **RECEIVE** updates/reports on public rights of way, verges and road safety matters. This will include **DISCUSSING** the ongoing issue of cyclists on the river wall footpath and **CONSIDERING** signage.

Numerous emails have been both received and sent about the river wall footpath. Pertinent points:

In a telephone conversation, Public Rights of Way recognised that this footpath is not suitable for cycling.

Cycling on the river wall is a civil offence (trespassing against the landowner). A byelaw or traffic regulation order could be imposed, however, this would require police enforcement. Traffic signs would need to be installed.

Barriers/gates can be installed on a public footpath 'for public safety', although not encouraged; mobility scooters, prams etc should be allowed access.

PROW can offer metal A4 signs stating 'footpath only, no cycling' for each end of the path. They are black text on white with the red circular symbol. The Clerk has asked if tailored signage would be possible, stating something like 'FRAGILE SURFACE DAMAGED BY CYCLE USE' or 'FRAGILE FLOOD DEFENCES'. PROW previously suggested wording such as 'CYCLISTS ARE TRESPASSERS'.

Levington Parish Council have also experienced issues of cycling on their river wall footpath. They have 'cyclists on the river wall footpaths all the time...' even 'cycling along the 3" wide boardwalk through the reed bed. They ignore all attempts at pointing out that they are on a footpath and not a bridleway.' PROW had provided signage but one sign has been broken off. Levington PC have suggested a joint approach.

The Clerk has asked PROW if they could supply a larger version of the sign which says 'Public Bridleway C300m...' on the Fishpond/Sandy Lane corner, to make it clearer that the bridleway is a limited length.

The Clerk has asked PROW if they are aware if/how cycling will be discouraged on the new proposed section of the England Coast Path. This section is still under consultation.

PROW suggested an informal survey of cyclists might be useful, to establish where cyclists are coming from, where they are going, how they found out about the route (possibly uncovering if the area has been promoted) and how they are getting to Waldringfield (cycling or by car). It would also be useful to get a rough estimate of the numbers of cyclists a day (which could possibly support a byelaw).

The County Council has 'a duty to maintain the surface of the public footpath 'commensurate with use', ie for walkers only.'

Waldringfield Parish Council

The Clerk has emailed the Environment Agency, asking if a sign specifically stating that cycling is prohibited could be installed at the boatyard (where there is already a sign). The current sign:



The 'hard' flood defence works from Swans Nest to the village slipway are currently still maintained by the Environment Agency. Here, the footpath is owned by each individual property on the quay.

In a report about beachside activities, a resident mentioned 'groups of youths not socially distancing and people sat all over the footpaths and some apparently smoking something down on the saltings.'

A report was received highlighting that the no cycling sign on the footpath at the back of the beach huts has been removed.

ITEM 9

To **CONSIDER** signage for the beach. This follows reports of dangerous behaviour in the river.

A couple of reports were received after a very busy day on 25th June.

Tony Lyon 'spent the morning trying to keep swimmers out of the main channel which was very busy with big boats going back and forth and SUP boarders and kayaks all over the place.' Another local couple 'rescued some kayakers' when one man 'fell out of his kayak downriver and couldn't back in.' Swimmers seemingly 'had no idea about the currents and were swimming out to the island and having issues getting back against the tide.'

'Boats out of control, had to push them off ours and untangle their tenders and then row the tenders out to their owners! Good job [names redacted] were out on their paddle board and there to help us with that one as we needed two rowing boats and a paddle board for the rescue!' '...had to rescue someone who decided to use his paddle board as a windsurfer and crashed into a tender with a dog on the back! Then swimmers who couldn't manage the ebb tide and didn't even know what one was' and 'a young girl 'learning' to use an electric outboard crashing into everything and then capsized!'

'The police boat did come along today about 3.30...'

'Poor Tony seems to have been left to patrol the river entirely on his own! People should understand that he is not supposed to be a lifeguard. I don't think all those visitors were aware that it is a tidal estuary. Some were definitely caught out yesterday as they didn't understand tides and weren't strong swimmers...I think the main problem seemed to be visitors who took to the water on a hot day in strong currents.'

'I didn't see many sailing dinghies but the ones that were out seemed to be well out of the way and under control. But the number of swimmers and SUP boards was unbelievable and they were gadding around in the middle of the channel with yachts...in a constant stream at high tide as normal. Some swimmers nearly ended up down river on the ebb on the saltings and some upriver of the boatyard on

Waldringfield Parish Council

the flood. At least they could end up on the saltings and have a long walk back in the mud. It's the ones swimming across or down the channel that could get run down that are the issue. They are very tricky to see from a boat.'

'Perhaps a sign saying 'this beach does not have a lifeguard. Warning: strong tidal currents', would help and then if someone is drowned the village has done all they can to warn people.'

Cllr Elliot forwarded a PDF with RNLI guidance on appropriate signage for different settings.

ITEM 10

To **DISCUSS** the ongoing issue of rubbish build-up and **CONSIDER** signage.

Norse has confirmed that the grey bins will be collected every week until the first week of September (they are currently only collected every two weeks). The blue bins will remain on a two-weekly collection schedule. Collections are made on a Friday.

Some suggested signs have been forwarded to councillors.

The 'Don't be a Tossler' campaign is being resurrected in Suffolk.
http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/radiosuffolk/pdf/keep_suffolk_clean_poster.pdf

ITEM 11

To **CONSIDER** becoming an interested party in the pre-examination stage of the Sizewell C Development Consent Order (DCO) application. This will require WPC registering an interest on the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) website and providing a short written summary of WPC's views on the DCO application. This is not a public consultation. The process concludes 30th September, before the examination period.

The Section 56 (s56) Notification Stage or the formal pre-examination stage of the process will begin on 8 July and run to 30 September. The minimum statutory duration of this stage is 30 days but the application is detailed and there are still some restrictions due to the pandemic response.

This is not a public consultation. PINS encourages stakeholders to read the application online. You can then register on the PINS website to become an 'Interested Party' by providing a written summary of your views on the DCO application. This is called a 'Relevant Representation'. As a registered 'Interested Party', you will be kept informed of progress and about opportunities to put your case forward at the next stage (the Examination).

Interested Parties: Anyone with an interest in the DCO application for Sizewell C can register their interest on the PINS website through a short written summary of their views. Those registering can then take a full part in the examination itself if they wish. Any party with an interest in the land affected by the application is automatically registered.

Waldringfield Parish Council

To **CONSIDER** becoming a signatory to the Anglian Energy Planning Alliance's letter to the Secretary of State, and to **CONSIDER** becoming part of a working group.

See letter.

Will any councils, or individuals from them, who wish to participate in a co-ordinated effort please let me know. Some councils have started to examine specific topics in detail, so it would be helpful if those councils could send us a few words to confirm which issues they are working on. Once we know who wants to participate we suggest setting up a googlegroup email list for councils or individuals to share information.

With best wishes.

Victoria Hambley

Secretary - Anglian Energy Planning Alliance

Waldringfield Parish Council

Dear Secretary of State,

Re: Suffolk Coast Energy Projects : open and fair public meetings and hearings

We the undersigned East Suffolk Parish and Town Councils write to express our concerns about Development Consent Orders (DCO) being considered by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in relation to energy constructions at the village of Friston by Scottish Power Renewables (SPR), and at Sizewell C by EDF nearby. The 2 Scottish Power applications also provide for a new National Grid connector which, if built, would provide the connection point for a further 6 major power projects which are at various stages of planning or consideration. We have already raised the issues around the cumulative impact on our communities (and wider across Suffolk) with the Secretary and Minister of State for Department of BEIS at the end of last year.

We wish to register our specific concern with your department about the issue of allowing PINS to proceed with the DCOs without full and open public meetings and hearings. PINS is considering the use of virtual events instead. Many towns and parishes have responded to PINS with their individual negative views. However, we wish to reflect the strength of feeling within our communities directly with you as Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government. We believe that virtual events are inadequate, unfair, and would be subject to legal challenge.

Your own Ministerial Guidance (13.03.20) recognises that there will be some circumstances in which virtual events cannot substitute for open and fair public meetings and hearings;

The Government recognises that in exceptional circumstances it may not be appropriate to proceed virtually and that alternative arrangements may be needed. These alternative arrangements should be taken forward speedily, where possible, taking into account the Government's guidance on social distancing.

Government guidance on social distancing, social isolation and public gatherings prevents us from holding public meetings to consult with our communities on these matters. There is no adequate substitute for these given that rural internet/broadband in Suffolk can be unreliable and slow. Many of those wishing to participate, including many of our local councillors, have limited or no access to the internet and varying levels of familiarity and confidence in using digital technology. As a result virtual events and virtual access to planning information and material will exclude many people from meaningful engagement. SPR and EDF will by contrast be supported by large, well-resourced IT departments with high quality technology and up to date networks. This disparity of resources is already an issue and further disadvantages local communities.

Our small towns and parishes have very limited resources and are made up of volunteers. Individual councils have had to take responsibility for engaging and consulting their own communities in order to respond to the many overlapping consultations about these projects. Time consuming and arduous at normal times, the current Covid crisis has made that responsibility exponentially more difficult when councils are helping their communities to manage the impact of the pandemic. If the current demands on small local councils are added to by consecutive or concurrent virtual DCO meetings and hearings (as well as other developing projects) as is being considered by PINS, this will almost certainly lead to some councils being overwhelmed. It is impossible to overstate that risk.

Despite some recent easing of the lockdown, we continue to have serious concerns about our communities' ability to fully participate in the process. We face ongoing restrictions in holding public events and limitations in being able to view easily DCO materials offline. Moreover, Covid-19 has created serious capacity constraints for many organisations, with key staff members on furlough, re-deployed, still shielding, or focussed on other pandemic-related matters. Given the scale, complexity, the cumulative impact and overlapping nature of such major power projects, it is our view that these applications are totally unsuitable for digital examination. We therefore ask that examination of these projects be delayed until such time as all parties are satisfied that full, fair and open public engagement can take place.

Cllr Tim Beach (Chair of Snape Parish Council), on behalf (list of town & parish signatories)

To **CONSIDER** attending the Joint Local Authorities Group's virtual engagement event on 29th July (confirmations by 22nd July, maximum of two councillors).

On behalf of Cllrs Richard Rout and Craig Rivett, Chair and Vice-Chair of the Joint Local Authorities Group representing Suffolk County and East Suffolk Councils, we invite you to an engagement event in relation to the Sizewell C application for Development Consent.

During previous rounds of public consultation run by EDF Energy in relation to the Sizewell C proposals, we have held town and parish engagement events to gather information to help shape our responses. The application for Development Consent Order has now been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and EDF Energy have announced that the section 56 period of engagement will be running from 8 July

Waldringfield Parish Council

until 30 September. This is an opportunity to review the documentation, register as Interested Parties with the Planning Inspectorate, and submit a relevant representation summarising your position.

The Councils would like the opportunity to talk with you once again. However, to ensure this can be achieved in a safe manner, we are proposing a virtual event on the afternoon of 29 July 2020. We ask that you join the event with up to two attendees from your town or parish council– we are limiting the numbers, as we have previously, to ensure we can manage break out areas.

The event will be held on the Zoom platform and a link will be sent to all registered attendees in advance of the date. Registration for the event will open at 13.00, with the event to commence at 13.15. The event is expected to close by 16.15, with a break included in the timetable. A detailed programme will be sent to registered attendees along with the link to the event and guidance notes for taking part. Please note that if you join via a Chromebook you will not be able to access the break-out rooms, you will be able to access the main room only. If you can download Zoom and create an account prior to registering with us, this will enable us to pre-assign break out rooms before the event begins.

Please ensure that you have registered to attend by 5pm Wednesday 22 July, registration will close promptly to enable final preparations to take place.

The event will be a mix of presentations and focussed facilitated discussion in smaller break-out groups, providing ample opportunity to ask questions of both Councils and to present your views and concerns to help shape both our and your response to the DCO.

If you would like to attend please email sizewellc@eastssuffolk.gov.uk. Please note that places are limited to a maximum of two per town/parish council. Please register by 5pm Wednesday 22 July.

If you have any questions then please do get in touch with Lisa Chandler, lisa.chandler@eastssuffolk.gov.uk or Michael Moll, michael.moll@suffolk.gov.uk.

We look forward to welcoming you on 29 July 2020.

Kind regards
Nick Clow | Energy Projects Co-ordinator
East Suffolk Council

ITEM 12

To **CONSIDER** a response to the Local Government Association's consultation on a new model member code of conduct. Consultation ends 17th August.

https://www.nalc.gov.uk/news/entry/1500-nalc-calls-on-government-to-introduce-sanctions-to-support-the-proposed-code-of-conduct?utm_source=Members&utm_campaign=53d4c29919-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_06_08_03_15_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_206970988f-53d4c29919-361940462&mc_cid=53d4c29919&mc_eid=b5df9a4189

<https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/LGA%20Model%20Member%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf>

Eighteen months after the Committee on Standards in Public Life reported to the Prime Minister on improving ethical standards in local government, the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) has been pleased to have worked with the Local Government Association (LGA) to take forward the recommendation to develop an updated national model code of conduct for all tiers of local government. This is an important measure NALC called for and proposed to the committee.

The LGA is now consulting on the proposed national model member code of conduct, and NALC is urging all local (parish and town) councils and county associations of local councils to consider the proposed code and respond to the LGA to share their views.

However, the report also recognised that current sanctions available to local authorities are insufficient, and NALC is also calling on the government to take urgent action to introduce the recommendation in the report for a new power for local authorities to suspend councillors for a period of up to six months. Failure to introduce this sanction alongside other measures will risk wider steps being taken to improve ethical standards, such as the model code of conduct and training for councillors and clerks, as being ineffective.

Now more than ever, high standards of conduct in government at all levels are needed to protect the integrity of decision making, maintain public confidence and to safeguard local democracy. That is why NALC is also calling for the Committee on Standards in Public Life to publish a timetable for reviewing progress on the implementation of the report's wider recommendations and best practice to ensure this important issue continues to be a priority for action.

From SALC:

SALC would encourage councils to provide a corporate response to this important consultation... However we would also highlight that it is also open to individual councillors and staff to make representations in an individual capacity.

We all know the impact that poor behaviour, bullying and harassment can have on individuals and on local councils as organisations, so it is vital we continue to work as a sector to improve standards and push for further reform, at both local and national level.

Therefore, while NALC will be responding to the consultation and engaging further with the LGA, we are also calling for further action by the government to introduce a new power for local authorities to suspend councillors for a period of up to six months, and for the Committee on Standards in Public Life to review progress on the implementation of the reports wider recommendations.

ITEM 13

To **CONSIDER** a response to the pre-planning application consultation on changes to the Foxhall Road recycling centre. Comments by 20th July.

Suffolk County Council is proposing to expand and improve Foxhall Recycling Centre. The proposals also involve highway improvements to the site entrance. The benefits of this scheme will be to:

- Remove the need for queuing on the highway
- Provide an improved space and layout for easier access
- Improve accessibility and increase capacity by eliminating the need for site users to climb steps to access containers
- Improve the Re-use Centre space
- Introduce greater separation between public vehicles and larger vehicles

We anticipate that a planning application for this proposed development will be submitted by end of July 2020. In advance of this we are placing information on our website to allow you to view the plans for the proposed redevelopment and provide us with any comments you may have. This should be on our websites later today at www.suffolkrecycling.org.uk and www.suffolk.gov.uk/consultations.

The consultation runs from 29 June – 20 July 2020. To submit comments or queries, please email: waste.manangement@suffolk.gov.uk

ITEM 14

To **CONSIDER** a response to Groundwork East's survey to ascertain interest in establishing a Climate Community Support Initiative. Comments by 16th July.

Questions to consider (simple questions not included):

4. Please briefly describe what your community looks like in terms of rurality and demographics. For example, 'Our community is very rural and isolated, and the majority of our residents are elderly'.

6. What would you say are the top three challenges facing your community?

Transport links

Deprivation

Old building stock (domestic and non-domestic)

Ageing population

Limited services

Funding cuts

Access to key utilities e.g. broadband, gas

Antisocial behaviour

Community cohesion

Other (please specify)

7. Does your Town or Parish Council have a working group dedicated to improving the environment and sustainability?

8. What have they achieved?

9. What is their ambition?

11. Where applicable, briefly describe the subject area you are receiving help with from each organisation.

12. How much communication would you say that your local authority provides on what they're doing to tackle climate change?

13. To your knowledge, has your town/parish council, county or district council declared a climate emergency?

15. Of the community buildings you have, to your knowledge, have any of them reduced their environmental impact, either through building improvements or advice? (Village Hall, Pub, School, Church)

16. To your knowledge, what are the main barriers for community buildings wanting to reduce their environmental impact?

Unsure where to go for advice

Lack of funding

Lack of commitment from management committee

Time constraints of the management committee

Not sure

Other (please specify)

17. To your knowledge, please select which community groups are operating locally:

Amateur dramatics club

Girlguiding groups

Scout groups

Gardening/allotment clubs

Arts and crafts groups

Lunch clubs

Sports/Fitness groups

Other (please specify)

Waldringfield Parish Council

18. Do you have any environment-related groups?

20. What additional services and businesses are there within your community?

Pre-school?

Youth groups?

Other (please specify)

22. How engaged would you say each of the above is with the community and Town or Parish Council?
(Includes school and pub)

23. Are any representatives from these services and businesses directly involved with the Town or Parish Council?

26. Are there any parts of your community that are particularly hard to reach and that you would like more involvement from?

27. Please explain which parts of your community are hard to engage:

28. How would you describe your community's engagement and cohesion as a whole?

There is a high amount of engagement and cohesion in my community

Some parts of the community are more engaged than others

There is very little engagement and cohesion in my community

29. To your knowledge, would residents be interested in a support service that helps them to reduce their own environmental impact and that of the wider community?

30. To your knowledge, what do you see the top five opportunities from reducing your communities' environmental impact being?

Greater community cohesion

Healthier lifestyles

Lower energy bills

Increased spending locally

Improved local environments

Improved opportunities to connect with nature

Greater food security

Safer roads

Greater local resilience to a changing climate

Less exposure to global oil and gas markets

Enhanced future prospects

A safer community

Contributing to local carbon reduction targets

Contributing to national carbon reduction targets

Other (please specify)

31. To your knowledge, what support would be required?

Carbon literacy workshops*

Working partnerships with community groups and businesses

Technical advice

Financial assistance

Funding advice

32. 'Green enablers' are volunteer local residents who are charged with putting plans into action, supporting projects from home-based energy savings schemes, community food growing initiatives, local biodiversity projects, and park and greenspace creation, to recycling and sustainable transport initiatives and activities to support access to green jobs.

What interest, if any, do you think individuals within your community would have to become a 'green enabler'?

There would be a considerable amount of interest

There would be some interest

Waldringfield Parish Council

There would be very little interest

The UK has a legal commitment to reduce its emissions to net zero by 2050 and Suffolk local authorities also have their own climate emergency journeys. Communities are well placed to help Suffolk achieve their aims through collective action. In this section, we're interested in finding out what you know about community climate net zero plans.

A community climate net zero plan sets out the achievable and relevant actions a community can take to reduce their environmental impacts and reduce their emissions to net zero. The plan will detail your community's carbon footprint and focus on a set of core themes including energy use, water, waste, and transport.

33. How much do you know about community climate net zero plans?

This is the first time I've heard about them

I have heard of them but I'm not sure what their purpose is

I have a good understanding of what they are

34. Would you be interested in helping to implement a net zero plan for your community?

35. What would the top three outcomes of interest be for you?

An assessment of our community's carbon footprint

Opportunities for reducing our carbon footprint

Opportunities for improving our local economy

Greater community cohesion

To see what other communities have done

Opportunities for a healthier local environment overall

Opportunities for developing green skills locally

Opportunities for developing jobs locally

* 36. Which, if any, of the following would be of interest to your community? Please choose your top five.

Roadshows

Events

Online events

Talks

Carbon literacy workshops

Independent technical advice available via telephone and/or email

Independent technical advice in person

Tools to help residents/groups determine the actual environmental impact of their activities

Newsletters

Engagement

Building up a volunteer network

ITEM 15

CLERK AND RFO REPORT

To **CONSIDER** and **APPROVE** applications for community grants, if any – Suffolk Friends of the Earth appealing for funds to engage expert scientific witnesses to assist with responding to the Sizewell C application.

To **CONSIDER** and **APPROVE** items of expenditure, and sign cheques and arrange for approval of BACS accordingly – see separate list.

Waldringfield Parish Council

13 July 2020 (2020-2021)

Waldringfield Parish Council PAYMENTS LIST

Voucher	Code	Date	Minute	Bank	Cheque No	Description	Supplier	VAT Type	Net	VAT	Total
16	Accounting, Website & Comp	11/07/2020		Unity Trust Bank		Zoom video conferencing	Zoom Video Communications	S	11.99	2.40	14.39
17	Grass cutting (field)	11/07/2020		Unity Trust Bank		Grass-cutting -field	SCL Landscape Management	S	120.00	24.00	144.00
20	Training	11/07/2020		Unity Trust Bank		Training	SALC	S	14.00	2.80	16.80
23	Stationery/Mileage/Etc.	11/07/2020		Unity Trust Bank		Expenses	Viking Direct (via R. Todd)	S	12.69	2.54	15.23
18	Church Field	11/07/2020	1799.10	Unity Trust Bank		Grant s137/72 or s19 MAP76	Waldringfield Church Field Tr	X	400.00	0.00	400.00
19	Village Hall LGA	11/07/2020	1799.10	Unity Trust Bank		Grant s137/72 or s19 MAP76	Waldringfield Village Hall Tru	X	500.00	0.00	500.00
21	Salaries	11/07/2020	1800.14	Unity Trust Bank		Salary/expenses adjustment	Rebecca Todd	X	41.40	0.00	41.40
22	Salaries	11/07/2020		Unity Trust Bank		Salary	Rebecca Todd	X	491.28	0.00	491.28
24	Grass cutting (field)	13/07/2020		Unity Trust Bank		Grass-cutting -field	SCL Landscape Management	S	60.00	12.00	72.00
Total									1,651.36	43.74	1,695.10

To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the Financial Reports and **UNDERTAKE** the independent Bank Reconciliation.

Waldringfield Parish Council

13 July 2020 (2020-2021)

Waldringfield Parish Council

Prepared by: _____
Name and Role (Clerk/RFO etc)

Date: _____

Approved by: _____
Name and Role (RFO/Chair of Finance etc)







Date: _____

A	Bank Reconciliation at 13/07/2020		
	Cash in Hand 01/04/2020		11,732.32
	ADD Receipts 01/04/2020 - 13/07/2020		10,293.45
			22,025.77
	SUBTRACT Payments 01/04/2020 - 13/07/2020		4,542.55
	Cash in Hand 13/07/2020 (per Cash Book)		17,483.22
B	Cash in hand per Bank Statements		
	Cash 30/06/2020	0.00	
	Unity Trust Bank 11/07/2020	0.00	
	Ipswich Building Society 30/06/2020	7,896.69	
	Barclays Community Account 30/06/2020	11,501.90	
			19,398.59
	Less unrepresented payments		1,915.37
			17,483.22
	Plus unrepresented receipts		0.00
	Adjusted Bank Balance		17,483.22
	A = B Checks out OK		

Waldringfield Parish Council

Your Community Account

At a glance

Date	Description	Money out £	Money in £	Balance £
30 May	Start Balance			13,316.41
1 Jun	 Cheque Issued Ref: 101214	415.80		12,900.61
9 Jun	 Cheque Issued Ref: 101211	750.00		12,150.61
10 Jun	 Cheque Issued Ref: 101210	72.00		12,078.61
	 Cheque Issued Ref: 101216	72.00		12,006.61
12 Jun	 Cheque Issued Ref: 101209	30.00		11,976.61
26 Jun	 Cheque Issued Ref: 101220	474.71		11,501.90
30 Jun	Balance carried forward			11,501.90
	Total Payments/Receipts	1,814.51	0.00	

30 May - 30 Jun 2020

Start balance	£13,316.41
Money out	£1,814.51
Commission charges	£0.00
Money in	£0.00
Gross interest earned	£0.00
End balance	£11,501.90

Your deposit is eligible for protection by the Financial Services Compensation Scheme.

Anything wrong? If you notice any incorrect or unusual transactions, see the next page for how to get in touch with us.

Page 1

13 July 2020 (2020-2021)

Waldringfield Parish Council Uncashed payments/transfers out (All banks) (Upto 13/07/2020)

Voucher	Date	Cheque No.	Description	Total	Bank
8	13/05/2020	101215	Audit Fee	158.00	Barclays Community Acco
12	04/06/2020	101219	Zoom video conferencing	14.39	Barclays Community Acco
13	04/06/2020	101219	Signage	47.88	Barclays Community Acco
16	11/07/2020		Zoom video conferencing	14.39	Unity Trust Bank
17	11/07/2020		Grass-cutting -field	144.00	Unity Trust Bank
18	11/07/2020		Grant s137/72 or s19 MAP76	400.00	Unity Trust Bank
19	11/07/2020		Grant s137/72 or s19 MAP76	500.00	Unity Trust Bank
20	11/07/2020		Training	16.80	Unity Trust Bank
21	11/07/2020		Salary/expenses adjustment	41.40	Unity Trust Bank
22	11/07/2020		Salary	491.28	Unity Trust Bank
23	11/07/2020		Expenses	15.23	Unity Trust Bank
24	13/07/2020		Grass-cutting -field	72.00	Unity Trust Bank
			Total.....	1,915.37	

Waldringfield Parish Council

Waldringfield Parish Council Summary of Receipts and Payments All Cost Centres and Codes

13 July 2020 (2020-2021)

A - Receipts

Code	Title	Receipts			Payments			Net Position
		Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	+/- Under/over spend
28	Precept	13,574.00	6,787.00	-6,787				-6,787
30	SCC Locality Grant							
31	SCC Footpaths Grant	200.00		-200				-200
35	ES Enabling Communities Grant							
36	Bank Interest	99.00		-99				-99
37	Grants and Donations							
38	Advertising income	85.00		-85				-85
39	VAT Refund							
44	CIL Funds	4,338.00	2,169.07	-2,169				-2,169
SUB TOTAL		18,296.00	8,956.07	-9,340				-9,340

B - Administration

Code	Title	Receipts			Payments			Net Position
		Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	+/- Under/over spend
1	Salaries				5,777.00	1,467.40	4,310	4,310
2	PAYE/NI							
3	Stationery/Mileage/Etc.				250.00	12.69	237	237
4	Post and telephone				80.00	16.11	64	64
5	Newsletter re 1972 LGA s142				400.00	78.60	321	321
6	Village Hall hire				300.00		300	300
7	Insurance				436.00		436	436
8	Membership Subs re LGA s111				400.00	257.95	142	142
9	Audit				135.00	158.00	-23	-23
10	Chairman's Expenses				50.00		50	50
11	Training				500.00	14.00	486	486
12	Election Costs							
40	Accounting, Website & Computing				450.00	23.98	426	426
42	Professional Services				250.00		250	250
SUB TOTAL					9,028.00	2,028.73	6,999	6,999

C - Playing Field/Recreational

Code	Title	Receipts			Payments			Net Position
		Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	+/- Under/over spend
14	Grass cutting (field)				780.00	300.00	480	480
15	Mole catching (field)				100.00		100	100
16	Repairs/Maintenance				1,500.00	376.50	1,124	1,124
17	Footpath Maintenance				400.00	39.90	360	360
41	AONB Grant Payments							
SUB TOTAL					2,780.00	716.40	2,064	2,064

Waldringfield Parish Council

Waldringfield Parish Council Summary of Receipts and Payments All Cost Centres and Codes

13 July 2020 (2020-2021)

D - Grants - s137/72 & s19 MPA71

Code	Title	Receipts			Payments			Net Position
		Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	+/- Under/over spend
21	General Grants				400.00		400	400
22	Church Field				100.00	400.00	-300	-300
23	Village Hall LGA				500.00	500.00		
24	All Saints Church				750.00	750.00		
25	WildlifeGroup				100.00		100	100
SUB TOTAL					1,850.00	1,650.00	200	200

F - Miscellaneous

Code	Title	Receipts			Payments			Net Position
		Budgeted	Actual	Variance	Budgeted	Actual	Variance	+/- Under/over spend
26	Miscellaneous							
SUB TOTAL								

Summary

NET TOTAL	18,296.00	8,956.07	-9,340	13,658.00	4,395.13	9,263	-77
V.A.T.		1,337.38			147.42		
GROSS TOTAL		10,293.45			4,542.55		

To **CONSIDER** any quotations received for the replacement Cliff Road bench.

ITEM 16

To **REVIEW** and **UPDATE**, as appropriate, the policies of the Parish Council and the Parish Plan (including the Emergency Plan). This will include approving the Complaints Procedure.

Revised Complaints Procedure emailed to councillors.

ITEM 17

To **CONSIDER** any correspondence received before the meeting

Reports of a drone over Cliff Road
Graffiti
Rubbish
Motorcycles

ITEM 18

PARISH MATTERS for the next meeting.

Website accessibility