Waldringfield Parish Council

Parish Clerk: David Lines
43 Fourth Avenue, Frinton-on-Sea, Essex CO13 9DY
E: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
T: 01255 678888 (with voicemail)
www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil

1639

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday, 20th September 2016

Present: Councillors Kay, Videlo, Elliot, Matheson, Gold and Winship and 19 members of the public

1 **APOLOGIES AND APPROVAL FOR ABSENCE OF PARISH COUNCILLORS** Apologies for absence received from Cllrs. Archer (holiday), Harraway (illness) and Reid (holiday), as well as from SCC Cllr O'Brien and SCDC Cllr Harvey.

2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – Cllr Kay declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in Item 7, the arrangements to deal with any planning application put forward for Waldringfield Golf Club

To **RECEIVE** delegated Declaration of Interest Dispensation decisions or **APPROVE** such dispensation requests as needed – **NONE**

Parish Issues – an opportunity for members of the public to bring matters to the attention of the Council and for parishioners to seek guidance from the Council –

*To **RECEIVE** a 15 minute presentation on behalf of the Waldringfield Golf Club with regard to its future development plans*

In the open part of the meeting, Mr. Melin (Lanpro) and Mr Bartram (Heritage Developments) gave a short presentation to the Council and members of the public, followed by a Q&A session. In closing the presentation, the Chairman thanked Mr Melin and Mr Bartam for their attendance and noted that the Parish Council, later in the meeting, would establish the format of dealing with any planning application arising from this project once formal notice had been received.

In other matters, a request for a bird deterrent above the swings and a closer examination of the *stepping snake* in the play area was requested. Cllr Winship gave a report on the devolution process, as presented at the SALC area meeting.

To **RECEIVE** reports from:

a. Suffolk County Councillor O'Brien – report provided and noted
b. Suffolk Coastal District Councillor Harvey – report provided and noted
c. Suffolk Police – No report provided.

3 It was **RESOLVED TO ADOPT** the minutes of the extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held on 23rd August proposed by Cllr. Matheson, seconded by Cllr. Elliot. **AGREED** by all present at the meeting.

4 **Matters for REPORT** from minutes of previous meetings and to **REVIEW ACTION POINTS** from the minutes of the Parish Council Meetings held on 9th and 23rd August. No further progress on the ongoing action points, but action items from the minutes had been completed, with the exception of Item 9, Planning Protocol, which would be actioned by the next meeting. The Play Space fund stood at £7,000+, and an application form was provided for the replacement of the cradle seats, etc. It was noted that building materials had been left at the side of the road. Cllr Videlo suggested that it belonged to the School's contractors and expected it to be removed shortly. Re the cutting of verges and hedges by residents, a draft announcement for Waldringfielders / the Newsletter would be circulated for approval.

5 To **CONSIDER** Planning Applications for **COMMENTS**:

DC/16/3518/FUL – Hut 7 Riverside – Replace old wooden boat shed with new wooden hut **SUPPORTED,** with no comments. Proposed by Cllr Gold, Seconded by Cllr Elliot, AGREED by all

DC/16/3650/TPO – March House School Lane – to fell Sycamore tree on northern side boundary on safety grounds
The Council **OBJECTED** to the application, based on the report provided by the Parish Tree Warden (attached). Proposed by Cllr Elliot, seconded by Cllr Kay, AGREED by a majority (4 - 2)

To **MAKE ARRANGEMENTS** to deal with applications received after publication of this agenda

1640

5+ To **NOTE** any application decisions received, including those after publication of this agenda

TPO 262 Eureka, Cliff Road – Oak tree and woodland on land at Eureka

To **RECEIVE** a brief report on the SCDC SAASP examination

Cllrs Kay and Elliot provided a summary of the attached briefing note, which was followed by a Q&A session. They also reported an informal approach from CEG/CODE, the new developers/agents for the Adastral Park site, who were aware of the recent history vis-à-vis WPC and wished to reignite an improved community engagement for the future. It was agreed that the best approach would be to conduct an informal meeting between a number of councillors and representatives of CEG/CODE, with the Clerk present to take notes of the meeting for later report to the Full Council and publication

6 To **CONSIDER** the continued use of the One Suffolk domain to host the Parish Website at a new cost of £50 p.a. and whether to retain the **waldringfield.org.uk** domain name for another year. It was **AGREED** to continue use of the One Suffolk domain under the new arrangements, but to defer the decision on the Waldringfield.org.uk domain until the next meeting. Proposed by Cllr Kay, seconded by Cllr Elliot.

7 To **MAKE ARRANGEMENTS** to deal with the expected proposals from Waldringfield Golf Club. It was **AGREED** to await any formal application before arranging a public meeting to consider it.

8 To **CONSIDER** public rights of way and road safety issues. The parish footpaths had been cut by the Council's contractor. Discussion about the merits of a third cut each year was deferred to a future meeting. Cllr Gold agreed to inspect the stepping snake in the play area, despite it not being highlighted as a risk item of any significance in the recent annual inspection

9 To **CONSIDER** repairs to the Playing Field Gate and any other equipment following the Annual Inspection of the playing field.
The Clerk had not yet obtained a quote for the repair to the gate. However, it was **AGREED** that, in light of its significance, repairs should be undertaken as soon as possible, with authority delegated to the Clerk. Proposed by Cllr Kay, seconded by Cllr Elliot

10 To **RECEIVE AND APPROVE** the report of the External Auditor, noting any recommendations therein – one minor recommendation. The Council **APPROVED** the report and noted the minor recommendation for action next year

11 To **REVIEW** and **UPDATE**, where appropriate, the policies of the Parish Council (N.B. this will be a standing item for the next several Parish Council meetings) – **Deferred**

12 To **RECEIVE** an update from the Parish Plan Groups
Cllr Winship had emailed a report on proposals to deal with Dog-Fouling, which was noted with a record of thanks. Other reports were deferred

13 **CLERK AND RFO REPORT**

To **RECEIVE** applications and **APPROVE** payments for community grants, if any - None
To **CONSIDER** items of expenditure and sign cheques accordingly - see separate list. With two additions (per updated list), Cllr Kay proposed the payments, seconded by Cllr Videlo, **AGREED** by all
To **RECEIVE** the Financial Reports and **UNDERTAKE** the independent Bank Reconciliation - Cllr Elliot undertook the bank reconciliation and proposed its approval, along with the Financial Reports. Seconded by Cllr Kay and **AGREED** by all

14 To **CONSIDER** any Correspondence received before the meeting. The Clerk apologised for the absence of the Correspondence List from the agenda papers, but provided details of the items verbally.
The list would be circulated to councillors subsequently for their records.

15 **PARISH MATTERS** for the next Agenda. Parish Plan Group reports / Completion of Planning Protocol / Waldringfield.org domain name / Apologies for absence from the next meeting were given by Cllrs Matheson and Gold

The Meeting was closed at 9.35 pm

1641

REVIEW OF ACTION POINTS AS AT 27th September 2016

Ongoing – Proposed change to Footpath 10 Brightwell together with associated circular route. **Action** None feasible for the time being. (11/2/2014) Further action **deferred** *(Abbreviated note from action points of October 2015)*

In progress - Road safety and lawful use of footpaths Road Safety - report sent to SCC Highways re Village entrance crossroads via Cllr P O'B. **Action:** Awaiting SCC Highway's recommendations. Road Safety group to lead. Clerk to write to SCC's Malcolm King to seek suggestions on an interim solution

Footpaths River Wall footpath. **Action**: SCC to erect sign in due course
(Abbreviated note from action points of October 2015)

In progress - Village Way ACTION SCC advised of PC recommendations. SCC Cllr O'Brien has committed £15,000 funding to the project Awaiting SCC Highways response – expected after consultation with residents *(Abbreviated note from action points of October 2015)* Now deferred by SCC to early 2016. Consultation completed in April/draft drawings produced – design stage now entered. SCC engaging with residents – road widening proposed but no new drop-kerbs

In progress - The archiving/disposal of the Parish Council records and old files. **ACTION** Sorting of files completed – Retained records to county archives where appropriate, unwanted files to be shredded over next few months. Anything of historic note to be identified and reported to the Council to decide its destination

Item 2

SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL REPORT SEPTEMBER 2016

Summer period and thus not a great deal to report except for the issue of devolution. The consultation period has just ended and it will be interesting to see the comments from the public. Below is listed the proposal:

Key elements of proposed Norfolk/Suffolk deal are:

- £25m funding each year for the next 30 years (£750m) to support economic growth, development of local infrastructure and jobs (this will increase the local economy to £43bn and create 95,000 jobs by 2026)
- £130m investment over five years to support the building of new homes across Norfolk and Suffolk
- Over the lifetime of the deal around 200,000 homes could be delivered
- Control of a £225m transport budget for the next four years
- Control of an existing c£20m annual adult skills fund to ensure the training offer matches the needs of local businesses and the local labour market
- Control of an existing c£2m annual Apprenticeship Grant for employers

As part of the consultation, people have been asked for their views on more decisions being taken locally, rather than at central government and whether they support the creation of a combined authority chaired by a directly elected Mayor for the two counties. – Personally I would have more enthusiasm for devolution if Cambridge had been part of the proposal, as was originally mooted.

I have been dealing with local issues, particularly in relation to overgrown verges, hedges, potholes,on the highway. There have also been **Highway** issues that have taken a long time to resolve but, happily, are being addressed.

There is good news in relation to **education** in Suffolk. At last, schools in Suffolk are improving, and 80% are deemed either good or outstanding. It has been a long haul but the improvements SCC has been initiating, through the Raising the Bar program, are showing results.

I have attended a recent SNT meeting plus chaired a workshop for the **Police** & Crime Panel and at both of these the most crucial issue, as far as I gauged, was communication. There is so much change and it is vital that the public are aware of what is happening. The highest concern regarded the new policing model that has reduced SNTs from 29 to 18 and removed 68 PCSO posts. However, the PCC is holding meetings in each of the 18 SNT areas. The new data recording system, ATHENA, is complete, but not without teething troubles.

The following day I had an informal meeting with Tim Passmore and communication was the main topic under review.

I accompanied Therese Coffey on her tour to most of the parishes in my division on 30th August.

Patricia

Items 3 and 4—next 4 pages

Waldringfield Parish Council

Parish Clerk: David Lines
43 Fourth Avenue, Frinton-on-Sea, Essex CO13 9DY
E: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
T: 01255 678888 (with voicemail)
www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil

1638

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 23rd August 2016

Present: Councillors Kay, Elliot, Matheson, Archer, and Reid, and 10 members of the public.

1 **APOLOGIES AND APPROVAL FOR ABSENCE OF PARISH COUNCILLORS**
Cllrs Gold, Harraway, Videlo and Winship on holiday. Cllr Reid agreed to be Clerk for the meeting

2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**–None
To **RECEIVE** delegated Declaration of Interest Dispensation decisions or **APPROVE** such dispensation requests as needed – **NONE**

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

3. It was **RESOLVED TO ADOPT** the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 9th August 2016. Proposed by the Chair and **AGREED** by all present at the meeting.

4 **Matters for REPORT and REVIEW of ACTION POINTS**
It was agreed to defer this item until the meeting of 13th September.

5 To **CONSIDER** Planning Applications for **COMMENTS** and to **NOTE** any application decisions:

Planning Applications - **DC/16/2488/FUL Merryfield Mill Rd (revised application)**
Demolition of existing dwelling and residential annexe and replacement with new dwelling and annexe. Amendment to existing vehicular access, parking and turning. After considerable discussion it was agreed to object to this application on the sole ground that the location of the planned building would excessively affect the privacy and outlook of the adjacent Littlefield property and that the planned dwelling would be acceptable if moved closed to the road. Such a modification was not considered to have a significantly adverse effect of the street scene. Proposed by Cllr Kay and seconded by Cllr Reid and passed by 4 votes to nil with one abstention. **Cllr Elliot to draft letter and Clerk or Cllr Kay to send.**

Planning Decisions

DC/16/2627/FUL –Littlefield, Mill Road. *Erection of domestic workshop and lean-to glazed canopy* It was confirmed that this application had been approved with conditions.

TPO 262 2016 It had been notified that a temporary six month tree preservation order had been granted on the oak tree at the entrance to the Eureka property on Cliff Rd.

The Meeting was closed at 20.25.

Waldringfield PARISH COUNCIL
www.waldringfield.suffolk.gov.uk
Clerk to the Council Mr D Lines
43 Fourth Avenue, Frinton-on-Sea
Essex CO13 9DY
t 01255 678888
e pc@waldringfield.suffolk.gov.uk

1635 **Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 9 August 2016**

Present: Councillors Kay, Elliot, Matheson, Videlo, Gold, Archer, and Harraway, SCDC Cllr Harvey and 2 members of the public.

1. **APOLOGIES AND APPROVAL FOR ABSENCE OF PARISH COUNCILLORS**
Cllrs Reid and Winship on holiday, SCC Cllr O'Brien and also from David Lines (Parish Clerk) -illness.
Cllr Videlo agreed to be Clerk for the meeting.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST– NONE**

To **RECEIVE** delegated Declaration of Interest Dispensation decisions or **APPROVE** such dispensation requests as needed – **NONE**

Parish Issues – an opportunity for members of the public to bring matters to the attention of the Council and for parishioners to seek guidance from the Council. Mrs Tucker informed the council that an appeal had been lodged against the planning decision regarding Eureka.
It was agreed to bring forward from item 11 the correspondence received regarding the Eureka Planning Decision Appeal to be discussed under Item 5.

To **RECEIVE** reports from:

a) Suffolk County Councillor No report provided.
b) SCDC Councillor gave a verbal report which included: Our MP Therese Coffey will be outside the village hall from 2.50-3.00pm on 30th August to meet constituents. ACTION – Clerk to post information on Waldringfielders. The Speedwatch scheme has commenced in Kirton but there have been some minor technical issues with the camera which she hopes will soon be sorted. Should be going to Bucklesham next.
c) Suffolk Police – No report provided.

3. It was **RESOLVED TO ADOPT** the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 26 July2016. Proposed by Cllr Kay, seconded by Cllr Elliot **AGREED** by all present at the meeting.

4. **Matters for REPORT and REVIEW of ACTION POINTS**
Letters re overhanging hedges have been sent to landowners with property abutting the Ipswich Road (no replies)
Letter re Temporary Footpath sent to Malcolm King (no reply). Letter of support re Ms Ehret's proposals for the Newbourne/Ipswich Roads junction sent to SCC Highways (no reply). Response as instructed made to Highways England consultation
Response as instructed to SCDC re bi-annual engagement forums. Meeting with Waldringfield Golf Club on August 15th yet to be confirmed (only one councillor – JE - has agreed to attend). Letter written to Mrs Lord re grass verges (reply to be included as part of Correspondence)
Action points – nothing to report (unless covered above)

5. To **CONSIDER** Planning Applications for **COMMENTS** (including those received after publication of this agenda) and to **NOTE** any application decisions:

STATUS: DRAFT UNTIL SIGNED

CHAIRMAN.....DATE.....

Correspondence regarding - **DC/16/0510/FUL –EUREKA, Cliff Road.** To note an APPEAL UNDER SECTION 78. It was agreed to write a letter to the inspector to highlight road safety issues and policy issues omitted from SCDC's refusal.
Cllr Elliot to draft letter and Clerk to send.

Planning Decisions
DC/16/2627/FUL –Littlefield, Mill Road. Cllr Harvey reported this application had been approved by SCDC today. **NOTED**

6. To **CONSIDER** the provision of additional funding for AONB grants expenditure items. Cllr. Kay reported a quotation had been received for an information board on the riverfront of around £316.00. There maybe further expenditure for good quality images, but it was **agreed** to ask the AONB if there was a standard design for this board and if they have images that could be used.

7. To **CONSIDER** public rights of way and road safety issues, including Community Speed Watch (CSW) See Cllr Harvey's report.
It was **agreed** to request Cllr Winship to ask the Welhams to cut their verge on the corner of Ipswich and School Roads as the tall grass is now restricting visibility around the corner. It was also **agreed** to ask Mr Rains to cut his verge on the corner of Mill Road for the same reason.

8. To **CONSIDER** a proposal for the purchase of new cradle seats and chains for the playground. It was **resolved** to replace the swing seats, chains and bushes to the 2 infant swings in the playground as described in the proposal at a cost of approximately £222. The Clerk is to investigate whether there is any money in the Playspace Fund to cover this. Proposed by Cllr Kay, seconded by Cllr Harraway, all **AGREED**.

9. To **REVIEW** and **UPDATE**, where appropriate, the policies of the Parish Council. It was **RESOLVED** to accept the **Planning Protocol** as prepared by the Clerk (see attached),with the addition of an introduction, final wording to be approved, and summary as follows:"Subject to the detail of the protocol described above, in general terms, where an applicant/developer seeks to discuss a proposed development with a member of the Parish Council or the planning group, any such discussion will take place as part of a Parish Council/Parish meeting which is open to the public and minuted.". Proposed by Cllr Kay, seconded by Cllr Elliot, all **AGREED**.

It was **RESOLVED** to add to standing orders that all planning applications to be discussed at a meeting must appear on the agenda. In the event of an application being received after the publication of the agenda, but before the meeting, then it will be dealt with as follows:

a) To request an extension until after the next scheduled meeting of the PC.

b) If an extension is not possible the PC will decide whether the application will be dealt with at a Special Parish Council Meeting or delegated to a Planning Committee Meeting, each of which would be publicised and open to the public.

Proposed by Cllr Elliot, seconded by Cllr Archer, all **AGREED**.

It was also agreed that the wording of the planning item on subsequent agendas will need adjusting to reflect this.

10. **CLERK AND RFO REPORT** (supporting documents prepared by the clerk now provided as an attachment)

a) To **CONSIDER** items of expenditure, payment of grants and sign cheques accordingly

STATUS: DRAFT UNTIL SIGNED

CHAIRMAN.....DATE.....

b) Total payments £605.82
c) Receipts to 31/7/16 **£250** … Balances held at Bank 29/07/16 and Building Society as at 31/3/16 – Bank **£6956.35** and Building Society **£7,587.41** Adjusted balance **£13,397.17** (as at 05/08/16) after non-presented cheques and receipts

In line with **Financial Standing Order 2.2**, to establish the authenticity of the Bank

Reconciliation report, the Receipts and Payments Summary, Uncashed Payments and Receipts

Summaries (if any), and the Bank statements were all examined and initialled accordingly, and no discrepancies were reported by Cllr Archer.

It was **RESOLVED** to accept Items a), b) and c) together with Accounts/Budget and these were signed accordingly. Proposed by Cllr Elliot, seconded by Cllr Archer, all **AGREED.**

11. To **CONSIDER** any Correspondence received before the meeting– as circulated. Mrs Lord's request for more frequent verge cutting to be deferred to a future meeting, as agreed at the July meeting as consultation required with other groups.
Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions – Cllr Kay to draft a letter to the Inspector to confirm that the PC has no further comments at this stage but will respond to SCDC's answering statement at the hearings

Cllr Gold will cut back the foliage around the Dog Poo bin near the Maybush which is currently very overgrown. She will also ask our footpath contractor to cut the small section of river wall footpath between the Manor Path and Jim Turners Bench as it is very overgrown and hasn't been cut for a couple of summers. It was reported that the Defibrillator has now been removed for use on standby on 3 separate occasions since being installed. It wasn't required but its usefulness has been noted

12. **PARISH MATTERS for next Agenda** Emptying/collection of rubbish bin in the playing field. Cllr Archer to empty the bin on this occasion and contact NORSE to establish how collections can be managed in the future and report to PC.
Update from Parish Plan Groups (deferred from previous meeting)

The MEETING was closed at 21.15.

Item 5—next five pages

SAASP Examination Hearings
at the Council Chambers, Melton Hill on 30th and 31st August 2016
Report by Cllr Ian Kay and Cllr Janet Elliot

All the documents referred to (by their library reference numbers) in this report can be found in the Hearings Document library at:
http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/local-plans/suffolk-coastal-district-local-plan/site-allocations-and-area-specific-policies/joint-examination/examination-documents/examination-document-library/

The hearings were to examine SCDC's Site Allocation and Area Specific Policies (SAASP, ***E-11***) and the Felixstowe Area Action Plan (***E-06***), and related documents, e.g Habitats Regulation Assessment (***E-12***). We attended the hearings for Issues 1, 2 & 3.

This report summarises the issues that were particularly relevant to Waldringfield. WPC had already submitted our consultation response on 30/5/2016 and this had been read by the inspector (see Representations *7883-6*, ***F-04***), so there was no need to repeat those comments. Our main focus at the hearings was to respond to SCDC's hearing statement (***F-04)***, to David Lock Associates' hearing statement on behalf of BT (***G-16***), and to what others said during the hearings.

The questions the Inspector had already asked (in ***F-06v2***) provided the format for the discussions, although the discussions did result in some overlap. Issues 1, 2 & 3 were covered by 35 questions, and this report is arranged around those questions that were relevant to Waldringfield.

As expected, the Inspector was inscrutable and gave no indication of whether or not our points met her approval, we will have to await her report to find out.

Issue 1 – Legal Requirements and Duty to Co-operate

Question 6*: Has a Habitats Regulations screening been carried out for the plans? What were the main findings?*

We pointed out that our comments in Representation *7884* have been brushed aside. We pointed out that the Appropriate Assessment (AA) had stated that information on visitor numbers to the Deben SPA was sparse and that a visitor survey should be commissioned. There is no reference to this in the SAASP. We did not consider this satisfactory. It has been 8 years since we first argued that a visitor survey of the Deben Estuary SPA is needed, and still nothing has been done, despite an admission by SCDC that up-to-date information on visitor numbers is needed and is still non-existent.

In WPC's Representation we had suggested that *"... the SAASP is changed to state that a visitor survey for the Deben SPA will be completed as part of the masterplan/BT revised planning application. This would provide baseline information against which any increase in visitor numbers and the associated increase in disturbance on the SPA from walkers and dog walkers can be monitored and appropriate action taken."* SCDC's response was: *"The level of detail requested is not appropriate in relation to paragraph 1.15. Any planning application will be required to comply with adopted policy SP20."* (***F-04****, p13*).

It was pointed out by Hopkins Homes that SCDC has no cohesive mitigation strategy – SCDC acknowledged that it had to work on planning applications on an individual basis. SCDC said that it was commissioning a cross boundary mitigation strategy but this would not be in place until 2017. We asked if a Deben Estuary visitor survey would be completed to inform this strategy – SCDC did not provide a clear commitment to this, only that everything that was necessary would be done. We also pointed out that there was no provision for monitoring the effectiveness of any mitigation measures put in place, particularly in relation to the BT site.

This issue overlaps and continues under Question 25.

***Question 10**: Are the plans consistent with the CS [Core Strategy]?*

We pointed out that SP20 contains several references to the *Martlesham, Newbourne & Waldringfield Area Action Plan (AAP)*, which now seems to have been abandoned. The CS (***D-05***) is therefore clearly now inconsistent with SCDC's current plans. This argument was deferred to Question 12.

Issue 2 – Coverage and approach

***Question 12**: The CS also includes a commitment to an Action Area Plan for Martlesham, Newbourne and Waldringfield. Has that now been abandoned and where is that documented? How are policies for that area to be delivered?*

SCDC's Hearing Statement (***G-02**, p2*) says:

"*2.9 The Council consider that the need for the Area Action Plan envisaged for Martlesham, Newbourne and Waldringfield has now been overtaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Area Designation of Martlesham and the fact that strategic housing and employment growth is being progressed by means of the Adastral Park planning application.*"

We pointed out that the *Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan* specifically excludes Adastral Park, at SCDC's insistence. In fact the decision to exclude Adastral Park from the *Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan* was taken on 5/5/2015, 15 months before SCDC's Hearing Statement quoted above, so SCDC are being deliberately misleading.

To progress the AAP *"by means of the Adastral Park planning application"* is unacceptable for the following reasons:

1. It would conflict with the CS
2. The planning application stage is too late - the plan will contain important decisions which will have been taken behind closed doors without any public consultation or guidance on the issues described in the 12 point strategy for the AAP in SP20. It is also in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, §188-191.
3. Public consultation for a planning application is very different from public engagement in drawing up an AAP. For the former, there is no opportunity for the public to choose between options or suggest alternatives - it is simply take it or leave it. Also, the only grounds for objection are violations of material planning considerations - if this cannot be demonstrated the public have no chance to influence the plan.

4. The planning application is for the Adastral Park development only; it will not (and should not) include the wider context, which does not concern BT. But BT are going to provide land for a 'country park or similar':
   "*Specifically, on land to the south and east of Adastral Park, strategic open space in the form of a country park or similar high quality provision will be required to mitigate the impact of development at this site and* ***the wider cumulative impact of residential development*** *on the relevant designated European nature conservation sites.*" (SP20, our emphasis).

   As it has a wider context than BT's site, the mitigation for cumulative impact needs to be addressed outside the BT planning application, i.e. in the AAP.

SCDC's Hearing Statement (***G-02***, *p2*) also says:

"*2.10 As detailed in paragraph 22 of the Councils LDS [**D-02**], an AAP for Martlesham, Newbourne and Waldringfield is not justified, however should anything change with respect of the Neighbourhood Plan or the planning application and the current approach, the Council will reconsider its position and take steps to ensure that Core Strategy Policy SP20 is delivered through an AAP as envisaged."*

The Local Development Scheme referred to above (***D-02***) says:

"*22. As Martlesham Parish Council have decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for their area, the Council no longer propose to prepare the Martlesham, Newbourne and Waldringfield Area Action Plan as indicated in Core Strategy Policy CS20 and this has been removed from the Local Development Scheme. Instead the policy requirements will be addressed through the Site Allocations and Area Specific Polices document, the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan and the planning application for the Adastral Park strategic growth area"*

We didn't want to repeat ourselves, so we simply pointed out that the same arguments apply to the above quote, namely:

- the Neighbourhood Plan excludes Adastral Park
- the SAASP excludes Adastral Park
- BT's planning application for Adastral Park is not the right place for consideration of the strategic planning that would have been in the AAP.

Hilary Hanlip's response to these points was that a 'masterplan' would be produced, and this would contain the consideration of the issues that would have been in the AAP, as described in SP20.

We said we didn't care whether community involvement is through a Neighbourhood Plan, an AAP or a 'masterplan' as long as it happens and has a reasonable chance of influencing the development.

We asked if this 'masterplan' would be produced by BT or SCDC, and would it be before or after BT's planning application was determined? If it was to be produced after the BT application had been determined (and presumably approved), many features (road layouts, building styles, etc.) would have been approved, and it would be difficult to change them in the 'masterplan', thus making the 'masterplan' redundant.

Hilary Hanslip said that BT's planning application was an <u>outline</u> planning application, which would

show indicative road layouts, etc. These could be changed at the 'masterplan' stage. If/when the outline planning application showing indicative road layouts etc is approved, from that would come the detailed plans for approval which would conform to the 'masterplan' by which the requirements of SP20 would be delivered.

[Note: this is an important point and we recommend that WPC includes it in its response to BT's outline planning application, if this happens before the 'masterplan' has been produced].

Issue 3 – Cross-cutting issues – housing

Questions 19a-23

There was a lot of discussion about the housing numbers, but we didn't participate significantly in this. The main thrust of this (argued by Persimmon Homes and others) was that the Housing Land Supply (***F-11***) data is flawed, in particular that the windfall numbers have been double counted.

Question 25*: Has a robust assessment been carried out in respect of the spatial distribution of the sites to assess the need for infrastructure, including greenspace, to meet the needs of the occupiers of the new homes? How has the potential impact on viability and deliverability been taken into account?*

We pointed out that in the examination of the CS in 2012 there was much confusion and disagreement over the amount of greenspace needed at Adastral Park. [We didn't say this, but the problem has not been resolved by the Inspector's report]. Clarity is needed from SCDC (not David Lock Associates!) on how much greenspace is required for each of its various functions, such as dog walking space for the residents of Adastral Park, mitigation of the cumulative impact of development on the Deben Estuary SPA, etc. There are national guidelines that can be used for these calculations.

We made a similar point about the impact of traffic: BT's traffic study did not include the Orwell bridge, the A14 or the cumulative impact of all proposed housing in the area (Felixstowe, Adastral Park and other developments). So it is inappropriate to rely on BT's traffic study alone.

Question 30*: Adastral Park – give further details and an update on the proposed planning application and the phasing and deliverability of the site's development in the plan period. Why has a planning application rather than an allocation been chosen for bringing the site forward?*

We pointed out that the history of BT's planning application, the CS, and the legal cases, described in David Lock Associates' Hearing Statement (***G-16***), were extremely biased, and we dispute much of what is said. For example, it fails to point out in *§1.04* and *§1.05* that in 2008 BT's application was for 2,000 houses when the CS assessed the housing need to be for 1,050. Many people thought the subsequent increase of the latter to 2,000 to be an example of the 'tail wagging the dog', which goes some way to explaining our anxiety over the issue of the disappearing AAP, and SCDC's suggestion that the policy requirements of SP20 could be addressed in BT's planning application. We also strongly objected to the term "*vexatious*" used to describe the legal challenge, as the High Court found that SCDC had erred in the earlier stages of the process (***G-16****, §1.32*).

Referring to the Housing Trajectory in David Lock Associates' Hearing Statement (***G-16****, p9*), we pointed out that when the secondary school is expected to become operational in Sept 2018 there will be 160 secondary school age pupils living in Adastral Park without a school. Where will they go, bearing in mind that all the other schools in the area are already full? We also pointed out that the 'secondary

school' isn't in fact a school, but an annex, probably to Kesgrave High School. Annexes create all sorts of problems, educationally, logistically, and they cause increased traffic.

Also, there is no mention of any 'masterplan' in ***G-16***. If work is to start in mid 2017 (***G-16****, §1.23*) that doesn't leave much time for:

- Community consultation before the outline planning application is submitted
- Outline planning application consultation and determination
- Consultation on the 'masterplan', and production of a final version
- Detailed planning application(s) consultation and determination, based on the 'masterplan'

Item 9—next two pages

For the full report, go to

http://waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/assets/parish-council-docs/WPC-Playing-Field-Inspection-Report-2016.pdf

PLAY AREA SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT

SC Town & Parish Councils

15 February 2016

RoSPA inspections are an independent safety assessment of the playground and equipment and are produced for RoSPA by

PlaySafety Limited
The Old Barn
Wicklesham Lodge
Faringdon
Oxon SN7 7PN

Tel: 01367 244600 - Fax: 01367 244112
E-mail: info@rospaplaysafety.co.uk Web Site: www.rospa.com/playsafety

PLAY AREA SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT

Site Owner : **SC Town & Parish Councils**

Site Name : Waldringfield PC - Cliff Road

Date of Inspection : 15 February 2016

Inspected by : Bob Wallace

The present overall risk rating for the play space is **MEDIUM**

If works and recommendations are undertaken the risk may be reduced.

Perimeter				
Gates x 3 Risk Score : 3 Risk Level : Very Low	Entrance	Finding : Entrapment on side(s) of gate Finding Date : 15/02/2016 Notes : Roadside gate, pinch / crush points.  Task : Adjust gate/posts/fit new rubber buffer to ensure a spacing of at least 12mm throughout the range of the gate to remove the entrapment. The 12 mm gap also should apply on the hinge side of the gate	Medium	8

Item 10—next three pages

The full 2016 audit can be seen via this link

http://waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/assets/parish-council-docs/WPC-Annual-Audit-2016-Notice-of-Completion.pdf

Section 3 – External auditor certificate and report

2015/16 Certificate

We certify that we have completed our review of the annual return, and discharged our responsibilities under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014, for the year ended 31 March 2016 in respect of:

Enter name of smaller authority here: WALDRINGFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Respective responsibilities of the body and the auditor

This smaller authority is responsible for ensuring that its financial management is adequate and effective and that it has a sound system of internal control. The smaller authority prepares an annual return in accordance with proper practices which:

- summarises the accounting records for the year ended 31 March 2016; and
- confirms and provides assurance on those matters that are relevant to our duties and responsibilities as external auditors.

Our responsibility is to review the annual return in accordance with guidance issued by the National Audit Office (NAO) on behalf of the Comptroller and Auditor General (see note below). Our work does not constitute an audit carried out in accordance with International Standards on Auditing (UK & Ireland) and does not provide the same level of assurance that such an audit would do.

External auditor report

(~~Except for the matters reported below~~)* on the basis of our review of the annual return, in our opinion the information in the annual return is in accordance with proper practices and no matters have come to our attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements have not been met. (*~~delete as appr~~opriate).

(continue on a separate sheet if required)

Other matters not affecting our opinion which we draw to the attention of the smaller authority:

Please see enclosed report

BDO LLP Southampton United Kingdom

(continue on a separate sheet if required)

External auditor signature BDO LLP

External auditor name BDO LLP Southampton United Kingdom Date 3/8/16

Note: The NAO issued guidance applicable to external auditors' work on 2015/16 accounts in Auditor Guidance Note AGN/02. The AGN is available from the NAO website (www.nao.org.uk)

ISSUES ARISING REPORT FOR
Waldringfield Parish Council
Audit for the year ended 31 March 2016

BDO

Introduction

The following matters have been raised to draw items to the attention of Waldringfield Parish Council. These matters came to the attention of BDO LLP during the audit of the annual return for the year ended 31 March 2016. This report must be presented to a full meeting of the smaller authority for review.

The audit of the annual return may not disclose all shortcomings of the systems as some matters may not have come to the attention of the auditor. For this reason, the matters raised may not be the only ones that exist.

The matters listed below are explained in further detail on the page(s) that follow;

- Minor issues

The following issue(s) have been raised as there are minor errors on the annual return which we wish to draw to the attention of the council so they do not occur again in future years.

Minor issues

What is the issue?

The following issues have been raised as minor issues or omissions have been identified in the current year's Annual Return:

The figure included in box 1 of the current year's figures does not agree by £1 to the figure in box 7 on the last years audited annual return.

Why has this issue been raised?

This is to draw these minor errors to the attention of the smaller authority.

What do we recommend you do?

The smaller authority should ensure in future years that the above minor errors or omissions are not included in the Accounting Statements.

Further guidance on this matter can be obtained from the following source(s):

Governance and Accountability in Local Councils in England - A Practitioners Guide, NALC/SLCC

No other matters came to our attention.

For and on behalf of
BDO LLP

Date: 03 August 2016

Item 13 - next four pages

19 September 2016 (2016-2017)

Waldringfield Parish Council
PAYMENTS LIST

Voucher	Code	Date	Minute	Bank	Cheque No	Description	Supplier	VAT Type	Net	VAT	Total
32	Salaries	15/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100959	Salary	Mr D Lines	X	389.99	0.00	389.99
33	Stationery/Mileage/Etc.	15/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100960	Travel Expenses	Mr D Lines	X	12.00	0.00	12.00
34	Post and telephone	15/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100960	Postage	Mr D Lines	E	15.36	0.00	15.36
35	PAYE/NI	16/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100961	PAYE & NI	HMRC	X	145.20	0.00	145.20
36	Footpath Maintenance	16/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100962	Footpath cutting	Impact Landscaping	S	240.00	48.00	288.00
37	Locality Grant Spend	16/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100963	Recycling compound materials	Realise Futures	S	43.11	8.62	51.73
38	Grass cutting (field)	16/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100964	Grass-cutting -field	SCL Landscape Management	S	120.00	24.00	144.00
39	Grass cutting (field)	16/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100964	Grass-cutting -field	SCL Landscape Management	S	120.00	24.00	144.00
40	Audit	16/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100965	Audit Fee	BDO LLP	S	100.00	20.00	120.00
41	Insurance	19/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100966	Insurance	Community Action Suffolk	E	495.83	0.00	495.83
42	Newsletter re 1972 LGA s142	19/09/2016		Barclays Community A	100967	Newsletter	Bettaprint Woodbridge Ltd	E	136.80	0.00	136.80
								Total	**1,818.29**	**124.62**	**1,942.91**

Waldringfield Parish Council

Bank Reconciliation at 16/09/2016

	Cash in Hand 01/04/2016			12,115.06
	ADD			
	Receipts 01/04/2016 - 16/09/2016			9,921.96
				22,037.02
	SUBTRACT			
	Payments 01/04/2016 - 16/09/2016			9,774.83
A	**Cash in Hand 16/09/2016** (per Cash Book)			**12,262.19**
	Cash in hand per Bank Statements			
	Cash	04/05/2016	0.00	
	Barclays Community Account	31/08/2016	5,809.76	
	Ipswich Building Society	31/03/2016	7,587.41	
				13,397.17
	Less unpresented cheques As attached			1,310.28
				12,086.89
	Plus unpresented receipts As attached			175.30
B	**Adjusted Bank Balance**			**12,262.19**

Waldringfield Parish Council

Uncashed payments\transfers out (All banks)

(Upto 16/09/2016)

Voucher	Date	Cheque No.	Description	Total	Bank
32	15/09/2016	100959	Salary	389.99	Barclays Community Acc
33	15/09/2016	100960	Travel Expenses	12.00	Barclays Community Acc
34	15/09/2016	100960	Postage	15.36	Barclays Community Acc
35	16/09/2016	100961	PAYE & NI	145.20	Barclays Community Acc
36	16/09/2016	100962	Footpath cutting	288.00	Barclays Community Acc
37	16/09/2016	100963	Recycling compound materiels	51.73	Barclays Community Acc
38	16/09/2016	100964	Grass-cutting -field	144.00	Barclays Community Acc
39	16/09/2016	100964	Grass-cutting -field	144.00	Barclays Community Acc
40	16/09/2016	100965	Audit Fee	120.00	Barclays Community Acc
			Total----------	**1,310.28**	

Page 1 16 September 2016 (2016-2017)

Waldringfield Parish Council

Uncashed receipts\transfers in (All banks)

(Upto 16/09/2016)

Voucher	Date	Cheque No.	Description	Total	Bank
11	15/09/2016		Footpath cutting	175.30	Barclays Community Acc
			Total----------	**175.30**	

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

Cost Centre A - Receipts

		Receipts			Payments			Net Position
Code	Title	Estimated	Actual	Var	Estimated	Actual	Var	+/- under/over spend
28	Precept	12,636.00	6,318.00	-6,318				-6,318
29	Council Tax Support Grant							
30	SCC Locality Grant	750.00	1,162.00	412				412
31	SCC Footpaths Grant	175.30	175.30					
32	Recycling							
33	Equipment Hire							
34	SCC Q of Life Budget							
35	SCDC Community Enabling Fund		1,000.00	1,000				1,000
36	Bank Interest	70.00		-70				-70
37	Grants and Donations		750.00	750				750
38	Advertising income	400.00	120.12	-280				-280
39	VAT Refund							
	SUB TOTAL	**14,031.30**	**9,525.42**	**-4,506**				**-4,506**

Cost Centre B - Administration

		Receipts			Payments			Net Position
Code	Title	Estimated	Actual	Var	Estimated	Actual	Var	+/- under/over spend
1	Salaries				5,150.00	2,261.54	2,888	2,888
2	PAYE/NI					368.80	-369	-369
3	Stationery/Mileage/Etc.				375.00	275.83	99	99
4	Post and telephone				120.00	24.77	95	95
5	Newsletter re 1972 LGA s142				480.00	341.80	138	138
6	Village Hall hire				250.00	250.00		
7	Insurance				490.00		490	490
8	Membership Subs re LGA s111				425.00	236.10	189	189
9	Audit				210.00	100.00	110	110
10	Chairman's Expenses				50.00		50	50
11	Training				200.00		200	200
12	Election Costs							
	SUB TOTAL				**7,750.00**	**3,858.84**	**3,891**	**3,891**

Cost Centre C - Playing Field/Recreational

		Receipts			Payments			Net Position
Code	Title	Estimated	Actual	Var	Estimated	Actual	Var	+/- under/over spend
13	Handyman's Wages				495.00		495	495
14	Grass cutting (field)				720.00	360.00	360	360
15	Mole catching (field)				250.00	200.00	50	50
16	Repairs/Maintenance				1,050.00	285.00	765	765
17	Footpath Maintenance				450.00	240.00	210	210
18	Locailty Grant Spend				750.00	2,067.05	-1,317	-1,317
19	SCC Quality of Life							
20	SCDC Community Enabling Fund					342.28	-342	-342
	SUB TOTAL				**3,715.00**	**3,494.33**	**221**	**221**

Cost Centre D - Grants

		Receipts			Payments			Net Position
Code	Title	Estimated	Actual	Var	Estimated	Actual	Var	+/- under/over spend
21	General Grants				400.00	400.00		
22	Church Field re OSA 1906 s9 & 1				400.00	400.00		
23	Village Hall LGA 1976 s19				500.00	500.00		
24	All Saints Church OSA 1906 et al				500.00	500.00		
25	WildlifeGroup				100.00	100.00		
	SUB TOTAL				**1,900.00**	**1,900.00**		

Cost Centre E - s137

		Receipts			Payments			Net Position
Code	Title	Estimated	Actual	Var	Estimated	Actual	Var	+/- under/over spend
27	S 137							
	SUB TOTAL							

Cost Centre F - Miscellaneous

		Receipts			Payments			Net Position
Code	Title	Estimated	Actual	Var	Estimated	Actual	Var	+/- under/over spend
26	Miscellaneous							
	SUB TOTAL							

NET TOTAL	**14,031.30**	**9,525.42**	**-4,506**	**13,365.00**	**9,253.17**	**4,112**	**-394**
V.A.T.		396.54			521.66		
GROSS TOTAL		**9,921.96**			**9,774.83**		

Item 14

Waldringfield Parish Council

Parish Clerk: David Lines
43 Fourth Avenue, Frinton-on-Sea, Essex CO13 9DY
E: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
T: 01255 678888 (with voicemail)
www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil

September 20th 2016

(If you wish to have more information on any of the following items, please contact the Clerk)

1. SALC – Encouragement to communicate with Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner re reduced support for Neighbourhood Watch teams
2. East Suffolk Partnership - Board reports
3. Scottish Power – updates on EA One, EA Three and future projects
4. SCDC Planning Committee call-in of Merryfield Planning Application
5. SALC – Survey offered re Public Services in Suffolk
6. Kesgrave High School – consultation re conversion to a Multi-Academy Trust
7. SCDC – Suffolk Coastal Disability Forum – 4th October
8. SALC – Update on Housing and Planning Act 2016 – Neighbourhood Planning
9. SCDC – Suffolk Coastal Area Meeting Papers
10. CEG/CODE – New Developers & Planning Consultants for Adastral Park
11. Natural England - Tranche 3 Recommended Marine Conservation Zones (rMCZ) in Suffolk
12. SCDC - fourth East Suffolk Partnership Annual Forum at Trinity Park Conference Centre, Bucklesham on Friday 11 November
13. Bawdsey Parish Council – EA 1,2 & 3 windfarm data and information