

BRIGHTWELL, FOXHALL & PURDIS FARM GROUP PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes

Of the Parish Council Meeting held at Trinity Park on Wednesday, 12th September 2012

Present

Cllr E Warham – Chairman
Cllr A Wells
Cllr A Day
Cllr E Lawrence
Cllr L Smith
Cllr B Newell
Cllr J Booth
Cllr G Watts
Cllr M Briggs
Cllr J Batham
Mrs A J Buggs – Clerk
1 members of the public

124.12 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received Cllr P O'Brien, PC Paul Smith, PCSO Andi Hillman and Cllr B Davies.

125.12 Declaration of interest

Cllr Smith declared an interest in Item 7 Planning and Cllr Day declared an interest in Item 12 of the agenda.

126.12 Minutes

The minutes of the Parish Council Meeting of the 11th July were approved as being a true record with the following amendment:

Agenda Item 115.12 Planning

PC1037 C12/1279 Trinity Park – “This application has now been withdrawn by the applicant” amended to read “Trinity Park has asked the applicant to withdraw this application.”

127.12 Matters arising from the minutes

Item 114.12 Clerks Report – Code of Conduct

The Clerk reported that SALC recommends that hard copies of the Parish Councillor's register of interests should not be stored by the Parish Council but a link should be placed on the council's website to SCDC On-Line Register.

128.12 The meeting was adjourned to receive reports from:

- Suffolk Police – PC Paul Smith – written report.

Councillors discussed the recent thefts from charity clothes/textiles bins situated at Sainsburys. It was agreed that the Clerk should write to Sainsburys about the possibility of the clothes/textiles bins being locked.

- Cllr P O'Brien – Suffolk Coastal District Council / Suffolk County Council – written report
- Cllr V Falconer – Suffolk Coastal District Council – written report

Cllr Newell said that she felt there was not enough detail in supporting statements for business planning applications. Cllr Falconer said it is usually a requirement that a Design and Access Statement is provided by the applicant.

Cllr Falconer reported that SCDC members were having training end September / early October on wind turbines. Cllr Falconer to notify Cllr Newell of the training dates.

The meeting was re-convened.

129.12 Clerk's Report

The Clerk's report had previously been circulated and it was agreed that some of the items should be discussed as per the agenda.

Suffolk Flood Plan

The following has been forwarded to parishes on behalf of Suffolk County Council.

Time is running out to have your say on flood plan

After such a wet spring and early summer this year, it's timely that Suffolk organisations are working together to prevent the often devastating impact of flooding caused by heavy rain.

The Suffolk Flood Risk Management Partnership is led by the county council, and is setting out proposals to tackle flash flooding in some of the worst affected areas.

Suffolk residents are being asked to have their say on the proposals as part of a new flood risk strategy by **Friday 14 September 2012**. All comments will inform the final strategy, which will be agreed by the Partnership in the autumn prior to being formally adopted by the individual organisations.

Around 5.5million people are victims of flooding across the UK each year. With the problem expected to get worse in future years, it is more important than ever to take action now.

The new strategy explains how partners including Anglian Water, the Environment Agency, county and district councils will be addressing the problem throughout the county. It also provides the following advice:

- Be aware of the risk in your area and take measures to protect your property from flooding
- Help us by keeping streams and rivers clear of debris, and always report fly tipping, which can block watercourses and contribute to flooding
- Know the planning regulations when it comes to paving over land

Find out more by visiting www.suffolk.gov.uk/floodrisk or have your say by filling in our online survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/ProtectSuffolkFromFlooding

Public Consultation: Joint Environmental Sustainability Policy and Action Plan

Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils have been working to reduce their environmental impacts through actions outlined in various policy documents including a Sustainability Action Plan, a Local Agenda 21 Charter, a Climate Change Strategy and a Green Travel Plan. Now the time has come to update these and the Councils have decided to rationalise them into a single Joint Environmental Sustainability Policy and Action Plan (JESPAP).

The draft JESPAP sets goals and actions for the two Councils as to how, by working with others, they will not only protect their unique natural environment but also reduce their impact on the wider environment, by taking measures that will lower their districts' carbon footprint and help reduce the levels of climate change we will need to adapt to. It has been developed through consultation with officers, cabinet members with responsibility for this portfolio, SCDC Policy Development Task Group and Overview and Scrutiny and Informal Cabinet at both Councils.

This consultation is going live today to give a six week consultation period.

A copy of the draft JESPAP and a survey is now live on the website <http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/greenissues/footprint/jespap/> and <http://www.waveney.gov.uk/jespap>.

LAIS Up2Date

Items of particular note on the above notice sent out by Suffolk Association of Local Councils previously circulated.

LAIS: Payments

An important Government consultation has been launched aimed specifically at local councils *Payments by Parish and Community Councils and Charter Trustees*. The consultation proposes removing the law that restricts local councils to one method of making payments (cheques with two councillor signatories). Local councils will wish to respond to Government on this consultation which will create greater flexibility in the ways local councils can make payments, whilst being able to continue with cheques with two councillor signatories if they so wish.

Planning

Three planning consultations have been launched all with the same deadline for comments:

1. Allowing greater permitted development rights in changing between Use Classes

It is proposed to create permitted development rights to assist change of use from existing buildings used for agricultural purposes to uses supporting rural growth; to increase the thresholds for permitted development rights for change of use between B1 (business/office) and B8 (warehouse) classes and from B2 (industry) to B1 and B8; to introduce a permitted development right to allow the temporary use for two years, where the use is low impact, without the need for planning permission; to provide C1 (hotels, boarding and guest houses) permitted development rights to

convert to C3 (dwelling houses) without the need for planning permission and to consider if any updates or amendments are needed to the existing descriptions within the use classes order.

2. Setting out a range of proposals to streamline the information requirements for planning applications

These proposals include changes to secondary legislation on information requirements for outline planning applications (e.g. removing the requirement for layout to be specified at this stage), and a requirement that local authorities update their local lists of information requirements at least every two years. It also sets out proposed changes to the standard application form. By cutting out what is described as 'unnecessary information in the application process' the proposals claim to make the system clearer, and easier to use, without undermining the ability for councils to make well-informed decisions.

3. Improving the performance of statutory consultees in the planning process

The proposals aim to ensure that there is an effective mechanism for applicants to obtain an award of costs where a statutory consultee has acted unreasonably. Local councils are not 'statutory consultees' for the purpose of this consultation and the position regarding local councils is therefore as previously.

It is also worth noting other specific measures which are being taken forward now and in the near future to help achieve the Government's planning ambitions, including:

- Following the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework in distilling 1,000
- Pages of policy into around 50, the Government now plans to review around 6,000 pages of supporting planning guidance. Details of the approach to be taken will be announced shortly.
- Speeding up the process for determining planning appeals - proposals on shortening and
- Streamlining the process will be published for consultation later this year.
- Uprating local councils' planning fees in line with inflation thereby reducing the burden
- On ordinary council taxpayers, who otherwise end up subsidising developers. Planning fees are set by Government and have not been increased since 2008.
- Ensuring councils whose planning decisions are consistent with an up to date local plan
- Are not ordinarily liable for costs if their decision is appealed.
- Making technical changes to the operation of the Community Infrastructure Levy
- Including ensuring that developers are not charged the levy twice, on the same development, if they amend existing planning consent.
- Extending the funding to April 2013 to the four organisations providing advice and support to communities leading the way on neighbourhood planning (the Royal Town Planning Institute; the Prince's Foundation for Building Community; the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England working with the National Association of Local Councils and Locality (the Building Communities Consortium).

Audit

Last year, the Government consulted on its proposals for a new local public audit framework and published its response in January 2012. The draft Local Audit Bill is now being published for consultation and pre-legislative scrutiny. The draft Bill sets out the proposed new audit framework for local public bodies, the process for the appointment of auditors, and the regulatory framework for local public audit.

Currently a 'lighter touch' regime applies to smaller bodies (with a turnover below £6.5m). This includes most local councils. Clause 5 in the draft Local Audit Bill makes provision for 'smaller authorities' and includes a power for the Secretary of State to make regulations as to how the new framework will apply to these bodies. So, as currently, there will be less onerous requirements than on larger bodies within the new framework. The key features of the new framework for the audit of smaller local public bodies are:

- A threshold, proposed at £25,000, below which smaller local public bodies would not be automatically subject to an external audit, coupled with increased transparency requirements (internal audit would be retained). A mechanism will be retained for auditor-led scrutiny of these bodies if problems are identified.
- A new transparency code for all smaller bodies with an annual turnover below £200,000.
- The code would require publication of:
 - All items of expenditure and end of year accounts;
 - Minutes, agendas and papers of formal meetings;
 - Internal audit report;
 - List of councillor/board responsibilities (or their equivalent);
 - Annual governance statement; and
 - Location of public land and building assets.
- The code would also recommend that these documents are published online, either on the smaller bodies' websites or on those of their billing authorities. Government is proposing that compliance with the code is mandatory for all smaller local public bodies below £200,000 but will undertake a statutory consultation with the bodies affected before the code is made mandatory.
- A proportionate regulatory regime and the limited assurance form of audit maintained and specified in a schedule to the code of audit practice produced by the National Audit Office. Smaller local public bodies will have the option to have their auditors procured and appointed by a sector-owned and sector-managed body. A proposal has been submitted by NALC and SLCC to run a sector led external audit programme. It will be important that any options currently available to local councils for internal audit arrangements are not reduced. If bodies do not wish to use the sector-led body they can procure and appoint audit services individually or jointly, with the use of an independent auditor panel. The Joint Practitioners' Advisory Group which advises on the current regulatory framework will, it is proposed, create the proforma for the 'annual return'.

Specific questions are asked in the consultation:

- Do you agree that the threshold below which smaller local public bodies should not be subject to automatic external audit should be £25,000?
- Are the additional transparency requirements we have proposed for those bodies who will not be subject to external audit robust enough to ensure that they will be accountable to the electorate?
- Are these transparency requirements proportionate to the low levels of public money these bodies are responsible for? What steps will smaller bodies need to take in complying with these new requirements? Are there any cost implications?
- Do you agree that our proposals for the eligibility of auditors of smaller local public bodies will ensure that they have the requisite expertise to undertake limited assurance audits?
- Are our proposals for the regulatory framework for the audit of smaller bodies proportionate?
- Do these proposals provide a proportionate and sufficiently flexible mechanism for procuring and appointing audit services to smaller local public bodies?

Highways/Planning

Local councils will be aware that Government has been exploring various ways in which to streamline planning processes which they see as inhibiting development 'while maintaining the essential benefits that they protect'. A consultation proposes permitting applications for a stopping-up or diversion order for highways to be submitted at the same time as applying for planning permission, whereas under existing legislation the developer can only apply after securing planning permission. The consultation proposes devolving decision-making to the local authority level.

Planning

Government is consulting on changing the listed building consents regime to reduce both the circumstances in which consent is required and the level of information applicants are required to submit. The consultation emphasises the need to protect the interests of developers and planning authorities and the need to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance but does not refer to community interests. Local councils will be considering the extent to which there might be a reduction in consultation with the community in this process.

Various alternative options are explored and views are sought:

- Submission to the local planning authority of a simple prior notification of the intention to carry out specified types of works to a listed building would then allow the planning authority either to allow the works to go ahead without further intervention, if they judged them acceptable, or to require the submission of a full consent application.
- A system of local and national class consents has been put forward as an alternative
- Measure to prior notification (above). Class consents, set up by a local planning authority, could be used to by-pass the need for consent for a defined class or classes of works affecting a defined area or group of heritage assets. The Secretary of State could also be empowered to grant a class consent for an area or group of assets that cross local authority boundaries e.g. canal networks.
- A "certificate of lawful works to Listed Buildings". Local planning authorities to grant a Certificate of Lawful Works either for proposed works to a listed building which do not have an impact on special interest or for existing works on the understanding and confirming that no consent is required. It is claimed that this will help avoid the confusion that arises when a planning authority has historically been reluctant to give a view on whether the work would require listed building consent and would remove the need for a full application to be made just in case.
- Accredited Agents replacing local authority officer recommendations on listed building consent, if applicants wish. This opening up of decision-making on listed building consents would allow independent accredited agents to make recommendations to local planning authorities in the exercise of their statutory duty to determine applications. Government is relying on research which indicates that nearly three quarters of all applications for listed building consent in town and city centres are made by an agent on behalf of the owner/tenant of the property. Local councils will be wishing to scrutinise this proposal in relation to the degree to which it provides transparency, accountability and independence of decision-making. The proposals would enable owners or developers to commission an independent agent to offer an expert report and recommendation, effectively "certifying" the works as acceptable.

Views on improving the measures available to address building neglect are also invited. Government is concerned with the number of listed buildings which have been on the Heritage at Risk Register

for a long time. Local authorities have powers to serve Urgent Works Notices or to pursue Compulsory Purchase Orders but find them problematic to exercise.

External Audit – Five Years from 2012/2013

The Audit Commission has confirmed the appointment of BDO LLP as external auditor to audit the annual return of Brightwell, Foxhall & Purdis Farm Group Parish Council for five years from 2012/2013. The cost of a basic audit will be £100 per year.

Changes to Street Lighting

Following the last meeting I contacted Suffolk County Council concerning the complaint received regarding part-night lighting and have received the following reply.

“We have now implemented part-night lighting across the whole of Suffolk, Foxhall and Purdis have been relatively late in the implementation programme when compared with Ipswich (mid May 2012 as opposed to September 2011), but there has been plenty of publicity over the last couple of years - we sent every PC posters and FAQs for use on their notice boards and at meetings earlier this year.

We have not returned street lights to all night operation simply at the request of the public - there has to be a valid reason for doing so, which we consider against the stated criteria. Only following consultation with the local members and the police have we reversed the original decision at a few locations. Generally these decisions have been made where there is sheltered housing or where the police have surveillance operations in progress; in the latter cases the lights will revert to part-night lighting once the police have completed their operations. We have also extended the time before lights are switched off on a few routes from town centres into residential areas, but only on the busiest nights e.g. Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights. You provide no explanation as to why you have requested we consider turning the residential areas of Purdis Farm back to all night lighting.

The greatest concern of the public has been the impact on crime when the street lights are turned off, and more specifically the fear of crime. Encouragingly, our 'before and after' monitoring is showing no increase in crime, and in some areas a decrease, although we recognise that this is over a relatively short period of time and is dependent on seasonal variations. Anecdotally, Norfolk and Gloucestershire also report decreases in crime. An 'out-of-hours' number has been given to the emergency services in order that they can request lights to be turned back on if required.”

130.12 Planning

The Planning Committee reported that the following planning applications had been considered since the last meeting:

PC1037 C12/1779 Trinity Park Purdis Farm - Installation of a 18m lattice tower surmounted by 3 antennas and 2 microwave dishes, an equipment cabinet and development ancillary thereto within a fenced compound. Trinity Park has asked the applicant to withdraw this application. Cllr Wells reported that due to the fact that he had understood that the application would be withdrawn the Parish Council had submitted the comments late when it was made aware that the application had not been withdrawn.

Parish Council comments:

On the 11th July our Planning Committee Chairman rang and spoke to Christine Bond who said that Chris Bushby had asked the company to withdraw their application. He understood from Christine that there had been a very general communication from the company some time ago, but no specific contact about this particular site. A few days after the 11th, the public notification letter was removed from the site therefore at the time we understood the application to have been withdrawn therefore the Parish Council did not put any comments forward to you.

1. This development covers a large ground area to where, over a year, thousands of people congregate and move. Many people are suspicious of such rays and some are positively afraid of them which could influence their attitude to Trinity Park.
2. A number of entries on the application form, design and access statement are incorrect or misleading; numerous typing errors, not East of England Showground, access road not into the golf course and the church mentioned is not St Mary's Church.
3. The development would be visible above the treeline, more importantly it is an 18m mast, topped by another 3m of antenna which in total will be a 21m structure.
4. The development is too close the proposed housing development and will be visible by them.
5. Visually intrusive across open landscape from Felixstowe Road direction and the structure is not in sympathy with the activities of the Agricultural Association.
6. The potential landlord is unwilling and precedent set that compulsory powers should not be used.

Additional comments following Parish Council meeting were sent to Rachel Knights SCDC Planning as follows:

The Parish Council support the landowner's view (Trinity Park) that there is a need for a mast in the area however it should not be situated in the proposed position.

SCDC decision:

No decision has been made.

PC1042 C12/1431 Part Front Garden 135 Bucklesham Road Purdis Farm – Use of land for the erection of 4 dwellings.

Parish Council comments:

Although Parish Council have no objection to the development they would like to reiterate the following concerns which they have already expressed for similar recent proposed developments in Bucklesham Road details below.

Although the applicant's agent has consulted with the Highways Department at Suffolk County Council it appears that no prior contact has been made with Suffolk Coastal District Council. We have also been made aware that there is likely to be a dispute about property ownership over the access.

Sewerage

Although Anglian Water has stated that the existing sewerage system still has capacity for extra houses, the Parish Council are concerned that sewage is still a problem in the Bucklesham Road area. The sewage appears in the gardens of 117 and 119 Bucklesham Road as well as being 'smellable' from neighbouring gardens. There has been overflow problems between Easter and to date this year. The concern is whether or not the effluent from another connection will flow through the pumping station which is situated by the Ipswich Golf Club entrance. If this is the case the Parish Council are strongly opposed to the connection at this point. The Parish Council would like assurances from Anglian Water that this increase in load on the sewerage system will not exacerbate the existing back-flow problems to some properties.

Insufficient parking

The Parish Council is concerned that there are insufficient parking spaces for the proposed development of 4 and 5 bedroom houses. Although the houses have garages, each property only had two parking spaces which raise concerns about the provision of parking for houses of this size.

SCDC decision:

No decision has been made.

PC1043 C12/1424 77 Bucklesham Road Purdis Farm – Erection of single and two-storey front and side extensions.

Parish Council comments:

No objection

SCDC decision:

None

PC1044 C12/1533 Tregenna Felixstowe Road Foxhall – Erection of detached double garage (amended siting to that approved under planning permission C12/0035 dated 23/02/2012)

Parish Council comments:

No objection

SCDC decision:

Approved

PC1045 C12/1603 Bucklesham Grange Care Home Purdis Farm – 2no. colour powder coated name signs mounted on timber posts.

Parish Council comments:

The Group Parish Council makes the following observations on this application:

1. The Parish Council believe that the care home is misleadingly named for the following reasons:

- a. It is not in Bucklesham. It is in the parish of Purdis Farm and Foxhall lies between Purdis and Bucklesham which is at least two miles away.
- b. Bucklesham Road starts at St Augustine's Church, Ipswich and continues through Purdis Farm and Foxhall, before reaching Bucklesham itself.
- c. There is a property named the Grange and a Grange Farm nearer to the care home than Bucklesham which we believe will cause confusion.

The signs appear to be large and intrusive. If the letters are only 0.13 in height why does the sign need to be 1.4m x 0.8m in size?

SCDC decision:
No decision

Cllr Wells proposed that the Clerk should request an invitation to a viewing of the care home by the Parish Council. 6 in favour – 4 abstain. It was agreed that the Clerk should write to the Care Home asking for suitable times and date during the evening to visit.

PC1046 C12/1628 Part Land West of Church Cottages Brightwell – Proposed irrigation reservoir for WO & PO Holdings Ltd

Parish Council comments:

The Group Parish Council makes the following observations on this application:

1. The red outline on the submitted plan does not include the landscaping and cottage protection bund. This bund is very close to the western access driveway of Church Cottages and its limit is not shown on the plan. No location is shown on the plan for the site of the pump housing and there is no indication of irrigation pipelines.
2. There is recent history on several occasions of run-off flowing down the hill from the field into the access drive and gardens of Church Cottages and also eroding the public footpath. Steep bunds might exacerbate the problem.
3. The site is close to the Mill River, not shown on the plan, which is a Special Landscape Area. How will abstraction here affect the local environment and further downstream?
4. There is a public footpath running at the eastern boundary of the site, which will lose the view across the field.
5. The site is in an archaeologically sensitive area with a barrow in the parish and this location has not previously been investigated.
6. Buzzards and sparrow hawks roost in the line of trees to the south of the site.
7. Much of the adjacent land is pasture, used for grazing and we question the need for a reservoir in this position.

Brightwell is a very small unspoilt village centred on the Mill River in a Special Landscape Area and close to the AONB. This application does not meet the planning process expected in the leaflet 'Farm Reservoir Design Guide' issued by Suffolk Coast and Heaths. The construction will obscure the view down the hill of the field towards the river and its height and proximity to Church Cottages will completely obscure their western view.

Considering the above observations we object to this application and consider the site unsuitable for purpose and such a large intrusion into this very attractive river valley landscape. Also we conclude that further consultees should be:

- Anglian Water
- The Environment Agency (Rivers)
- Suffolk Archaeological Unit
- English Nature
- SCC Countryside Access Department

SCDC decision:

No decision

PC1047 C12/1588 141 Bucklesham Road Purdis Farm – Details as required by conditions 17 & 19 Discharge of Conditions

Parish Council comments:

There is a proposed increase in residential development in this area. Considering the concerns of the current neighbours about satisfying the conditions of the permission granted we object to relinquishing control over conditions 17 and 19.

SCDC decision:

No decision.

PC1048 C12/1711 60 Murrills Road Purdis Farm – Erection of two storey side extension.

Parish Council comments:

No objection

SCDC decision:

No decision

Appeal Decision – Ref: AP/J3530/A/12/2168301 Foxburrow Farm Waldringfield Road Brightwell IP12 4PT

The Clerk reported that the appeal had been allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of two Wind Technik Nord 250kW wind turbines atop a 45m tower to be installed on a concrete base measuring approximately 10m x 10m (energy for farm and the National Grid) in accordance with the terms of the application Ref C11/1750 dated 6th July 2011.

The Clerk highlighted some of the conditions attached to the planning permission:

1. Should either wind turbine cease to be employed for electricity generation purposes it shall be taken down and removed from the site, together with all other above ground ancillary works,

within 12 months of the last date of electricity generation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2. No development shall commence until full details of the finish of the turbine blades and monopole and of the design and external appearance of any ancillary buildings, any engineering works and hard surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
3. This permission is for two Wind Technik Nord 250kW wind turbines and for no other type of wind turbine unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. No development shall commence until satisfactory precise details of a Landscape Enhancement scheme (which shall include species, size and numbers of plants to be planted) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to include the reinforcement of tree screening along the road frontage north of the site, the removal of inappropriate conifer planting and the restoration of hedgerows with suitable native plants.
5. The approved Landscape Enhancement scheme shall be implemented not later than the first planting season following commencement of the development (or within such extended period as the local planning authority may allow) and shall thereafter be retained and maintained for a period of 5 years. Any plan material removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season and shall be retained and maintained.
6. Any of the trees or hedges shown to be retained or planted on the approved landscape enhancement plan that are lopped, topped, pruned, uprooted, felled, diseased, wilfully damaged or in any other way destroyed or removed without the prior written consent of the local planning authority within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced during the first available planting season, with trees or hedges of a size and species, which shall previously have been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

131.12 Future Plans for the Parish

Cllr Wells requested that the Parish Council contact SCDC requesting a “tidy up” order to be issued on the owner of the Hollies.

Cllr Wells asked why large vehicles were using Straight Road when this had previously used another route to get to the top fields at Nacton Home Farm. It was agreed that Cllr Wells should draft a letter to owners of Nacton Home Farm.

132.12 Sewerage – Bucklesham Road

Cllr Warham reported that the sewerage problems are being investigated by the Regional Manager. The results of their deliberations should be received by the 14th September from the Area Manager and Mr Minter. Mrs Caley has also had a response from the Complaints Department with suggestions as to how the problem could be solved. Cllr Warham said that things were progressing positively and she would report back to the October Parish Council Meeting.

Cllr Briggs reported that in addition to the problems with sewage in Bucklesham Road there is also a wrong smell of sewage in Meadow Crescent / Murrills Road.

133.12 Brightwell – Diversion of Footpaths 9 and 10

Cllr Newell reported that she had recently attended a meeting concerning the diversion of footpaths 9 and 10. At the moment the footpaths are not designated as bridleways however horse riders from Waldringfield regularly use it. Waldringfield Parish Council is concerned that when the footpaths are diverted and subsequently reinstated they will be the width of a footpath and not a bridleway. Currently the footpaths are considerably wider than the statutory footpath width. Waldringfield Parish Council is very keen to have the footpaths designated as bridleways and it is likely that Waldringfield will approach us to make an application. Cllr Newell proposed, seconded Cllr Batham that, if requested, the Brightwell, Foxhall & Purdis Farm Group Parish Council apply to have footpaths 9 and 10 designated as bridleways – all in favour.

134.12 Brightwell Seat

Cllr Wells reported that the village seat had been received from the manufacturers and will be put in place by Mr Smith as soon as possible.

135.12 Felixstowe Road – Service Road Waiting Restrictions

The Clerk reported that she had received a letter from Aaron Gordon at Suffolk County Council stating that they had received a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for the A1156, Felixstowe Road (Service Road, near to the Shepherd & Dog) requesting that the restrictions should be imposed on a Monday to Friday basis but not on Saturdays or Public Holidays. Aaron Gordon has asked whether the Parish Council would agree to this change to the TRO.

Following discussion Cllr Day proposed, seconded Cllr Watts that the TRO be amended to read: No waiting 8.00 am – 6.00 pm Monday to Friday except for Public Holidays. 8 in favour, 2 abstained. It was therefore agreed that the Clerk should reply to Aaron Gordon accepting the proposed changes.

136.12 Finance

Income

None

Expenditure

Clerk's Salary and Expenses August 2012	
Clerk's Salary and Expenses September 2012	
Suffolk Acre - Renewal of Insurance Policy 2012/2013	£349.10
Glasdons –Brightwell Village Seat	£564.14

Cllr Briggs proposed, seconded Cllr Newell that the above expenditure be approved – agreed.

137.12 Correspondence

a. Planned Service Interim Arrangements

Information documents for the Development Management leaders for each of the three main areas and break down further into the interim individual officer responsibilities for the sub areas have been circulated to all councillors.

b. Code of Conduct

Following the changes to the Code of Conduct new 2012 Declaration of Acceptance of Office and Dispensation guidance and applications forms have been received. These new documents should be used for all new councillors.

138.12 Meetings attended by councillors/clerk

Cllr Warham reported that she had attended the meeting organised by Cllr O'Brien of all Chairmen within her Ward. The aim of the meetings is for parishes to work together to support each other.

139.12 Members questions to the Chairman

- a. Cllr Briggs reported that hedges in Woodrush Road had overgrown the kerbs. It was agreed that Cllr Briggs should email details including photographs to the Suffolk County Council Highways Department.
- b. Cllr Briggs reported that she was concerned that councils had received an email on behalf of Jane Basham the Labour Candidate which appeared to be asking councils to canvass on her behalf.

140.12 Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held at 7.30 pm on Wednesday, 10th October 2012 at Trinity Park.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 10.00 pm

Signed Date.....

Angie Buggs
Clerk to Brightwell, Foxhall & Purdis Farm Group Parish Council