

BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting held at the Village Hall on 21 May 2013

Present : Councillors D Risk (Chairman), H. Saxton, K Churchill, S Thurlow, J Fielder, P Summers and W Elson
Clerk and RFO A M Hounsell
County Cllr P Bellfield
28 Parishioners

1-1314 - Chairman's welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chairman welcomed those present to the meeting and advised that apologies had been received from Dist Cllr R Snell, PCSO C Hassler, and from Pam Reade, Anne Hayward, Lord and Lady Cunliffe, Sarah Thorne, Jackie Hounsell, Wilda Woodland, Ruth Garratt, Ruth Risk, Peter Thurlow, John Weston, Mary Mitson-Woods and Frank Eyles

2-1314 - Minutes of Previous Annual Parish Meeting

The minutes of the previous Annual Parish Meeting of 22 May 2012 were accepted by the meeting and signed by the Chairman as a true record

3-1314 – Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

Drainage Investigation by Anglian Water (previous minute 3-1213)

The clerk advised that he had again corresponded with Anglian Water (AW) particularly pointing out they had failed to follow through on their previous promises and that the surface drainage changes had not progressed since AW's presentation to the Annual Parish Meeting in May 2011. The clerk had also reported raw sewage overflows in Low Street.

AW had eventually responded to the Clerk's further correspondence declining the opportunity to address this meeting but they advised that they had resolved to remedy the poor service that has been received in Brandeston and resolved to take action. They maintain that the reason for this is definitely the inflow of surface water to their system. Therefore, they have developed a number of solutions which will help to contain and remove all flows from the catchment so as to prevent overflows, pollution and loss of service.

AW have approval for a capital investment scheme to improve the sewerage system serving Brandeston and resolve this matter. They are willing to attend a future meeting to explain their proposals at a date to be agreed – perhaps June/July. The clerk was instructed to write to AW to make arrangements for this proposed meeting and request that they to write to all residents of the village to confirm the arrangements. The meeting expressed its concern at the failures of AW to follow up on its previous promises and to resolve these problems.

4-1314 - Chairman's Report for 2012-13.

The Chairman reported upon the Council's work over the year – see attached notes

The chairman confirmed that the council were continuing to press for speed checks in the village.

5-1314 - Financial Report

The RFO then provided a brief summary report indicating that the Council's financial affairs remained healthy (see attached).

The RFO thanked Mr Donald Evans for his diligent internal audit of the council's accounts.

6-1314 - Village Hall

Mr P Baker, Chairman of the Village Hall Management Committee, presented a brief report whilst advising that there would be a full report to the Annual General Meeting of the Hall Committee – see attached notes.

7.1-1314 – Report of Cty Cllr Bellfield

Cty Cllr Bellfield presented his report - see attached notes

7.2-1314 - Report of Dist Cllr Snell

Dist Cllr Snell had advised his apologies for absence but had provided his report – see attached notes.

8-1314 - Report of PCSO Hassler

PCSO Hassler had advised his apologies but had provided his report (as attached) including advising of a total of 14 crimes in Brandeston during the previous year.

9-1314 – Parish Plan – Review

Mr N Hayward who had played a substantial role in the establishment of the Brandeston Parish Plan (BPP) reminded the meeting of the background and details of the BPP as follows :-

The Plan was published formally in October 2008 following several public meetings to present the results to the village. A number of documents were evolved during the preparation stages including a questionnaire, the report, appendix D (data) to the report and minutes of the steering group. These are all publically held in the village hall foyer and published on the Brandeston website.

One hundred and sixteen questionnaires distributed of which 104 were returned which is approximately 90% response

The questionnaire/survey covered households, personal (e.g. residency/age profile), opinion (how should Brandeston develop (e.g. jobs/farming/shops?), transport/travel/safety, planning/housing/building, services, classes/clubs/sports, communications and councils, environment and personal comments (what Brandeston means to me)

Mr Hayward stated that the conclusions of the Plan (based on the responses of residents) were very clear:-

- Brandeston has evolved significantly over the last 40 years but has managed to absorb these changes and preserve its charm, culture and spirit **but has now reached its sustainable limit**
- Brandeston is remote from centres of employment and, with the cost of fuel, makes low-cost housing unsustainable
- SCDC's village plan for Brandeston of 1988 noted that the infrastructure (e.g. roads) precluded significant development here, and the situation has not since improved
- Residents value its present form whilst recognising the need for **gradual evolution but emphatically reject any major development**

In particular, Mr Hayward drew attention to Section 10.11 of the questionnaire which asked "How would you like Brandeston to develop in the future" The results show that of 242 responses to a multiple answer question, 74 said that Brandeston should have a balanced range of ages and 156 said that Brandeston should stay much as it is.

Mr Hayward suggested that the questions "today" are : are the 2008 conclusions – confirmed at subsequent Annual Parish Meetings – still valid? Do we support the BPP? He invited the meeting to endorse the 2008 BPP.

The meeting unanimously agreed its endorsement of the conclusions of the 2008 BPP.

10-1314 - Any other business as may be raised and accepted as appropriate by the Chairman

(i) Current planning approvals – Mutton Lane (C12/1939, 4 houses and C12/1979, 6 houses)

A number of residents in Mutton Lane raised their serious concerns over the works now being carried out at the old Office Farm site. The clerk explained that under the latest government planning rules it was virtually impossible to stop any "sustainable" development in the countryside outside of Green Belt areas.

Mrs Scott-Douglas stated that there was a methane study being undertaken at C12/1939, although this did not cover the area of most likely contamination. The clerk agreed to write to SCDC to point this out and request remedial measures.

Cllr Summers confirmed that the parish council had received and considered the outline consent for application C12/1939. This consent included a number of protections such as the requirement for further contamination studies, archaeological survey, proper disposal of contaminated waste, arrangements for vehicle parking during construction etc. Cllr Summers suggested that since the residents of Mutton Lane were far better placed to observe breaches of consent conditions, it would be appropriate for them to obtain a copy of the conditions and use these to report any non-compliance concerns to SCDC.

A number of residents then suggested that it seemed the parish council would thereby "leave them on their own". Cllr Fielder said he was astonished at this statement – not least because of the parish council's very strong opposition to both these applications. Further, the clerk advised that a number of residents had attended a meeting of the council and had made their views known and these had been incorporated into the council's response to SCDC. Some (but by no means all) residents in Mutton Lane had sent letters of objection to SCDC – as had a number of residents in other areas of the village.

Mr Hutson asked if the residents did raise non-compliance issues with SCDC whether the council would support them. The clerk strongly affirmed that they would do so.

Concerns were also raised regarding the ownership of land to the immediate east of the approved application C12/1979. The clerk confirmed that this issue had been raised with SCDC without a satisfactory conclusion.

The council confirmed that they would continue to monitor the position of these two applications.

There being no further business, the Chairman thanked all present for their attendance and closed the meeting at 10.00 pm