

SNETTISHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Snettisham Parish Council held on Wednesday, 17th April, 2019 at 7.30 p.m. in the Memorial Hall

Present:

Cllr R Pugh (RP) – Presiding

Cllr J Bateson (JB), Cllr G Byrne (GB), Cllr S Dark (SD), Cllr G Deverick (GD), Cllr P Morton (PM), Cllr H Platt (HP) Cllr D Snelgrove (DS)

Also in attendance: Borough Cllr I Devereux (ID)

Approximately 60/70 members of the public

Minutes taken by Rachael Edwards (Administration Assistant to the Council)

Meeting started at 7.30pm

2019.04.17.01 – There were **apologies** for absence from Councillors Barker, Billington and Carey. The Chairman also offered apologies on behalf of the Clerk.

2019.04.17.02 – There were no **declarations** of interest.

2019.04.17.03 – Public Participation: Sue Watson and Norma Hart asked about the progress of the Pigeon planning application and also raised their concern that housing had been allocated on land that had not been originally included when the SNP referendum had been held (they would now have 8 neighbours rather than the original 4 planned) – there were also more houses being developed on the land than original identified in the SNP; Avril Almey – the planning application had not yet been submitted; there had been some slight alterations to the original plans to allow for the inclusion of two parcels of land which would be gifted to and benefit the community and an increase in the number of affordable houses (RP). After some discussion, it was suggested that following the meeting, clarification be sought from the Clerk/Pigeon as to the exact area and number of houses being built on the land. PM highlighted that the majority of parishioners had identified Poppyfields as their preferred site for any such development. Reference was made to the consultation events at which attendees had been informed by Pigeon that it had been at the request of SPC that the “gifted” land to be allocated for the purpose of a Village Hall – this was an unfortunate use of a term, any such plans for the use of the land would be in full consultation with the Village and any new ideas would also be sought. The timescale was also some 4/5 years away as the Community Infrastructure Levy would not be paid until after any development had been completed on the site (RP). SD also explained that during his time on SPC (albeit not standing at that the forthcoming election), different ideas/potential plans were always being discussed and challenged behind the scenes, such as a Village Hall, parking on the Market Square, lack of general parking facilities, access to local businesses for what was an increasing elderly population; there was no blueprint. Any such firmer plans would be consulted with the village to ascertain their views.

SD welcomed the number of people in attendance at the meeting and responded to questions raised in relation to proposals for the A149. He outlined the history in relation to the proposed plans and explained that NCC were the party who were

Signed:

(ir)

Date: 15/5/2019

currently consulting on the plans however, they were not the authors of the road safety camera scheme – this had come from the PCC and the Police's Road Safety Partnership. The decision had been made in 2016, based on 2015 data, on the speed camera placement, length of route etc. This had not been consulted on and not communicated to SPC until March 2018. The concerns with the proposals had been taken up by Division Councillors, not just in relation to speed restriction measures but also other safety concerns. NCC Highways took the concerns on board and the scheme was halted immediately whilst a review took place in relation to the junctions and speed limits along the route. NCC Highways were now consulting with statutory partners, to tease out all the local issues about what is acceptable and what might work, prior to refining/altering the scheme and putting it to public consultation. However, SD highlighted that, depending on the outcome on the initial consultations, the plans may never reach the stage of public consultation, or may differ greatly prior to wider consultation. The proposals were two-fold; one to reduce the speed limit to 50mph around Snettisham and Sandringham, including extending it past the Lamsey Lane road junction; the second was junction changes in the area. SD suggested that the reduction in speed limit should be welcomed but proactive discussions be held with Tom McCabe, the head of NCC Highways, in relation to the proposals on junction redesign. The proposals in their current form, were socially unacceptable and would impact on village life. A positive meeting with Tom McCabe had already been held with Wolferton PC. It was important to take the opportunity to work with NCC, particularly when funding was potentially available, and come up with some alternative proposals, as opposed to a simple negative response. Consideration could be given to improved and reflective signage, road markings, protected lane turns, cats eyes etc. Bob Almey asked if the cameras were able to detect speeding motorbikes – no; general concern expressed that motorbikes were in fact the worst hazard and any safety cameras should also be able to detect offending riders. SD stated that proactive police enforcement also needed to be encouraged, both by marked and unmarked police cars. David Bocking referred to historic promises made by NCC when the bypass was constructed in relation to Station Road and Common Road and possibly funding for the construction of a footbridge. SD suggested that he should arrange a meeting with Tom McCabe to discuss the proposals with SPC as soon as possible.

2019.04.17.04 – As **Chairman**, RP stated this would be the last SPC meeting over which she would preside as Chairman; although not legally bound, it had been informally agreed that two years was a sufficient period of time for any Chairman to serve and therefore she would be standing down. She thanked fellow Councillors for their support. She expressed her sorrow at the recent house fire in Longview Close and offered her best wishes, in particular, to the two individuals directly affected by the fire. RP also explained, in relation to finance, that she and two other Councillors had met with the internal auditor, and assured everyone that he did exist! Finally, she informed everybody that a Community Engagement Surgery was being held by the Police at Dersingham Library on Wednesday 24th April from 2pm until 4pm and encouraged people to attend. She also highlighted there were still numerous scams circulating and advised vigilance.

2019.04.17.05 – *The **minutes** of the meeting on 6th March, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and duly signed.*

Signed:

Date: 15/5/2019

2019.04.17.06 – There were no **matters arising** raised from the above minutes.

2019.04.17.07 – For **BCKLWN**, ID reported that fly-tipping was still a major issue and he had supported the County-wide “SCRAP Fly-Tipping” campaign road-show which had attracted much interest and a number of good ideas. He was working with local Ward Members to address complaints of rubbish being dumped in private back-alleys in North Lynn and exploring cost-effect approaches for resolution. ID explained that he sat on a Panel that allocated funding received from new dwellings, some of which had been invested in a new recreational guide for the Coast & Wash, coupled with the facility to report any inappropriate behaviour in an instant. ID also explained that he was Chairman of the WECMS, and referred to the recent press coverage of vehicles becoming stranded on the beach in the mud. He reported that there was now actually more sand and shingle (+8%) on the beach than in previous years; it was the EA view that the beach was in fact building up rather than eroding which was a welcome sign. In response to a query raised by HP in relation to fly-tipping, ID explained that recent figures reflected a decrease in fly-tipping to that of the previous year, although there was still a lot more to do. There was also a lot more publicity surrounding the issue, which had led to the public perception that it had increased. Encouragement and support was also being offered to private landowners to clear any rubbish from their land as soon as possible.

For **NCC**, SD reported, because of the forthcoming elections, the Council was in what was termed a “purdah” period and therefore there was very little activity. He explained that he was not standing for re-election as a Parish Councillor but would continue to attend future SPC meetings in his capacity as a Councillor for NCC for the next two years. He would also support the locally elected Borough Councillor following the election. He took the opportunity to refer to the two campaign leaflets/flyers that had been recently circulated around the village and urged all candidates to “play nicely”. Any campaigning, verbal or otherwise, by law, need to be factually correct and accurate, which had not been the case to date. There were only a few contested local Parish Council elections in West Norfolk, and all eyes would be on how these were conducted. We were blessed to live in such a wonderful village and the community had rallied together to commemorate WWI; it would unfortunate if this community spirit was lost.

2019.04.17.08 – No relevant **Police** reports had been received.

2019.04.17.09.a – Council agreed the **budget** monitoring report.

2019.04.17.09.b – Council agreed **membership** of **NALC** and **NPTS**.

Prop: HP; 2nd: GD; unanimous

2019.04.17.09.c – All **expenditure** listed was agreed subject to clarification that the invoice for one¹ contractor who had been listed, had been approved at the previous meeting of SPC.

Council had received copies prior to the meeting of the Annual Governance Statement, signed by the Internal Auditor.

2019.04.17.09.d.i – Council agreed the **signing** of the **Governance Statement** on the Annual Audit form.

Prop: PM; 2nd: HP; unanimous

¹ Subsequently confirmed – agreed at the SPC on 6th March 2019

Signed:

r)

Date: 15/5/2019

2019.04.17.09.d.ii – Council agreed the **signing** of the **Financial Statement** on the Annual Audit form.

2019.04.17.10.a.i – There was no report on any **planning responses** made under planning protocol.

2019.04.17.10.a.ii – Council agreed to support PA 19/00570 (14 Cherry Tree Road)
Prop: DS; 2nd: GD; unanimous

2019.04.17.10.a.iii - Council agreed to object to PA 19/00577/RM due to the insufficient construction and scale of the ditch/drainage dyke to allow for future cleaning and maintenance.

Prop: DS; 2nd: PM; unanimous

2019.04.17.10.a.iv.1 – Council agreed to support PA 19/00685 (Hall Farm, Old Church Road)

Prop: DS; 2nd: PM; unanimous

2019.04.17.10.a.iv.2 – Council agreed to defer PA 19/00688 (Beggars Roost, Manor Lane) given the lateness of receipt and insufficient time to consider it.

Prop: RP; 2nd: DS; unanimous

2019.04.17.10.a.v – It was highlighted that as SPC now had the SNP in place, this offered the village future protection. Council agreed to reiterate this in their response to the consultation on **BCKLWN Local Plan**.

2019.04.17.10.a.vi - The response, drafted by the Clerk, to NCC on the consultation on speed limit changes, and other matters, affecting the **A149** was read out by the Chairman. SD suggested that the response was, in this instance, too defensive, and reiterated that the proposals had come from the PCC and the Police's Road Safety Partnership, and not NCC. NCC had been tasked to consult on the proposals. He explained that the proposals had been heavily debated at County level by the local Division Councillors, and he stressed the importance of working with NCC, and to hold constructive dialogue with them, to gain the best solution for all concerned, rather than send them the draft response. He reiterated that such proposals as improved and reflective signage, road markings, protected lane turns, cats eyes etc all should be discussed as alternatives. HP queried why Heacham and Wolferton had already held discussions with NCC, particularly as the proposals affected Snettisham the most – they appeared to be "quicker off the mark". SD also reiterated, that depending on the outcome of the initial consultation with statutory agencies, the proposals may never reach public consultation stage, or if they do, may in fact greatly differ. He again suggested that Tom McCabe be invited to attend a meeting with SPC to hold constructive discussions as the proposals in their current format, were socially unacceptable to the village. In response to questions from the public, SD explained that he hoped Tom McCabe could attend a meeting within the next week or so and then he would subsequently report back to the village. He was confident that such a meeting could be arranged, as he was in regular contact with Tom McCabe, but if for any reason it proved not possible, the draft letter could be revisited or an extension could be sought on the timescale to respond. He also highlighted that any such proposals would be subject to Traffic Regulation Order(s). Richard Bird referred to the recent planning approval of some 600 houses (with a likely further 600 being approved subject to an appeal) to the south of Snettisham and a considerable number of new developments in Heacham and Hunstanton to the north. He suggested that a long-term strategy was required for the A149, rather than a "pinprick" approach. He referred to the volumes of traffic, and the time it

currently took to travel to and from King's Lynn, particularly when major events were on such as the Sandringham Flower Show. In his experience as a Borough Councillor, he had tried but had struggled to arrange any meetings with Tom McCabe. He suggested that focus should not be on minor junctions but the much bigger picture and urged SPC to call other Parish Councils to action [applause]. *Council agreed to support the proposals for the installation of average speed cameras.*

Prop: SD; 2nd: HP; unanimous

Council agreed that any average speed cameras installed must have the facility to detect speeding motorbike riders.

Prop: PM; 2nd: GD; unanimous

Council agreed that SD arrange a meeting with Tom McCabe to discuss the proposals with SPC on junction redesign and other safety matters as soon as possible.

Prop: SD; 2nd: PM; unanimous

Council agreed that the response drafted by the Clerk to the consultation be put on hold until the above meeting has taken place.

Prop: HP; 2nd: PM; unanimous

2019.04.17.10.b – no **Amenities and Services** report.

2019.04.17.10.c.i – **Governance**: *Council agreed that the revisions of **Standing Orders** be **deferred** until the next meeting of the Council.*

2019.04.17.10.d/e – no **Personnel** or **Project Development** matters.

2019.04.17.10.f.i – **Working Group Reports**: The summary report of the **Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire** be **deferred** to the next meeting of the Council.

2019.04.17.11 – *Council agreed that a **public statement** be prepared summarising the achievements of SPC over the last four years for consideration at the **Annual Parish Meeting**.*

2019.04.17.12 – GB reported on the **MHT** meeting held on 1/4/19 and took the opportunity to explain his background in sport and previous fundraising projects, and that as SPC representative on MHT felt he could contribute in this capacity. Unfortunately, he had felt the situation had become difficult, with the two organisations (SPC/MHT) appearing to be against one another. GB reported that all Trustees had been reappointed at the meeting, the only change being the appointment of a new Treasurer. In conversation with the architect appointed to survey the site to advise on the best possible position for the proposed MUGA, the architect had expressed surprise that a planning application had already been submitted. He had also concluded that the existing Tennis Court was not the best position for the MUGA. [intervention from the floor]. There had also been concerns raised by the CSNN team and the Planning Officer at BCKLWN. GB stated that the plans currently published on the MHT website for the MUGA did not relate to those of the agreed appointed contractor, and were in fact from a different supplier. SPC had supported the proposals for the redevelopment of the Pavilion and various financial information had been presented at the meeting with £250k required to fund the proposals. He highlighted that SPC could not claim the VAT back as they were not the project owner and the MHT were not VAT registered, therefore a further approximate £50/£60k would need to be raised. David Bocking referred to the parish allotment project having reclaimed VAT – this had been a SPC owned project. Figures had also been produced suggesting future

Signed:

Date: 15/5/2019

use of the new facilities as well as job descriptions for a Manager and booking secretary, both positions being unpaid. SD also took the opportunity to state that SPC was the custodians of Parish funds, which ultimately belonged to the parishioners and it was its job to spend the money wisely. The proposals for the MUGA and pavilion were on land owned by SPC and run by the MHT. There had, as part of due diligence, been a number of questions raised by SPC over the last few months in order to help achieve the best possible outcome. It was part of the role of all Councillors, at all levels, to raise questions and not be in fear of asking such questions. SPC had always supported the proposal for a MUGA but wanted to ensure it was in the right position, and as result, with the agreement of the MHT, an independent surveyor had been commissioned. As a result of this survey, they had concluded that the current proposed position (on the existing Tennis Court) was not the best position for a MUGA. He referred to the statement made by the Chairman of the MHT at the last meeting of SPC in which he had stated that "we have looked at all these points". SD referred to his recent own fundraising activities for the WWI centenary and explained that he would go through "hoops" to provide information and answer any questions that were raised on any detail as to why and how the money would be spent. In conclusion, he stated SPC had always supported the proposals for a MUGA and the redevelopment of the pavilion; it would happen but at the current point in time, things had reached an unfortunate point. PM stated that SPC would not be "bullied" into making any decisions. [SD took the opportunity to inform everyone, he had received a response to an earlier text from Tom McCabe to confirm he would be happy to meet with SPC in the new few weeks to discuss the proposals in relation to the A149 etc.].

2019.04.17.12.a – A meeting earlier in the day in relation to proposals for a **Village Good Neighbour Scheme** had been attended by three Councillors and had also been well attended by other organisations/members of the public. The initiative was led by Community Action Norfolk who were looking to form a Working Group, with an appointed Chair, to take the idea forward. *Council welcomed and agreed to support the scheme.*

2019.04.17.13.a – Various suggestions for an improved **location for the visiting Post Office** (problems currently experienced with the gravel at the MHT car park) were discussed such as the Doctors Surgery, the Market Square or the Queen Victoria. It was highlighted that the decision was not within the remit of SPC, other than that they had ownership of the Market Square. *Council agreed that a question be posted on Facebook to ascertain villager's views as to where they believed would be the best place for the van to be located.*

2019.04.17.13.b – *Council agreed that consideration of the **publication of meeting notes** (such as Project Development Group) be **deferred** for the next Council to determine as a matter of policy.*

2019.04.17.14 – No **agenda** requests or **AOB**.

2019.04.17.15 – Public Participation: Arthur Clarkson queried as to when the results of the Pigeon public consultation events would be known; HP – verbal feedback had been given but SPC were awaiting formal feedback. Bob Almey highlighted there were in fact two new Trustees appointed at the recent MHT meeting (not as previously reported). Linda Standeven referred to the earlier statement in relation to the surveyor's advice on the position of the MUGA stating

Signed:

ir)

Date: 15/5/2019

that at the meeting the surveyor had actually "offered no opinion"; GB clarified that he had spoken to the surveyor outside of the meeting. Linda Standeven also stated that the Tennis Court was already a MUGA.

2019.04.17.16 – *The **Annual General Meeting** of Council was confirmed as 7.30pm on Wednesday, 15th May in the Memorial Hall.*

Meeting ended at c.9.35pm

Abbreviations:

BCKLWN – Borough Council; CSNN – Community Safety & Neighbourhood Nuisance; EA – Environment Agency; HMG – Her Majesty's Government; MHT – Memorial Hall Trustees; NALC – Norfolk Association of Local Councils; NCC – County Council; NPTS – Norfolk Parish Training & Support; PCC – Police and Crime Commissioner; SNP – Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan; (S)PC – (Snettisham) Parish Council; WECMS – Wash East Coast Management Strategy

Signed

(air)

Date: 15/5/2019