

THURSTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the MEETING held on Wednesday 22 July 2020 at 6.30pm by VIDEOCONFERENCE of Thurston Parish Council.

Present (by video): Cllrs. Dashper (Chair), Cllrs. Haley, Hay, Morris, Rainbow, Towers, Turner and West.

Also in attendance (by video): Mrs V Waples, Parish Clerk and two members of the public (*in attendance until the end of Agenda Item 4*).

1. **OPENING** – the Chairman opened the meeting advising all that the Video Protocol adopted by the Parish Council, would be enacted for this meeting and welcomed Cllr. Hay to his first meeting on joining the Parish Council. *A copy of the Protocol is available from the Clerk or can be downloaded from the website: <https://thurstonparishcouncil.uk/parish-council/policies-procedures-and-strategy/>*
2. **APOLOGIES** –
 - a) Council received apologies for absence from Cllr. Fawcett for a personal commitment.
 - b) Acceptance of the apologies submitted was agreed by all, aif.
3. **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST FROM COUNCILLORS INCLUDING GIFTS OF HOSPITALITY EXCEEDING £25** –
 - a) To receive declarations of pecuniary, local non-pecuniary interest(s) and personal interests in items on the agenda and their nature including gifts of hospitality exceeding £25 – there were no declarations declared for the agenda under discussion. Cllr. Hay declared that he was a farming landowner and was happy to be advised on any pecuniary or non-pecuniary matters.
 - b) To receive declarations of lobbying for planning matters on the agenda – there were none declared.
 - c) To receive requests for dispensations – none had been received prior to the meeting.
4. **PUBLIC FORUM** –
 - a) To receive questions and matters of concern from those in attendance on the agenda under discussion – there were none raised.
 - b) To receive matters of concern relating to Thurston from members of the public in attendance
 - A member of the public raised the issue of ASB at the Cavendish and the question of the PCSO's working hours. He asked Cllrs. to consider whether the money currently spent on a PCSO would be better spent on a youth worker working in conjunction with the young people of the village. This would also allow out of hours working. A proactive line should be taken to spend money on engaging with the young people of the village and in the area as opposed to on a PCSO that is not able to respond to the issues raised at times outside of their working hours.
 - A further member of the public raised the following issues:
 - a) they had written formally to complain about a member of the council's staff and wished to know the status of that complaint. They made reference to a number of emails sent to the Council.
 - c) they wished to know why that person had been given details of the complaint made against them and that until that very evening there had been trolling and malicious comments being made about members of the public by that staff member.

The Clerk as Proper Officer reminded all that there were processes to be followed and that should a complaint be raised; the public forum was not the place nor was it the place for the debate to be had. The complainant was asked to put the evidence in writing to the council to allow it to conduct a proper investigation in line with its procedures. The member of the public was reminded of the Malicious Communications Act 1988.
5. **PLANNING MATTERS** -
 - a) To consider Council's response to the following planning application as statutory consultee:

So approved at the meeting of 05.08.2020

- DC/20/02717 – Application for tree works to a tree subject to a TPO MS52/A1 – fell 1 No For Tree @ 15 Blackbird Close – Council was in agreement that this was a prominent tree in the area and was one of two still remaining. Given recent works that had been carried out this area was now very open. It was agreed that this was a poor application and that professional advice about the health of the tree should be sourced. Noted that this was a 2nd request to fell this and that next-door neighbour had put in several applications and they had been refused. It was agreed that the Council would recommend refusal until professional advice has been sought to determine the health and supporting evidence is submitted, aif.
 - DC/20/02934 - Householder planning application – erection of a single storey side extension @ 3 Sandpit Drive – why not done under permitted development rights. Appears to be fairly straight forward and all were in support of the application as submitted, aif.
- b) To consider whether Council should submit further responses to planning appeals as submitted:
- DC/19/01617 – Planning Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/20/3254390 – Dover Farm Developments Ltd – application for outline planning permission (access to be considered, all other matters reserved) – erection of 1 No dwelling (following demolition of barn @ barn located on southern side of Barrell’s Road – noted that refusal was on the same grounds as mentioned by the Parish Council. Following what was said in the Planning Cttee Meeting earlier that day it was agreed that the status of the NDP had had a massive boost and that Cttee Members had looked at the NDP very clearly and had taken account of what was in the NDP. It was agreed that the Clerk would review the statement of case and ascertain if there were any matters that ought to be challenged. It was agreed that it was correct to place emphasis on the word focused and understand the definition given to the terminology of the NDP. It was therefore agreed that the Council would delegate responsibility to the Clerk to review the statement of case and ascertain whether further comments should be submitted.
 - DC/19/05465 – Planning Appeal Ref: APP/W/3520/W/20/3249891 – Mr and Mrs G Le Mar – outline planning application (all matters reserved) – erection of 2 No detached dwellings with garages @ land east of Woodlands, Barrell’s Road – it was pointed out that in the statement of case – para 19 it was stated that the LPA..... Appeal site is out of settlement boundary but the way that Policy 1 of the NDP is written it should be allowed to – noted that this was only a view of the agent but it should be challenged. It was agreed that the Council would delegate responsibility to the Clerk to review the statement of case and ascertain whether further comments should be submitted, aif.
 - DC/19/05113 – Planning Appeal Ref: APP/W/3520/W/20/3250591 – Mr G Denny – Planning application – erection of 2 No dwellings with cartlodges and vehicular access (including amendment to existing stable access to the rear) @ land at The Planche, Church Road – It was agreed that the Council would delegate responsibility to the Clerk to review the statement of case and ascertain whether further comments should be submitted, aif.
- c) To note determination by the LPA of the following applications:
- DC/20/01994 - Planning Permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension and front porch (retention of porch) @ 33 Oakey Field Road
 - Discharge of Conditions Application for 4942/16 - Conditions 6 (Hard, soft and boundary treatment landscape works), 10 (Materials), 11 (Screen walls and fences), 16 (Estate roads and footpaths), 18 (Manoeuvring and Parking), 19 (Refuse/Recycling bins), 20 (Surface water discharge prevention), 22 (Strategy for disposal of surface water), 23 (Implementation, maintenance and management), 24 (Sustainable Urban Drainage System), 25 (Construction Surface Water Management Plan), 26 (Foul and waste water discharge) and 31 (Provision and implementation of electric car charging points) @ land at Meadow Lane
 - DC/20/02427 - Planning Permission for works to trees covered by a TPO @ 4 Marley Close
- d) To note matters arising from approved planning applications:
- College Park (Persimmon Site) – Oak Trees along Ixworth Road – ongoing discussions – Cllr. Turner still heavily involved in this – it was noted that Highways had confirmed that the

So approved at the meeting of 05.08.2020

proposed layout drawn up from discussions with a number of parties for the Additional Sports Facilities for the College was acceptable from their point of view, but clarification was still awaited on whether or not Oak Tree T29 will still need to be removed. It also appeared that positive amendments were being taken in the area of the caretakers bungalow for the route of the footway/cycle route which would obviate the need for a build-out into the highway.

- Land at Meadow Lane – start date appeared to be imminent given the number of conditions that were being submitted for approval.
 - Land at Barton Road - start date confirmed as September this year.
 - Noise pollution emanating from current and future sites – given that Persimmon had been allowed to have extended working hours due to COVID-19 and that all five sites in Thurston could be in the throes of development, residents had raised the concerns of noise pollution. Cllr. Hay made the meeting aware that within the law white noise backing up alarms should be used to avoid / reduce noise pollution. It was agreed that he would research the relevant legislation and liaise with the Clerk who would approach the site manager and/or enforcement at MSDC.
- e) To consider further the request submitted by Linden Homes for consideration of any upcoming initiatives, relevant area investments or events planned for the area that they could consider supporting in some way as part of their general community outreach – Clerk had reviewed The Foundation which was operated by Linden Homes and it appeared that a variety of community events were supported. Suggestions from Council included a contributions to the Fun Run the following year; the Scarecrow Event run by the Library; a post COVID-19 event run by the Parish Council in the following year; support for the Library in terms of a laptop for the screen; support for a Climate Emergency Event. It was agreed that the Clerk would liaise with the Library, the Under Fives; the Scout and Brownie Groups and the Cavendish Hall to ascertain whether they have any projects that might need such support.
- The Clerk was also asked to submit a request to Linden Homes to clear up the debris from surrounding areas emanating from their site in particular along Pakenham Road especially as they were keen to invoke their environmental credentials.
- f) To receive an update on Planning Application SCC/0011/20MS to be determined by Suffolk County Council – the Clerk confirmed that the Schools Infrastructure Programme Officer had confirmed that the delays to the determination of the application was due to the discussions that had been taking place involving a number of parties around the new “Persimmon” footpath/cycleway, the SCC planning application for the proposed pitch and car park and the impact of both on established trees along Ixworth Road. It was noted that the school have confirmed that they were happy to release the land for the re-routed foot/cycleway on the basis this will be more than compensated for by the additional land the school gains if the application is approved. In view of the fact the school site area will significantly increase as a result of the joint proposals they were investigating whether they needed to seek DfE approval for the disposal of the land for the re-routed foot/cycleway.
- g) To consider the request from the Planning Officer at MSDC with regards to Linden Homes for consideration of what community infrastructure is still required for Thurston (on a without prejudice basis to the Council’s basic position of objection) – it was agreed that the PC should reiterate its position over the objections to the increased in dwellings for this and confirm that although the PC were being asked for its views it would be difficult to respond to in any formal manner as it was not party to the discussions that had been had between the Planning Officer and the Agents / representatives for Linden Homes. However in relation to the community infrastructure that was still required in Thurston, the PC would be happy to request that the original layout showing allotments and the Green Spaces need to be reinstated as their removal has allowed the extra dwellings to come forward. It was noted that the signed S106 was matched to the numbers that were originally agreed and should this step be seen as a plot to try to offset community infrastructure by increasing the numbers. All agreed that that which was required is what was in the original submitted and approved outline plan, aif.

So approved at the meeting of 05.08.2020

6. YOUTH MATTERS -

- a) To receive an update on the formation of a Youth Council – whilst positive steps were being taken in setting this up there was an obvious need to understand how to integrate the Youth Council with the Council to allow a two-way communication process to be achieved. Cllr. Turner was positive that this could be achieved over time.
- b) To consider further the replacement Youth Shelter on New Green – the landowner and Cllr. Turner had looked at where the new shelter could be sited, and it was agreed that the most suitable place would be close to the Gym Trail but further away from the New Green Centre. Cllrs. raised issues over the understanding of why a replacement shelter was being discussed; reasons as to why the previous shelter had been removed and why was the Council replacing this after such a short time. The question was asked that if there are issues with ASB in the village are we not now putting ourselves in a position of criticism if we put a thing back into the community? It was noted that those who had previously been causing anti-social behaviour were in the main users of cars and the area in which the shelter had been situated had acted as a magnet for ASB for those associated with these groups. It was noted that those who had been requesting a new youth shelter in a new location fully understood the issues of responsibility and accountability and were positive in wishing to forge a link to the PC and to the local community. It was argued that the move to install a new shelter after a period of time had been promised with the removal of the previous shelter and that with the formation of the youth council there was a very positive link to the young people of the village. The landowner was positive and agreed that to site the youth shelter where it is being proposed will create a positive family area. All were reminded that a commitment was made that it would be replaced with something and that it did behove the PC to understand the risks that might result from it being replaced. It was further pointed out that the Youth Council was a way of moving forward and there is a need for the PC to support those who are prepared to act in a positive manner. Expectation is for a September installation. The Council was reminded that in accordance with its own FRs there was a need for 3 quotations to be sourced. It was agreed that the Clerk would contact Kompan and a further company for quotations to bring back to the Council for the August meeting to allow Council to move forward on this project.

7. COUNCILLOR REPORTS:

- a) to report village matters of concern to the Clerk
- COVID-19 – could the signage also be erected into all the play areas and closer to the Gym Trail on New Green
 - New Green cyclepath/footpath across the Green – confusion arises with the signage “no cycling” on grass area on New Green and the faded cycling marks on the dedicated cycle route.
- b) to update the meeting on reports from Committees / Working Groups
- Recreational Facilities - £10k grant had been received from the MSDC/government pot. The Cttee were looking at spending the majority of that on works to the pavilion and in particular the small gable end to the front. Resurfacing of Car Park at Cavendish Hall will now take place in the October half-term. CIL Neighbourhood bid for replacement seats and benches. It was confirmed that no clubs were able to use the Pavilion due to social distancing issues and it appears unlikely that the Cricket Club will return anytime soon.
 - Library – hoping to extend opening hours over the coming weeks.
 - Emergency Plan (COVID-19) – still functioning although not a huge amount of demand. All NACS written to and have confirmed that they are willing to continue. From discussions with MSDC and SCC it appeared likely that the scheme would be kept running until next Spring to allow for any localised spikes. All were informed that a postcard drop would be delivered around the village to allow all to have an update.
 - Village Information Booklet – the Clerk confirmed that she and Cllr. Fawcett had recently met to discuss this project were looking at how it can be resurrected. It was noted that a Draft

So approved at the meeting of 05.08.2020

document would be presented for discussion at the September meeting and that a copy might, once approved, all uploaded onto the website which would allow for the document to be kept up to date more easily. Hard copies would be delivered to all new residents within the village.

8. CLERKS REPORT – to receive the Clerks report and in particular:

- a) to receive the reports of items actioned under delegated powers – the meeting were made aware that the Parish Council’s business continued as normal and that the Clerk was still able to report matters to other agencies even though some of their responses were questionable. The Clerk confirmed that effective 4th August she would be on a phased return to work and would be in the office for one day a week – day to be confirmed.
- b) to receive items of correspondence for noting only – all matters of a non-urgent matter had been circulated to Councillors since the last meeting.

9. To confirm the date of future meetings:

- a) 5th August 2020 – full Council Meeting – via Zoom - commencing at 7.00pm
- b) 19th August 2020 – full Council Meeting – via Zoom – commencing at 6.30pm

10. TO RESOLVE THAT UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISISON TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960, THE PUBLIC BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DUE TO THE CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF THE BUSINESS TO BE DISCUSSED – *it was resolved that the public be excluded from the meeting due to the confidential nature of the business to be discussed –*

- a) to receive and discuss information on negotiations over a possible land transaction involving the parish council – the meeting was updated on the response over the timing of the land option and informed that the development of the whole site would be determined by its intended use and securing ay appropriate permissions.

CONFIDENTIAL MATTER DISCLOSED.

The meeting was informed that another meeting between interested parties for the area under consideration had been requested and dates were awaited.

11. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING – there being no other business the meeting was closed at 20.14pm.

Appendix A - Glossary of Common Abbreviations used

Aif	All in favour
AGAR	Annual Governance and Accountability Return
APM	Annual Parish Meeting
ASB	Anti-social Behaviour

So approved at the meeting of 05.08.2020

BACS	Bankers Automated Clearing Services
BUAB	Built Up Area Boundary
BMSDC	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
CC	Credit Card
CCG	Clinical Commissioning Group
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
Chq.	Cheque
Cllr.	Councillor
CMP	Construction Management Programme
Cttee.	Committee
DC	District Council
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government
DD	Direct Debit
FOI	Freedom of Information
FR	Financial Regulations
GPoC	General Power of Competence
HMRC	Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
JR	Judicial Review
LAIS (from SALC)	Local Association's Information Services
LGBCE	Local Government Boundary Commission for England
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MSDC	Mid Suffolk District Council
NHS	National Health Service
NDP	Neighbourhood Development Plan
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NR	Network Rail
PC	Parish Council
PCSO	Police Community Support Officer
Pdf	Portable Document Format
PIISG	Parish Infrastructure Investment Steering Group
Rec.	Recreation
RFO	Responsible Financial Officer
SARS	Suffolk Accident Rescue Service
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SALC	Suffolk Association of Local Councils
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SID	Speed Indicator Device
SNT	SaferNeighbourhood Team
SO	Standing Order
SPS	Suffolk Preservation Society
TCC	Thurston Community College
TNPSG	Thurston Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TRO	Traffic Regulation Order
VAS	Vehicle Activated Sign

So approved at the meeting of 05.08.2020