

**Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council**  
**Minutes of a meeting of the Council held on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2018**  
**in the Parish Rooms, Grundisburgh.**

NOTICES had been posted according with regulations.

Present: - Messrs.W.Barber, C.Burch, G.Caryer, S.Barnett (in the chair), J.Dunnett, P.Franklin, D.Higgins, P.Kendall, J.Lapsley, R.Youngman, Mrs.M.Bean, Mrs.J.Bignell, Mrs.A.Willetts, District Councillor.A.Fryatt and 20 members of the public.

The Chairman welcomed Mr.Franklin to his first meeting as a member for Grundisburgh.

Warm congratulations were expressed to St.Mary's Church for the memorable Remembrance Day Service held at the church on the 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2018.

**1. Apologies for absence** All councillors attended.

**2. Declarations of interest** Mrs.Bignell, Mrs.Willetts, Mr.Higgins and Mr.Kendall declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in Village Hall matters.

**3. Minutes** The minutes of a Meeting of the Council held on the 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2018 had been circulated and were therefore taken as read. Mr.Franklin asked for Mr.Walters name to be removed from Item 1 Apologies for absence. It was proposed by Mr.Dunnett seconded by Mr.Franklin, to unanimous approval, that after amendment, these minutes be signed by the Chairman as a true record. There were no matters arising.

**4. Public Open Forum** It was proposed by Mr. Barnett seconded by Mr.Dunnett, to unanimous approval, that the formal meeting be suspended, and members of the public invited to address the meeting.

The following issues were raised:

- Members of the public were urged to concentrate on the role of a Custodian Trustee
- Vehicles are dangerously speeding in the vicinity of Weir Pond Green
- The importance of obtaining evidence of speeding to back up requests for traffic calming measures.
- If the Parish Council were to contribute to the cost of maintaining the Olde Forge Stores forecourt it could set a dangerous precedent ?

Mr. Paul Whittingham explained the position of the Parish Council as Custodian Trustee and the reasons why the Village Hall Management Committee were considering applying to the Charity Commission for a change of status to a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO).

He explained that when the old village hall site was formally conveyed to the village by the Conveyance of 1962, a trust was established by that conveyance which is now the Village Hall Management Committee (VHMC). The Governing Document of the VHMC was set out in a schedule to the Conveyance. The role of the VHMC is to manage the asset for the benefit of the community in accordance with the terms of the trust. The VHMC members are described as the administering trustees.

The land and hall were, however, conveyed to the Parish Council to hold as Custodian Trustee. The role of a custodian trustee is essentially to hold an asset. The role goes back to legislation passed as long ago as 1906. Custodian trustees have very few other rights or obligations. The duty of a custodian trustee, as set out in statute, is to concur in and perform all acts necessary to enable the managing trustees to perform their duty. This will include transferring legal title to other parties, such as a CIO in the event of the charity being incorporated. A Custodian Trustee does not have any management function in the running of a charity. Under the legislation, there is in fact an office of the Public Custodian Trustee who would potentially hold all kinds of assets without knowing much about any of the bodies for whom it holds the assets, let alone intervening in the management.

***Public Open Forum cont...***

In 2015, the *new* village hall site was transferred as part of the enabling development of the Foulger site. This was handled by Lightfoot O'Brien Westcott of Woodbridge. Having recently checked with Richard Pepper, the land transfer was made in favour of Richard and Judith Pepper to hold in their capacity as trustees of the VHMC. At roughly the same time, the cash contribution was paid to the bank account of the VHMC in the sum of £280,000.

While no formal decision has been taken, it is the intention of the VHMC to seek to form a CIO as the model to use going forwards with the new hall.

Traditionally, most charities were established as trusts with trustees operating under a trust deed of some kind. The charity as such did not have an independent existence or as we say in the law, was not a legal person. It existed because of the trustee body operating as a trust. As such, trustees of an unincorporated charity face the risk of personal liability in the event of the charity becoming insolvent or being sued. If they have acted properly, trustees can be indemnified out of the assets of the charity. In the last few decades, society has become far more litigious and many charities found that they were unable to attract people to act as trustees.

The preferred model then became the use of a limited company. Not a conventional company with shares but the lesser known "company limited by guarantee". Such a company became the preferred model for incorporated charities. The directors of the company are, in law, also the trustees. The members of the company (who are conceptually like shareholders except there are no actual shares), have certain rights and powers. Therefore, the trustees/directors have to obtain members' resolutions before they are allowed to do certain things under company law. The members have the right to remove the directors/trustees from office, which helps to provide some governance in these structures.

The problem with companies limited by guarantee is that they are governed by charity law as well as company law. Therefore, any appointment of a director has to be notified both to Companies House and the Charity Commission. Their accounts have to comply with charity law and company law and be filed in both regulatory bodies.

The government therefore passed legislation about 11 years ago, which enabled the formation of a bespoke structure for charities to use. This was the CIO. As a body of rules needed to be created and a computer system produced to deal with registrations, the CIO entity did not finally become available to use until 2013.

Since then, it has become the default model for charities. Many new charities set up as a CIO and many existing charities convert from an unincorporated model into a CIO.

A CIO works much like a company in many ways. The committee members are the trustees. The CIO is a separate legal person so, like a company, it can hold property, enter into contracts, take legal action and be sued in its own name rather than through its trustees. It has the advantage of being administered only by the Charity Commission. Therefore, the only filings to be made are to the Charity Commission, not to Companies House.

There are two kinds of CIO. A Foundation model and an Association model. The latter would be the most appropriate for a village hall. The Foundation model does not have a separate body of members so is administered by its trustees only. The Association model has members as well as trustees and therefore is conceptually very similar to the company limited by guarantee. The VHMC will no doubt take advice on who ought to be members of the CIO. I would expect that it would at least comprise persons from the user groups and the Parish Council but that is a matter for those who assemble the constitution.

Additionally, you have to have a constitution. The Charity Commission prescribe a model constitution. Certain parts of the model constitution can be amended or bespoke to the particular circumstances of the individual charity but much of the text will remain common to all CIOs.

Like any charity, whether incorporated or unincorporated, the CIO has to have a charitable purpose which has to be approved by the Charity Commission. No doubt that will say something like "to provide a village hall for the benefit of the community of Grundisburgh, Culpho and environs" or some such wording. Everything which the CIO does has to be consistent with its purposes.

***Public Open Forum cont...***

If the CIO was successfully incorporated, at some stage the assets of the current charity would be transferred to it, to hold for the CIO's charitable purposes. Mr. Whittingham didn't know if this would be after the new hall is built or not. The Parish Council would therefore have to transfer the land to the CIO which would then hold it in perpetuity unless and until the CIO was either wound up or the site was replaced with another one.

One of the principal reasons why the CIO was created was because fewer people were willing to take the risk of being trustees. In the future, given that the new village hall is a larger venture, it may prove impossible to find people willing to act as a trustee if the current unincorporated constitution was preserved. The fact that a CIO removes the risk of personal ruin (in the absence of misconduct in office by the trustees) ought to be welcomed, rather than regarded as a flaw in the plan.

Once it is properly understood, it ought to be plain to see that a CIO is a much more appropriate charity structure for the new hall. It has been specifically devised to be the recommended model for a charity and has a body of regulation around it through charity law to protect the assets and the beneficiaries. If anyone was going to set up a new charity for a sizeable village hall today, they would almost certainly go for the CIO model and nobody would now seriously suggest starting with the model used in 1962 which was a product of its time and is now very outdated.

Mr. Bryan Laxton informed the meeting of his initial review of the current status of the project and recommending the actions required to complete the project.

The existing village hall has come to the end of its economic life and could well require more than £100,000 expenditure in the next few years even to retain its basic facilities in a state to allow it to be hired out. To improve/refurbish the hall would cost at least £250,000. This was not an option.

In order for this project to be considered an overall success he believed that broad based support needs to be gained from the community for the new village hall. We should aspire to achieve a result which not only gains support from the community, but also excites the community.

The project team needs to

- ensure it is seen as running an open and transparent process and
- engage with user groups and the wider community in order to gain their support.

He is establishing a web site so that the whole community can have access to the latest information.

Three options have been considered in the last few weeks and they are merely examples of what could be pursued with public support. They are

- tweaking the current proposals to save some costs
- a midway option
- a much smaller hall capable of being built within the limitations of the current assets of the VHMC.

As far as possible, anyone in the village who is prepared to offer their services for free, or at cost, is given every opportunity to be involved in the project.

In the meantime, VHMC should continue to work with the existing Architect and Quantity Surveyor, engage a legal advisor to begin working to ensure we have a good and marketable title to the existing site and also appoint an agent to advise on the existing site. We have already created a working party to look at all financing options and they need to be ready to report early in the new year.

He believed the biggest challenge is the current predicted cost of the project. The current plan anticipates a total cost of £813,000 which some believe does not give value for money and others believe is simply too expensive.

### **Public Open Forum cont...**

Mr.Laxton has met with the Architect and the Quantity Surveyors (QS) on a number of occasions to discuss the design and cost. There is no right or wrong way to design a village hall, but they have an enormous amount of experience and have been very helpful.

His initial remit to them was threefold:

- **“A” Current proposal.** To seek to “tweak” the current proposals to see if any significant costs can be saved.
- **“B” Midway option** To design and cost another option which gives the community most of what it is seeking, but at a substantially reduced cost. There was no specific cost target given but the QS, Architect and Mr.Laxton undertook an iterative process looking and re-looking at design and cost together to reach a midway solution between A (above) and C (below). The total cost used (purely for illustrative purposes) for this midway option is in the order of £650,000.
- **“C” £500,000 option.** To design a new village hall assuming a total of £500,000 with which to build a replacement hall. This sum was chosen as it is very roughly equivalent to the current assets held by the VHMC, (including the existing hall site).

On the assumption that it would not be appropriate to design a bigger and more expensive hall and also that the current funds should all be used to build a new hall, Options A and C are likely to be the most expensive and lowest cost options sensibly worth considering. Option B is merely an arbitrary middle ground between Options A & C. It is not a proposal, but merely an indication of a midway alternative. The total cost used (purely for illustrative purposes) for this midway option is in the order of £650,000.

**5. County Councillor’s Report** No report.

**6. District Councillor’s Report** District Councillor Tony Fryatt reported...

**6.1 Local Plan Review** The District Council undertook consultation on the First Draft Local Plan between July and September this year. Over 3,500 responses have been received from 1,300 individuals and organisations. The Council intends to publish the Final Draft Local Plan in January 2019, at which point representations will be invited in relation to the soundness of the plan. Following this, the Plan will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination. On Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> November, as part of the process leading up to Cabinet and Council meetings in January, a revised draft of the Local Plan will be presented to the Council’s Scrutiny Committee.

**6.2 Ward boundaries finalised for new East Suffolk Council** Ward boundaries for the new East Suffolk Council have been published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. The final recommendations propose that East Suffolk’s 55 councillors should represent eight three-councillor wards, ten two-councillor wards and eleven one-councillor wards.

In response to local feedback during the public consultation, the Commission has changed some of the proposals it put forward in July, as well as changing the names of some proposed wards as a result of local suggestions.

The full recommendations are available on the Commission’s website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk).

The proposed new arrangements must now be implemented by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force the recommendations – will be laid in Parliament in the coming weeks. The draft Order provides for the electoral arrangements to come into force at the authority’s first elections in 2019.

**6.3 Free Parking Announced To Support Good Causes** The East Suffolk councils are playing their part in supporting good causes – by offering free car parking at key times. Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils are planning to provide free parking at their car parks across east Suffolk on Armistice Day and in the build up to Christmas.

**6.4 Armistice Day Parking:** With this year marking the 100th Anniversary of the 1918 Armistice, many people across the district are planning commemorative events. This year, 11<sup>th</sup> November falls on a Sunday, so the events are likely to attract large crowds to commemorate the sacrifice of all those in the armed forces who died during World War One. The councils are therefore offering free parking at every car park across Suffolk Coastal and Waveney for the entire day, as there are parades and events being staged in different places throughout the day.

***District Councillor's Report cont...***

**6.5 Christmas Events** The councils are also supporting shoppers and traders in the build up to Christmas, particularly with events such as Christmas markets and Christmas lights being switched on. Obviously, in the build up to Christmas, there is a larger variety of events being held over a longer period of time. So, the council are offering periods of free parking during the weeks leading up to Christmas. Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils will offer two-hour blocks of free parking to support local shops and community organisations, which can be used to link to specific events twice during the build up to Christmas (so two sessions of free parking in the four-week period before Christmas). Town and Parish Councils can decide which days they would like to operate the two-hours of free parking, and in which car park(s) across east Suffolk, then contact Sue Keeble at Norse to express their interest and take up the offer. Sue can be contacted at: [Susan.Keeble@ncsgrp.co.uk](mailto:Susan.Keeble@ncsgrp.co.uk)

**6.6 Council aims to secure superfast broadband for the remote parts of rural Suffolk** Work is now underway to deliver broadband to remote areas in the district. Suffolk Coastal is committed to reaching the parts that will be missed by the general roll-out of superfast broadband across the county. While the council has played a full role in the Suffolk Better Broadband Programme, delivering superfast fibre broadband across Suffolk, it is clear that up to 3% of properties will have missed out, when the current programme is completed in 2020. That 3% is disproportionately going to fall in rural areas. That's why the Suffolk Coastal Enabling Broadband Programme Board was set up last year, to ensure that these rural communities were not left behind. The council has worked with the local communities, plotting the worst-affected areas and what needed doing. This spring, the Conservative administration agreed to set aside £250,000 to pay for it. Work has now begun to deliver improved coverage in those areas and ensure that all our Suffolk Coastal communities are able to grow and prosper. More information about our Enabling Better Broadband Programme is on the East Suffolk website, at this link: <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/community/enabling-better-broadband-in-suffolk-coastal/>

**6.7 Green Bin Rollout & Removal of Unwanted Brown Bins** Phase One of delivering the new garden waste bins to homes in Suffolk Coastal is now nearing completion, although the council will continue to deliver the new bins to those who signed up for the scheme later. All unwanted brown bins will now be collected. This is being done area by area, according to the normal routes and dates for collection. A week before the removal of the brown bins, refuse crews will leave a hanger on all grey bins when they empty these. The hanger will explain what to do and when to put the brown bins out for us to take away. If the brown bin is no longer required, households are being asked to put the unwanted bin out with their blue bin on the normal collection day and re-use the bin hanger. Please securely attach the hanger to the unwanted brown bin so that the 'tick' is clearly visible. Residents can also put a note on any unwanted brown bin, asking for it to be taken away. Just make sure it is securely attached and clearly visible. On collection day, the refuse crews will empty ALL brown bins as well as green bins. Any unwanted brown bins will then be sprayed with temporary paint and left on the side of the road. The removal crews will pick these up later on the same day. The removal crews will only take the bins with the sprayed marking. If there is any doubt as to whether the bin is wanted or not, it will not be removed. Suffolk Coastal will aim to publish a weekly schedule on the website of the roads from which the bins will be collected. This may change, depending on how many bins are left out for removal.

**6.8 Polling Station Review** Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils are currently reviewing the polling stations before the elections taking place in May 2019. As part of the review, everyone has the opportunity to comment on the polling stations used, and their suitability, facilities and accessibility. The (Acting) Returning Officer (ARO) published his report and recommendations last month, which is open for public consultation until 30 November 2018. The final proposals will be presented and considered at a full meeting of the East Suffolk Shadow Council on 28 January 2019.

Comments or representations can be made in writing to:

Electoral Services, Suffolk Coastal District Council, East Suffolk House, Riduna Park, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT

Electoral Services, Waveney District Council, 2 Canning Road, Lowestoft, NR33 0EQ or by email to [elections@eastsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:elections@eastsuffolk.gov.uk)

More details about the review and a schedule showing the current polling district areas and their allocated polling station venues can be found on the East Suffolk website: [www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/elections/review-of-polling-districts-polling-places-and-polling-stations-2018/](http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/elections/review-of-polling-districts-polling-places-and-polling-stations-2018/)

***District Councillor's Report cont...***

**6.9 Woodbridge Skatepark set to expand** Plans are being developed to expand the popular Skatepark in Woodbridge. Following the recent refurbishment of the neighbouring Deben Leisure Centre, the area immediately behind the leisure centre became vacant. This area has now been earmarked to expand the space available at Woodbridge Skatepark. Suffolk Coastal wants to hear what the users would like to see in the additional space. To have your say, please email your ideas to [leisure@eastssuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:leisure@eastssuffolk.gov.uk) by 16 November 2018. On 16 February 2019, an event will be held where the skate companies present their design ideas to the users, who will vote for their preferred one. Once the winning design has been chosen, the users will have the opportunity to sit down with the skate company to go through the design and work with them to make sure they get what they want.

**7. New Village Hall**

Proposed by Mr.P.Franklin seconded by Mr.J.Dunnett. To discuss and clarify the ownership of the old Grundisburgh Village Hall and the new Grundisburgh Village Hall site plus cash.

*Existing Village Hall Conveyance 1962*

Mr.Franklin explained that he had studied the 1962 Conveyance and had come to the following conclusions

- The existing charity is called the 'Grundisburgh Village Hall'. It is an unincorporated charitable trust.
- The Charity Trustees have full legal responsibility for the charity's conduct and liabilities.
- The Custodian trustee is the Parish Council (i.e. the Public Trustee, PTA 1906)

*"A custodian trustee has transferred to it all securities and documents of title referring to the trust property"*

*"The trust property shall be transferred to the custodian trustee as if he were the sole trustee"*

*"All sums payable to or out of the income of the trust property shall be paid to or by the custodian trustee"*

- The Village Hall Management Committee (VHMC) is the Managing Trustee (PTA 1906) comprising 5 elected and up to 11 nominated representative members.
- So all VHMC members are Managing Trustees.
- The VHMC meeting of the 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2018 noted that the Charity's Trustees were in discussion with solicitors to alter the status of the existing charity to become an incorporated charity (known as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation which would still be a registered charity). It would no longer be a Trust.

*"Charitable companies are not trusts and cannot therefore operate with a custodian trustee"*

*"Lord Cranworth grants and conveys to the Council the land and building to hold" (1962 Conveyance)"*

*New Village Hall Site and Cash from Foulger family*

- Registered in 2015 in the names of Richard Pepper and Judith Bignell as Trustees of Grundisburgh Village Hall charity, not in the name of a Custodian Trustee.
- There is no reference to the Custodian Trustee (Parish Council) in the Land Registry record.
- The Custodian Trustee's responsibility is to act for the Grundisburgh Village Hall Charity as a whole (per 1962 Conveyance)
- So the title of the Felgate site and the accompanying Foulger cash should have been transferred to the Grundisburgh Village Hall Charity and held by the Parish Council as Custodian Trustee on behalf of the community.
- The Parish Council would then have held the new village hall site and assets in addition to the existing site and assets on behalf of the community. This is currently not the case.

Conclusion

There is a mistaken or deliberate "irregularity" in the registration of the new Village Hall site which needs to be explained and rectified as soon as possible. Does this irregularity anticipate the current plan to alter the status of the Trust to a CIO which has legal status of its own ?

All above quotes in *"italics"* are from Charity Commission Guidance Notes 2012 unless otherwise indicated.

### ***New Village Hall cont...***

Mr. Franklin further maintained

- that a function of a Custodian Trustee is to “pick up the pieces” if the CIO failed.
- on liquidation the remaining assets could be distributed to a similar charity outside the village
- the Village Hall Trustees are not listed on the Charity Commission Web Site
- the land for a new village hall should have been conveyed to the Parish Council as Custodian Trustee
- the £280,000 cash contribution should have been received by the Parish Council and then released to VHMC as they deemed appropriated

The Clerk disputed Mr. Franklin’s assessment of the role of the Parish Council’s role as Custodian Trustee and quoted from the Clause 21 Liquidation of the 1962 Conveyance which states that on liquidation “*for the benefit of the inhabitants of the area of benefit*”

Mr. Barnett proposed seconded by Mr. Caryer, to unanimous approval, that a legal opinion should be obtained to clarify the Parish Council’s responsibilities to Grundisburgh’s Village Hall as Custodian Trustee with regards to all assets of the Village Hall charity. Was the current position correct or was any change needed.

### **8. Old Forge Stores**

Proposed by Mr. J. Dunnett that the Council reconsiders its response to the request from the Village Stores for financial assistance towards the cost of improving the access to the shop from the highway; in light of their recent difficulties re burglary and their constant efforts to keep the store free from mud and water. It is after all a food store.

Mr. Burch reported that he had he had spoken to the owner of the Old Forge Stores who was not interested in contributing to the cost of repairing the forecourt.

Rain water obviously runs down from the bowling green towards the road. This collects by the road Tarmac and the shop parking area and is also topped up by the road water. He urged care in involving the Parish Council as the forecourt is not its responsibility.

He considered a drainage system would have to be installed to manage the excess rain water and this would need the County Council’s Highways Department’s involvement. Any repair/re-surfacing work without dealing with the water problem would be ineffective.

### **9. Financial Matters** The Clerk reported:

**9.1 Audit Accounts year ended 31 March 2018** The audit is now complete. There were no matters the auditor brought to the Council’s attention. The Notice of Conclusion of Audit has been posted on the Parish notice board and on the Parish Council’s Web Site. It was proposed by Mr. Barnett seconded by Mrs. Willetts to unanimous approval, that the Annual Return and the Audit Opinion be approved and accepted by the Council.

**9.2 Finance Sub Committee** The committee meeting scheduled for the 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2018 was cancelled due to a lack of a quorate.

***Financial Matters cont...***

**9.3 Ratification of payments made since the last meeting and approved at the time**

Mr.R.Fletcher	£28.00	War Memorial – Algae cleaner
	£65.00	War Memorial – hedge cutting
	£192.00	Village Green posts painting
	£23.46	Cuprinol protector
Anglia Water Business Ltd	£28.19	Allotment water charges
St.Mary’s Church PCC	£20.00	Contribution towards the purchase of 3 Silhouette Statues. Anonymous donation of £100 received reducing the £70 donation agreed at the previous meeting.
Mr.J.Ager	£515.20	Clerk’s Salary August/September 2018
	£59.08	Clerk’s Expenses August/September 2018
	£105.17	Three compatible toner cartridges
Grundisburgh Parish Rooms	£144.00	Room hire 06/08/2015 – 13/11/2017
Mr.R.Fletcher	£150.00	Village Green Grass Cutting
	£90.00	War Memorial Hedge

It was proposed by Mr.Kendall seconded by Mr.Kendall, to unanimous approval, that these payments be ratified.

**9.4 Payments received since the last meeting**

Mrs.S.Goode	£12.00	Allotment rent
Mr & Mrs.Herbert	£24.00	Allotment rent
Mr & Mrs.Leech	£12.00	Allotment rent
Mr & Mrs.Kersey	£24.00	Allotment rent
Mr & Mrs.Dunnett	£12.00	Allotment rent
Mr & Mrs.O’Kane	£12.00	Allotment rent
Suffolk Coastal District Council	£105.26	CIF payment – The Old House, Half Moon Lane, Grundisburgh

**9.5 Emergency payments made prior to the meeting under Section 5.7 of Financial Standing Orders**

Grundisburgh Village Hall	£25.00	Hall Hire 9 <sup>th</sup> August 2018
Business Services at CAS Ltd	£287.33	Insurance
PKF Littlejohn LLP	£240.00	Audit Fee
Suffolk Coastal Norse Ltd	£64.00	Dog Waste Bags
Vertas Group Ltd	£269.57	Playing Field Grass Cutting July-September 2018
HM Revenue & Customs	£257.60	Income Tax
Vertas Group Ltd	£182.64	Playing Field Grass Cutting October-December 2018
Mr.R.Fletcher	£480.00	Village Green grass cutting October-November 2018

**9.6 Other payments requiring approval**

Mr.J.Ager	£515.20	Clerk’s Salary October/November 2018
	£53.86	Clerk’s Expenses October/November 2018
	£140.94	Windjammer A1 A Frame Notice Board
	£16.97	A4 paper, C5 envelopes
Mr.J.Dunnett	£9.35	Millennium Meadow – petrol for mower, saw and strimmer
SALC	27.00	Payroll Service
Mr.B.Quinton	£111.92	Memorial bench – installing concrete base
Mr.D.R.Quinton	£162.38	Memorial bench – installing concrete base

It was proposed by Mr.Barnett seconded by Mr.Caryer, to unanimous approval, that these payments be made.

**Financial Matters cont...**

**9.7 Account Balances as at 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2018**

Business Tracker Account	£62.43
Current Account	£16,266.80
Post Office Investment account	£20,901.70
VAT to claim	<u>£485.82</u>
TOTAL	£37,716.75

**9.8 Budget Report attached**

**9.9 Application for grants** Project: “Chap’s Chat” Mr. Paul Wiffen has applied for a grant towards purchasing a device that allows people with a hearing difficulty to hear when chatting in groups. The device is a ‘multi-directional microphone’ [called a ‘pen’] and base holder, plus a fob worn around the neck of each hearing-impaired person. The base with pen is £500 + VAT and the fobs are £116 each + VAT This project has been running for 10 months and now has 6 members all in their 80s plus. It gives contact and conversation to isolated men in the village. It meets most Friday mornings at Mrs Williams for one and a half hours. This has been a great success and hopefully will grow. It was noted that grants, in these circumstances, should be paid to voluntary organisations and not individuals. It was agreed that this application should be considered at the Finance Sub Committee at a meeting to be held in January, 2019.

**10. Planning Report** Mrs.Willetts reported:

**10.1 Application approved by Suffolk Coastal District Council since last Parish Council meeting**

DC/18/2286/FUL Builders Yard, Charles Avenue, Grundisburgh. Erection of 4 dwellings

This application was brought to the Referral Panel on the 18<sup>th</sup> September where the Planning Committee Chair and Vice-Chair considered the referral requests made and the details of the proposed development.

The Panel considered that the principle of re-development was acceptable in terms of policy DM10 because the applicant has demonstrated an alternative local site for the employment use. Furthermore, that the scheme design revisions had been made to overcome issues on previous refusal ref. DC/17/1583/FUL.

For these reasons, the Panel considered there was not a need to refer this item to the Planning Committee for determination.

Highways had objected to the parking provision for the site stating that

Please regard this as a holding recommendation for refusal until the issues below have been rectified:

1. It appears that the frontage parking areas are around 4.5 metres in length, which cannot accommodate many modern vehicles. Garages should be set back at least 6 metres from the footway or parking spaces should be at least 4.8 metres in length in frontages, as recommended in Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2015). Where these areas are below the required dimensions, the plots will not have adequate parking provision. Please amend the frontage parking areas to ensure that dwellings have adequate parking provision.

2. The proposed parking arrangement for Plot 1 is not suitable. The Northern spaces requires a difficult manoeuvre into and out of the spaces, it is also within close proximity to the junction with Charles Avenue. The second access is proposed directly the junction of Alice Driver Road and Charles Avenue. This does not comply with the guidance set out within the Drop Kerb Application and is also directly onto of a tactile pedestrian crossing point.

It is hoped that with minor amendments to the proposal, the Highway Authority can recommend the necessary highway related planning conditions.

The Plans were not amended. The proposal is contrary to Policy DM21 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies) which states (a) proposals should relate well to the scale and character of their surroundings particularly in terms of their siting, height, massing and form. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF also deals with this matter. The form and scale of the development of the site should take its steer from Charles Avenue as that's where the site's main frontage lies. Charles Avenue contains single storey not two storey dwellings.

DC/18/3275/FUL Cemaree Meeting Lane Grundisburgh Suffolk IP13 6TT

Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and proposed replacement dwelling.

DC/18/3264/FUL 43 Post Mill Gardens Grundisburgh Suffolk IP13 6UP

Proposed Extensions

***Planning Report cont...***

DC/18/3690/FUL 8 Red Barn Piece, Grundisburgh. The work will be for a two bedroom single storey extension to an existing detached bungalow

**10.2 Application withdrawn since the last Parish Council Meeting**

DC/18/3319/LBC Bridge House Woodbridge Road Grundisburgh Suffolk IP13 6UF  
Replacement of 12 Windows/Pair of French doors and two sidelight panels by doors

**10.3 Applications received since last the Parish Council meeting awaiting a decision**

DC/18/3838/VOC Rookery Farm, Otley Road, Grundisburgh. Application Reference Number:DC/17/3948  
We wish to make amendments to the previously approved landscaping details. The minor changes include the provision of 1.8m high brick boundary walls separating the garden spaces of Barns A & B and a small increase of the driveway area to Barn B. We wish the condition to be changed so that it references the new updated landscape drawing 1082-02C.

**10.4 Application awaiting a decision**

DC/18/3290/LBC Grundisburgh Hall Ipswich Road Grundisburgh Suffolk IP13 6TW  
Remove and replace failed render on Southern elevation of Grundisburgh Hall with a lime render onto oak lath. Remove impervious masonry paint to the West and East faces of the building and replace with a breathable paint.

**10.5 Hill House Woodbridge Road** Several Parishioners asked about the construction going up at the rear of the above property. After phoning the District Council the planning officer confirmed it had no planning permission, he came out to look at the site. He later confirmed by phone that it was permitted development. It is the correct distance from the boundary of the site, the correct height and the correct size in relation to the site.

**10.6 Planning Decisions** Mrs.Willetts was very disturbed at three recent applications approved by Suffolk Coastal which clearly breached the District Council's Local Plan It was agreed that she should write to the District Council seeking an explanation as to why the District Council's policies were not being adhered to.

**11. Roads & Transport Report** Mr.Caryer reported:

**11.1 SAVID** There have been recent discussion in SAVID on what its role is going forward and a strategy review was held last week. The results of this review will be discussed at the SAVID AGM and meeting, to be held in the Parish Rooms Grundisburgh, commencing at 7.30pm on 14th November. Members of the Parish Council are invited to attend.

**11.2 Speeding in Grundisburgh** Two main initiatives are underway, one to enable a Speed Indicator Device (SID) to be located in the village, the other to re-establish a Speedwatch Team (use of handheld speed gun).

*Speed Indicator Device (SID)*

Grundisburgh will have shared access to a SID which is due to be acquired by SAVID, funded by County Councillor Robin Vickery's Locality Budget.

Grundisburgh also has shared access to a SID held by Suffolk Police which was purchased by the 12PT (Twelve Parishes Together) which Grundisburgh was a member. Unfortunately, the Police have taken the SID out of action as 5 other SIDs within the general Woodbridge area have been damaged by a motorcyclist. One SID was struck with a blunt instrument destroying it, and the others had the backs forced open, and the batteries and wires were ripped out and stolen.

*Actions taken to date:*

- Currently 15 volunteers have been identified to manage signs
- Support has been obtained from Mr.Vickery
- Identification of possible SID locations is being finalised (for assessment by Suffolk County Council).
- A letter to check that residents in the vicinity of proposed SID locations have no objections has been distributed. 74 letters were sent out.
- A request for assessment of our proposed locations from Suffolk County Council is awaiting feedback from residents (point 4 above).

## ***Roads & Transport Report cont...***

### ***Speedwatch***

The Speed Watch Team will, following training, monitor and record traffic speed using a hand-held speed gun. The aim is not to catch as many speeding drivers as possible but to reduce speed in areas of concern. For more details see <https://suffolkroadsafe.com/speeding/community-speedwatch>

### ***Actions taken to date:***

Currently 8 volunteers have been identified to join the team and a meeting with the Suffolk Police's Community Speedwatch Team has been arranged for 7.30pm on 28<sup>th</sup> November. Parish Councillors are invited to the meeting.

**11.3 Street Name Plates** The Clerk reported that he had Emailed Norse Suffolk Coastal Norse on the 25<sup>th</sup> July with reminders sent on the 10<sup>th</sup> September and the 12<sup>th</sup> October reporting that there are several streets/roads in Grundisburgh which have no name plates which presents difficulties for visitors and delivery vans to find them. The following have been identified the following: Elm Tree Farm Lane, Wood Farm Lane, Gull Lane, Gull Corner, Charity Lane, Otley Road, Woodbridge Road, The Street. In addition, the Clerk had discovered two ancient post cards showing long lost and forgotten names, Sandy Lane & Sandy Walk, for the lane running past the old school, church and through the parish rooms ford. It would be great if those names could be restored. He attached copies of the post cards. The Clerk asked for street name plates to be installed at these locations. A response is still awaited.

**11.4 Telephone Kiosk Village Green** BT has painted the Telephone Kiosk

**11.5 Speed Limits in Culpho** The Clerk has asked County Councillor Robin Vickery to forward the request made at the previous meeting, see Item 10.2, in which Mr.Lapsley requested that County Council Highways should be asked to carry out a traffic survey with the intention of extending the limit from Tuddenham to Little Thatch. .

**11.6 Driftway** Mr.Dunnett asked the Clerk to identify the owner who has responsibility for the condition of the road between St.Mary's Church and the Old School.

### **11.7 Other Highway issues reported to County Council Highways**

Report reference numbers: 00221377

GRUNDISBURGH ROAD, CULPHO

Date reported: 11/09/2018

Description: This problem was reported on the 13th August 218969 and 219075 - one even included a video. No action has been taken. Heavy rain floods the road. Drivers coming around the corner see it too late and either brake or swerve. Pedestrians can only pass by walking in the middle of the road. You would get totally soaked if you walked on the headland & a vehicle came through.

#### ***County Council Highways response***

Following your recent report, we are pleased to confirm that work will be carried out to rectify the issue that you raised with us within approximately 20 working days.

Report reference number: 00221547

THE STREET, GRUNDISBURGH

Date reported: 13/09/2018 Date response received 20/09/2018

Description: Infilled and resurfaced trench across the road is deteriorating badly and sinking and needs repairing

#### ***County Council Highways response***

One of our officers has visited and assessed the defect at the location you reported. We believe that at this time the defect does not warrant remedial action; however, we will continue to monitor the location as part of our routine inspections, and if the matter worsens significantly we will take action

***Roads & Transport Report cont...***

Report reference number: 00221549

STONEY ROAD, GRUNDISBURGH

Date reported: 13/09/2018 Date response received 20/09/2018

Description: Potholes need repair

*County Council Highways response*

Following your recent report, we are pleased to confirm that work will be carried out to rectify the issue that you raised with us within approximately 14 calendar weeks.

Report reference number: 00221923

LOWER ROAD, GRUNDISBURGH

Date reported: 18/09/2018 Date response received: 27/09/2018

Description: Verges are overgrown reducing visibility. This report is submitted at the request of Councillor John Dunnett who maintains that land on the crossroads was donated to the County Council to ensure that it would be kept clear of vegetation.

*County Council Highways response*

One of our officers has visited and assessed the defect at the location you reported. We believe that at this time the defect does not warrant remedial action; however, we will continue to monitor the location as part of our routine inspections, and if the matter worsens significantly we will take action.

Report reference number: 00222127

FELGATE WAY, GRUNDISBURGH

Date reported: 20/09/2018 Date response received: 27/09/2018

Description: The verges on the north and south sides of the entrance to Felgate Way seem to have been missed on the County Council's verge cutting programme and are now grossly overgrown.

*County Council Highways response*

Following your recent report, we are pleased to confirm that work will be carried out to rectify the issue that you raised with us within approximately 14 calendar weeks. Work has been carried out

Report reference number: 00222769

STONEY ROAD, GRUNDISBURGH - Footpath over Parish Rooms Ford Bridge

Date reported: 28/09/2018

Description: Footpath is badly worn and in a dangerous condition

*County Council Highways response*

Following your recent report, we are pleased to confirm that work will be carried out to rectify the issue that you raised with us within approximately 20 working days.

**12. Footpaths & Environment Report** Mr.Caryer reported:

- The minutes of a meeting of the Footpaths and Environment Committee held on the 8<sup>th</sup> October, 2018 had been distributed to councillors.
- Mr,Robin Gurdon is arranging for the new village hall site weeds to be cut.
- The Christmas Walk to Mr & Mrs.Hill's home at "Chiltern Ross", Hasketon will take place on the 18<sup>th</sup> December.

**13. Reports from Council representatives to other Organisations**

**13.1 Village Hall** Mr.Higgins report of a meeting of the Village Hall Management Committee held on the 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2018 had been distributed to councillors and is appended to these minutes – Appendix "A".

**13.2 SALC** Mr.Barnett reported that minutes of a recent meeting of the Suffolk Coastal Area Meeting had been circulated to members.

**Reports from Council representatives to other Organisations cont...**

**13.3 Playingfield** Mr Caryer reported:

- Secretary There is a vacancy for a secretary as the current secretary (Ian McIvor) is moving away from the area. A new secretary will be required.
- Booking secretary Mrs Garrod announced her intention to retire as Booking Clerk in April 2019. She has been doing the role for a long time and has found it more stressful and a hassle recently with the attitude of some users and the need to clean up after some of them. A new booking secretary will be required.
- Play Area The Play Equipment has been inspected, nothing serious was found and several items will be addressed with the removal of the fence and gate. There is nothing requiring immediate attention but, due to wear, the rubberised surfaces around play equipment will need to be replaced with new rubber or changed to a different surface.
- Joy Riders There has been a problem with joy riders over the summer at strange times of night. This had been reported by neighbours. The Chairman had spoken to the Police who said that residents should call 101 and provide details.
- Dogs There has been a problem with dogs defecating on the field. No dogs are allowed by Fields in Trust.
- Finance No major issues - Currently income is slightly above budget, but expenditure is about on budget.
- Maintenance The exterior maintenance plan is nearly complete. The floodlight poles at the ends of the Pavilion needed painting as well as the barrier now it has been repaired. The two new doors will be given an extra coat of wood stain.
- Interior maintenance It was agreed that the ceiling in the Away Changing Room needed cleaning to remove the mould and repainting. It was also agreed that another extractor fan should be installed with a timer and linked to the light switch as the present one needs to be turned on independent of lights or showers.

**14. Items for next meeting**

Annual Parish Meeting Because of the District & Parish Council Elections will be held on Thursday 2nd May 2019 the 2019 Annual Parish Meeting must be held between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> May.

**15. Public Open Forum** It was proposed by Mr. Barnett seconded by Mrs. Willetts, to unanimous approval, that the formal meeting be suspended, and members of the public invited to address the meeting.

The following issues were raised:

- Hill House, Woodbridge Road was suggested as a SID site
- The owner of the Olde Forge Stores forecourt is contemplating erecting a notice notifying residents that they use the forecourt at their own risk.
- The Village Hall Management Committee were urged to get on with the building of a new hall and should improve its communications with residents.

**16 Any other business**

**16.1 Christmas Tree** Mrs. Bignell agreed to arrange for a Christmas Tree to be erected on the Village Green

**16.2 Café 66** A sell out Magic Show was held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October and a Christmas Fair will be held on the 5<sup>th</sup> December in the Village Hall.

**16.3 Outstanding Issues** The Clerk will maintain a list of Outstanding Issues

**16.4 2019 Council Meetings** January 14, March 11, May 13, July 8, September 9, November 11

All meetings to be held in the Parish Rooms except for the July meeting which will be held in St. Botolph's Church, Culpho

**Action Summary**

- |                           |            |
|---------------------------|------------|
| 7. Clerk                  | 11. Clerk  |
| 8. Clerk                  | 11.6 Clerk |
| 9.9 Finance Sub Committee |            |

## Appendix “A”

### Report for Parish Council: re Summary of Village Hall Management Committee Meeting dated 25/10/18

#### Present:

J Bignell-Pepper, R Pepper, P Kendall, M Sandford, A Willetts, P Bailey, D Higgins, T Kearney (later)

#### Also attending:

B Laxton, P Dring (Castons), A Wilkinson (KLH Architects), D Scrivener (Ensors) for main agenda item

#### Summary of Discussions:

- Discussions were largely concerned with a summary and explanation of the initial Report and Review of the GVH project undertaken by BL who had previously committed to publish the full report to the PC by the beginning of November.
- Since I understand BL will be repeating this process for the next PC Mtg scheduled for 12<sup>th</sup> November, and I don't wish to steal his thunder, there seems little purpose in telling you now what he will most likely say at that meeting, assuming that it is more or less the same. However, if you would like an earlier opportunity to read the report in full in order to better formulate your preliminary thoughts, then I will be happy to forward it by email upon request.
- Suffice for now to say that the report was largely endorsed by the VHMC, nevertheless there were some salient points that arose in discussions as follows:
- BL's starting point was that Grundisburgh 'deserved' a new village hall and that a significant proportion of the community had 'voted' in favour of the idea in the past. He also emphasised that from his perspective nothing was set in stone and that all aspects of the project needed to be reviewed including communication and community involvement.
- BL had been active in validating and identifying both existing and new professional expertise to contribute their skills and knowledge to the NVH project. [*There seemed to be an implication that this group of advisers, comprising Messrs Dring, Wilkinson, Scrivener and Whittingham would form BL's review team and have responsibility primarily to him and perhaps a semi-detached relationship with the existing NVH Steering Group*].
- BL proposed several additional initiatives as set out in his report recommendations to the VHMC as follows
- A building survey of the existing hall had already taken place and his report contains a brief summary of its findings. No previous report had been commissioned by the VHMC.
- The registration of the existing village hall with the Land Registry and other associated work to straighten out other potential difficulties that might otherwise hinder the conveyance process
- There was some difference of opinion between JB and BL concerning the planning constraint on the demolition of the OVH prior to the completion of the NVH – previously recommended by the Chair of the Trustees to SCDC – which represented a considerable handicap in progressing the sale of the OVH at an optimum price. BL recommended that the VHMC should now seek to have this self-imposed condition
- removed or, at the very least, relaxed. It was agreed that this discussion would continue outside the confines of the meeting between JB and BL.
- The identification of potential sources of grants would become the responsibility of a small working party led by DS to identify third party finance options since little progress had been made to date in obtaining additional finance for the project.
- It was not clear what the cost of this additional /greater involvement on the part of Castons, KLH, Ensors and Ashtons would be. [*BL seemed to be leading the negotiation of fees with these advisor's firms*]. The implicit assumption was that the value of their contributions would exceed the expense of their professional fees.

**Appendix "A" cont...**

Other general discussions:

- RP advised the meeting that the charity trustees were in discussions with Birketts to alter the existing status of the GVH charity from unincorporated to incorporated in the interests of obtaining a limited liability protection for the Trustees
- *[In effect this would appear to entail the transfer of the deeds of the two village hall sites and buildings to a Charitable Incorporated Organisation, away from the existing unincorporated charity. Whether this potential change alters the responsibility or standing of the PC as custodian trustee clearly needs to be clarified and the consequences considered by the PC; for instance as to whether this change is in the best interests of the beneficiaries ie. the community as a whole]*
- JB had asked Lord Cranworth to be a sponsor of the NVH project, but he had declined this 'invitation'.
- The current balance of income/expenditure to end of September 2018 shows the following:

	<b>Income</b>		<b>Expenditure</b>		<b>Profit/Loss</b>	
	<u>2017/18</u>	<u>2018/19</u>	<u>2017/18</u>	<u>2018/19</u>	<u>2017/18</u>	<u>2018/19</u>
<b><u>OVH</u></b>	4801.00	3402.00	6733.27	4451.26	-1932.27	-1049.26
<b><u>NVH</u></b>	419.90	7501.65	4629.65	4074.24	-4209.75	3427.41

- The potential for increasing rental fees was discussed, but any decision was deferred until the new financial year.

NB. price increases have only been applied in the last five years. MS confirmed that there appeared to be steady demand for the hire of the hall. RP commented that there was much price undercutting between halls in the vicinity of Grundisburgh.

DMH  
31/10/18