

GRUNDISBURGH & CULPHO PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING 8TH JULY 2019

Notices had been posted according to regulations.

Present:

Messrs. S.Barnett (SB), C.Burch (CB), J.Dunnett (JD), P.Franklin (PF), G.Caryer (GC), D.Higgins (DH), P.Kendall (PK), R.Youngman (RY), Mrs.J.Bignell (JB), Mrs.A.Willetts (AW), Mr J Lapsley (JL).

In Attendance: Mr C Hedgley (CH) District Councillor, Mr PJS Knights (PJSK) Clerk, 9 members of the public.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies received from Mr Robin Vickery, County Councillor

2. To receive member's declarations of interest

Non-pecuniary interests were declared in Grundisburgh Village Hall by PK, JB, AW & DH. JD declared an interest in the Millennium Meadow in respect for his personal expenses claim for fuel reimbursement for equipment used to maintain the meadow.

3. Minutes - To approve the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council held on the 13th May, 2019, and matters arising

CH noted as a matter of accuracy that his apologies were tendered for the meeting of 13 May.

The minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 13th May had been circulated and were therefore taken as read. It was proposed by DH and seconded by AW, that these minutes be signed by the Chairman as a true record. There were no matters arising.

4. Public Open Forum

JB proposed that Standing Orders be suspended to facilitate the Public Open Forum, and AW seconded the proposal.

John Fleet, of Westholme, the Green, stated that he currently has no option other than to park his car on the grass at Weir Pond overnight whilst work is being undertaken at his house, because his garage is too small. Mr Fleet said that as soon as works are completed, he will park his car on his property. JD stated that he did not wish a precedent to be made for permanent parking on the grass.

Mrs Katherine Smith, of Willow Cottage, The Green, wished it to be known that she has a legal right of way to access the drain that runs through her garden for the purposes of maintenance.

Mrs Pauline Coomber wished to bring to the attention of CH the state of disrepair of the pavement fronting her bungalow at 6 Ipswich Road. Mrs Coomber had previously brought this matter to the attention of Mr T Fryatt (District councillor), and Mr Robin Vickery (County Councillor). Mr Hedgley undertook to follow this up on behalf of Mrs Coomber.

Mrs Pat Ross of 3 Post Mills Crescent brought to the attention of the meeting the problems being caused by development at the neighbouring property to hers, 5 Post Mill Crescent. The driveway is dug up, fencing has been erected which impedes access, and water is entering her garage as the adjoining garage has been demolished. The question of the development at No: 5 is a matter of considerable concern to the Parish Council and has been raised in a letter of complaint to the Planning Department. Mrs Ross also noted that there is a silting problem with the village green. Clerk to follow this up.

Chris Dennis Suggested that the Parish Council might make a contribution towards the repair of the parking area in front of Forge Stores. The owner of the shop has laid an amount of concrete in an attempt to repair it. The

Parish Council has an earmarked reserve of £1,500 for this purpose. JD suggested that part of our CIL funds might be used for this purpose. PJSK cautioned that spending public funds to effect a repair to private property used by a commercial business might be beyond the legal powers of the Parish Council and might be open to challenge. GC reported that he has attempted to get a Groundsworking Specialist to look at the problem but to date this has not happened. RY suggested that part of the problem was caused by poor drainage. In conclusion PK asked that GC has a professional survey the site and provide an approximate costing for repairs, which will enable consideration of whether a long-term repair is feasible, and how it should be paid for.

Mr Nick Green of Hasketon enquired why is Mr Robin Vickery (County Councillor) pro the Ipswich Northern Relief Road proposal and does the Parish Council have a view or policy regarding this issue. PK stated that the Northern Relief Road consultation timetable has only very recently been announced, and that a public consultation meeting was to take place the next evening (9 July) in Grundisburgh Village Hall. Therefore, the Parish Council has not had sufficient time to consider that matter but will formulate a view on the matter after this meeting.

Mr Bryan Laxton presented an update regarding the New Village Hall Steering Committee (Appendix B)

The report is self-explanatory, and updates the community with progress with fund raising, the launch of the upgraded website and social media campaign via Facebook, and compiling the business case for The Big Lottery.

It is with regard to The Big Lottery business case, which is a detailed and complex process, that the main contention arises. The Big Lottery fund has already flagged that the demolition clause which is a restrictive covenant which precluding the demolition of the old village hall until the new village hall is commissioned is a serious issue from the point of view of cash flow. The Steering Group and the Parish Council were of course fully aware of this issue. BL advised that he has entered into discussions with ESC regarding a revision to this clause by way of a compromise which would allow the old hall to be demolished once a contract to construct the new hall had been signed, i.e., the new hall would be within touching distance. BL asked that as many people as possible joined the New Village Hall Facebook page, which would enable everyone to be kept up to date with progress. BL stated that he hoped the Parish Council were happy with the general direction that the New Village Hall Steering Committee were following.

DH asked whether the Steering Committee would be publishing its correspondence with The Big Lottery on its website. BL advised they would not as the matter was under current negotiation, and that the Steering Committee would not wish to show "all its hands". JL, AW, & JB advised that it was not appropriate that the Parish Council requests this level of information as it was a matter for the Steering Group and the VHMC to determine.

Mr Will Barber wished it to be known that the Steering Group and Village Hall Management Committee are always open and transparent.

RY mentioned that the new village hall used to be a standing agenda item, and it was agreed that when the Steering Group have something to report then it will be an agenda item. The Steering Group via BL will always be invited to submit a report to our agendas.

Mr Will Barber announced that the 1st Grundisburgh Cycle Ride takes place on 11th August and it would be appreciated if everyone would support it. Maps are available on the village hall website. Mr Barber asked whether the organisers could use the village green for erecting a first aid tent and other recreational facilities for the event which was agreed. Additionally, the event will need some volunteers to register riders and sell tickets on the day.

The Open Public Forum was closed by PK and Standing Orders were re-instated.

5. County Councillors Report

None received.

6. District Councillor's Report

CH presented his report – Appendix C.

CH spoke regarding the proposed Northern Relief Road which he is opposed to in view of the irreparable damage it would cause to our environment and rural village life. The case for developing it has not been proven, and other alternative proposals have not been adequately evaluated. There is nothing in the proposals which demonstrate how our villages will be protected. CH has met with our local MP who also opposes the proposals, and it has been agreed that a fighting fund will be established to finance an opposition communications plan, a website, and to pump-prime opposition activity. Potentially, a judicial review of the consultation process could be requested as the consultation period is taking place at short notice over the main holiday period, ending in early September. Therefore, an extension to the consultation period is being requested. The first consultation meeting is taking place on 9th July at Grundisburgh Village Hall – CH asked that as many of us as possible attend and question the panel.

7. Resolution: Mr. P Franklin proposes that the Parish Council purchases a battery powered strimmer for maintaining public areas in the community, maximum cost £300. Seconded by Mr G Caryer.

PF confirmed that he would ensure all volunteer users would be given instruction in responsible and safe operation of the strimmer and would be given all appropriate tools to work with the strimmer safely, such as high vis jackets if working near the highway. Electric trimmers are easier to use than petrol ones, are easier to maintain, and less noisy. PF undertook to store the strimmer and keep a log of usage.

Resolution carried by a majority vote.

8. Resolution: Mr P Kendall proposes that the Parish Council purchases a new accounting package, Scribe, at a current annual subscription of £257 net of vat. PJSK reported that the current legacy system dates back to 2003, is out of date, and unsupported. The transfer of the financial records from the previous clerk's computer has been achieved by purchasing JioSoft Money Manager, which is compatible with the legacy program, Quicken. However, it will not perform all required functions such as budgets, bank reconciliations, and requires significant manual intervention.

JD stated that he thought this was very expensive for an accounting package. PJSK advised that at approximately £5 a week he thought it very good value in view of the efficiency and productivity the system would deliver. PF asked whether the PC would be tied in on a contract. PJSK advised that it is an annual subscription which does not have to be renewed.

Carried by a majority vote (JD abstained and asked for a review in a years' time)

9. Annual Parish Meeting

PK gave a verbal report on the Annual Parish meeting. PK advised that JD had written to him and given him some useful feedback – such as the slide shows were irritating, and he appreciated the generosity of the Youngman family for providing the catering. JD noted that PK had not given him the benefit of a reply to his letter. PK apologised, and verbally acknowledged JD's letter and contents, but corrected JD however on the matter of the catering which the Parish Council paid Barn Café to provide.

Reports were given by a number of organisations such as the Women's Institute, the Scouts, and G.A.D.s

It was agreed that the next Annual Parish Meeting should have definite agreed aims and objectives

PK undertook to write a minute for the meeting.

10. Financial Matters

Letters of thanks

Disabilty Advice Service (East Suffolk), Suffolk Family Carers, East Anglian Air Ambulance, Citizens Advice

Ipswich, Grundisburgh Baptist Chapel, Grundisburgh Youth Club, Suffolk Accident Rescue Service, Lighthouse Women's Aid.

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

Payee	Amount	Reason
Citizens Advice Bureau	£50.00	Donation
Disability Advice Service	£50.00	Donation
East Anglian Air Ambulance	£100.00	Donation
Lighthouse	£25.00	Donation
Suffolk Accident Rescue Service	£100.00	Donation
Fynn Lark News	£100.00	St. Botolph's Benefice Magazine
Suffolk Family Carers	£25.00	Donation
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	£60.00	Donation
St.Botolph's PCC	£195.00	Grant towards cost of maintaining church yard
St.Mary's PCC	£640.00	Grant towards cost of maintaining church yard
Grundisburgh Baptist Church	£195.00	Grant towards cost of maintaining church yard
Youth Club	£600.00	Grant
SALC	£525.34	2019/2020 Subscription
Suffolk Coastal Norse	£57.70	Trade refuse collection – St.Mary's Church
Glasdon UK Limited	£131.38	Litter bin – Basket Makers Corner
Mr.R.Fletcher	£160.00	Village Green Grass Cutting April
Parish Rooms	£72.00	Room Hire from 05/11/18 – 18/04/19
Mr.J.Ager	£515.20	Clerk's Salary April/May 2019
	£97.94	Clerk's Expenses April/May 2019
	£96.00	Clerk's Office Allowance April-May 2019
	£11.37	A4 paper & C5 envelopes
Vertas Group Ltd	£206.39	Playing Field grass cutting 01/04/2019 – 30/06/2019
Wescotec Ltd	£4,140.00	S.I.D. Purchased on behalf of SAVID, funded by Robin Vickery's locality budget

It was proposed by GC and seconded by SB that these payments be ratified.

Other payments requiring approval

Payee	Amount	Reason
Campaign to Protect Rural England	£36.00	Subscription
Barn Cafe	£253.14	Catering Annual Parish Meeting
Grundisburgh Village Hall Management Committee	£25.00	Hall Hire, Annual Parish Meeting
Mr John Dunnett	£13.98	Millenium Meadow – petrol for grass cutting
Mr Robert Crouch	£10.54	Padlocks for S.I.D.
Robert Fletcher	£320.00	Grass Cutting
Mr P. Knights	£71.27	Clerks Expenses – Printer Cartridge (£21.64), Postage Stamps (£14.64), JioSoft (£34.99)
Mr P Knights	£740.52	Clerks Salary May, June, July
HMRC	£128.80	PAYE Clerk's Salary

It was proposed by SB and seconded by AW that these payments be made.

Budget Report

Account	Balance
Business Tracker Account	£62.52
Current Account	£17,231.15
Post Office Investment Account	£21,053.28
VAT to claim	£781.33
TOTAL	£39,128.28

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The Parish Council have received the following CIL payments

25/10/2017	Old House, Half Moon Lane	£102.17
25/04/2018	Old House, Half Moon Lane	£102.17
26/10/2018	Old House, Half Moon Lane	£105.26
03/05/2018	land adjacent 5 Post Mill Crescent	£622.43
TOTAL		£932.03

Future expected receipts

30/09/2019	land adjacent 5 Post Mill Crescent	£622.43
30/03/2020	land adjacent 5 Post Mill Crescent	£641.30

An Annual Report must be published by Parish/Town Councils that have received a proportion of the CIL funds by 31st December for the previous financial year (i.e. neighbourhood funding received in April and October 2019 must be reported in the 2019-2020 report by 31st December 2019) This report must be published on the Parish Council's Web Site.

The Parish Council must use CIL receipts passed to it for

- (a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure or
- (b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area

The question of whether CIL could be used to pay for the trimmer or to clear the silt in the stream. The trimmer would not qualify as infrastructure and we have sufficient general reserves for that purpose. DH wondered whether CIL could be used to ameliorate the negative affect that recent planning decisions have had on residents.

Bank Account Signatories

PK has completed the bank forms and has sent these back to the mandate team so hopefully he will be confirmed as a signatory shortly.

National Savings Account

National Savings have requested all current signatories complete a new account mandate with up to date information. PJSK will ask current signatories to complete their details as requested.

11. Membership of Staff Committee (Carried forward from Annual Meeting)

SB proposed that PK be added to the Staff Committee, and JD seconded the proposal. The Staff Committee now comprises AW, JL and PK.

12. Parking on grass at Weir Pond (Carried forward from Annual Meeting)

Matter raised by JD. JD stated that he could accept parking of one vehicle on the grass for a limited time only. JD happy to discuss this with the landlord.

13. Planning Report – See appendix “A”

AW provided a full report (Appendix A)

AW expressed concern of the lopping of trees subject to TPOs at the Highbank site. In essence ESC have given

permission for dwellings whose dimensions will not fit the site without the lopping of the trees. There is not much we can do except keep complaining but there is a growing sense of impotence regarding planning breaches and ESC.

Regarding the proposed development within the Local Plan at the Chapel Field Site, ESC needs to demonstrate they have addressed each and every one of their own planning criteria for the site, and the Parish Council will hold them to account to demonstrate that they have done this.

AW has read all comments submitted by our residents via the planning portal regarding the Local Plan and the Chapel Field site, of which there has been a good number, all of which have opposed the proposed development except for one.

AW advised she was extremely disappointed to find that JD had submitted comments in support of the development. JD's comments which can be viewed on line read:

"I Have been a resident of Grundisburgh for 78 years and an "elected" parish councillor for 59 years. I have always been of the opinion that Chapel Field is the place for development (not Top field – the Hopkins estate)".

AW opined that it was important to recognise that JD does of course have the right to register his own opinion, but that it was misguided for him to infer his opinion was submitted as a parish councillor. His views on the matter are diametrically opposite to that of the Parish Council and indeed the vast majority of residents he serves as a councillor.

Additionally, JD had uploaded the Chapel Field flyer circulated to residents earlier in the year to the ESC portal in PDF format. It was therefore noted, that despite JD's claims to the contrary, that he does have access to a computer.

JD apologised to the Parish Council for his actions in this regard.

The demolition clause of the old village hall came under discussion, and the question of potentially changing the clause to the compromise position of allowing demolition on signed construction contracts for the new village hall. The Village Hall Management Committee will need to submit a planning application for the alteration of this clause in the usual way.

JB advised that she thought there would be a danger that some regular users of the hall, such as GADs might drift away if there was a period when no hall at all was available. JB was of the opinion that interim arrangements such as use of the School Hall would not be acceptable to GADs

14. Road and Transport Report

GC advised that the S.I.D. is now fully deployed and collecting data which will be fed to the Police Authority.

15. Footpath and Environment report

Nothing to report other than a quotation is being sought for the maintenance of our benches. Some may need replacing if they are too far gone.

16. Passing Bays installed during EA ONE enabling works

Correspondence received from Scottish Power to the effect that the passing bays have been completed to a permanent standard and the Highways Agency is considering adopting them on completion of the project. The views of local Parish Councils are being sought prior to making a final decision on the matter. After discussion it was agreed by a majority vote (7 for) that PJSK would reply to confirm we are happy for them to be adopted but that we would prefer for the passing-place signs to be removed as they are out of character with the rural environment and could attract the unwanted attention of fly-tippers.

17. Future of Save our Rural Roads Campaign (SORR)

Correspondence received from Tony Fryatt regarding possible disbandment of the initiative and distribution of residual funds held back to the participating Parish's. Our views are sought. A majority vote (7 for, GC abstained) confirmed PJSK would reply confirming we wished for SORR to be wound-up, and residual funds distributed back to members.

18. To Receive from Council Representatives to other organisations

SALC – SB advised the new Chairman wants to merge ES and Waveney. This could lead to a split location of meetings.

SAVID – GC confirmed S.I.D. is operational and gathering data which will be fed back to the Police and Local Authority.

VHMC – DH confirmed that there had not been a meeting for two months and that there had not been a review of hire pricing.

19. Public Open Forum

PK suspended standing orders and opened the Public Open Forum.

Chris Denny – would like access to all papers before a meeting. PJSK said that provided he had all papers to hand 10 days before a meeting he would be happy to email them to any resident who requested them.

Alan Walters – Could Councillors please speak up during our meetings as it is difficult to hear them.

Pat Ross thanked the Parish Council for supporting the Duck Race, it was a great success and significant funds were raised.

Brian Laxton – New Village Hall Steering Group. Brian asked whether, if the Parish Council was asked by The Big Lottery or VHMC for a letter of support whether the Parish Council could agree now that it would write such a letter, as this would save time in waiting for a subsequent meeting to discuss and agree the matter. Unfortunately, councillors felt unable to agree to this as the proposal is precluded by virtue of Standing Orders which will only allow business to be conducted by way of resolutions submitted to the agenda. It was agreed that the VHMC would write formally to PK asking for a letter of support and that the request would be dealt with according to standing orders.

John Fleet – regarding parking at Weir Pond, Mr Fleet requested a period of 12 months grace to resolve the issue and asked that his landlord not be involved. Agreed.

PK closed the open forum and standing orders were re-instated.

20. Any Other Business

Ablitts Meadow – We have been asked by English Rural Housing association whether we will be prepared to advertise the sale of a shared ownership property in Ablitts Meadow – agreed. PJSK to action.

2019 Council Meetings

September 9, November 11, all meetings to be held in the Parish Rooms.

21. Items for next meeting

- The Ditch at Meeting Lane / Orchard End
- Tree at Littleton Meadow

22. Co-option of two councillors to represent Grundisburgh (closed session)

Agreed that two vacancies will be informally advertised. PJSK to action.

Action Log:

Item 8 – Stream (PJSK)

Item 9 – Produce minutes of Annual Parish Meeting (PK)

Item 10 – National Savings signatories details (PJSK)

Item 16 – Passing Bays (PJSK)

Item 17 – SORR (PJSK)

Item 20 – Ablitts Meadow (PJSK)

Meeting closed 10:30pm

APPENDIX A

Planning Report July 8th 2019

Application approved by SCDC since last Parish Council meeting

DC/19/0869/FUL Newlands Otley Road Grundisburgh Suffolk IP13 6RY

Two log cabins for holiday rental .

DC/19/1535/VOC Land to The Rear Of Highbank

Variation of Condition 2 off DC/14/3465/FUL Erection of three detached dwellings and associated garages land rear of Highbank Grundisburgh. Yet another application on this site.

This time for extensions to properties 1&3

David H expressed concerns about the amount of work being carried out on the TPO trees on this site. I phoned Nick Newton(NN) Arboriculture and Landscape Manager ES he said he would try to visit the site. I spoke to Kevin Muttitt who visited the site that evening and was concerned about the amount of equipment stored under the trees including cement which was covering the ground and tree trunks. Kevin sent photographs to NN. Derek Cole & DH phoned me on 18th June worried about the chainsaw activity on the site. Once again I got in touch with NN he said he would try to phone the builder to see if he was complying with their agreement, but rather tellingly he said 'He can't get access because of the trees to build what he has permission for'.

This is condition 5 of the planning permission. The phased scheme of protective fencing shall be implemented in accordance with Drawing No LSDP 10900.01 Rev F; received 10 March 2017. At no time during the development shall there be any materials, plant or equipment stored, or building or excavation works of any kind undertaken, beneath the canopies of the trees and hedges. All fencing shall be retained and maintained until the development is complete. Reason: To protect the trees/hedgerow during the course of development in the interest of visual amenity.

DC/19/1483/FUL Churchill Meeting Lane Grundisburgh IP13 6UB

Erection of single storey rear extension

DC/19/1632/FUL 16 Playford Corner Culpho Suffolk IP6 9DL

The construction of a single storey kitchen extension to the rear of the property.

DC/19/1786/FUL 46 Orchard End

Single storey extension to south of side of property. Erection of new porch, repositioning of conservatory to rear of property.

DC/19/1536/PNH 19 Orchard End Grundisburgh Woodbridge Suffolk IP136UA

Prior Notification (Householder) - Construction of a rear extension

DC/19/1360/DRC Outbuilding At 3 Pine Grove Lower Road Grundisburgh Discharge of condition(s) No 2 & 3 on DC/17/1031/ARM Approval of Reserved matters of

DC/15/0469/OUT Demolition of existing outbuilding + erection of detached dwelling - approval of details in respect of layout, scale, landscaping, appearance & Access.

DC/15/0469/OUT was refused by SCDC April 2015 but was allowed on appeal with conditions

This was an application that PC objected to as the site was some distance from the physical limits boundary.

Applications withdrawn

DC/19/1155/FUL The Granary Rookery Farm Otley Road Grundisburgh Woodbridge Suffolk

Proposed Cart Lodge and change of use from agricultural land to residential.

Applications received since last the Parish Council Meeting

DC/19/2376/TCA Old School The Green Grundisburgh Woodbridge Suffolk IP13 6NF
Proposal T1 Horse Chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*)- to re-pollard back to established (previous) pollard points, leaving furnishing growth, final height of approximately 6m (in height) After consultation with Kevin Muttitt Planning committee sent comment below Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council supports the above application to re-pollard Horse Chestnut T1. The Tree is a very important feature in the Conservation Area in the historic centre of the village.

The Parish Tree Warden Kevin Muttitt has advised, after visiting the site that 'pollarding has been performed to a good standard over several cycles. This is the correct treatment for such a tree to maintain a safely managed crown in line with BS 3998 recommendations for tree work.'

DC/19/2511/TCA Parish Rooms , The Green Proposal Trees located to side of bridge at rear of PR carpark T1 Horse Chestnut – clear self set Ash and Elder beneath crown, remove epicormics growth, reduce crown off buildings, reduce height to 15m balance crown, (as advised by Kevin M)

DC/19/2591/TPO 3 Thomas Walls Close. G1 4no. Sycamore pollard to maintain suitable size and allow more light to garden. T1 Sycamore leaning tree with decay around first main union, Fell.

Letter of complaint

Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council (GPC) wish to make an official complaint to East Suffolk District Council about 3 decisions made by the Planning department in 2018.

The planning policies contained within the current Local Plan, used by the District Council to determine planning applications across the district, are subject to interpretation .

The interpretation of the policies used to approve the three applications listed below, totally lacked common sense and the normal use of the English language.

- 1) DC/17/5459/FUL Land adj 5 Post Mill Crescent. Proposed bungalow with garaging.
Approved at officer level 6th March 2018
- 2) DC/18/1636/FUL Land south of 24 Pound Cottages, Pound Corner, Ipswich Road / Park Road. Proposal: Erection of a detached dwelling and double carport.
Approved 23rd July 2018
- 3) DC/18/2286/FUL Builders Yard, Charles Avenue, Proposal: Erection of 4 dwellings.
Approved 27th September 2018

Three very different applications, but all had one thing in common: SCDC officers had the policies which should have been used to refuse the applications. The impact these decisions have had and will have on various residents of the village is quite unnecessary and the biggest problem of all is that the people have no appeal system. If developers and landowners, making the financial gain from these applications, had been refused permission they could have gone to the government inspectorate to appeal that decision so policies would have been tested. The man in the street and parish councils have no such opportunity to test the way policies are used and decisions made.

The Post Mill Crescent (PMC) application is the only one that has been started, but what a huge amount of unnecessary distress and disruption it has caused and is causing, particularly to the owners of 3 & 7 PMC.

The long term owner of 5PMC died; the property was eventually sold to a developer who divided the large corner plot and obtained permission to build another detached bungalow in the garden. The PC and neighbours objected on the grounds of Policy DM7 infilling and backland development which states: *'Proposals for the sub-division of plots to provide*

additional dwellings will be permitted provided that: (b) it would not result either in tandem or similar unsatisfactory types of backland development that would significantly reduce residential amenity, mainly as a result of increased noise and loss of privacy, or result in the erosion of the particular character of the surroundings'.

GPC objected as it was considered that the drive was too narrow to accommodate 2 properties. This has since been proved to be true in that a skip delivered to the site whilst the owner of 3 PMC was away could not be recovered without the cooperation of both the residents of 3 and 7 PMC. The site was then sold on at auction. The new owners have had to arrange with the landowner of Chapel Field to gain access via the rear of the site going over a Public Right of way. Two garages were demolished, part of the planning consent, and the contents left on site. The PC understands there is now a boundary dispute with the residents of 9 Red Barn Piece, the property to the east of the site. SCDC should have listened to GPC and suggested a large extension to no 5 as has happened in other parts of PMG instead of allowing the plot to be divided causing so much distress and ill will.

In the case of DC/18/1636/FUL Land south of 24 Pound Cottages, Pound Corner, Ipswich Road / Park Road. Proposal: Erection of a detached dwelling and double carport.

This site is outside, but adjacent to, the Physical Limits Boundary (PLB) of Grundisburgh, therefore policy DM4, Housing in Clusters in the Countryside, applies. DM4 defines a cluster in the countryside as containing 5 or more dwellings located no more than 150m from the edge of an existing settlement. There are only 3 dwellings within this distance, outside the physical limits boundary, i.e. Pound House, South View and Park View. Dwellings further along Park Road are outside the 150m limit (no footway). Houses the other side of the proposed site, along Ipswich Road, lie within the village boundary, and therefore cannot be counted as part of a cluster in the countryside as different policies apply. Hence there is no countryside cluster to which the site relates.

The officers report argued differently and did not follow common sense in that a policy called Housing in Clusters in the Countryside should mean just that.

Grundisburgh is a Key Service Centre and the site is within 150 metres of the settlement. There is a continuous line of dwellings adjacent Ipswich Road and Park Road, one which the site would fall within whereby it would constitute infilling. Objections from local residents and the Parish Council suggest the site does not fall within a cluster because - for it to be so - the 'cluster' would have to include dwellings already within the physical limits boundary. However, the policy does not preclude dwellings located within the settlement boundary contributing to make up a cluster. On this basis the dwellings at: Fair View; Fairlands; 24 and 25 Pound Cottages (all within the settlement boundary) are in a row adjacent and the application site forms an infill plot between these properties and the property to the south at Pound House (which is outside the settlement boundary). This is considered to make up a cluster in the context of policy DM4. Furthermore, when looking at what the policy is aiming to achieve, it is clear that the objective is to permit new housing within a small group of existing properties whereby it would relate well to a sustainable settlement. In this regard, the proposal accords with the objectives of policy DM4 and the principle of development is therefore acceptable.

The Parish Council would suggest that the officer is wrong in that by interpreting the aim of the policy *to permit new housing within a small group of existing properties whereby it would relate well to a sustainable settlement*, all that would happen is PLB would have no strength and creeping ribbon development according to the whim of landowners would take the place of planned development. This site is now for sale.

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

GPC and several parishioners objected to this resubmission of a previously refused application DC/17/1583/FUL. In the officers report to that initial application the following comments were made, which still apply to the 2018 application.

Although occupying a corner location, and noting that Alice Driver Way does contain two storey dwellings, 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 lays. Charles Avenue contains single storey not two storey dwellings.

Whilst government guidance talks of the need to secure efficient use of land, this should not be at the expense of poor design and poor relationship to the character of the area. The proposed plot sizes differ; considerably to those in the vicinity and this results in a poor layout out of character with the area. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF deals with this matter as does Policy DM21 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies) DPD

County Highways recommended to refuse the application due to inadequate parking stating
CONSULTATION RETURN DC/18/2286/FUL PROPOSAL: Erection of 4 dwellings
LOCATION: Builders Yard, Charles Avenue, Grundisburgh, IP13 6TH

Grundisburgh is classed as a sustainable location, so all dwellings should provide parking as recommended in Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2015) 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 on 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.

Mr Harry Grace Development Management Technician

The parking problems have not been addressed. Charles Avenue is the access to the Grundisburgh Doctors surgery; there is a lot of on street parking at surgery times. Alice Driver Road is the access to Grundisburgh Primary School. The catchment area includes Clopton so a bus attends the school twice a day as well as parents' cars.

All of the above decisions have caused residents and the Parish council of Grundisburgh to lose any faith they may have had in the ability of SCDC planning department to defend their village against unsuitable development. There is growing concern that the officers dealing with these decisions are not applying the impartiality their positions demand. The Local Plan must be interpreted using common sense and the English language not manipulated to satisfy developers and landowners out to make money at the expense of the environment and residents.

Letter of response from East Suffolk In black. My suggested response in red
by email to: grundisburghpc@outlook.com

Dear Mr Knights

Complaint reference CCCT121707928 - planning decisions in Grundisburgh and Culpho

Thank you for your letter referring to three planning applications granted planning permission in Grundisburgh in 2019. I am sorry that you feel you have to raise concern over these applications.

I will deal with these applications in turn:

DC/17/5459/FUL – Post Mill Crescent

The application as submitted sought planning permission for one detached bungalow. I note that the Parish Council consider that an extension to the host dwelling should have been considered as a preferential development, however, the Local Planning Authority is required to consider the acceptability, or otherwise, of the development proposed, not any alternative proposition, unless it is formally presented via an application.

In considering the application officers sought to balance all the correspondence received, and planning policies, which are positive and supportive of the development proposed. The concerns of the Parish Council, and some third parties, were appropriately balanced but in the view of the Council were not so significant or demonstrable when weighed against the policy support. I appreciate that the Parish Council take an alternative view on the policy position – unfortunately that is the nature of planning which can at times be subjective. However, officers considered this proposal in light of other applications and decisions elsewhere to ensure that a consistent application of policy ensues.

Local knowledge has not been taken into consideration and not been given the weight it deserves. It is very difficult to imagine how any planning officer visiting the site could have thought that 2 properties could use the single access.

The drive is too narrow to serve 2 properties that position is now proven. Nothing is happening on the site, the driveway is fenced off and the adjoining neighbours are left totally inconvenienced and



with an eyesore outside their front doors.

It is inevitable that there will be disruption during the construction phase – that is the case with all developments, big and small. In order to minimise disruption as far as possible Officers attached a Construction Management Plan as a condition. This in effect controls how the development takes place. We have not been alerted to any possible breach of the Plan and therefore assume that development is proceeding in compliance.

The officer report states 'As with any development, regardless of the scale, there will be some impacts as a result, although most of these will be temporary and during the

construction phase of the development. Given the small size of the proposed dwelling, it is not envisaged that the construction programme will be unduly long.

It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would not have an active street frontage, however that does not make the development unacceptable. The dwelling would front the access drive and this scenario is not overtly different to some other dwellings in the very close vicinity. It is not considered, with all other matters considered to be acceptable, that this would be a reason upon which the application could be refused and substantiated at appeal, especially given the clear steer to take a positive and speedy response to new residential development.'

There is not another property, accessed from the Post Mill Gardens an area of some 100 properties, that has a shared drive. That is why the Parish Council suggestion of an extension to the property was so relevant. The planning authority could/should have notified the applicant of their intention to refuse but stated favourable consideration would be given to an extension to the existing semidetached property.

The issues with regards to access and leaving of possessions, is not a matter which can be controlled by the Local Planning Authority and is a civil matter between the various parties affected.

Finally, in respect of this application, you refer to the inability of third parties to appeal the decision. This is true but is the case with planning statute and is not therefore only relevant to East Suffolk. Whilst the Council could have refused planning permission, and have the policies tested at appeal, in this instance it was concluded that the development was acceptable and therefore in accordance with policy was approved.

The total situation is a shambles caused by one unnecessary planning permission.

- a) 2 neighbours with a total shambles outside their properties
- b) 5PMC is vacant, it cannot be accessed other than on foot.
- c) if the driveway were resurfaced it would be impossible to access the parking area to 5PMC without trespassing onto 3PMC driveway.
- d) the site at the back is not big enough to build the bungalow that has been granted permission
- e) there is not room for any parking area let alone an area to manoeuvre a vehicle.
- f) there are 2 owners involved 5PMC semi bungalow owned by the original applicant and the site of the garden of 5PMC.

Because of the incompetence of SCDC planning officers there is little chance of the site being use for some considerable time so rather than gaining a dwelling the statics have lost a habitable bungalow and caused much disruption to the neighbours.

DC/18/1636/FUL – 24 Pound Cottages

This application, for one dwelling, was considered under the cluster policy (DM4) of the Local Plan and debated and considered by the Suffolk Coastal District Council Planning Committee. I recall that the Parish Council attended the meeting to address Members who therefore had due regard to the concerns raised. In addition, the consultation response from the Parish was included in the Committee report in full. I have reviewed the officer report and consider that it provides a detailed analysis of the proposal against the policy and found compliance. I appreciate that the Parish Council have taken an alternative view of the policy, however I do not believe that the incorrect decision has been reached in this instance and the development is policy compliant.

Grundisburgh Parish Council maintains that the officer's interpretation of DM4 Housing in Clusters in the Countryside was wrong and misled the planning committee. It did not follow the policy as below

Development Management Policy DM4 Housing in Clusters in the Countryside states *Proposals for new dwellings within 'clusters' will be acceptable, subject to satisfying the following criteria:*

- (a) The scale of development consists of infilling by one dwelling or a pair of semi-detached dwellings within a continuous built up frontage;*
- (b) It would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the cluster or any harmful visual intrusion into the surrounding landscape;*
- (c) Particular care will be exercised in sensitive locations such as conservation areas, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas; and*
- (d) The cumulative impact of proposals will be a major consideration.*

A 'cluster' in this context:

- Consists of a continuous line of existing dwellings or a close group of existing dwellings adjacent to an existing highway;*
- Contains 5 or more dwellings; and*
- Is located no more than 150 metres from the edge of an existing settlement identified as a Major Centre, Town, Key Service Centre or Local Service Centre. This distance may be extended to 300 metres if a footway* is present.*

The definition above is clear a cluster is located no more than 150 metres from the edge of an existing settlement. Nowhere does it state also within it.

The officers report stated *Objections from local residents and the Parish Council suggest the site does not fall within a cluster because - for it to be so - the 'cluster' would have to include dwellings already within the physical limits boundary. However, the policy does not preclude dwellings located within the settlement boundary contributing to make up a cluster. On this basis the dwellings at: Fair View; Fairlands; 24 and 25 Pound Cottages (all within the settlement boundary) are in a row adjacent and the application site forms an infill plot between these properties and the property to the south at Pound House (which is outside the settlement boundary).*

Policies that cover proposal within the PLB are completely different to those that cover applications in the countryside.

DC/18/2286/FUL – Builders Yard, Charles Avenue

The application approved followed an earlier scheme which was refused by officers under delegated powers for a number of reasons. Officers carefully considered the revised submission and determined that it was acceptable having due regard to all responses received and overcame the earlier reasons for refusal.

GPC does not consider that all SCDC's reasons for refusal of DC/17/1583/FUL at officer level in June 2017 have been addressed. The following reasons for refusal still applied to DC/18/2286/FUL

- a) No evidence has been supplied to demonstrate that there is no current or long term demand for all or part of the site for employment purposes. Furthermore, the proposal would not deliver any substantial planning benefit which would overcome the harm resulting from the loss of employment space. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies) DPD.*
- b) The proposed plot sizes differ considerably to those in the vicinity and this results in a poor layout out of character with the area. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF deals with this matter as does Policy DM21 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development*

Management Policies) DPDScale of the development of the site should take its steer from Charles Avenue as that's where the site's main frontage lays. Charles Avenue contains single storey not two storey dwellings.

- c) *By virtue of the set back of the proposed dwellings from the highway and the garage sizes, both falling below standards required by Suffolk County Council in their Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2015), the scheme does not make adequate on plot parking provision and therefore is likely to cause pressure on the highway to compensate for parking.*

The wider highway issues are acknowledged however it is not the role of this application to overcome existing problems and they are best resolved via discussions with the Highways Authority and subsequent investigation of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). The scheme though itself meets its own parking requirements.

GPC were not commenting on existing problems merely pointing out as County Highways had done that there was inadequate parking space for one modern car on the driveways of the proposed properties. There is often hazardous on street parking at busy surgery times this approval will only exacerbate the existing situation, on a road that is adjacent to the access to the village school.

I hope this provides clarification on those three decisions. The detailed reports that sit alongside these decisions are publically accessible and hopefully expand further. At times these decisions do run contrary to views of Parish Councils and local residents; however I am confident that all issues are carefully considered. I am sorry that you feel officers are not acting impartially, however I can assure you that my team carefully balance out all issues in reaching a decision and no decision is manipulated in favour of one particular party.

I am more than happy to offer any further clarification if required.

GPC considers that far too few applications are being seen by elected members therefore our influence at the local level is even less. Why is this?

What should I do if my complaint remains unresolved?

If you feel that we have not resolved your complaint then you can ask us to complete an internal

review (Stage 2 complaint) within 1 month of the date of this letter.

Please see our website <http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/contact-us/compliments-comments-andcomplaints/>

or phone us on the above number for more information about our complaints process.

How do I ask for my complaint to be reviewed?

You can reply by email to the address above, complete the online complaint form, phone, visit or write to us. Please see our contact webpage for details

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/contact-us

Let us know the reference number of your original complaint and why our reply does not resolve it.

If you want to raise new issues that you did not complain about originally, these will be treated as a new (Stage 1) complaint.

Yours sincerely,

Liz Beighton | Planning Development Manager

East Suffolk Council

Local Plan to be reported at the meeting.

APPENDIX B

Report from the VHMC Steering Group for the PC Meeting on 8th July

Introduction

We are pleased to announce that Elaine Beckett has joined the Steering Group. Elaine's energy together with her specialist skills in PR, Marketing and Communications will be very valuable to us in the next stages of this project. Due to pressures on his time, David Scrivener has reluctantly advised that he is unable to provide regular assistance to the steering group at this time. He remains committed to the project as a member of the community and is happy to help on specific matters whenever he can. I would like to thank David for his support so far and we look forward to his input from time to time in the future.

Upgraded website and social media

The new website is up and running and we believe it has been a success so far. Its arrival was announced via a leaflet drop as part of the Grundisburgh News distribution. Our Facebook page (Grundisburgh New Village Hall) now has 141 members and is linked to the website.

Big Lottery

I hope people will have seen that our application for £200,000 was given Stage 1 approval by the Big Lottery and we have now moved on to Stage 2 where we have some more detailed questions to answer. This is a huge leap forward for us and makes the prospect of a new hall something much more tangible and within our reach.

I am nervous to suggest that the first stage was the biggest hurdle, but certainly it was great to get the support in principle for a new hall.

Other Grants

We have set ourselves the increased target of raising £200,000 from various other grant applications. Gill Davies has kindly volunteered to work on this with us and has unearthed a further 20 or so entities to whom we can apply, taking our target to over 90 organisations.

This is a slow process as each application needs to be hand crafted and even with some standard documents, it takes a very long time to fill read each of the different instructions on each website and then fill out the various forms. If anyone would like to help with making these applications, the assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Match Funding

We have set ourselves the target of raising £100,000 from the match-funding initiative.

We have the match-funding programme up and running with the initial £50,000 of pledges and this is being used to encourage and match fund other donations made by other people. So far we believe we are close to £70,000 raised/pledged. This includes the two concerts by the Grundisburgh Symphony Orchestra as well as the Cake Stall on the Village Green on 16th March, which together

raised almost £1,500 and will be match funded to almost £3,000. The GADS play "Mightier than the Sword" raised £500 and will be match funded to £1,000. Well done to everyone at GADS for their generous donation.

There are other events planned such as a cake stall and display at the Village Show on 13th July, a village Family Cycle event on 11th August (Will Barber and Richard Pepper are organising this) and a supporters evening at The Dog. The Family Cycle event will be a very visible event which is aimed to not only attract a lot of participants, but also keep the issue of the fund raising for the new village hall very visible for the whole community.

Gift Aid

We have applied to HMRC in order to benefit from Gift Aid on many of the donations we have collected and hope to collect in the future and we await the final documentation from them.

Community Consultation

There remains a commitment to consult as widely as possible with the village about the size, layout and cost of the new village hall.

This will be undertaken once we have a better idea of what funds are available to us for to build the new village hall. At the moment the size/cost of the new hall is a moving feast because it depends enormously on the grants we may get from the Big Lottery amongst others.

Demolition condition

The Big Lottery flagged this condition up as one which may cause us cashflow issues (although we were already aware of this, hence the application to East Suffolk). I have recently been back to East Suffolk and although the senior planning officer is supportive of a compromise, I have not managed to get a date from the case officer, despite numerous chases and attempts. I am determined to ensure that this will be resolved before too long.

Bryan Laxton
Steering Group Chair Bryan.laxton@hotmail.com

APPENDIX C

District Councillors Report to Grundisburgh and Culpho Parish Council



July 2019

Cllr Colin Hedgley Cllr Tony Fryatt

Northern Relief Road.

The first steps are being taken regarding this contentious subject. County Councillors were given an initial briefing on 27th June. District Councillors were then given a briefing on the 4th July at East Suffolk House. It goes without saying that both Tony Fryatt and myself are deeply concerned about this project. We are working hard with our MP and others in order to find ways to at least mitigate the effects of this scheme, if not to force a complete re think by Suffolk County Council. We had hoped to bring you some more positive news today but things are not quite in place yet, hence the lateness of this report, but soon will be. It is interesting to note that all three routes go through the Carlford and Fynn Valley ward and so that means that our fellow residents will suffer no matter what. Numerous questions present themselves not least what will happen on the stretch of A12 between Woods Lane and Seven Hills Junction which is already excessively busy. But we must concentrate on our area and our constituents. I urge you to go to the Consultation Meeting tomorrow at the Village Hall and also go onto the website and complete the questionnaire.

We will keep you informed as events unfold.

Committee Membership

Both of your District Councillors sit on the Planning Committee (South) and have successfully navigated the first full meeting. Cllr Hedgley, who is Chairman of the Council, also sits on the Licensing Committee and the Licensing sub- committee that deals with applications and revocation.

New seafront play area is officially open in Lowestoft

A new children's play area along the seafront in Lowestoft is officially open, in time for families visiting the First Light Festival to enjoy. Following the allocation of funding from the former Waveney District Council (now East Suffolk Council) and a contribution of £10,000 from the Lowestoft Tourism Group, work to extend the play area at Royal Green began in April. These works, carried out by contractors Sutcliffe Play and delivered by East Suffolk Council in partnership with Sentinel Leisure Trust and East Suffolk Norse, have now been completed on schedule. This play area is just part of our ongoing work to regenerate the seafront area; in addition, we have attracted a number of new seafront concessions and refurbishments to the former lifeguard station are now complete.

We will continue to progress other projects which will enhance the seafront and attract even more visitors to Lowestoft and the wider area."

Suffolk resident urges people to take up offer of new affordable homes

Colne Housing resident Michele Logson is urging people in housing need in East Suffolk to apply for brand new homes that have just been built. Mrs Logson's new home is part of the biggest development that housing association Colne and their development partner Icen Homes have undertaken in the county.

They are creating 60 new homes in Melton, near Woodbridge, and residents are moving in in phases throughout 2019 and 2020. There are still homes available and Colne is encouraging people in housing need to register now. This is a major step forward for addressing homelessness in the Suffolk area.

Prior to the move, Mrs Logson, 48, struggled to afford privately rented accommodation in Wickham Market, eventually she had to move to temporary accommodation.

With her teenage daughter, this was a tough situation for Mrs Logson. She feared that she "wouldn't be in with a chance of getting a home in Melton" and could not believe it when her application was successful.

She emphasised how the Colne team were helpful and reassuring, adding: "I feel more secure, I know that the home is ours now. There is more stability for us here".

Mrs Logson is not the only resident embracing life in Melton. She described how she had already met her new neighbours and formed a sense of community.

She said: "Everyone is really nice and friendly. We are near to Woodbridge but just far enough out of town".

Mrs Logson is positive about the future and pleased that her daughter can now settle in one place. She is passionate that others should apply for the new homes to see if they too can benefit from this development.

Colne's Chief Executive, Sara Thakkar, said: "Melton is a beautiful village and we believe that it is critical that local people and their families have access to affordable homes in rural locations such as this. This is our largest development in Suffolk and we are optimistic about the difference this will make."

Colne encourages other people to register with Gateway to Homechoice to discover if they too could be eligible for a new property in Melton, near Woodbridge.

Colne manage over 3,000 homes across Essex and Suffolk, with enabling independent living at the forefront of their strategy

Nominate your Suffolk unsung heroes

In a unique partnership, Community Action Suffolk (CAS), Suffolk County Council and the Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC) have launched the new Suffolk Community Awards.

These collaborative awards celebrate and recognise the huge contribution that groups, individuals, town and parish councils make on the overall quality of life in our communities across the length and breadth of Suffolk.

Christine Abraham, Chief Executive of Community Action Suffolk, said:

"The CAS awards celebrate and recognise those "who go the extra mile" and make positive contributions to their community.

We are delighted this year to be joining with SALC and Most Active County to bring all these awards together in one evening recognising many unsung heroes in Suffolk."

Previously the three organisations ran separate events – namely the CAS Awards, the SALC Village of the Year competition, newsletter and website of the year awards and, Suffolk County Council's Most Active Community Awards (run in partnership with SALC).

East Suffolk Council is proud to be a sponsor for the SALC Town and Village of the Year category, with sub-categories for small village, large village and town.

Sally Longmate, Chief Executive of the Suffolk Association of Local Councils said:

"Our Village of the Year Competition has not run for a few years and needed a review. Having attended the 2018 CAS Awards I instantly recognised there was potential to bring things together and focus on showcasing some of the fantastic outcomes that are being achieved.

I am especially excited about putting the spotlight on the work of town and parish councils and the important contribution they make.”

There are 15 awards available ranging from youth participation and young person of the year to community building, contribution to volunteering, most active communities and village and town of the year. CAS is also delighted to announce a new award ‘Suffolk Good Neighbour Award’ – sponsored by Suffolk Community Foundation.

There is a simple online application/nomination process through a new dedicated website. The closing date is 21 July 2019. Full details can be found at www.suffolkcommunityawards.co.uk.

The awards will be presented on the 24 September 2019 at the Museum of East Anglian Life.

Ending period poverty in East Suffolk

As part of a scheme inspired by students in Felixstowe, free sanitary products are now being made available through community venues across East Suffolk.

Earlier this year, students from Felixstowe Academy began a campaign in school to end period poverty. The ‘Proud, Period!’ campaign aims to support young women by making free sanitary products available within school. As a result of this work, the school now has six boxes containing sanitary products available for pupils to use; toilets containing the boxes are marked with a red glitter heart on the door. Inspired by the ‘Proud, Period!’ campaign, councillors at the former Suffolk Coastal District Council began a similar scheme, targeting the wider area. Entitled ‘Period Poverty’, the scheme is now being introduced throughout East Suffolk and local businesses, community groups and organisations are encouraged to get involved.

‘PP Boxes’, containing a variety of individually wrapped sanitary items, are being rolled out to some East Suffolk locations over the coming weeks, including community centres, food banks and sports centres. Locations supporting the scheme will display an East Suffolk Period Poverty sticker, indicating the premises has a PP Box on site.

Cllr Letitia Smith, East Suffolk Council’s Cabinet Member for Communities, Leisure and Tourism said: “Having been inspired by the pupils from Felixstowe Academy, our district-wide campaign will provide sanitary products to girls and women across East Suffolk should they need them. We are grateful to those community locations who have already requested to help the scheme and we are delighted that PP Boxes will be available in those places shortly.

“To ensure the boxes are available in a wide variety of towns and villages across East Suffolk, we need more businesses and venues to get involved, either as box holders or as suppliers for the products in future. We are also able to provide support to other schools who may be interested in creating their own campaign to end period poverty.” A new website (www.eastsuffolkperiodpoverty.com) will be launched on 1 July, enabling people to search for their nearest PP box as well as other local initiatives, and providing information and other resources. Businesses, organisations and schools interested in joining the scheme are asked to contact Chloe Winlow at info@eastsuffolkperiodpoverty.com

The PP Boxes will be replenished by East Suffolk Norse for the time-being however donations are very welcome. Donations can be brought to East Suffolk House in Melton, Riverside in Lowestoft or given directly to your nearest PP Box holder. The boxes are currently stocked with products from TOTM, which are made from biodegradable organic cotton, however donations from all manufacturers are welcome.

