

**Minutes of the Meeting of Easton Parish Council held on  
Monday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2017 at 7.30pm in Easton Village Hall.**

**Present:** Peter Milliken (Chairman)  
Mark Caton  
Claire Chisholm  
Mark Cordy  
Jan Hudson  
Mike Jobling  
Catherine Moore, Locum Clerk

**Also present:** District and County Councillor Margaret Dewsbury and 20 members of the public were also in attendance.

**1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Jonathan Bailey.

**2. A47 Duelling Proposals**

The Chairman welcomed Nick Atkinson of Highways England to the meeting. Nick gave a briefing on the outline plans for the duelling of Easton to Tuddenham, noting that a non-statutory consultation would be held in March 2017. Highways England was keen to gather information and evidence to assist with deciding on the best option, and had no preference for any particular routes or schemes. The preferred route would be announced in September 2017, with a Development Consent Order application being submitted after that.

Discussion ensued with the following points raised:

- Highways England would look at the impact of consented planning applications and the traffic this would generate. Currently the Food Hub was not consented. General modelling took place to allow for economic and traffic growth. Highways England was aware of and would acknowledge the Food Hub in their modelling, with the decision on the preferred route being based on evidence gathered at the first stage of consultation. Any major development would trigger a second statutory consultation.
- Duelling of the A47 would not bring more traffic to the road, and would therefore not increase the levels of toxins in the air. The Food Hub would be considered as a separate issue when assessing the needs of the road.
- The details of the Broadland District Council Development Management DPD 2015 Policy TS2 were not known in detail, and it was suggested that a transport assessment should form part of decision making. It was confirmed that this related to Broadland District Council's work around the Food Hub and was not directly the responsibility of Highways England. The use of traffic figures in the Local Development Order process would be questioned and a response given asap.

**NA**

**3. Declarations of interest for items on the agenda and applications for dispensations**

None.

**4. Adjournment for Public Participation**

*The meeting was suspended to allow members of the public to speak.*

The Chairman invited public discussion on the Highways England proposals to dual the A47.

- County Councillor Margaret Dewsbury noted that she was a member of the A47 Alliance group, and had asked at a recent meeting whether the Easton roundabout would be improved alongside improvements to other junctions. It was confirmed that this was currently not known as the options had not been scoped. The consultation included Tuddenham and to Easton roundabout, so this would be included in the consultation. The corridor requirements would be considered, and junction detail would not be set out at this stage.
- A representative of the Wensum Valley Alliance asked whether the Food Hub was constituting a major reason for the western link? It was confirmed that individual projects would not become dependent on each other, and that Highways England would assess on cost/benefit.
- A member of the public noted that the Blind Lane junction was next to the proposed Food Hub and was narrow and dangerous. Broadland District Council had suggested that Highways England would not accept Blind Lane as a junction for the Food Hub. It was confirmed that options would be put forward and considered, which might include a completely new road with the existing A47 becoming a local road.
- It was confirmed that road safety was a serious consideration and Highways England worked with Norfolk County Council to ensure that proposals met strict safety criteria.
- Concern was expressed about the human impact of the duelling, noting that rumble strips had caused serious noise disturbance and had taken some time to rectify. It was noted that a letter had been received stating that households in the immediate vicinity would receive a personal visit to assess the impact, however nothing further had been heard. In response, Nick acknowledged that some previous communication had been poor, and that he would follow up on the contents of the letter. Statutory compensation was given for loss of amenity or valuation.
- It was confirmed that the March consultation would not include information regarding levels or environmental impact purely because at this stage, no route had been determined. A corridor of potential route would be presented, and specialists would be present at the exhibitions to discuss concerns. The intention of the stage 1 consultation was an open and transparent dialogue.

The Chairman thanked Nick Atkinson for his attendance and discussion.

11 members of the public left the meeting.

*The meeting was reconvened.*

## 5. Minutes of the meeting held 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017 were **agreed** as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, proposed by Mark Caton, seconded by Mike Jobling, all in favour.

## 6. Reports

- i) Police Community Support Officer  
No report.

**ii) District and County Councillor Margaret Dewsbury**

Margaret reported that she had attended the South Norfolk Council Cabinet meeting where the proposed Food Hub was discussed, with a view to South Norfolk Council supporting the Local Development Order. Previously the concept had been informally agreed. She reported that the following matters had been brought to the attention of Cabinet:

- Alterations to the papers were identified and support was given subject to those alterations. Concern was raised about the tightness of conditions.
- The parking arrangements for the church were raised, noting that cars would be mingling with HGVs. It was noted that in other areas, there were problems with narrow lanes an escort vehicles, with cars having to be moved to allow large vehicles through.
- Flooding concerns were raised, noting that the bunding was high, with a drain, and capacity was not good. Water would go down Blind Lane, and there had been flooding and fatalities.
- The field next to the church was a concern, as it was used as a toilet by people such as lorry drivers and travellers. This land could be turned into a car park.
- The visual impact from Taverham Road was discussed, noting concern about glare from roof mounted PV arrays.
- 10% of the energy for the facility was proposed to be from low carbon sources, with a 2009 Savills report suggesting a biomass combined heat and power plant. Broadland District Council did not know what was proposed to be houses on the site.
- Noise, smell and light pollution going towards Easton was raised as a concern.
- Links with the UEA, Norwich Research Park and Hethel Engineering Centre would increase rat running in the villages, and could turn the proposed spine road for the new 900 houses development into a busy route. Vehicles were likely to use Marlingford Road to access the B1108.
- The 2014 Scoping Report had included the whole field, and the Secretary of State had directed that an Environmental Impact Assessment was to be carried out. This would be considered by the South Norfolk Council Scrutiny Committee.

The Chairman reported that he had also attended the meeting which was well presented and had raised a lot of discussion points. He was keen for Broadland District Council to revisit their decision not to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment, and to consider the protection of the heritage area around the church.

**7. Matters arising from the minutes**

None.

**8. Updates on ongoing issues**

**i) Neighbourhood Plan**

It was noted that the next meeting would be on Wednesday, and that the documents were ready for submission and available on the website. They would be submitted to South Norfolk Council within a week, and it was hoped that this would go to March Cabinet with a view to referendum in May.

**ii) Food Hub**

A response to the consultation had been drafted and was available on the website. These would be amended once the compliance of Policy TS2 had been clarified. It was suggested that the detailed intended use of the site should be clarified with the

landowner. Norfolk County Council Highways had not responded to the consultation, and the church did not appear to have been approached regarding the widening of roads and installation of foot and cycle ways. It was noted that consecrated ground could not be developed. It was **agreed** to submit the draft response, subject to Policy TS2 amendment, proposed by Mike Jobling, seconded by Jan Hudson, all in favour.

*2 members of the public left the meeting.*

## 9. Progress reports

### i) Parish Allotments

It was expected that a years notice would be given to vacate the land, and the Section 106 agreement did state that an alternative amenity would have to be provided. Once a Notice to Quit was received, the process would begin. It was confirmed that the repair to the water tap would be effected as the allotments would remain there for the immediate future. It was suggested that the Diocese wished to sell with vacant possession and was therefore issuing the Notice in good time.

It was confirmed that there was no need to get three quotes for the tap repair if it was being done for free, provided it was being completed competently. It was confirmed that the volunteer was a qualified plumber.

### ii) College Heights

There were no new issues at College Heights. The new dog bin was to be installed shortly. The new stoppers were not compatible with the self closers.

### iii) Planning Application 2014/2611

It was noted that Staples were moving out, and that the new shop would be a toy store.

### iv) Meeting with David Harvey

Moved to confidential business at the end of the agenda.

## 10. Grounds Maintenance Tenders

The Chairman opened the sealed tenders and read through the prices received from Norse, CGM, Garden Guardian and Gary Lake. It was noted that there had been issues with the contract, although this was as much to do with poor communication by the Parish Council as anything else. The contract would be better managed in the future. It was proposed to accept a 3 year fixed contract with a 3 month probation period, stating that failure to perform would result in the contract being terminated at the end of year one, proposed by Peter Milliken, seconded by Mark Cordy. It was suggested that the savings were not sufficient for a three year deal, and an amendment to the proposal was made by Jan Hudson to offer a one year contract, with consideration to move to three years from 2018 onwards. The amendment was accepted by the proposer and seconder of the original motion and became the substantive motion. It was **agreed** to accept Gary Lake's quotation for a period of one year, all in favour. Other contractors would be notified of the results.

Clerk  
Clerk

## 11. Finance

### i) Payments for February 2017

It was noted that payments had been signed off at the Finance meeting.

### ii) Minutes of the Finance Meeting

It was **agreed** to accept the minutes of the Finance meeting, proposed by Jan Hudson,

seconded by Mark Caton, all in favour.

iii) Recommendation of the Finance Meeting

Discussion ensued regarding the interest available on business deposit accounts. It was **agreed** that this would be considered further, with a view to whether money could be tied up for any time, and looking at providers with the best interest rates.

JH

12. **Training**

It was suggested that certificates could be displayed on the website showing the level of training councillors had received. It was suggested, however, that this could give a false impression of knowledge, and agreed that this would be considered further at the next meeting. The Clerk had requested further training.

13. **Awards for All Scheme**

Deferred to the next agenda.

14. **Dog and Waste Bins**

It was noted that South Norfolk Council were changing their charging structure for dig bins, with a phased introduction of new charges as well as new charging for those installed before 2002. It was noted that Easton had been paying for 5 of their 9 dog bins. The Parish Council was under contract with South Norfolk Council but would be looking to a private company for competitive prices.

The damaged bin was awaiting replacement, with a new bin on order. Mark Cordy would arrange siting the new bin. It was noted that dog fouling was worsening, and that any sightings of dog fouling offences should be reported to South Norfolk Council so that action could be taken. It was suggested that the village could be leafletted on this matter.

15. **Defibrillator Training**

Deferred to the next agenda.

16. **Parish Partnership Scheme**

The Chairman reported that he had not heard back regarding the funding application yet, and that he would chase this up.

PM

17. **Western Link Consultation**

The first meeting was scheduled for 23<sup>rd</sup> February, and the Chairman would be attending.

18. **Adjournment for Public Participation**

i) *The meeting was suspended to allow members of the public to speak.*

A member of the public stated that they had attended the meeting to hear the item with David Harvey, and was disappointed that this was being discussed confidentially. She felt that the village should be kept informed and that the Parish Council should not be secretive. The Chairman noted that this matter had to be kept confidential during contract negotiations, and apologised that the confidential nature of this business had not been highlighted on the agenda.

*The meeting was reconvened.*

**19. Correspondence**

None.

**20. Outstanding Items**

Diocese House Leaves

Nothing had been done about the leaves and the dead tree was still standing. Mike Jobling agreed to liaise, and another letter would be sent.

**MJ**

**21. Items for next month's agenda**

- Car parking, especially around school times.

It was noted that a post had been damaged at Buxton Close, the Chairman **agreed** to report this to Norfolk County Council.

**PM**

**22. Exclusion of the Press and Public**

It was **resolved** to exclude the press and public for the duration of item 23 on the agenda, as matters related to contractual negotiations, proposed by Peter Milliken, seconded by Jan Hudson, all in favour.

**23. Discussion with David Harvey**

The Council discussed confidential matters with David Harvey.

**24. Dates to note**

None.

**25. Date of the Next Meeting**

The next meeting would be Monday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2017 7.30pm at Easton Village Hall.

The meeting closed at 10pm.

**CHAIRMAN**