

RISBY PARISH COUNCIL**Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 3rd November 2016**

Councillors present: Derrick Abrey (Chairman), Simon Gray, Chris Sutton and Steve Smith

Also present: Joanne Kirk (Clerk), Borough Councillor Susan Glossop and 12 members of the public.

Open Forum

The Open Forum began with a presentation by Richard Sykes-Popham (RSP) from Carter Jonas and Gavin Smith (GS) from GAP UK about Risby Business Park. They apologised that they have got off to a poor start in Risby and explained that they have come to the meeting to try and improve relations with the community. Gavin Smith explained a bit about GAP UK and the role as a plant hire company. GAP are the legal owners of the site on Risby Business Park. They own the land marked with a red line on the plans which were distributed to those present. They want to regularise the existing facilities on the site and show their future proposals. Landscaping will include the existing bund on the northern end of the site and noise mitigation measures to minimise the impact on residential properties nearby. The site currently employs 11 skilled non agricultural jobs and this would increase to 25 if the proposal goes ahead. Traffic numbers will be lower than those approved in the 2008 Masterplan.

The following comments were made by residents

- It is disappointing that very little consideration has been taken of the 2008 Masterplan which took a long time to complete
- The original bund on the northern end does not exist as it was removed by the developers.
- The noise impact on residents is unacceptable.
- One resident who owns some units on the business park said he bought them on the basis that the Masterplan would be adhered to as this is what he was told at the time. He asked at what level of the thought process was it considered acceptable to build something in complete contradiction to the original plan.
- It is despicable that no conversation took place with other owners on the site. Why did GAP's solicitors not advise them that there was no planning permission in place to carry out the work that they did?
- The current building was designated as office space. There has now been a change of use.
- Other business owners were unaware that GAP would be using the shared access. They had been told that the access to the GAP site would be separate. The road wasn't originally designated to go so close to their units. The road should be further to the right of blocks A and B.
- I cannot believe that a reputable company like Carter Jonas would put its name to this application.
- One resident said that her boundary is 3m from the house. It was agreed in 2008 that the building would be B1 use (offices). She had no problem with this. The current structure has been poorly built, there is no noise protection and it has a negative impact on her property. She can hear vibration and people talking in the yard and this has stopped her using her garden at times.
- Several residents confirmed that they are disturbed by the noise. Lorries and forklift trucks can be heard reversing, compressors can be heard cleaning out sewage tankers and in the old building, people can be heard talking in the building.
- They are happy with the business park as was agreed in the Masterplan
- In Welham Lane there has been toilet paper in the bushes which comes out when the toilets are flushed out, the workers on the site have stuck their fingers up at residents and one person's wife has been flashed at. GAP expressed disappointment at this.
- Some residents have written to GAP but no response has been received.
- Residents were hoping that GAP would come and show that it has taken into account the concerns of residents by moving buildings away from residential properties rather than put in a retrospective application which is the same as the one it withdrew in March
- The Masterplan was acceptable and had the right mix of B1 and B8 usage with B1 closest to properties and a lot of screening. The industrial work needs to be moved away from residential properties.

Response from Richard Sykes-Popham and Gavin Smith (GS)

- Richard Sykes-Popham said the bund does exist but it is only 1.5m high

- RSP confirmed that there is a masterplan laying out how the site should be developed, but there is nothing to stop an applicant coming forward and submitting a different application. When GAP bought the site, the previous owner was under the impression that there was an extant planning application. This was challenged by residents as this should have been picked up by GAP's solicitor before any work started.
- GS said that GAP required a large site. There was a frame of a building. The previous owner was aware of GAP's proposals. GAP realises that they made a mistake. GAP admits they were encouraged by the owner to carry out the work without any checks taking place. GAP apologised for this.
- RSP said he wants to address the concerns of residents in the planning application. He believes that the site should be developed in a way which takes into account the concerns of residents. He said he would like to make this work.
- The existing building has been re-clad (GS)
- RSP said the impact of their proposal could be mitigated against.

The following questions were asked:

- Has there been an application for the work which has currently been carried out? RSP - No
- So it will be a retrospective planning application? RSP - Yes
- Which company did GAP buy the land from. GS said he would have to check this.
- What is your comment on your disregard for the rules and the impact on residents? Do you do this in every part of the country? GS – no and he apologised again for this.
- Can we be reassured that all work has stopped? Yes, all construction work has been stopped but the plant is still operational
- The problems have arisen because GAP came in and carried out building work without planning permission. Why should residents and the PC be sympathetic to GAP? There is an arrogance from GAP particularly as the planning application has not changed from the application which was withdrawn 5 months ago. Why did the work continue without planning permission?
- Have the sewers been adopted by Anglian water? RSP was not sure and would need to check.
- 4 of the properties in Welham Lane had their main sewer diverted through the GAP site without permission. Were they aware of this? RSP did not know about this. GS said as far as he was aware the previous sewerage arrangements were inadequate and that drains had flooded. Subsequently the problem has been resolved. He confirmed that they have a licence from Anglian Water.
- Do they have a plan of the drains? Yes, GAP agreed to look into this. Have the drains been adopted by Anglian Water as the quality of the work is horrendous?
- How do they propose to deal with surface water, foul sewage and trade waste from toilet cleaning operations?
- What are the next steps? RSP - They will go away and review their comments. He asked the Parish Council to submit all the comments in writing. They will look at way to proceed. This will lead to a planning application.
- What are you minded to advise your client of after tonight? RSP - That they are fully aware of the true position based on comments made tonight.
- What is the status of the Enforcement Notice? An appeal has been lodged. It is likely to be several months before the appeal takes place. An appeal stays the requirements of the notice, pending the outcome of the appeal. If the appeal is dismissed, the inspector can re-impose the Enforcement Notice or amend it. Theoretically GAP can continue to do whatever they want. RSP has advised them not to do that. GAP does, however, intend to carry on with what they are doing now until the outcome of the appeal is known.
- Will GAP take measures to put in a bund and noise mitigation measures? GS - Yes, they always intended to do this. Residents were asked to submit suggestions of possible mitigation measures to the clerk and individually if they wished to.
- How do they propose to landscape the site particularly the transition area between the site and Welham Lane?
- What do they propose to do about the existing boundaries and the unsound substructures?
- Can they explain why the site has been developed in such an unsympathetic way, at deviance from the 2007 Masterplan and without consultation of planning or Building Regulation approval?

Borough Councillor Susan Glossop asked GAP to work with their neighbours, otherwise the planning application will go nowhere. There is an Enforcement Notice and the conditions made in the need to be reflected in any further applications.

The Parish Council meeting began at 8.15pm.

1. Acceptance of apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Julian Read, Jill Gray and Ian Turner. County Councillor Beccy Hopfsenberger also sent her apologies.

2. Declaration of Interest in items on the agenda

No councillors declared an interest in any items on the agenda.

3. Approval of minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 1st September 2016 and the planning meetings held on 21st September 2016 and 3rd October 2016.

It was resolved that the minutes were correct. The chairman then signed them.

4. Borough Councillor's report

Susan Glossop spoke about:

- The proposed application for the lorry Park – The application has been held up due to highways concerns.
- Changes to blue bin recycling. Leaflets have been sent to every household.

5. Police issues

a) SALC survey about local policing

The clerk agreed to email a link to councillors.

b) The police and lost property

Suffolk Police do not deal with the majority of reports of lost and found property. If firearms, drugs, high value items, laptops, cameras or mobile phones are found they should be taken to one of their public enquiry offices in Ipswich, Lowestoft or Bury St Edmunds. No attempt should be made to handle dangerous items: contact the Police via **101** or in an emergency **999**.

Items such as passports, driving licences or bank cards should be returned to the issuing agency.

If someone loses something, this does not need to be reported to police unless it is a hazardous item such as a firearm, ammunition, explosives, chemicals or poisons: again, contact us the Police via **101** or in an emergency **999**. If residents are unsure what to do, there is an online form which will direct them to the most appropriate course of action, or the appropriate alternative agency.

6. Update on list of actions agreed at the last meeting

There were no outstanding councillor actions.

7. Finance

a) Approval of any payments and signing of Schedule of Payments

It was resolved that the following payments would be approved:

- Cynthia Boreham – bus shelter cleaning – Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1953, s4 - **£240.00**
- J P Kirk expenses – LGA 1972, s111 – **£9.64**
- McGregor Services – Grass Cutting – Open Spaces Act -1906, ss9 and 10 - **£174.00**

Chris Sutton and Steve Smith signed the Schedule of Payments. The Chairman then countersigned it.

b) Approval of payments authorised between meetings

It was resolved that the following payments, which were authorised by the Chairman and clerk, would be approved.

- Vodafone UK - phone upgrade for clerk's phone as the previous one was fault – authorised by Derrick Abrey - £19 a month + one off fee of £10 and £4

c) Regular payments made between meetings but previously authorised

The following regular payments were made between meetings:

12/09/16	Fidelity Funds Network	£15.00
20/09/16	Vodafone UK	£17.79
30/09/16	J P Kirk	£314.04
03/10/16	McGregor Services - grass cutting	£444.00

19/10/16	Vodafone UK	£22.81
31/10/16	J P Kirk	£314.24
01/11/16	Anglian water - water charges for allotments	£42.11

c) **Approval of the record of online payments**

It was resolved that the record of online payments would be approved. Chris Sutton then signed it.

d) **Signatory to complete the checklist of Internal Controls**

Chris Sutton completed and signed the checklist of internal controls.

e) **Draft budget 2017/18 and budget report**

It was resolved that the draft budget would be amended to keep any precept increase below 3% in line with the previous year's figures.

8. **Planning**

a) **Information presented by GAP UK during the Open Forum**

It was resolved that the clerk would email a resume of what was said to GAP during the meeting along with the following comments:

The parish Council expresses its disappointment that a firm of GAP's standing has behaved and continues to behave so appallingly to the residents of Risby. The Parish Council trusts that they will take on board the strength of concerns of their neighbours, both residential and commercial, in particular relating to noise, the proximity of the plant to neighbouring properties and the behavior of their current contractors.

9. **Highways/rights of way matters/tree or transport issues:**

a) **Confirm of locations of grit piles**

It was resolved that the current locations are acceptable.

10. **Village issues**

a) **How will the phone box be used once it has been adopted?**

It was resolved that the phone box would be used as a housing for the defibrillator as it will be more visible to residents

b) **Update on the defibrillator**

The clerk has received a quote from Wel Med of £1,366.25 + VAT. To date £1,700 has been raised. It was resolved that the clerk would liaise with the Village Hall Trustees and order a defibrillator as soon as possible.

11. **Correspondence**

a) **Next Parish Conference, Monday 14th November 2016 between 6.30pm and 9pm at the Memorial Hall in Newmarket**

Councillors were asked to notify the clerk if they wished to attend.

b) **Survey about the delivery of public services**

The clerk was asked to email the link to councillors.

c) **Boundary commission consultation – for information only**

The current parliamentary boundaries in Suffolk were designed to achieve electoral equality and have resulted in some as fairly arbitrary dividing lines. The Boundary Commission proposal is for there to be 7 constituencies in Suffolk with South Suffolk Constituency to be split between three districts instead of two. West Suffolk and Bury St Edmunds remain split between two. In the case of the South Suffolk Constituency, there are (and will remain) two district wards from St Edmundsbury: Clare and Cavendish with just over 3000 electors. Full details of the proposals are available at: <https://www.bce2018.org.uk/>.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.02pm.

Signed (Chairman) Dated