

LITTLE MELTON PARISH COUNCIL MEETING
at the VILLAGE HALL, MILL ROAD, LITTLE MELTON
TUESDAY 9 SEPTEMBER 2008

PRESENT	John Heaser (Chair), Stewart Cable (Vice-Chair), Wilf Chamberlain, Duncan Frazer (from 7.55 pm), Graham Tomlin and Joan Wheatley. As from 7.50 pm District Councillor Christopher Kemp was also present. Two members of the public were present, namely Mr Barnes of Palm Bay, Mill Road and Mr Wood of Homefield, Mill Road.
APOLOGIES	Apologies for absence were received from Tony Berry, District Councillor Garry Wheatley and County Councillor Judith Virgo.
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	The Chair asked if any member(s) wished to declare an interest in an item/items on the agenda. No declarations of interest were forthcoming.
MINUTES	The minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 22 July 2008 were – subject to the amendment of substituting the word “curtilage” for the word “cartilage” on line 31 of the first page – on a proposal by Graham Tomlin which was seconded by Stewart Cable, accepted as a true record of the business conducted. A copy of the minutes was therefore signed accordingly by the Chairman for retention in the Parish Council records.
PUBLIC, DISTRICT AND COUNTY COUNCILLOR PARTICIPATION	No matters for discussion were raised under this item.
PLANNING	<p>PARISH COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION It was confirmed that the Parish Council recommendation in respect of the latest application submitted by Baker Brickwork Ltd. proposing the construction of a one and a half storey detached dwelling house with attached double garage (reconfiguration of the internal layout) on land at the eastern end of the Close (2008/1613) had been “no views or comments”.</p> <p>SNC OFFICER RECOMMENDATION The Clerk referred to Mitchell & Butlers revised application proposing externally illuminated and non illuminated signs for the Village Inn, 33 School Lane (2008/1547). The Parish Council’s email to SNC, dated 25 August, had noted that under the applicant’s revised proposal the prominent illuminated sign adjacent to the road, formerly designated 05, had been removed from the proposals. Most surprising then was the erection, on 4 September, of all proposed signage including the deleted illuminated sign near the road, in advance of the determination of the application! In consequence the Clerk had dispatched an urgent email to SNC regarding this matter and requested that it be brought to the attention of the NW Area Planning Committee when it met on Monday 8 September. It was</p>

	<p>noted that the SNC Officer recommendation (based on the revised proposal) was “approve with conditions”.</p> <p>According to the latest (verbal) information, obtained earlier in the day, SNC had approved the revised application but had also issued a decision notice for the illuminated sign near the road to be removed within 28 days and, should this fail to occur, for enforcement action/prosecution to follow.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site Adjacent Willow Cottage, 7 School Lane – approval of reserved matters for new dwelling relating to planning permission 2006/0428 to discharge/agree conditions 1,2 &5 (2008/0913). It was noted that the revised location of the proposed property was now slightly nearer the road. 2. Gemini, 14 Gibbs Close – approval of loft conversion to living space (2008/1077). 3. Collingwood, Mill Road – approval, with conditions, under delegated powers of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension (2008/1408). <p>OUTSTANDING</p> <p>Gable Developments (Norfolk) proposing change of use and adaptation of redundant pig rearing unit (adjacent Villa San Lorenzo, Watton Road) to form single residential dwelling. After enquiring with SNC the Clerk had ascertained that this application had been withdrawn on 23 April – but because of a breakdown in communication the PC had not been informed!</p>
<p>PARISH AMENITIES</p>	<p>NEW EXTERNAL PAIR OF DOORS TO VILLAGE HALL</p> <p>Although the new doors had been fitted in late July the contractor’s attention to the small work to ensure satisfactory completion remained outstanding. The Clerk had met the SSGE Service Engineer on site about this matter on 14 August – and it had been agreed that this fault would be rectified – but to date this remedial work remains to be undertaken.</p> <p>REPAIR OF “SPRINGIE”</p> <p>Stewart confirmed that this work remained outstanding and added that he hoped to be able to obtain the necessary specialist tool soon.</p> <p>It was also mentioned that some maintenance work was necessary to the rope bridge as underneath two ropes coach bolts were probably needed to replace the rusted brackets. Wilf Chamberlain kindly agreed to look into precisely what was required and undertake the remedial work.</p> <p>PLAY EQUIPMENT SURFACING</p> <p>The Clerk reported that he had obtained information from Associated Surfaces & Materials Ltd, Northampton, for the D.I.Y. repair of small areas of safety tiling/filling of gaps. It was noted that excluding VAT and delivery a single kit would cost £56-15 and a double kit would cost £75-00.</p> <p>However it was debateable how long the filling of small gaps and the sticking down of the edges of the tiles would last.</p>

	<p>The Chairman said that he had also obtained information on an adhesive which could be used to re-glue the few tiles that required attention and it was thought that such remedial action (butting the defective tiles up together to remove the gaps) was preferable to attempting to fill small gaps.</p> <p>Another option that John had looked into was the laying of a man made carpet (held down by regularly brushed sand) over the two largest tiled areas with the edges of the carpet tucked underneath the outside edges of the tiled areas. This solution was not considered appropriate especially taking into account the cost of £4,500!</p> <p>In conclusion it was agreed that the Chairman would pursue his enquiries further.</p> <p>PLAY EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY</p> <p>John Heaser said that he understood that Mrs Hazell of Manor House had indicated that she might be prepared to take on responsibility for looking after the regular local inspection/ maintenance of the play equipment and added that he will talk to Mrs Hazell about the implications etc.</p> <p>NOTICEBOARD</p> <p>The Clerk reported that having spoken to John Symonds since the last PCM he had ascertained that John Symonds is to make – at minimal cost or without cost - a replacement noticeboard for display to the front of the Old Church Hall; however the new board (reusing the old support posts) would not be available for use immediately.</p> <p>The Parish Council was also made aware that Sarah Graves of Gibbs Close had suggested another noticeboard be sited on the village playing field on or near to the young childrens play area but with the replacement of the noticeboard on Mill Road - which most parents and children would be walking past to go to the playing field – it was thought that further provision would be unlikely.</p> <p>HIRE OF FOOTBALL PITCH</p> <p>Firstly the Clerk confirmed that the PC had agreed to a one off hiring of the pitch – by NHS Ambulance staff – on the afternoon of Sunday 14 September and that a cheque for £20-00 had already been received and paid into the Parish Council’s bank.</p> <p>Secondly the Chairman mentioned that he had recently received an enquiry regarding the availability of the pitch and the cost of the hiring and it was agreed that he would respond that the pitch was currently available for regular hiring at the approved cost of £20-00 per match for adults.</p>
<p>HIGHWAYS</p>	<p>PROPOSED COMPLETION OF MILL ROAD FOOTWAY</p> <p>The Clerk referred to the telephone call, on 20 August, from Helen Childs, Traffic Design Section, Planning & Transportation Department, Norfolk County Council in which he was informed that the County Council required an affirmative response from the Parish Council in respect of the section of the proposed footway (north side) running west of Gibbs Close up to where the Mill Road</p>

	<p>turns in a northerly direction up towards the Village Hall. It was noted that the funding for this section, and the already agreed section outside Ancarva and Homefield, ie for the whole scheme would come from the Safer Journeys to Schools Initiative and it was hoped that more children (and parents) will walk to the local school if this improvement is implemented.</p> <p>The Clerk added that following receipt of this latest information and request he had notified all those residents (both sides of Mill Road) that would be directly affected requesting their views.</p> <p>The Clerk drew attention to the request for the Parish Council to respond to Norfolk County Council with its views the following day because an urgent response was necessary if the proposed new metalled footway was to be approved and constructed within the current financial year. In addition it was noted that an affirmative response was required from the Parish Council as otherwise there was no guarantee that the County Council would be able to include the scheme in a future programme of capital works.</p> <p>Mr Barnes, Palm Bay, Mill Road, who resides immediately opposite the short section of new footway that will front Ancarva and Homefield was invited to speak, by the Chair, and expressed concern at the implications for visibility and Mr Wood (Homefield) suggested better signage than proposed to ensure priority for vehicular traffic approaching from a south/easterly direction.</p> <p>The merits of these views were considered and in conclusion the Parish Council agreed to approve the construction of the whole of the footway scheme but also request that the improvement includes signage stating that vehicular traffic approaching from the crossroads direction should have priority where Mill Road – following construction – would narrow.</p> <p>NEW FOOTWAY (SCHOOL LANE) NEAR THE CLOSE</p> <p>The Clerk confirmed the recent construction of the short section of metalled footway along the eastern side of School Lane from The Close northwards in front of 68 and 70 School Lane.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY SPEEDWATCH SCHEME</p>	<p>Despite local publicity for approximately three months it was confirmed that no volunteers had come forward from Little Melton to participate in the CSS. In consequence the Clerk had, on 18 August, notified Holly Blundell, Neighbourhood Support Officer (Wymondham, Hethersett, Mulbarton, Bowthorpe and Costessey) of Norfolk Constabulary accordingly.</p>
<p>BT TELEPHONE KIOSK FUTURE</p>	<p>The Clerk reported the receipt of further information – following the ending of the initial public consultation period on 6 September – which included (a) the possibility of retaining red kiosks, without the payphone, for historical and aesthetic reasons, and (b) BT’s Adopt a Kiosk Programme under which the local authority can decide to “sponsor” the service, contributing towards the cost of maintenance. It was confirmed that not one parishioner had expressed an objection to the proposed removal of the telephone kiosk in Little Melton.</p> <p>The next part of the exercise is for the publication of the draft</p>

	<p>decisions locally, to give a final opportunity for the public to make their views known (Ofcom requirements put upon SNC as the responsible public body) and following the ending of this further consultation on 10 October a Final Notification of the decision will be made to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>The Clerk confirmed that a poster – seeking comments (by 10 October) on SNC’s proposed opposition to the removal of the local kiosk – had been erected on the kiosk etc.</p>
<p>LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW – BOUNDARY COMMITTEE’S PROPOSALS UPDATE</p>	<p>District Councillor Christopher Kemp commenced the discussion by drawing attention to the changes that continued to be introduced and said that if a unitary authority for the whole of Norfolk, including Lowestoft, was approved and accepted it would be the largest unitary local authority in England.</p> <p>Mr Kemp also mentioned that he had received further information earlier in the day, but had not so far had the time to digest it, and that a judicial review was a strong possibility and added that there may be illegal points to consider including the Community Partnership Boards and Area Arrangements.</p> <p>Mr Kemp said the SNC position was that (a) there was no case for unitary local authorities, (b) the status quo should be retained, and (c) it would resist any removal of parish councils into a Greater Norwich area.</p> <p>Joan Wheatley’s view was that the more that the District Councils pushed for the status quo/some retention of District Councils the more would be the likelihood of the expanded (doughnut) Norwich becoming the reality.</p> <p>Joan Wheatley further said that as Norfolk County Council is already responsible for approximately 80% of local authority services this helped strengthen the case for the introduction of a unitary authority for Norfolk.</p> <p>In conclusion, and after some debate, the Parish Council agreed that it did not want to become a part of a Greater Norwich area.</p>
<p>GREATER NORWICH DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP</p>	<p>John Heaser referred to the potential “new town” approximately the current size of Wymondham being put forward on land between Little Melton, Hethersett and the A47 NSB. This option would include an initial phase of at least 4,000 new houses, possibly increasing to 7,000 new houses in the longer term, with associated facilities and infrastructure etc.</p> <p>The Chairman made the point that such a massive development would not be, as described, a “new town” but would just be a suburb of Norwich.</p> <p>The Parish Councillors expressed unanimous opposition to such massive development (Option 1 & 2) being located immediately alongside our village.</p> <p>In conclusion after considerable discussion it was agreed that John Heaser would draft a proposed response to the GNDP Technical Consultation and send this, via email, to all the parish councillors (and Clerk) for comments prior to dispatch of the agreed Parish Council view to the Joint Core Strategy/Greater Norwich</p>

	Development Partnership by the required date of 26 September.
NEW BUS SERVICE	The Clerk confirmed the introduction – on Monday 1 September – of a new direct weekday bus service (Route 9) that was running from the village into Norwich Bus Station. The service was operated by Konectbus and the bus can be boarded from opposite the Little Melton telephone box at 0931, 1131, 1331 and 1531 with return journeys from the Bus Station Stand 5 commencing at 1000, 1200, 1400 and 1600.
CONCLUSION OF AUDIT	The Clerk reported the conclusion of the audit of the Parish Council's accounts for the financial year 2007/2008 and the public displaying of the required "Notice of conclusion of the audit and the right to inspect the Annual Return" etc. The only comment by the External Auditor had been that the Parish Council should in future ensure that the Assets Register includes the value of each asset. The Clerk also drew attention for the necessity for the Annual Return for the year ending 31 March 2009 to be approved by the Parish Council by 30 June 2009. Appropriate arrangements will therefore have to be in place to ensure this earlier deadline is met, including arrangements for the completion of the Council's internal audit.
CLERK OF THE COUNCIL'S CORRESPONDENCE	The Clerk drew attention to the Clerk of the Council's schedule of correspondence, as provided to each Parish Councillor with the agenda, together with the late additions received since 4 September. Items highlighted were:- Village Inn closure/opening. Standards Board complaints – email from NCAP&TCs 20/08/08. Norfolk Police Authority – letter of 29/08/08. Norfolk Constabulary – Mobile Police Office visit 15 September. SNC letter re Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005: The Fouling of Land by Dogs District of South Norfolk Order No 1 of 2008. Norfolk Link (August 2008) LG Review edition.
BILLS/RECEIPTS	On a proposal by Duncan Frazer, which was seconded by Graham Tomlin, the undermentioned invoices were authorised for payment:- Marcus Kett – VPF maintenance July 2008 (100934) £ 186-04 Mr R Sinclair – Refund (50%) B/B 25/7-24/8/08 (100935) £ 9-49 NCAP&TCs – Annual subscription 2008/2009 (100936) £ 154-50 Mazars – Audit of accounts 2007/2008 fee (100937) £ 158-62 Marcus Kett – VPF maintenance August 2008 (100938) £ 186-04 In addition authority for the payment of the invoice from SSGE (100933) amounting to £1,169.12 for the fitting of a pair of new UPVC doors to the western elevation of the Village Hall was granted but it was agreed that payment would follow the satisfactory resolution of the minor outstanding work. The following receipts were reported to the Parish Council:-

	<p>HM Customs & Ex. – refund VAT 1/10/07-31/05/08 £ 493-19 Hethersett Wanderers FC – hire of VPF football pitch 26/7, 23/8 and 30/8/08 £ 60-00 Robert Cork’s hire of VPF football pitch for a match between NHS staff 14/09/08 £ 20-00</p> <p>The Clerk concluded this item by referring to the agreed hiring of the VPF football pitch for an adult friendly on 24 August 2008 by Eaton Beehive FC (arranged by Michael Waters) but said that the hiring charge of £20-00, which was to be paid by Michael Waters, had yet to be received. The Clerk confirmed he would continue to seek to contact Mr Waters to resolve.</p>
DATE OF NEXT MEETING	<p>The date of the next meeting of the Parish Council was confirmed as being Tuesday 21 October 2008 and that this would commence at 7.30 pm in the Village Hall. There being no further business the meeting concluded at 9.05 pm.</p>
	<p>Chairperson.....</p> <p>Date.....</p>