

## **LINGWOOD & BURLINGHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

### **Minutes of the Meeting held at the Lingwood Village Hall Meeting Room, Station Road, Lingwood on Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2018, 7.30pm.**

**Present were:** Simon Stevens – Chairman, Giles Mack – Vice Chair, Ian Chapman, Richard Morton, Cathy Pye, Roz Simpson, Marina Tubby, Ian White and Sonya Dickinson – Clerk.

**18/106. Welcome & apologies for absence:** Apologies were received from, Brenda Jones, District Councillor David Ward and County Councillor Brian Iles.

**18/107. Declarations of interest:** S. Dickinson - Finance b) iv).

**18/108. Public Forum including Presentation from Brown & Co. regarding proposal for Buckenham Road potential development:** (10 minutes allocated for Public participation):

We were joined by 13 members of the Public including Paul Clarke from ESCO Developments, Andrew Wooltaton and Ana Safronoff from Brown & Co.

Paul Clarke - Looking at the South side of the Village, between Buckenham Lane and Buckenham Road, the land put forward to the GNLP by the landowner. It would be a long term plan, what would people like to see there?

The Parish Council objected to the development of this site on the GNLP Consultation as it is felt that development should be on the North of the Village before the South is done, due to increased traffic having to drive through the Village to get to the South side. The Parish has had more than its quota of housing on the old Village Hall site and the next site to be developed should be the old first School on Chapel Road before agricultural land which is outside the development boundary should be touched. The development of the first School would take us past our quota to 2036.

Public – Might not be accepted on the GNLP, we are already in excess of our housing allocation.

Brown & Co. – This is a long term thing, not next week or next year.

Public - GNLP scope and see what sites are available and the preferences chosen.

I was a Parish Councillor between 89-99 and the Parish Council's view then, was to expand to the North as there is better communication.

Public – Struggling a bit, I thought this was going to be a presentation about proposals. Could we get a supermarket or GP Surgery? We have a lack of G.P.'s so would be hard to get them to come.

Public – Consultation at an early stage is useful – The principle of them coming in and asking the questions of what would be acceptable is good.

Brown & Co. – The Parish may get something for it if they go for it rather than fighting it.

Public – The access roads into Lingwood are so poor so couldn't take the increase in traffic.

Employees of Esco Developments look for sites to take through the planning process, not all are successful. We try and consult up front to see what may be liked.

Public – They have an idea of what they'll like to do?

Browns – Just driven 150 miles from Banbury where a new medical centre is promised as and when a development of houses is built, they are still in negotiation as 75 properties put in for but the Council only want 60.

In Taverham 93 houses are on a site which includes woodland – We are improving the woodland to make it more public. This is in addition to CIL and Section 106. The road layout is also being improved near that site.

We are trying to understand what the Parish wants rather than imposing something.

Simon – We need to ask what the Public want on the site.

Don't forget the Parish Council resolved to put on the GNLP document that there was to be no development on the site.

It is better to be in the early decision stage rather than just objecting to development, come back to us when worked on the road improvements.

Chris and Councillor Richard Morton attended the Blofield A47 exhibition; only the Blofield bridge has a footpath, the White house one doesn't. The Walk – bike – scoot initiative has a bearing on it as does the footpath/Burlingham crossing. County Farms now support the Burlingham crossing and also handed the document (GI) that highlights it as vital. Jon Donlevy says he will forward. NCC Committee are meeting and this is an opportunity to lobby them, they

only accept suggestion if in question form and they need to come from individuals, so have e-mailed and asked if I can send our 6 suggestions. There is only 15 minutes for all questions to be read and they are chosen on a first come basis, so if the questions are at the bottom of the pile they may not get read. 5pm 9<sup>th</sup> October, there is an opportunity to speak to NCC Committee.

Public – Concern the junction at the Western end from the South can go to Norwich but no access from Norwich and across to Lingwood apart from the original one, which would mean more traffic through Blofield. As a former Highway Engineer, the skew Bridge is expensive to construct, a straight bridge with a roundabout at either end would be cheaper.

Simon – They said that new specifications mean that junctions are not allowed within 1 km of each other which is why the bridge is skew.

Public – If the original slip road went to the roundabout of the connecting bridge, then onto the A47 dual carriageway there wouldn't be a need for the 1km. This would be easy to achieve, the current design is poor. I am going to the Blofield meeting next week as it will impact them with more through traffic. Cucumber lane roundabout is also not good as it is.

Simon - The Old Yarmouth Road should have a left only into Cucumber Lane to alleviate the queues but this is outside of HE area. Thank you for your recommendations.

Public – I asked about 20mph signs on Station Road and was disappointed that it wasn't on the minutes.

Simon – It was on some minutes and Highways were asked again. (5<sup>th</sup> June and 3<sup>rd</sup> July).

Marina – We had the same enquiries when the School was on Chapel Road, they said no because of lack of Street lights. They even took away the signs the Children designed.

Clerk – Enquired and the only 20mph sign that could be possible is by the School and with lights only on in the morning and evening at the start and end of School. Permission would have to be granted and the Parish Council would have to purchase, install and maintain them. The Public as an individual could put forward the 20mph suggestion to NCC Highways Committee.

Request for signs 'No dogs in the MUGA'

Beacon for 11<sup>th</sup> November, can this be done? Ben said it is in hand. Bruno Peak the Pageant Master has organised the Beacon being lit, I have e-mailed Sonya on 18/7/18.

Sonya replied to the e-mail asking if Ben would still light it or teach someone else?

**18/109. Minutes of the Meeting 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018:** Were signed as a true record.

**18/110. Matters arising from 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018 Meeting:** None.

**18/111. Correspondence:** a) NPS e-mail regarding the lapse of planning application 20140979 – Redevelopment of Site for Residential Development and Retention of Existing Nursery Building For community Use (Outline for 23 dwellings) at Lingwood Primary School, Chapel Road, Lingwood.

NPS have said they wish to put in a new application without transferring the old Nursery Building to the Parish Council as they wish to put more properties on there to counteract the extra costs of new drainage constraints and the layout due to TPO's on trees. They say the Parish Council has sufficient buildings to use and will get Section 106/CIL for adding to the New Village Hall or renewing the Reading Room.

The Parish Council wished to keep the Nursery building and parking to encourage a Doctors Surgery. The original Section 106 agreement cost the Parish Council £1,104.50 in Solicitors fees to set up so re-imbursement would be required. The building is worth a lot more than the Section 106 we would get but it would cost us to convert and upkeep if not taken on by a Surgery as there seems to be a shortage of Doctors. Ask what sort of figure we would get. We could ask the developer to convert the Nursery Building? **Decision:** Ask for the Solicitors fees to be reimbursed and for a rough calculation of how much 106/CIL would be due.

Q. Has anything been done about the fly tipping on the Orchard? The neighbouring property has had building works and the rubble is next to their new fence. A. It looks like the neighbour is the culprit and should be given the opportunity to remove it before we get it moved and give them the bill.

The lights at the Station are now timed to go off but they still haven't put the hoods on that they promised.

The Burlingham Green Notice board got blown down with the high winds but the repair and

replacement has been done quickly and very well, thank you.

**18/112. Action Log:** Nothing to report.

**18/113. Linwood Park Run – to discuss the request for £1,500 set up donation:** Ref the £3,000 set up, other grants have been applied for from Active Norfolk etc. to the value of £1,500 but £1,500 is requested from the Parish Council. There has been an e-mail from a generous resident offering £500 towards the Parish Council's possible donation which would mean only £1,000 is required from the Parish Council. It is a one off payment and no requests will be made at a later date. The skate park was turned down because there is one in Acle but this is not costing the Parish Council as much as a skate park would plus there are no ongoing costs or maintenance. Two proposals were put forward, 1. For £1,000 donation. 2. £500 donation, with the Village Hall putting in the other half as they were due to make money on the Hug a Mug. The Village Hall will be responsible for the maintenance etc. and do not make enough profit to pay the £500. Proposal 2. Was not seconded.

**Decision:** It was resolved by majority (6 for, 1 against and 1 abstention) to donate £1,000 plus the £500 donation from the resident.

**18/114. Highways, including response to A47 Consultation:** There is no bridge for pedestrians or footway at the Eastern Junction. Richard says they have softened their point of view for a crossing point. We should respond with what we want and not what we think they'll do. Jon Donlevy said to ask for a crossing point not specify a bridge or underpass.

A47 Public Consultation Exhibitions for the proposed new junctions; Questionnaire mostly filled out but additional info to be tweaked and circulated to Councillors for approval before being sent;

4b. If the bridge was straight across with a roundabout at either side, the existing East bound On slip from the existing Blofield Bridge junction could be integrated to allow for traffic to exit at the existing Blofield Bridge off slip to a roundabout and either carry on to Burlingham, join the A47 or use the bridge to access that side of Blofield and go on to Lingwood without passing through Blofield.

5b. Extra provision should be made for pedestrian/cyclist/equestrian in the form of extra wide paths for safety and that the adjoining Burlingham connecting footway is a foot/cycle way to encourage people to use these healthier forms of transport.

6. The Parish accesses are reduced by this scheme. In the 'access from local residents section' P15., HE was aware from the outset a crossing at Lingwood giving direct access to Burlingham and Visa Versa was required. The Scheme fails to address the repeated request for a crossing at or near Lingwood Road and the footbridge previously shown to address this has been erased.

Similarly the requested 200m section of foot/cycleway to link the South Walsham Road east to the existing to Acle access has not been provided.

The farm track from Lingwood Road to Blofield could also be made into a footpath/cycle path/bridleway to help replace some of these paths lost by the scheme.

7b. Environmentally the new scheme has meant that a car will be needed to cross the A47 to access Schools, (walk, bike, scoot initiative), public transport, cycle ways, walks and bridleways. The proposed route adds 3km per journey travelling up to Blofield Bridge and back down the other side. The footbridge shown in the earlier scheme should be reintroduced or the cheaper underpass, favoured by Norfolk County Farms, should be chosen. The onward link to foot/cycle access from South Walsham Road eastwards should also be provided as well as a footway/cycleway/ safe crossing over the Eastern Junction bridge provided.

10. The consultation process has been a bit disappointing with the main concerns from our Parish seemingly being ignored.

**18/115. Finance:** a) Payments Received: i) BDC 2<sup>nd</sup> ½ of precept. £12,351

b) Authority to pay was granted for: i) British Gas, MUGA Electric £57.58 (Chq No. 2173).

ii) PD Electrical – Repair to MUGA switches £75 (Chq No. 2170).

iii) S. Donovan park and allotment tap £48, HMRC £12, parts £18.07 (Chq No's 2171 + 2172).

iv) Clerk's expenses July/Aug/Sept £210.39 (Chq No. 2169).

v) K. Monsey, Cemetery grass £ 495 (Chq No. 238).

c) Donation - Royal British Legion Wreath donation, (£50 last year). **Decision:** It was resolved to donate £50 again this year. (Chq No. 2174).

*There being no further business the meeting closed at 21.15 -*

*Next meeting of the Parish Council is on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018, At Lingwood Village Hall.*