

**MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF LAKENHEATH PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT THE  
METHODIST CHURCH CHAPEL ON MONDAY 12<sup>th</sup> MAY 2008 at 7.00PM**

Present :- Messrs D Gathercole (Chairman)

Mrs A Chambers (Vice Chair)

J Gentle

I Frost

J Ingham

D Lucas

E Morley

R Rolph

I Smith

M Whitehand

In Attendance:- Cllr Colin Noble

14 members of the public and 1 member of the Press were present.

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN & TO RECEIVE DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE**

Cllr Gathercole was nominated, seconded and elected unanimously.

Cllr Gathercole thanked the outgoing Chairman, Cllr Gentle.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr Rissen - a previous meeting, at which she is Secretary – apologies accepted & Sqdn Ldr Neild.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Gathercole – planning, Village Hall & Playing Fields.

Cllr Morley – planning (item 10(b))

**4. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR**

Cllr Chambers was proposed & seconded; Cllr Smith was proposed & seconded. Cllr Chambers received 7 votes & Cllr Smith received 2 votes – Cllr Chambers was duly elected.

**5. POLICE MATTERS**

No police present.

**6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING OF 7<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2008**

Acceptance of minutes was proposed, seconded and agreed by all.

*The Chairman closed the meeting.*

**7. REPRESENTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A member of the public stood up to say he lived in Station Road, had done so for 22 years, taking retirement from USAF and that his quality of life was about to suffer greatly if proposed development of 23 houses on land to rear of 65 – 73 Station Road goes ahead. An access road

will be put in between his house and no. 65 meaning that his & his son's bedroom will be 9 feet from the road. Why is the access road not going between houses which have sold their land? He contended that the Parish Council are his representatives & he urged them to vote against the proposed development. Another member of the public, on the same issue, said that he (works in village) and his wife (a teacher at the local school) have a vested interest in the village. He has, with Parish Council support, successfully fought off other much smaller developments. He stated that in their own documents FHDC have stated that Lakenheath is "6 years ahead of targets in housing development". He added that in 2006 the Government Inspector had stated that a much smaller development (2/3 houses) was "totally out of character". The density is 3 to 23. 23 is not consistent. He appealed for consistency from the Parish Council urging them to vote against the proposed development. Another member of the public had heard that Tesco's is buying Matthews, is this true. The Chairman said the Clerk would make enquiries. A member of the public asked about the NATS Consultation – would Lakenheath be affected? The Clerk and one of the Councillors stated that it was their understanding that Lakenheath should not be directly affected.

*Resolved – Clerk to ascertain the position regarding changes at Matthews.*

**8. REPORTS FROM :-**

**a) RAF COMMANDER**

In his absence the Clerk read reports re helicopter flights, proposed out of hours flights – helicopters & F15s and "quiet hours". Message is, however, that USAF try to be mindful, as far as possible, of residents. There was also a complaint about fuel smell – investigated, nothing found but appreciation sent – could have been spillage. Cllr Chambers said she had received complaints about flights, esp. from residents in Briscoe Way. Proposed that Clerk send a letter of complaint to RAF Commander, seconded & agreed by all but one Councillor.

*Resolved – Clerk to send letter of complaint re flying activity.*

**b) FOREST HEATH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Cllr Rona Burt is new Chair of FHDC with Cllr Malcolm Smith as Vice Chair. Cllr Gathercole said that he is now Vice Chair on LDF.

**c) SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL**

Cllr Noble added his comments to NATS consultation to say that there is concern in Newmarket to the extent that trainers (horse) could relocate. Issue being taken up by MPs. Flytipping in droves bordering the village was subject of a multi agency meeting held at end of April. An Action Plan has been formed. Cllr Noble said that a priority is to reroute HGVs. Dip in road at Woodlands has been repaired although not entirely satisfactorily. There was much said about Local Government Review and "One Suffolk" bid. Cllr Whitehand said that following on from a Neighbourhood watch meeting he had attended residents would like 30MPH limit extended the full length of Maids Cross Hill & traffic calming measures in Woodlands. The latter point was not widely accepted – where would not benefit from traffic calming? Cllr Smith said water collects at the South side of Mutford Green. The Clerk said she had referred this to SCC (2man gang). Cllr Whitehand raised the ongoing issue of road signage for road narrowing in Wings Road.

*Resolved – Cllr Noble to pursue extended 30MPH Maids Cross Hill & signage for Wings Road.*

*Cllr Noble left the meeting.*

*The meeting was reopened.*

**9. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES NOT ELSEWHERE ON AGENDA**

Cllr Whitehand, as agreed took up Parish Council seat at a rather poorly attended Neighbourhood Watch Meeting in Quayside Court. Attendees would like to know what is happening in and around village, Cllr Whitehand it is hoped can bridge that gap. 2 items were brought from meeting – footpath o/s wall of Lakenheath Hall, whose jurisdiction – whilst under development - FHDC. Replacement Neighbourhood Watch sign – Clerk advised it is the group themselves who are responsible. Cllr Gathercole had brought a letter from FHDC re FHDC office refurbishment. There is to be a Special Council Meeting on this in view of Local Government review. FHDC will keep us updated. Cllr Morley asked about new Village Sign – was advised it had been up for about 2 weeks. The Clerk read out e-mail from Mr Horne stating that if the Parish Council was to have a press/photo shoot the PC may wish to invite a Mr How from Worlington (he flew Stirling Bombers from Lakenheath and Mr Horne had sought his advice during the production of the new sign. It was proposed to have a photo shoot (with Cllr Chambers & Mr How), seconded and agreed by all.

*Resolved – Clerk to arrange contact with Mr How for photo/press coverage.*

**10. PLANNING MATTERS.**

Cllr Gathercole said that he had taken advice on whether or not he should leave the meeting at this point – no conflict providing he does not vote.

**a) TO RECEIVE A REPORT FROM PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Cllr Rolph presented a report from the Planning Committee. 6 applications had been considered, of those 4 were approved:-

F/2008/0199/FUL (inc amended plan) – erection 2 storey house – 79 Back St (fronting Broom Rd)

F/2008/0184/FUL (amended) – erection single storey side ext. – 1 Broom Rd Close

F/2008/0274/FUL – erection single storey front/rear ext. – 9 Wingfield Ave

F/2008/0175/LBC – erection detached garage, insertion new French doors/canopy over door, replacement sash windows – Brewery House, Anchor Lane

There were objections to :-

F/2008/0255/FUL – erection 2 chalet bungalows & garages & new garage for existing dwelling – 3 Roughlands. Objection – too cramped & not in keeping with area, erection 1 family sized bungalow more appropriate.

F/2008/0254/FUL – erection detached garage (dev. affecting a listed bldg.) – Brewery House, Anchor Lane. Objection – size & design of garage not considered appropriate.

FHDC made 3 decisions in contradiction of the Parish Council's Planning Committee:-

F/2008/0170/FUL – land between 127-133 High St – Approved

F/2008/0184/FUL – 1 Broom Rd Close – Refused

F/2007/0475/FUL – 82/82A High St – Approved

**b) TO CONSIDER F/2008/0236/FUL** – major development 23 houses & bungalows inc access roads & associated works – land to rear 65,69 & 73 Station Rd

Cllr Ingham said that 2 gentlemen had spoken very eloquently and had good cases for objection and as Councillors they were elected to support the people of Lakenheath. Cllr Rolph agreed but

said that FHDC did not always agree. He went to to say that gardens would be small and not sufficient for families/children. There should be a redesign with fewer houses. Cllr Frost agreed. Cllr Chambers said that there was no infrastructure in the village to cope with increased development. Cllr Gentle said it is the other way round – increased facilities will only come with further development. Cllr Lucas agreed that there are not enough amenities and little space for amenities. It was proposed and seconded that the Parish Council should object to the development. This was agreed by all, except Cllrs Gathercole & Morley – both of whom had declared interests. Grounds for objection were :- not in keeping with character of area; bad design; high ratio of affordable housing; access point not acceptable; proximity of existing dwellings. The Parish Council would demand a total survey of the capability of the sewage system prior to any development. It is to be noted that smaller developments in the area have already been rejected – last one by Govt. Inspector in 2006 and that 2008 report from FHDC acknowledges Lakenheath is ahead of development plans.

*Resolved Clerk to contact FHDC Planning Dept outlining PC objections to above application.*

**c )TO CONSIDER ANY OTHER OUTSTANDING APPLICATION/CORRESPONDENCE**

The Clerk read out an email from FHDC in response to Parish Council query on the naming of the development on Eriswell Rd “The Grange” (not considered appropriate). FHDC had noted the Parish Council’s objections but had approved the name “The Grange”. Cllrs Smith & Whitehand said that there is no regard for local opinion. It was agreed that the Clerk should write back to FHDC expressing displeasure at their decision.

The Clerk read a lengthy email from the Development Monitoring Officer at FHDC re Lakenheath Hall – covering caravans, tree felling, asphaltting, wood burning, minibuses, reported large numbers of males on the site & plywood boarding against existing properties . FHDC acknowledge “the site is a mess & that the developer is the worst they have had to deal with but to see the site finished and all the trees replanted is their main aim”.

*Resolved Clerk to contact FHDC re street naming, as above.*

**d)TO APPOINT 5 MEMBERS TO PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Cllrs Frost & Morley stated their wish to resign from the Planning Committee. Cllrs Ingham & Chambers were proposed, seconded and voted by all to take up vacancies on Planning Committee.

**11. LAKENHEATH CEMETERY**

**a)TO RECEIVE A REPORT FROM THE CEMETERY COMMITTEE**

In absence of Cllr Rissen, the Clerk said that she had been advised the Cemetery was neat & tidy as usual and that the tree pollarding had been done. Cllr Gentle said that he thought a decision had been taken some time ago to plant smaller trees in between the lime trees, with a view to eventually taking out/down the limes. It was decided that this issue should be taken up by the Cemetery Committee and that they should come back to the Parish Council with their views. Cllr Rissen had received a call from the local undertaker re the placing of a memorial bench in the New Section of the Cemetery. The friends & family of the deceased were asking if the bench could be placed in the Garden of Rest Section of the New Cemetery, looking towards the bottom of the New Cemetery. This was proposed, seconded and agreed by all.

*Resolved – Cemetery Committee to debate the planting of smaller trees – in between the limes – and to advise the Parish Council of their proposals.*

**b) TO CONFIRM EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS OF BURIAL**

There was 1 – Sydney Dupe.

**c) TO APPOINT 5 MEMBERS TO CEMETERY COMMITTEE**

Cllrs Gathercole & Smith stated their wish to resign. Cllr Frost was proposed, seconded and voted by all to take up vacancy – the Clerk having pointed out that only 1 vacancy existed as there had been 6 on Cemetery Committee.

**12. STREET LIGHTING – The Firs 102A High Street**

The Clerk said that she had had a lengthy phone call with SCC in Ipswich re this and Mr Rushbrook of SCC advised that even if the Parish went direct to EDF & Carillion, their quotes would not be any cheaper and would have to be done in 2 stages. The Clerk had subsequently heard from SCC in Bury St Edmunds who quoted £2817.30 plus VAT for a light o/s The Firs. The Clerk had contacted the officer at SCC, BSE, to see if a light on the other side of the road would be possible (on the existing post) and if so to provide a quote. The indication at the time of the phone call was that it would be possible and could save between £1,000 and £1,500. There had not been a response at the time of the Parish Council Meeting. Cllr Morley asked if going ahead with this light might set a precedent, at which point the Clerk reminded the meeting that there had been 3 earlier requests for lights which had not been discussed in detail. It was suggested that if SCC, BSE, came back with a much lower (£1,000 - £1,500) quote for a light on the other side of the road, *which would give the same amount of light*, then this is what the Parish Council should opt for and the Clerk should go ahead with arrangements without coming back to the Parish Council. This was proposed, seconded and agreed by all but one of the Councillors.

*Resolved – Clerk to get quote for light on existing post on opposite side of road and if significantly lower AND it has been established that the same amount of light would be given, the Clerk should submit an order for the light.*

**13. LAKENHEATH TIMES – Content/Cost/Advertising**

Cllr Ingham, who had a number of other village/town publications with him, suggested that advertising in Lakenheath Times could help defray costs and that clubs could contribute articles etc, sporting results could be included, perhaps planning applications. Cllr Chambers stated that the Church had been assured that there would be no advertising in the “Parish Paper”. Cllr Whitehand offered to look into cost of the Mundford magazine. It was proposed, seconded and agreed by all that Cllr Ingham would talk to the Church (Rev Leach) re issue of advertising.

*Resolved – Cllr Ingham to speak to Rev Leach; Clerk to circulate the other village/town papers to Councillors & Cllr Whitehand to make enquiries about cost of Mundford magazine.*

**14. REVIEW OF DECLARATION OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS**

Just prior to the meeting the Clerk had been handed a newspaper cutting which suggested that Councillors should complete a declaration of interest annually. The Clerk said she was not aware that this was the situation but that she would seek guidance from SALC. In any event, however, she wished to remind Councillors of their need to keep their declaration up to date.

*Resolved – Clerk to confirm whether or not there is a requirement to complete declarations annually.*

**15. FINANCIAL MATTERS**

**a) PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

A listing of accounts paid/to be paid was tabled. Acceptance was proposed, seconded & agreed by all.

**b) BANK RECONCILIATION**

Bank reconciliation to the end of April was tabled. Acceptance was proposed, seconded & agreed by all.

**c) INCOME & EXPENDITURE REPORT Y/E 31 MARCH 2008**

A draft report was tabled for information only – the Clerk said she had not yet finalised the figures.

**16. CORRESPONDENCE**

Much of the correspondence had been circulated. However, the Clerk read out a letter from the Gardening Club, in which they declined to “adopt” the planters on the Village Green. Cllr Morley suggested local retailers may like to “adopt” a planter.

*Resolved – Cllr Morley to contact local retailers.*

**17. ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

The following were put forward :-

Emergency Plan

Boundary Commission Review – should we have a view, as a Parish Council

**18. TO NOTE DATE OF NEXT MEETING – MONDAY 2<sup>nd</sup> JUNE 2008**

There being no other business the meeting closed at 9.00pm.