

Parish Liaison Meetings

Minutes

Monday, 23 September 2019 at 18:30

Present: Councillor Smith (Chair), Councillor Wainwright, Councillor Bird, Neil Shaw (Strategic Director), Sally Pearson (Executive Services Officer)

Parish Councils: Hopton, Caister, Bradwell, Mautby, Somerton, Belton and Browston

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES

Councillor Smith informed the Parish Council's that the papers for the meetings will no longer be sent out but will be available a week prior to the meeting on the Council's website.

It was previously agreed that future meetings will commence at 6.30pm.

The posters and stickers referred to under Item 5 are available to Parish Councils on request.

The minutes were agreed subject to the date change in Item 3 (Minutes) to read 12 March 2018.

4 PARISH COUNCIL QUESTIONS

SOMERTON Parish Council

1. Query voter registration for non residents in Somerton. Persons who own properties in Somerton, are on the local Register of Electors but do not reside in Somerton ie the properties are not their main residence. Can second home owners vote in local and national elections in the Borough even though they do not have their main residence here?

The Chairman reported that there are particular circumstances where electors may be entitled to register at more than one address.

Students

Students often live at two different addresses, one during term time and one during the holidays. Students are entitled to register in respect of both addresses if you consider that they have their permanent home in both places.

Second homes

Depending on the purpose for which a person is resident at their second home, they may be deemed to be resident there. In each case, a person would need to be able to show they are permanently resident at both addresses.

The entitlement is to register – it is still an offence to vote twice in the same election. Therefore they would be entitled to vote in local elections in both places, but for national elections they can only vote once.

The Chairman added that if anyone has suspicion of malpractice to contact Denise Wilby, Elections and Licensing Manager.

1. How many fines for littering has GYBC imposed over the last year?

The Chairman reported that with regard to litter Fixed Penalty Notice's (FPN's), historically the Borough Council has very much taken an educational stance on littering generally providing a warning to those caught doing it. As a result the Borough Council does not often issue FPN for littering, only in the more extreme cases whereby a person refuses to pick the rubbish up, and would only issue a couple each year. A review is being undertaken and the Borough Council would be looking at doing targeted enforcement work around the issue of littering. As a department Environmental Services has targeted its resources at the issues of flytipping and dog fouling and last year secured 31 prosecutions and a further 32 formal actions against offenders.

BRADWELL Parish Council

1. Parish Precept – will the Borough Council still be able to contribute Council Tax Support Grant towards the Parish Councils' precept amounts for 2020-21?

The Chairman reported that the future projections assume reductions in funding (for the parishes) along the same lines as the overall funding for the Borough Council is assumed to reduce.

- ii) Will the Borough Council still be able to contribute concurrent functions grant for 2020-21 at the same level as in previous years?

The chairman reported that there are currently no plans or proposals to reduce the concurrent function grant paid to the parishes compared to previous years, similarly no growth assumptions have been assumed either.

The Chairman added that GYBC should know the Government settlement figure in early December and that following a report to Policy and Resources Committee it will then need to be ratified at Full Council. Assumptions can not be made until this time.

ORMESBY Parish Council

1. Whilst I understand that travelling circuses are exempt from planning regulations is there any action that can be taken regarding their fly posting activities? They leave the posters when they move on and others have to remove them. I expect that many other villages have the same problem.

The Chairman reported that advertising by travelling Circuses can cause an issue and GYBC often do find that they indiscriminately put signs up. Whilst there are exemptions in place for them around being able to advertise they should still write to both Norfolk County Council and the Borough Council's own Planning Department to highlight where they intend to advertise and make sure what they are doing is acceptable. Where the Borough Council are made aware that excessive signage has been put up a visit to the circus will be undertaken to try and address the issue and get them to reduce to a more acceptable level. Direct enforcement can be difficult. To issue an FPN you have to take action against the person who put the signage up (not against the Business) so you need to be able to identify the actual person. As a result the preferred route is trying to work with Circuses when they arrive to keep the signage to a more acceptable level and having them removed when they leave.

CAISTER Parish Council

1. Are GYBC declaring a Climate Change Emergency

The Chairman reported that following a resolution from Council a letter had been sent to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial

Strategy. A reply had since been received from the Minister of State for Business and Energy. This had been considered by the Policy and Resources committee and has now been referred to the Environment Committee to continue work on this matter.

A representative from Caister Parish Council expressed concern that established trees are being removed to make way for housing developments.

The Chairman reported that if a tree has a tree preservation order it is protected. Councillor Wainwright added that where trees need to be removed there are sometimes conditions attached to the applicable planning consent that trees have to be planted in an alternative location.

1. Repairs to Beach Road Car Park - Not fit for purpose
2. Ponding at end of Tan Lane Footpath, leading on to Beach Road Car Park

The Chairman answered both questions together and reported that the car park was not in the capital projects for the foreseeable future as the business case for a total resurfacing did not stack up in relation to usage and income.

The Chairman also gave some background information on the car park. The car park was originally a hoggins surface (just sand and gravel) , but at some time in the late 1980's early 1990's , this car park was surfaced with a tarmac base layer , but never had a surface wearing course laid.

The car park repair and maintenance budget is used to undertake any repairs on this car park.

Any potholes that develop are periodically filled and surfaced and a number of these have been carried out over the year.

In the last few years, the ponding problem just inside the entrance had been solved by installing new soakaways and the "patchwork" area of pothole repairs around these was over surfaced at the same time. On another occasion, the entrance roadway was also over surfaced .

The Chairman added that when you a new piece of tarmac/or patch is laid in an area – the area is then sealed, however the surrounding area remains in the same state as it was before, therefore could become vulnerable to decay.

The Chairman reported that Paul Houghton, GYBC Building Surveyor would investigate the ponding issue at the end of Tan Lane footpath, although from Mapping Browser the footpath would appear to be an Norfolk County Council path. GYBC continually review and inspect all our car parks and will continue to maintain as necessary.

A representative from Caister Parish Council requested the income figure for the Beach Road Car Park. The Chairman advised that a written response would be provided.

The Chairman advised that Norfolk County Councillors have £6000 per annum to spend on local projects and advised that the Norfolk County Council member for Caister Ward is Councillor Penny Carpenter.

iv) GYBC spent £3 million on Consultants, was it deemed value for money and did it affect the outcome of anything?

The Chairman confirmed the actual spend for consultancy as £1.8m and £1.48m for agency costs. He reported that the Council did not spend £3m on consultants. The amount of spend incurred on consultants has reduced in recent years.

“For some specific pieces of work such as the Marina Centre Redevelopment or Town Centre Regeneration, or to provide short-term management support during periods of internal change, consultants are still occasionally used where they bring, on a temporary basis, specialist expertise and extra resource which would not be cost-effective or useful to employ internally. Sometimes these consultancy fees are covered through external grants for projects.

The Chairman added that consultants are brought in for specific pieces of work where there is not the resource or expertise in house. An example of this is the Future High Streets Fund. GYBC submitted an expression of interest for funding which was one of only 53 Councils, 4 in the Eastern Region to be successful. £165k of funding was awarded to fund consultants to work up a Business case for the full bid as the expertise and technical knowledge is not available in house. The bid will be submitted in January 2020 and the decision should be known in April 2020. If the bid is successful GYBC could be awarded up to £25m of funding.

The Chairman clarified that the funding is specifically for the Town Centre. Any bid submitted is closely monitored in line with the HM Treasury Green book.

The Chairman informed the meeting that GYBC were also eligible to bid for funding from ‘The Stronger Towns Fund’ however the criteria and full details of the funding had not yet been received.

5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A representative from Bradwell Parish Council asked for clarification with regard to the Badger Building site on Beccles Road and the ownership of play areas if the Parish does not want to take on the area and what then happens to the S106 monies. The Chairman advised that he would look into this and reply directly. Concurrent function grants were also discussed. Councillor Wainwright advised that a planning application for the site has not been considered by the Planning committee to date.

A representative from Caister Parish Council requested an update on the

planning application in Jack Jones Way. The Chairman advised that he will request an update and reply directly.

The meeting ended at: 19:15