

HINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL HELD IN THE LINCOLN HALL ON TUESDAY 03 MARCH 2020.

Present

Cllr Eldridge – Chairman

Cllr Foord – Vice Chair

Cllr Amey, Cllr Christien, Cllr Dore, Cllr Dunnett, Cllr Field, Cllr Gott, Cllr Sykes, Cllr Tyson

Clerk – Ali Doe

There were 11 members of the public present including County Cllr Dewsbury

1. **Apologies for absence** were received from Cllr Shingfield and District Cllr Bendle
2. **Introduction of newly Co-opted Councillors**
Cllr Christien and Cllr Gott were introduced as the newly co-opted members of the Town Council and were thanked for coming forward as a Cllrs and welcomed to the Council.
3. **Signing and Delivery by newly Co-opted Councillors of the Acceptance of Office forms**
The Acceptance of Office forms were signed by Cllr Christien and Cllr Gott and given to the Clerk.
4. **Declarations of interests with regard to items on the agenda and to consider requests for dispensations**
Declarations of interest were made by Cllr Christien, Cllr Dunnett and Cllr Field with regard to agenda item 6 in respect of owning land, bordering land defined in the draft GNLP consultation. Written requests for dispensation were received prior to the meeting from Cllr Christien (agenda item 6.3.a.2, 6.3.b.3, 6.4.a.2 and 6.4.b.3) , Cllr Dunnett (agenda item 6) and Cllr Field (agenda item 6.3.b.4, and 6.4.b.4). Each request for dispensation was considered by the Council and it was agreed to permit Cllrs Christien, Dunnett and Field to take part in the discussion and voting in respect of these agenda items.
5. **To agree a Chairman to preside over any agenda items of this meeting, if both the Chairman and Vice Chair are unable to preside due to (agenda item 1) Apologies for absence and /or (agenda item 4) Declarations of interests**
Cllr Eldridge confirmed he was able to Chair all agenda items.
6. **GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN**
 - 6.1 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WITH REGARD TO THE GNLP - Members of the public may make a statement or ask a question of not more than three minute's duration**
 - 6.1.1 Representatives from Clayland Homes (who are promoting development on GNLP sites GNLP0298 and GNLP0335) advised that they felt the assessments of these sites as unsuitable were inaccurate. The plans for development of these sites were outlined (plans were available for the public to view) and it was stated that homes would not be "identikit" built but be of low-density individual properties of traditional country style, delivered in phases. The development plans were said to include an area of community woodland and could incorporate parking or a link to site named as GNLP0395. It was noted by Clayland Homes that these sites were close to and gave good pedestrian links to facilities such as the sports centre, library and village hall, with good pedestrian links to businesses in the centre of town, it was also stated that (making the comparison with the "GNLP teams preferred site" GNLP0520) these sites (off Watton Road), benefit from not being near to the industrial area (and therefor no

conflict between domestic traffic and commercial traffic exiting the industrial area on Norwich Rd), had no flood constraints and would be of a lesser visual impact. Clayland Homes would welcome the input of the Town Council and the opportunity to work together.

6.2 CORRESPONDENCE – to receive and discuss correspondence received from residents (etc) regarding the GNLP (correspondence not for public inspection)

The following 4 items of correspondence regarding the GNLP were received prior to and read at the meeting

- Clayland Homes – brief outline of their proposed development of the sites GNLP0298 and GNLP0335 and request to attend the meeting to give a short presentation.
- A resident objecting to development of Swan Field, Hardingham Road (GNLP0544R) due to increase in traffic, road and pedestrian safety concerns regarding the narrowness of road and lack of pavement.
- A resident objecting to further development on the Norwich Road due to poor road (traffic and drainage) and pedestrian infrastructure.
- A resident raising ongoing concerns regarding flooding of the Seamere Road/Mill Corner area, in respect of the Hops development and concerns that future development will exacerbate the problem.

In discussing the correspondence the Council were in agreement with the residents points regarding Swan Field and it was noted that the Town Council had made representation regarding this site during the previously GNLP consultation. It was noted that there had been a reduction in the number of houses proposed, however this did not negate the issues regarding location, road safety, poor road and pedestrian infrastructure.

The Council also noted that there have been long standing concerns regarding flooding of the low lying areas of Seamere Road and Mill Corner and these concerns were put forward prior to the Hops being built, but insufficient notice was taken and therefore adequate measure were not put in place to mitigate flooding.

6.3 COUNCILLORS - to disclose opinions expressed at the GNLP roadshow event and having regard to those opinions and opinions expressed in 6.1 and 6.2 discuss 6.3 as below:

Councillors and the Clerk attended the GNLP roadshow on 25 February 2020 and were able to collect the opinions of residents regarding the GNLP proposals. These were collated and circulated as bullet points to all Cllrs prior to this Town Council meeting and are listed below. Members of the GNLP team agreed to meet with members of the Town Council to further discuss the concerns raised and suggestions put forward for alternatives to the preferred options sites. The Clerk is to arrange this meeting.

Comments collected at the GNLP roadshow

OBJECTIONS with regard to “preferred option” GNLP0520:

- On going issues with the Hops regarding surface water and heating
- Too close to the industrial area
- Issues with footpath access into Town Centre/Library/Village Hall
- The Hops has already ruined the approach to Hingham (don’t want more of the same, they are an “eyesore”)
- The houses (at the Hops) will not age (in terms of style) well and the design of houses (if the same as The Hops) are not IN KEEPING with the town
- Resident from the Hops was “told by Abels” that the field to the east would not be built upon and they bought their property based on that as they believed that they would retain countryside views

- Flooding of Seamere Rd, not enough time has passed since Hops been built to know if long term flooding will be a problem as the ditches/etc become overgrown
- Speeding and visibility concerns B1108
- Lack of new infrastructure before building (pedestrian links to centre of town and road improvements)
- Potential of flooding (to lower lying areas) from “Hops Phase 2”
- No safe crossings or walking routes from either preferred sites

Comments IN FAVOUR of GNLPO520:

- Houses are quite comfortable/economical (when the heating thermostat was moved!)
- The houses could be built quickly (Abels “ready to build”)
- The Norwich Road site would be preferred as no “through traffic”, as it is more likely to be occupied by people who work in the city and would probably not affect any issues in the Town Centre

Comments regarding other sites

Dereham Rd (preferred option GNLPO503):

- Concerns regarding speeding/accidents and the additional cars using Fairland Junction and the parking that takes place on the Dereham Rd
- No safe crossings or walking routes from either preferred sites to the centre of Town

Swan Field (Hardingham Road GNLPO544R):

- Road is too narrow and dangerous

Attleborough Road (Ladies Meadow GNLPO395):

- Could provide a Cemetery extension, car park and about 20 houses Behind Springfield way/Sports Centre (GNLPO5012 and 0502)
- Could provide an extension to the playing field giving scope for improvement of facilities and parking with a possible entrance via bottom of field for a new footpath/cycle path
- The sites off Watton Road are nearer and have better footway links to the centre of Town and facilities (Library, Village Hall, Sports centre)

General Comments:

- Would like to see more affordable housing so families (children of long standing Hingham families) can remain in the town
- More houses equals more pressure on school and Drs and parking in town, in particular at the school
- Would like more bungalows
- A lack of new infrastructure or commitment in the policy to improve infrastructure before building
- Would like to see more on offer for Hingham with developments other than just houses, e.g developers to provide better facilities like in other parishes where new village halls/sports facilities have been built
- Smaller developments of fewer houses over time therefore having less of an impact to the town in one go this may also produce a wider range of housing options for people

- Difficulties in general for people with mobility scooters to get around the town made worse by people parking on pavements, improvements/infrastructure needed to remedy this
- (Possibly not relevant to GNLP – but...) Co-op Lorries / beeping horns from 6AM, lorries parking on the pavement so resident (Norwich Rd) can't get out of front gate
- There was a belief that approx. 9 bungalows will be built on land on Hall Lane there are concerns that the land floods
- Too many houses proposed for Hingham and it doesn't include all of the "extra" (windfall) ones that will be built in the town

It was noted that there were inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the GNLP site assessment documents, which had led to sites being deemed unsuitable, in particular with regard "poor pedestrian links" and visual impact, however site GNLP0520 had been specified as a preferred option whilst having very poor pedestrian links to the centre of Town and library/village hall and would be the most visually impactful site due to prominence on the B1108.

a) The sites specified as "Preferred Option" sites

(6.3.a.1) GNLP0503 Land north of Springfield Way and west of Dereham Road

Concerns were raised regarding the lack of footway from the site to the Fairland, although the site assessment document stated that there would need to be a "Provision of a continuous footway at the west side of Dereham Road from the site access to Pottles Alley", it was noted that this is unlikely to be possible due to a residents wall on Dereham Road (where the current footway ends). Concerns were also raised regarding low adherence to the existing 20 and 30 mph speed limits on Dereham Road and the dangers already posed by cars being parked from the Attleborough Rd junction to Baxter Road junction. The site assessment also stated that minor carriage way widening on Dereham Road would be required, however it did not state where this would be carried out and therefore it is not known if it is achievable (for example if it is proposed for Dereham Road through the Fairland, the road is bordered by village green).

It was noted that the development (proposed 20 houses) is of a preferred scale.

(6.3.a.2) GNLP0520 (part of) Land south of Norwich Road

It was noted that there has been large scale and vehement opposition expressed toward development of this site. Concerns were raised regarding the existing Hops development and flooding issues that have not been mitigated, it was disclosed that some properties at the southern end of the Hops had experienced damp and had to have remedial works to improve surface water drainage within the gardens. There are long standing concerns with regard to flooding of Seamere Road/Mill Corner and fears that further development of the higher ground on Norwich Road will exacerbate the problem. It was noted that land to the south of GNLP0520 and the Hops was still agricultural land that would need farming. Development of GNLP0520 could restrict agricultural access to this land and also render the land low yielding should it become waterlogged due to surface water run off from the development site.

Many residents had expressed that the Hops had had a negative visual impact on the approach to Hingham, with the design of the development not being in keeping with the rest of the Town. The visual impact of GNLP0520 would be far greater as it stands on higher ground, it would therefore be visible from much of the surrounding areas and would obliterate the views over the open fields to the surrounding countryside. It was also raised that more houses of the same design as The Hops would have an irreversible detrimental visual impact on the town and create more of a perception of a separate community within the town.

There were several aspects of road safety highlighted, low adherence to the speed limit, access from the proposed development onto the B1108 due to the bend to the east of the site. Dangerous proximity to the existing industrial area, which has been designated for expansion (as HIN2), are concerns that the domestic traffic from the proposed development would be exiting onto the B1108 in too closer proximity to the industrial estate, which when expanded will see an increase in vehicles of undetermined number and size (the industrial estate already sees large number of vehicle movements from HGV's).

The proximity of GNLPO520 to the Industrial Area also raised concerns regarding the potential for residents of a new development at GNLPO520 to be affected from pollution from the industrial area (noise/smells).

It was also noted that there is an absence of a continuous footway on the south side of the B1108 to the town centre, due to there being no footway on the south side of B1108 between the Hops and Bears Lane and at the Fairland, and because of the extremely narrow footway by Beaconsfield House on the north side of Norwich Street, if walking from GNLPO520 (or the Hops) pedestrians would have to cross the B1108 twice to get to the Co-op, 3 times to get to the Chemist and 4 times to get to the Library and Village Hall. It was also suggested that GNLPO520 is further away from the centre of Town (Market Place) than the sites off Watton Rd/Springfield Rd.

Concerns were raised with regard to the presence of trees protected by TPO's and the feasibility of a pedestrian island on the B1108 serving GNLPO520 and it was questioned as to whether there was enough room for creating vehicular access onto the development, in particular as the presence of TPO trees had previously prevented a pedestrian island being installed at the eastern end of the Hops development.

Concerns were raised that allowing GNLPO520 to be developed will then open up the potential for GNLPO310 to be developed in the future. A development in this location would further exacerbate all of the issues raised in regard to GNLPO520. The site assessment document stated that "GNLPO310 (Approx. 172 dwellings) is not considered to be suitable for allocation at the current time as it would need to be developed in conjunction with, or following site GNLPO520 otherwise development would be separate from the existing built form of the settlement".

It had been previously suggested by the developer promoting GNLPO520 that residents from Hingham would be more inclined to work in Norwich/Wymondham and therefore a development on Norwich Road (GNLPO520) would prevent additional traffic travelling through the town and via the dangerous B1108/Fairland crossroads. It was discussed that this rationale is unsupported as it is conceivable to assume that there would be residents that would work in other locations such as Dereham and Attleborough. Dereham would also be likely to be a destination for residents to visit for supermarket (and other) shopping.

(6.3.a.3) HIN2 Land adjacent to Hingham Industrial Estate at Ironside Way, Hingham

Although HIN2 is the "designated" employment area in Hingham under the GNLP, there are no timescales for this area being developed to increase employment opportunities. It was also noted that there are many independent businesses in Hingham, the Co-op, agriculture and a small "industrial" area off Dereham Road that could all provide employment opportunities. With regard to GNLPO520, other development sites could provide better pedestrian access to the existing employment opportunities within the town. It was noted that the employment area would retain the tree screen on Norwich Road and would use the existing access of Ironside Way, however, this means that at some point there will be increased industrial traffic of unknown size and frequency exiting and accessing the industrial/employment area, to and from the B1108.

b) The sites specified as "Unsuitable/Unreasonable"

(6.3.b.1) GNLPO273 Land west of Attleborough Road

It was noted that points in the site assessment document deeming GNLPO273 unsuitable were valid and correct (“This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is located some way from the existing settlement limit with no safe walking route to the local primary school”).

(6.3.b.2) GNLPO298 Land opposite Hingham Sports Centre, Watton Road

Concerns were raised as to why this site had been deemed unsuitable, as the rationale is contradictory in relation to GNLPO520 which has been specified as a “preferred option”. The developer (Clayland Homes) promoting GNLPO298 and GNLPO335 (according to their plan) can demonstrate the feasibility of a provision of a footway link to Hingham Town Centre. It was noted by Cllrs that this footway link would be more adequate than the footway link from GNLPO520 (Norwich Road) although the need for a pedestrian priority crossing point would need to be addressed.

It was also noted that the site assessments also states that GNLPO298/GNLPO335 has few or no flood constraints where as GNLPO520 has high flood mitigation. (These points highlights inconsistencies and contradictions in the site assessment process).

The developer also indicated that the development would include provision for wildlife, a community woodland and could incorporate an access point from GNLPO335 (from an adopted road) to GNLPO395, which the Town Council consider should be allocated for the provision of a cemetery extension and car park (with pedestrian access to the Fairland through Rectory Gardens). The idea of a Community Woodland was welcomed by Cllrs.

It was noted that a development on GNLPO298 and GNLPO335 would be likely to have a less detrimental visual impact on the approach to Hingham than GNLPO520, although the development would need to provide a range of housing (to suit varied needs) but be in keeping with the Town. The developer had advised that the development would be deliverable in phases, and this was also welcomed, although generally there are concerns regarding the amount of new housing commitment allocated for Hingham in the GNLPO.

The Town Council consider that this site (and GNLPO335) and the proposals made by the developer should be more fully explored as a preferred option/feasible alternative to GNLPO520, to which there are vehement objections

(6.3.b.3) GNLPO310 Land south of Norwich Road, north of Seamere Road

Concerns were raised regarding the suggestion that the site could be considered suitable if developed in conjunction with or after GNLPO520, due to the vehement and extensive objections stated against GNLPO520 it was suggested that this site be deemed as unsuitable for housing development and that it should not be considered for development at any future time, even if GNLPO520 were to be developed.

(6.3.b.4) GNLPO335 Land south of Watton Road

See **(6.3.b.2) GNLPO298 Land opposite Hingham Sports Centre, Watton Road** above (discussed in tandem).

(6.3.b.5) GNLPO395 Land west of Attleborough Road

It was noted that the Town Council in the previous GNLPO consultation, agreed that GNLPO395 should be allocated for the provision of a cemetery extension and car park (with pedestrian access to the Fairland through Rectory Gardens). It was noted that safe vehicular access could be achieved through development of GNLPO298 and GNLPO335. It was suggested that very small-scale development of GNLPO395 could help to support a car park, concerns were raised regard to landscape and heritage impacts if such a development was to take place.

(6.3.b.6) GNLPO501 Land west of Springfield Way

(6.3.b.7) GNLPO502 Land west of Springfield Way

Concerns were raised as to why these sites had been deemed unsuitable, as the rationale is contradictory in relation to GNLPO520 which has been specified as a “preferred option” (with regard

to flood mitigation and footway links). A development on GNLPO501/ GNLPO502 would be likely to have a less detrimental visual impact on the approach to Hingham than GNLPO520,

It was noted that NCC Highways have commented that there is not an achievable highway access point, Cllrs consider that this would be achievable, using land currently owned by the Town Council to create an access point onto Springfield Way. The Clerk is to contact the land owner to discuss the feasibility/possibility of this.

Cllrs considered that a development in this location would give better pedestrian access (than GNLPO520) to the town's sports facilities, village hall, library and small businesses in the Fairland and Market Place. Children would not have to cross the B1108 to access the primary school (as they would from GNLPO520). Although it is considered that this footway link would be more adequate than the footway link from GNLPO520 (Norwich Road), the need for a pedestrian priority crossing point on the B1108 would need to be addressed.

It was discussed that a development on GNLPO501 in conjunction with land from GNLPO502 could provide a much needed extension to the playing field and sports centre car parking facilities, which are currently inadequate to support a growing community. Objections raised against development of GNLPO501 and GNLPO502 have focused on the problem of on road parking on Springfield Way and Watton Road during popular events held at the sports centre, development of these areas and provision of land for additional sports and car parking facilities could alleviate these issues with on road parking.

(6.3.b.8) GNLPO544R Swan Field, Hardingham Road

It was noted that points in the site assessment document deeming GNLPO273 unsuitable were valid and correct. "This site is not considered to be suitable for allocation due to highways constraints. The narrowness of the carriageway and the lack of a continuous footpath is compounded by the very poor forward visibility for vehicles travelling around the adjacent bend on Hardingham Road "

c) The "Strategy Policy" document

It was noted that even though Hingham had been defined in the GNLPO policy document as a Key Service Centre, there was no definition in the policy/strategy document of what a Key Service Centre is. It was also raised that there was no benefit to the Hingham community from Hingham having this definition as it did not come with a commitment to improved infrastructure and facilities in the town. It was noted that Hingham does not have a high school and does not have a purpose built library, and the current facilities (Lincoln Hall, Sports Centre, Bowls Club, School, and associated parking) are inadequate to sustain growth and are already subject to parking problems leading to complaints.

Concerns were raised regarding the number of houses allocated to Hingham under the GNLPO, 100 new homes, on top of the existing commitment of 16 homes and on top of that, an unknown number of new homes through small "windfall" development sites. It was commented that this growth is not sustainable, without improvement to the existing infrastructure and facilities of the town. And that although the preferred option would be to have no additional development (that request is likely to be rejected), smaller sized gradual development may be less impactful on the existing infrastructure and facilities such as the school and Dr's Surgery.

Concerns were also raised that Hingham school and Drs surgery were also having to support families from the surrounding developments in the Breckland area and for which no CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is given to the Town Council. (The Clerk advised that Breckland had not adopted the CIL system of planning charges).

It was noted that (many) businesses and residential properties in the Market Place and Fairland do not have off road parking and that on street parking in Hingham is becoming hazardous, in particular on Dereham Road/Fairland. In relation to reducing pollution/climate change it was noted that businesses would be unable to provide electrical charging points for vehicles of customers and staff in the future. A public carpark with this facility is needed to sustain growth in the town.

Concerns were also raised regarding the limited bus services in Hingham and that the previously Joint Core Strategy had defined Hingham as having a “limited bus service” since the JCS was adopted there has been a reduction in bus services and threats of loss of the already severely limited direct bus service to Dereham, The GNLP policy document notes that Hingham has "good transport links". It was noted that this is not an accurate description and is contradictory to the JCS .

Concerns were raised regarding the lack of commitment in the policy to deliver road safety improvements to Hingham to combat speeding undertake improvements to the Fairland junction and to install a pedestrian crossing on the B1108, while further development of Hingham will result in more traffic movements through the town.

Concerns were raised regarding the policy of “windfall development” as this is unclear and ambiguous and has potential to significantly increase the amount of development (in small pockets) over time.

It was noted that sites in the GNLP consultation were defined as being within the 3000m buffer zone to SSSI. In the context of the climate emergency, where several species of wildlife native to Britain are becoming extinct or at risk of extinction the point was made that it should be ensured that housing developments are not built on areas where rare species of wildlife may exist, or indeed, where extension of the urban area will contribute to the depletion of wildlife. Should housing development take place wildlife habitat should be preserved, protected, enhanced and improved.

6.4 TOWN COUNCIL – to agree an outline response to GNLP consultation:

It was agreed that the Clerk should draft a response to the GNLP consultation for all sites and to draft a response to the policy document based on (but enhancing) the points made in the discussion, and send this to Cllrs to ensure all points had been covered prior to submitting the response.

a) The sites specified as “Preferred Option” sites

(6.4.a.1) GNLP0503 Land north of Springfield Way and west of Dereham Road

It was agreed to object to GNLP0503 being designated as a preferred option (as detailed in 6.3.a.1), although it was noted that the small scale size of the proposed development was preferable.

(6.4.a.2) GNLP0520 (part of) Land south of Norwich Road

It was agreed to object to GNLP0520 being designated as a preferred option (as detailed in 6.3.a.2).

(6.4.a.3) HIN2 Land adjacent to Hingham Industrial Estate at Ironside Way, Hingham

It was agreed to submit concerns regarding the proximity of GNLP0520 to HIN2, and note that HIN2 is not the only employment area in Hingham.

b) The sites specified as “Unsuitable/Unreasonable”

(6.4.b.1) GNLP0273 Land west of Attleborough Road

It was agreed to support the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0273 as unsuitable.

(6.4.b.2) GNLP0298 Land opposite Hingham Sports Centre, Watton Road

It was agreed to object to the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0298 as unsuitable (as detailed in 6.3.b.2).

(6.4.b.3) GNLP0310 Land south of Norwich Road, north of Seamere Road

It was agreed to support the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0310 as unsuitable, and that it should remain unsuitable in the event that GNLP0520 is developed (see 6.3.b.3).

(6.4.b.4) GNLP0335 Land south of Watton Road

It was agreed to object to the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0335 as unsuitable (see 6.3.b.4 and 6.3.b.2)

(6.4.b.5) GNLP0395 Land west of Attleborough Road

It was agreed to support the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0395 as unsuitable with regard to development, and to request that the site be allocated for a cemetery extension and car parking (see 6.3.b.5).

(6.4.b.6) GNLP0501 Land west of Springfield Way

(6.4.b.7) GNLP0502 Land west of Springfield Way

It was agreed to object to the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0501 and GNLP0502 as unsuitable (see 6.3.b.7).

(6.4.b.8) GNLP0544R Swan Field, Hardingham Road

It was agreed to support the GNLP decision to deem GNLP0544R as unsuitable (see 6.3.b.7).

c) The "Strategy Policy" document

The Clerk advised that she could draft a response based on the discussions and points raised in agenda item 6.3.c.

It was noted that an officer from the GNLP team had advised Cllrs at the roadshow that Hingham may benefit from having a Local Plan. It was noted that this had previously been discussed by the Town Council and that it had emerged that Local Plans are expensive both financially (although some funding may be available) and costly in time. It was noted to other plans such as the district councils local plan and what will be the GNLP would supersede/over-rule a town/parish local plan in a decision making process and that a local plan would not allow a parish to dictate that there be no further development in that parish, it may give a parish more say on style of developments to be built.

7. Public participation (GENERAL) session - (15 minutes) (Members of the public may make a statement or ask a question of not more than three minute's duration).

A representative from the Hingham Road Safety Campaign gave a brief presentation regarding the road safety campaign and concerns regarding the B1108, in particular with regard to if GNLP0520 is developed. It was stated that the campaign group consider that the B1108 is not "fit for purpose" and that if GNLP0520 is to be developed then significant changes to the road layout would be required. It is the view of the campaign that a development (on GNLP0520) should not be permitted to be built right up to the road, as has been the case with the Hops, as this would remove any scope for widening the carriageway of the B1108. The campaign group suggested that, should GNLP0520 be developed then the road layout should be altered and the only practical answer is the construction of a new single carriageway inside the line of oak trees, making the existing road outbound only.

It was stated that Hingham had been "left behind" with regard to road infrastructure improvements, with the existing issues having been raised in a Town Appraisal in 1995

"Numerous questions were asked regarding problems caused by traffic. In particular crossing the main road is a major concern; some form of pedestrian crossing or traffic calming was requested by several people, although so far the County Council has declined to accept any of the suggestions."

"From the volume of comments and criticisms raised by people...it appears that an appraisal of the whole highway and pavement provision in the town is needed. To date repairs and improvements have been carried out piecemeal but an overview would produce more meaningful long-term solutions."

It was suggested that there is a need for speed calming measures, and these should include a roundabout on Norwich Road and on Watton Rd (by Springfield Way). It was also stated that the town has many substandard and narrow pavements and at no point on the B1108 in Hingham, do pedestrians have priority over traffic and all requests for such a crossing point have been refused by Norfolk County Council.

It was pointed out that NCC only seem to budget for major road improvements/works or for very minor resurfacing and pothole filling work, with very little in between.

The campaign group asked for a collaborative approach to lobby the authorities for road infrastructure improvements in Hingham.

The Chairman thanked the Road Safety Campaign Group for the presentation and the work they are doing.

8. Accuracy of the Minutes of the Town Council meeting of 04 FEBRUARY 2020

The minutes of the Town Council meeting of 04 February 2020 were agreed as correct and signed by the Chairman.

9. Matters arising from the Minutes of 04 FEBRUARY 2020 (written Clerks report circulated prior to the meeting , includes other updates see Appendix A)

10. Working party reports

There had not been any working party meetings and therefore no working party reports.

11. Reports from representatives on external bodies//Cllr attendees at external meetings etc

There were no reports regarding external bodies/meetings.

12. General Correspondence (information/circulars etc)

12.1 Hingham Road Safety Campaign – display of banners

12.2 Lincoln Hall AGM 17th March 2020

12.3 Norfolk ALC Bulletin

12.4 Norfolk ALC Wellbeing – Climate Change Meetings – Hempnall Village Hall

12.5 Your Voice in South Norfolk Meeting

12.6 Christian Fellowship Church –Market Place BT Phonebox

The Clerk advised that the Christian Fellowship Church had confirmed that they had given the phone kiosk back to BT, and BT had intimated that they would return the payphone to the Market Place. The Clerk was thanked for her work on this issue.

13. Correspondence (not for public inspection) as addressed directly to Hingham Town Council (from residents etc.)

13.1 Poor state of the Watton Road Playing Field following the Antiques Fair

13.2 Parking issues during Antiques Fair

The Clerk confirmed that she had passed details of these complaints to the Hingham Playing Field Association. The Clerk also advised that she had heard that the Antiques Fair may be moving venue (away from Hingham), but was unsure if this was accurate and had asked the HPFA if they are able to confirm if this is true.

14. To discuss and agree any required responses/actions in relation to any item(s) of correspondence

14.1 (ref: 12.6 Christian Fellowship Church –Market Place BT Phonebox) The Clerk is to write to the Christian Fellowship Church to thank them for returning the Kiosk to BT.

15. District Councillor's report

District Cllr Bendle was not present at the meeting.

16. County Councillor's report

County Cllr Dewsbury confirmed that Hingham Town Council were amongst the 153 successful applicants for Parish Partnership Funding.

Cllr Dewsbury advised that Easton had undertaken a Neighbourhood Plan had found it to be very useful with regard to influencing the outcome of planning applications in the Parish.

It was noted by the Town Council that they had previously been advised by the District Cllr that a Neighbourhood Plan would be overridden by the District Council's determining of planning applications, and was therefore not worth the financial and time costs involved, and concerns were raised that Cringleford's Neighbourhood Plan had been ignored.

17. Planning Decisions

17.1 2020/0138 - Erection of single storey rear and side extension
Southfields 4 Norwich Street Hingham NR9 4LJ - Approval with Conditions

17.2 2019/2564 - Remove existing low door and doorway to cloakroom and replace with higher door and doorway keeping with other ground floor doors.
Re-use existing doorway as cupboard.
Quorn House 10 Market Place Hingham NR9 4AF - Approval with Conditions

18. Planning Applications

(as notified by SNC for consultation)

18.1 2020/0216 - St Andrews Lodge Attleborough Road Hingham NR9 4HP
Proposal: - Erection of detached timber garden room

The Council agreed to recommend that the application be approved.

18.2 2020/0287 - 12 The Dell Hingham Norfolk NR9 4HJ

Proposal: Erection of picket fence with trellis

Concerns were raised that this would be the only property in the vicinity with a fenced frontage. The Council agreed to recommend that the application be approved.

(as notified by NCC for consultation)

To view -

<http://eplanning.norfolk.gov.uk/PlanAppDisp.aspx?AppNo=FUL/2020/0007> 18.3
FUL/2020/0007 Hingham County Primary School, Hardingham Street Removal of two mobile classbases and permanent provision of new 10-bay triple classbase modular building. External works to include temporary site access, asphalt hard play area, additional 6no. parking spaces, play area canopy, store shed, cycle shelter, fencing and associated works.

The Council agreed to recommend that the application be approved, as it is evident that the children require more up to date facilities to learn in. It was also agreed to re iterate the points previously made with regard to the lack of information regarding the projects "green credentials" and sustainability and that it would be more cost effective to re-assess the whole of the Hingham Primary School site and to make the necessary expansion and improvement to ensure that the school can accommodate a growing number of children as the town is further developed by more new housing, rather than to just replace "old for new" classroom space now.

19. (other planning applications where the Town Council is not a consultee – for information only)

19.1 2020/0321 Fell - scots pine
49A Admirals Walk Hingham Norfolk NR9 4JL

(ITEMS 20 – 21 FINANCE)

| ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT 03 March 2020 | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|
| cheque number | TOTAL | | PAYEE | DETAILS |
| 104037 | £849.01 | | staff | wages (826.63) |
| | | | | cleaning products (11.40) |
| | | | | binbags (1.99) |
| | | | | MOPHEADS (8.99) |
| 104038 | £909.28 | | staff | wages |
| D/DEBIT | £61.69 | | NEST (D/DEBIT) | PENSION |
| 104039 | £240.00 | | Couzens UK Ltd | LIGHTING MAINTENANCE |
| 104040 | £2,967.29 | | TTSR LTD | GRASS CUTTING |
| 104041 | £115.31 | | XEROX FNANCE | PRINTER RENTAL |
| 104042 | £638.36 | | E-ON | STREET LIGHTING |
| 104043 | £282.00 | | COMMUNITY HEARTBEAT | DEFIB BATTERY |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | £6,062.94 | | | TOTAL VAT £710.15 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

20. To approve Accounts for Payment (as below and any additional invoices received)

The Clerk advised that she had received an additional invoice since the publication of the agenda (additional invoice from Community Heartbeat for a defibrillator battery. The accounts for payment were agreed as below and the cheques were signed.

21. To note the (corrected) date of the Finance Committee Meeting TUESDAY 17 MARCH (7.30PM) venue to be confirmed

Noted

22. To confirm that the newly co-opted Councillors have received a copy of the Good Councillor Guide, Code of Conduct, Standing Orders and Financial Regulations.

Cllr Christien and Cllr Gott confirmed that they had received the Good Councillor Guide, Code of Conduct, Standing Orders and Financial Regulations.

23. For the newly Co-opted Councillors to receive the "Registration of Pecuniary and Other Interests" forms - which must be completed, signed and returned to the Clerk by 31 March 2020

The "Registration of Pecuniary and Other Interests" forms were given to Cllr Christien and Cllr Gott.

24. To consider/discuss the Mediaeval Market planned for 04 July 2020

Rev. Sally Wallace-Jones had written to the Town Council to outline plans for a celebration event to commemorate the 700th anniversary of the completion of the present church, part of the event is to have a Mediaeval Fair on 04 July 2020. Permission was being requested from the Town Council to use the Fairland to stage the Fair, and assurances were given that appropriate licenses, risk assessments and insurance would be in place. The Council agreed to grant permission for the Fairland to be used.

25. To consider and respond to the Norfolk County Council Bus Services Consultation

It was noted that the changes to bus route number 3 did not address the concerns raised previously with Konectbus regarding Earlham Road. It was also commented that the busses do not run late enough (either way) to cater for people working later in the evening, socialising, or visiting the theatre. The Clerk will respond accordingly.

26. To propose items for the next agenda (meeting date 07 APRIL 2020)

The following items were requested for the next agenda:

Proposal to write to South Norfolk Council to request that the hedge on Norwich Road (which had been removed) be reinstated.

Proposal to set up a new working party to look at the feasibility of a Neighbourhood Plan.

To set a date for the first meeting of the Policy Working Party.

27. 'Exclusion of the Press and Public under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 to discuss the following matters:'

The following agenda items contain commercially sensitive information and is therefore confidential

It was agreed to ask the Public to leave the meeting for agenda items 28 and 29.

The public left the meeting.

28. To consider any tenders received for Internal Auditor (to undertake 2019/20 internal audit)

One quotation had been received including an estimate that it would take 7-9 hours to undertake the internal audit. It was proposed and agreed to accept this quotation and appoint as internal auditor (for audit year ending 31 March 2020).

29. To consider the quotations received to replace 2 damaged footway lighting columns

Quotations were received from 1 contractor to replace 2 damaged street light columns

One steel column on Lincoln Close which appeared to have had been hit by an unknown vehicle and one concrete column on Hall Moor Road which was crumbling at the top of the column. Both to be replaced with Steel columns and LED lanterns. It was proposed and agreed to accept these quotations and request that the work be carried out.

The meeting ended at 9.50pm

Signed Chairman

Clerks Report for 03.03.2020

| MIN | Update |
|---|--|
| | Matters Arising From the minutes of the meeting on 04.02.2020 |
| 4.3 | Non occupation of Higher Complex Care Accommodation on Hardingham Road – The Clerk has contacted H B Villages who were the applicant of the last planning application for the site – they have responded to acknowledge that they are still involved in the site but have not as yet answered the query regarding its lack of residents |
| 9.1 | Talley Alley Light - the Clerk will meet with the lighting contractor (to discuss this and other lighting issues) sometime in March – meeting planned 04.03.20 |
| 9.3 | Konectbus – Route changes – Konectbus have been chased for a response – as yet one has not been received – the letter was forwarded to Cllr Martin Wilby (NCC) |
| 13.2 | <p>Parking issues on the Market Place (and Fairland) – the concerns raised have been forwarded to NCC highways, the District Cllr and Norfolk Constabulary</p> <p>Correspondence with the Highway engineer is ongoing with regard to possible white H Markings on the Dereham Rd as a way to try to prevent the parking – photo has been sent to the highway engineer – the Clerk will send further photos as evidence of the parking issue</p> <p>Highway engineer advised that Market Place parking is not perceived as a danger or problematic</p> <p>No response as yet from the District Cllr or Norfolk Constabulary</p> |
| 26 | Quotations for Lockable Bollards for the Fairland Green to be discussed at a future meeting |
| 32 | Church (car park) wall – the PCC have confirmed the planned supporting buttresses are acceptable and required on safety grounds. |
| | Other Updates |
| A letter was sent to the PCC for their meeting in January, regarding permission for tree work to the lime tree, and the request from a resident to reduce the trees overshadowing the Market Place properties. A response is awaited. | |
| The Clerk is arranging a meeting with the lighting maintenance contractor to discuss undertaking the condition survey on the footway lighting, and providing a quotation for changing to LED and re numbering the lighting stock and possible solutions to replacing the Tally Alley light – meeting planned 04.03.20 | |

Market Place Payphone – complaint letters to BT, SNC and OFCOM sent
 SNC had responded to the letter, the Clerk has followed this up by re iterating some points in her original correspondence that SNC had not seemed to grasp and requested that SNC lodge their own complaint with OFCOM regarding BT contravening the 90 day consultation process – UPDATE a further response from SNC was no different to their first response – SNC have not agreed to make their own complaint to OFCOM – but advised they would “support “ the Town Council complaint - .

OFCOM had written to advise that BT had advised them that the payphone/kiosk is on private land and was not a “public” payphone and therefore will not investigate the complaint. The Clerk has written back to OFCOM to advise that the Council do not consider the Market Place green falls within the definition of private land, being that the Council is a tier of Government, and the land is maintained at public expense – and ask that the complaint be examined – an acknowledgement has been received. No further correspondence with OFCOM

The Clerk has also argued the “private land” issue with BT – who have advised that they would escalate the complaint.

UPDATE - BT have made enquiries with Christian Fellowship Church regarding the return of the kiosk to BT – BT are now suggesting that a payphone will be installed in Hingham – If the Kiosk is not returned by the Church, BT will look for an alternative place for a payphone – but as yet have not provided any further details -

Moving the litter bin on the Market Place – the local company have looked at the bin and it should be feasible for them to move it – when they have staff capacity to do so.

Re-siting of the Town Council notice board – a suitable place has not been identified in the Market Place and removing the notice board from it’s current location may leave damage to the building –
 The clerk advises considering the purchase of a new purpose build free standing notice board if there is a suitable location in the Market Place

Risk Assessment - this is being worked upon to improve the document to make it more robust and clearly identify actions and responsibilities

Communications Policy (including social media - this is being worked upon – Cllrs are reminded not to comment on public social media pages making reference to themselves as Councillors, in a way that could give inaccurate information or be misleading or misconstrued as the Council having discussed and agreed something, when this is not the case.

Cemetery fees discretion policy – The Clerk has been working on this as an overall Cemetery Fees Policy all points relevant to the fee structure including frequency and method of fees reviews This is to be finalised and brought back to a future Town Council meeting.

OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Church Clock – advice /quotations will be sought in the new year.

Staff/Cllr communication/relationship protocol to be drafted

Skate Park surface repairs – the Clerk has spoken with a ground maintenance officer from a local company who has advised that the surface joins could be “banded”. Enquiries to be made with contractors as to feasibility and cost of this suggestion

Extension of Cemetery Driveway and turning circle – The Clerk has spent some time in the cemetery looking at the area that would be required to extend the driveway – the area is very extensive – and the clerk is concerned about the application of such a large area of tarmac – (environmental and cost)

There may be other more appropriate solutions – including a shorter tarmac extension followed by “matting” under the grass surface (and possibly a tarmac path for better pedestrian/disability access), and leaving the existing grass as a driveway over the old cemetery area - advice is needed from a funeral director with regard to vehicles used. The use of the driveway (as in frequency) for funerals is minimal – therefore the grass should not become too worn from being driven on - this requires a lot of further thought to ensure the Council have a cost effective but long term solution for the future use of the cemetery .

2 steel liners for the Market Place bins to be ordered – need to re measure the inside of the bin – (liners available at a reasonable price are a slightly different size to the existing ones (by mm’s)

“Please do not park on the grass” signs to be priced/depending location of installation of bike racks

Commemorative Plaque for the Fairland Bus shelter – To be ordered

Report prepared 02 March 2020 – does not include Matters Arising when the item is on the forthcoming meeting’s agenda

Crime Figures –<https://www.police.uk/norfolk/D12/crime> – Jan 2020 on or near

The Dell Anti-social behaviour 1 Violence and sexual offences 2

Admirals Walk - Violence and sexual offences 1

Ringers Lane - Criminal damage and arson 1 Violence and sexual offences

Lincoln Avenue - Public order 1 Violence and sexual offences 3

Stone Lane - Criminal damage and arson 2

Mill Corner - Public order 1

Attleborough Road - Other theft 1