



# MELTON PARISH COUNCIL

IMC(20)M04

## **COVID-19 EMERGENCY: INTERIM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**Minutes** of the meeting of the Parish Council Covid-19 Emergency Interim Management Committee (IMC) held on Wednesday 17 June 2020 via audio link commencing at 14:00.

### **Present:**

Cllr Mr B Banks  
Cllr Mr N Brown  
Cllr Mrs C Gradwell  
Cllr Mr A Porter  
Cllr Mr C Taylor

### **Absent:**

None

### **In Attendance:**

Cllr Ms D Darby (*part meeting only*)  
Cllr Ms J Hosking (*part meeting only*)  
County Councillor Mr A Nicoll (*part meeting only*)  
District Councillor Ms R Smith-Lyte (*part meeting only*)  
Mr W Grosvenor **Clerk and Executive Officer to Melton Parish Council**  
Mrs P Alder **Assistant Clerk and Management Officer**

	<b>PART ONE – OPEN AGENDA</b>
<b>20.32</b>	<b>TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> There were no absences.
<b>20.33</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>
<b>20.33.01</b>	<b>To receive Amendments to the Register</b> There were none.
<b>20.33.02</b>	<b>To receive Declarations of Pecuniary Interest in Respect of Items on the Agenda</b> There were none.
<b>20.33.03</b>	<b>To receive Declarations of Non Pecuniary Interest in Respect of Items on the Agenda</b> There were none.

20.33.04	<p><b>To consider Full / Partial Dispensations for Pecuniary Interests Declared</b></p> <p>It was noted that there had been no requests for dispensations.</p>
20.34	<p><b>TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b></p> <p><b>It was RESOLVED</b> to agree the Minutes of the IMC meeting held via audio link on 27 May 2020 (Minutes IMC(20)M03 previously distributed).</p> <p><b>Proposed by:</b> Cllr Gradwell                      <b>Seconded by:</b> Cllr Banks</p>
20.35	<p><b>TO CONSIDER NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED</b></p> <p><i>Cllr Brown, as Chairman of the Planning and Transport Committee, took the chair for this Item only.</i></p>
20.35.01	<p><b>DC/20/1636/OUT Land west of Public Right of Way 21, Woods Lane, Melton</b></p> <p>Outline application for up to 27 self-build and custom-build dwellings off Woods Lane.</p> <p>Following a long discussion, <b>it was RESOLVED</b> to recommend refusal of this application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site lies outside the physical limits boundary for Melton as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan and is not allocated for development.</li> <li>• The site is part of a green corridor linking open countryside to the north of Melton with footpaths leading into Woodbridge, and should be protected both for its landscape quality and to avoid the coalescence of Woodbridge and Melton (existing Local Plan policies SP15 and SP17 apply).</li> <li>• The proposed removal of the existing hedge / tree cover along Woods Lane represents environmental harm in this sensitive location.</li> <li>• Councillors are concerned at the prospect of an additional vehicle access point along this stretch of Woods Lane, and the additional traffic movements likely to impact on the Melton crossroads.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed by:</b> Cllr Porter                      <b>Seconded by:</b> Cllr Banks</p> <p>The Clerk in conjunction with the Chair of Planning and Transport Committee will agree a detailed response to be sent to East Suffolk Council.</p>
20.35.02	<p><b>DC/20/1831/OUT Land off St Andrew's Place and Waterhead Lane, Melton</b></p> <p>Outline application with some matters reserved for residential development of up to 55 dwellings, with access off St Andrew's Place.</p> <p>Cllr Brown introduced the discussion in respect of this Item. He set out the background to the application. The site forms part of an area designated for development under Policy MEL20 in the Melton Neighbourhood Plan, but only as part of a comprehensive development package for what remains of the 9.7 hectares of land off Wilford Bridge Road, following the completion of the Riduna Park development. This application represents an attempt at a piecemeal approach which delivers only the housing aspect without any of the associated community benefits and will make satisfactory development of the remainder of the site more difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Following discussion <b>it was RESOLVED</b> to recommend refusal of this application for the following reasons:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As stated above this application is not in line with the Policy MEL20 in the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• There are significant challenges in terms of flood risk and drainage relating to this site and the proposals for addressing them fall short of what is required by Suffolk County Council by way of mitigations.</li> <li>• In its vision for the development of this site, the Parish Council has always maintained that access to the new housing must be via either the access road serving the Riduna Park development or via a new road directly to (a realigned) A1152. This application proposes access only via the St Andrews estate. This is completely unacceptable because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The additional level of traffic would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety.</li> <li>○ The level of mitigations required to make such a proposal acceptable is not considered possible.</li> <li>○ The green areas on the estate are needed for play and recreation and should not be sacrificed for parking and to enable access to the new housing.</li> <li>○ The St Andrews estate is completely unsuitable for use by construction traffic.</li> <li>○ From the estate, access to the road network is via Station Road (where flow is constrained by parking) and thence to The Street, which leads to Melton crossroads, already suffering from over-capacity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed by:</b> Cllr Porter                      <b>Seconded by:</b> Cllr Taylor</p> <p>The Clerk in conjunction with the Chair of Planning and Transport Committee will agree a detailed response to be sent to East Suffolk Council. A copy of that response will be sent to the County Highways Development Control Officer dealing with this application.</p>
	<p><i>This part of the meeting concluded at 14.50. A short recess followed and the meeting reconvened at 15.00 with Cllr Porter in the chair.</i></p>
<p><b>20.36</b></p>	<p><b>TO CONSIDER FINANCIAL AND INTERNAL CONTROL MATTERS</b></p>
<p><b>20.36.01</b></p>	<p><b>To receive and consider the financial management reports for the period 1 April 2020 to 31 May 2020.</b></p> <p>(Papers IMC(20)36.01 and IMC(20)36.01a-i)</p> <p>These papers, previously distributed, set out the financial position at the end of Period 2 of 2020/21. Income received in the period totalled £133,875, which includes CIL funds transferred to an earmarked reserve of £84,916 and the first instalment of the precept for 2020/21 - £43,474. Without CIL the overall income was £48,959 (all figures rounded).</p> <p>Overall expenditure to 31 May was £29,951 – 21.6% of the annual revised budget of £138,505. This expenditure included both the 1<sup>st</sup> half yearly repayment in 2020/21 of capital and interest on the Public Works Loan Board loan and arrears of business rates. Without these two large payments totalling £16,265, expenditure for the first two periods of the year would have been around 10% of the year’s budgeted expenditure.</p> <p>Cash resources as at 31 May totalled £481,770, which together with the VAT refund gave a figure for total liquid assets of £482,498. Deducting restricted and earmarked reserves, and the rent deposit held in respect of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor lease of the Council’s offices, gave a general reserve figure of £73,497.</p> <p><b>It was AGREED to NOTE the report.</b></p>

<p><b>20.36.02</b></p>	<p><b>To receive and consider the Budget report</b> (Paper IMC(20)36.02) This report, previously distributed, sets out the breakdown of the total expenditure referred to in Minute 20.36.01 against the budget by expenditure code. <b>It was AGREED to NOTE</b> the report.</p>
<p><b>20.36.03</b></p>	<p><b>To receive and consider the Internal Audit report</b> (Paper IMC(20)36.03) The report of the Audit carried out on 10 June, and previously distributed, was considered together with the Clerk's comments on the auditor's recommendations emailed in advance of the meeting directly to IMC Members. The report concluded that "the Council is clearly well-run with good systems and very good record-keeping". The Audit Statement that goes to the external auditor is unqualified and clear in terms of compliance with the internal control objectives. The six recommendations made and the IMC response (<i>in italics</i>) are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Employee Fidelity insurance – this should be increased from the current £250k to £425k. <i>This recommendation was <b>AGREED</b> and the Clerk will progress together with the review of insurances required by the divestment of the parcels of land from East Suffolk Council.</i></li> <li>2. Asset Register – remove items valued at either under £100 or £500, include both the asset value and insurance value and also ensure that the Council is not underinsured. <i>It was <b>AGREED</b> to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Remove purchased items valued at under £100 (whilst leaving the proxy values for gifted items in place)</i></li> <li>• <i>Retain the present practice of recording acquisition values in line with the JPAG guidance</i></li> <li>• <i>Subject to raising the level of employee fidelity cover, to retain the current level of cover, add the new assets being acquired, and then further review overall adequacy on renewal of the policy in September. In general terms it is not accepted that the Council is currently under-insured.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Acting within legal powers – record the legal power against every item of expenditure made. <i>As before this recommendation is not agreed. Following discussion it was however <b>AGREED</b> that when the budget for the following Council year is set in January, Councillors will have drawn to their attention the powers that are available to local councils in readable form.</i></li> <li>4. Appointment of Internal Auditor – this should always be done by Full Council. <i>The Council's Financial Regulations do not make the responsibility clear and it was <b>AGREED</b> to amend FR 2.5 and the Committee Terms of Reference to delegate this function to the Finance, Employment and Risk Management Committee.</i></li> <li>5. Procedural matters – confidentiality: The reason for an Item being considered as confidential should be clearly stated. <i>This is usually done and the recommendation <b>NOTED</b>.</i></li> <li>6. Procedural matters – delegation of powers: The Interim Management Committee (IMC) was not established lawfully by resolution of Full Council. <i>It was explained to the Auditor that this was because the meeting at which the delegation for the emergency was to have been approved by resolution had to be cancelled at the last minute. Delegation was agreed via emails to</i></li> </ol>



