

**MINUTES OF ALDEBURGH TOWN COUNCIL MEETING HELD REMOTELY ON  
MONDAY JANUARY 11<sup>th</sup> 2021 AT 7.00 pm**

Present: Cllr Webster – The Mayor took the Chair.

Cllr Blackburn	Cllr Digby
Cllr Fellowes	Cllr Fox
Cllr Harris	Cllr Jones
Cllr Howard-Dobson	Cllr Lewis
Cllr Osben	Cllr Palmer
Cllr Piers-Hall	Cllr Smith

**1. Apologies:** Cllrs Haworth-Culf, Bond and Cooper (ESC).

**2. Councillors' Declaration of Interest:**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. To Approve the Draft Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 14 December 2020:**

The draft minutes of the Council Meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> of December 2020 were approved by a show of hands. Cllr Palmer abstained as he did not participate in the meeting.

**4. SCC report and Correspondence:**

Cllr Rainger reported on concerns for the county in respect of the levels of COVID - 19 admissions to hospitals during a third lockdown. He reminded everyone of the type of support services that SCC was involved with, including Home But Not Alone and the financial support scheme for the needy.

SCC was engaging with EDF over the latest plans for Sizewell C, including the beach landing facility, the impact on rail freight and on the night rail scheme. It will be interesting to see their response. In respect of SPR, there is a meeting of JLAG shortly where SCC will once again spell out its opposition to the plans. SCC will very firmly push back on SPR projects which do not have local support.

Cllr Rainger raised the question of the Suffolk Twenty-Twenty fund, government-sponsored money which the County has split into different areas. Adult learning tools, Discover Suffolk, Quiet Lanes, vehicle recharging points and tree planting are just some of the ideas which could impact on Aldeburgh.

Cllr Rainger reminded Cllrs, especially on the Services Committee, of a street guide consultation which worked around the guidance of new developments, particularly the walking and cycling elements of those schemes.

Cllr Fellowes asked about the junction of the A12 at Friday Street in the light of the energy proposals. Cllr Rainger admitted he had no clear idea of what was involved because EDF Energy wanted to do one thing and SPR wanted to do something else. He promised he would find out.

Cllr Smith questioned Cllr Rainger about the Quiet Lanes plan, saying that signs littering the streets advising motorists to slow down would be unsuitable. Cllr Rainger explained that only one sign at the beginning of road would be necessary, a view taken by Cllr Lewis who insisted that just one sign would be useful. However, Cllr Lewis did point out that it was unlikely that Aldeburgh would qualify for a Quiet Lane.

Cllr Rainger's report can be read in full at <https://russrainger.wordpress.com/>

**5. ESC report and Correspondence**

In the absence of the District Cllrs, who were attending another meeting, the ward report had been previously circulated to all Cllrs.

**6. Police Report**

There was no Police Report this month, although a COVID – 19 briefing notice had been produced which had been circulated to Cllrs, ATC's website and noticeboards.

**7. Public Forum:**

Cllr Webster suspended Standing Orders for the Public Forum.

No members of the public were in attendance and so the Mayor reinstated Standing Orders.

**8. COMMITTEES REPORTS:**

**8a. PROPERTY & FINANCE COMMITTEE:**

**8ai) Report from Chairman of Property & Finance Committee**

Cllr Jones reported that she would shortly begin working on the third quarter financial analysis which would be presented for discussion in advance of January's Committees meeting. This will give members the opportunity to understand more detail about the predicted outcome of income and expenditure at the end of the financial year.

Cllr Jones, with Cllr Fox, met the architect relating to the refurbishment scheme for King's Field public conveniences. He had agreed to draw up all proposals for the lavatories, including visiting the site, carrying out a measured survey, the production of a sketch survey for the completed work and to obtain all necessary planning permissions. Cllr Jones encouraged everyone to support this proposal.

**RESOLUTION to APPROVE** professional fees relating to the drawings of the public conveniences at King's Field was **PROPOSED** by Cllr Palmer and **SECONDED** by Cllr Piers-Hall

<b>In favour</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Against</b>	<b>0</b>

**Abstentions**                    **0**  
**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Cllr Jones reminded Cllrs of the plan to extend and resurface the King's Field car park. The car park would be extended to within a foot of the existing wooden fencing and a large mound would be removed adjacent to the Groundman's Cottage. There were three quotations but only one addressed all points raised within the given specification. Cllrs Fox, Digby and Piers-Hall all agreed that although not the cheapest, this quote best matched ATC's requirements. Cllr Jones was planning to address SCC and ESC about potential grant applications towards the cost of this significant outlay. Once this work was completed, it was agreed to ask Norse to use East Suffolk car parks whilst their crews had a break, rather than needlessly damaging the new surface.

**RESOLUTION** to **APPROVE** expenditure relating to the extension and resurfacing of King's Field car park by a known contractor was **PROPOSED** by Cllr Piers-Hall and **SECONDED** by Cllr Harris.

**In favour**                    **13**  
**Against**                    **0**  
**Abstentions**                **0**  
**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**8b. SERVICES COMMITTEE:**

**8bi) Report from Chairman of Services**

Cllr Palmer reminded Cllrs about the Leiston Road parking scheme which finishes on the January 15<sup>th</sup> 2021. The request for the 40mph speeding limit on the Saxmundham Road is shortly to be decided. Cllr Palmer thanked Cllr Rainger for his intervention in this matter, particularly as ATC is asking for more financial support than SCC was prepared to give. It was agreed that if this is passed, a speed reduction on Slaughden Road would be included on the TRO.

The signage at the entrance to Crag Path is awaiting a quote as it is a Road Traffic Order, but once it is approved, it is hoped that the signs will go up quickly. It would take SCC 18 months to complete the work, as it is deemed a relatively low priority. As ATC has agreed to fund the works, it has been requested that all signs are in situ by Easter 2021.

Plans for the provision of two new bus shelters on the High Street and on Linden Road are being progressed with SCC, who will also dispose of the old shelters. Cllr Jones pointed out that there are enough funds to do the job, but it will need splitting between this financial year and the next one.

Additional rubbish bins have finally been installed at King's Field, both equipped with lids to minimise the problem of litter. Drains have been cleared, but there remains much work still to be completed.

Cllr Lewis pointed out that the new footpath between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness had been suggested to Cllr Rainger for possible inclusion in the Twenty-Twenty budget.

## **NSIPs**

**SPR:** In addition to the Report previously sent to all Cllrs (see Appendix 1), Cllr Fellowes raised two objections; National Grid, who should be held to account for its offer of a connection on the Suffolk Coast which triggered the DCO and secondly, the need to press for a community impact assessment.

She also questioned why the three District Councillors representing our area failed to speak at an ESC Cabinet meeting on this subject. She was disappointed that the councillors concerned are at another meeting this evening and have not made any representation at Aldeburgh's meeting. Cllr Osben felt frustrated that the District Councillors were attending a meeting in Friston and none was able to attend ATC. It is particularly important that Aldeburgh is represented given the overwhelming level of antipathy towards SPR. Given the case against SPR, Cllr Osben wondered why ESC had changed their position. Cllr Fellowes agreed, saying that now there was the opportunity of calling in that decision.

Cllr Fellowes called for a letter to be sent to ESC formally complaining about the lack of engagement or consultation regarding the decision to adopt a neutral position.

There was a lengthy discussion which involved much criticism of the SPR proposals. In answer to a question from the Town Clerk, Cllr Palmer suggested that it was a good idea if a letter from the Anglian Energy Planning Alliance was sent to ESC representing the views of Aldeburgh and other surrounding parishes. Cllr Fox agreed, saying that she has learned a lot from this evening's meeting. She also congratulated Cllrs Palmer, Fellowes, Osben and Lewis on their dedication.

## **8c. PLANNING:**

### **8ci) Report from Chairman of Planning:**

Cllr Webster reported that the Planning Appeal on the Toll House has been refused.

The Historic Planning Policy Consultation expires on 1 February 2021. The document covers the conservation of historic buildings and Cllr Webster will respond following a Planning Committee meeting next week.

Cllr Fellowes requested more information about a consultation which ATC had been invited to comment upon, on which fields would lend themselves to solar power cells in the Newmarket area.

## **8d. GRANTS, REQUESTS & EVENTS:**

### **8di) Report from Chairman of Grants, Requests and Events Committee**

Cllr Webster thanked Cllrs who have offered their support with the packing and distribution of food parcels. There have been numerous messages endorsing the work of the Town Council, fully appreciative of the effort being made by them. Aldeburgh United Charities also distributed Coop vouchers to several families prior to Christmas and Cllr Harris thanked those who responded.

**9. Representatives' Reports:**

- Cllr Fellowes attended a meeting of the East Suffolk Community Partnership for Aldeburgh, Leiston and Saxmundham and reported on a modest scheme to award grants of between £250 and £1000 for priority projects, including promoting an active healthy lifestyle, reducing social isolation for older people and managing the aspirations of younger people.
- Cllr Harris attended an on-line meeting with the RNLI

**10. The Town Clerk:**

The Town Clerk reported that the Police were taking a much firmer line with people visiting the town and those who were still attempting to access second homes. The Police have been carrying out regular patrols since Christmas, with a concentrated presence on coastal towns such as Aldeburgh and Southwold.

The Town Clerk reported that she was aware that there are a number of elderly residents waiting to receive vaccination who feel they have been forgotten. If Cllrs are approached, they must reassure patients to wait until they have been contacted by the surgery or Suffolk GP Federation. AGNES has just sent an email to ATC offering to take patients to Woodbridge. CATS and Suffolk On-Board Community Transport have introduced similar schemes.

The food parcel scheme which was introduced last year was so popular that ATC is going to reintroduce this with effect from week commencing 18 January 2021. The parcels would be simpler, with Cllr Fox contributing home-made soup. It was hoped that funds would come from the Community Partnership, in addition to support from other organisations in the town. Cllr Fox wondered if it would be possible to switch the parcel day to Tuesday, a move which was unopposed.

The Town Clerk was currently finalising all the bank reconciliations for the third quarter so items could be included in a variance report for the next Committees Meeting.

**11. Mayor's Notes:**

Cllr Webster had nothing to report.

**12. Correspondence:**

There was nothing to report.

**13. Gifts and/or Hospitality Received by Councillors:**

There was nothing to report.

**14. Items to Pay:**

Details had been previously circulated to all Cllrs with an additional five items waiting for approval. All payments were **PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL** by Cllr Jones and **SECONDED** by Cllr Webster.

**In Favour**                    **13**

**Against**                      **0**

**Abstentions**                **0**

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

There being nothing further to discuss the meeting ended at 8.40pm.

**The next meeting of Aldeburgh Town Council will be held remotely on  
Monday February 8th 2021 at 7.00 pm**

## **APPENDIX ONE (unedited)**

### **Energy Projects report to ATC meeting 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

**National policy** – three new policy documents you may wish to look at, are:

[Offshore Transmission Network Review](#) , [National Grid ESO's Offshore Coordination Report](#) and The Gov White Paper [Powering Our Net Zero Future: Energy White Paper](#) published Dec 2020. All these mention the benefits of integrated approaches; however, the real danger is that either Friston could be made the central energy Hub for the region, and/or that any policy changes are made too late to influence the DCOs for SPR or SZC thus will not prevent the harm to, and destruction of, our area.

#### **Scottish Power Renewables DCO:**

We are half way through the Examination phase of the DCO for EA1N and EA2 which will finish on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2021. At this point the Planning Inspectorate will then collate and put their recommendation to the Sec of State. Via the PINS website you can view transcripts or recordings of all the previous hearings and view the documents sent in by the applicant and interested parties and responses to these, as well as other information that the Planning Inspectorate has requested. The following are the key events (all via Zoom) with the theme they will cover, and the deadline dates by which we can respond to these by;

Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> January = Deadline 4 for responses to Rule 17 request from PINS for further information from SPR, NG and OFGEM etc. Also, responses to the application by SPR for additional land acquisition.

Thursday 19<sup>th</sup>/Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> and Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> January = Issues Specific Hearings 3 (Biodiversity & Habitats) 4 (Onshore environment, construction, transport & operational effects) and 5 (socio, economic, land & sea use effects).

Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> January – Open Floor Hearing 6

Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup>/Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> January accompanied site visits (not sure if these will go ahead in this format due to Tier 5 lock down).

Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> January – Open Floor Hearing 7

Friday 29<sup>th</sup> January – Issue Specific Hearing 6 (on the DCO in general or any other matters).

Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> February = Deadline 5 for responses to all the previous ISH and OFHs since deadline 4. Then once these are submitted, they will be published, for further response by 24<sup>th</sup> February which is deadline 6.

#### **East Suffolk Council's position on SPR DCO:**

As reported to the last meeting, the Council for East Suffolk did not use the word 'object' in their verbal response during the last round of Issue Specific Hearings and we were totally surprised and concerned that it appeared that East Suffolk had somehow changed their position. The cabinet meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2021 has now proposed/agreed this. See below extracts. There were no questions or comments by our Ward members at the Cabinet meeting. The papers for this meeting (attached) provide details of mitigation and compensation which the applicant has offered in negotiation with ES including an administration fee to ES council, a Tourism fund, and funds to enhance the AONB. Although ES still say they are concerned about noise, design and cumulative impact they

mention the ‘investment and jobs’ in the area, quote:

“we recognise the importance economically of this industry to local ports and particularly towns of Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth. EA1 awarded a 30-year contract worth £25m and a further £45m in construction contracts to companies within 9 miles of Lowestoft.”

“following constructive negotiations with SPR the Council has now been presented with an improved set of mitigation/compensation measures in addition to further information/clarification on a number of matters. When these measures are taken collectively, they are considered sufficient to enable a recommendation to be presented which allows the Council to remove its objection to the overall impact of the onshore substations.

This change of position does not represent the views of local residents, or those who live in, work in or visit surrounding communities, or views of Town/Parish councils. The recommendation is:

“The Cabinet, at its meeting on 7 January 2020, resolved that whilst maintaining overall support for the principle of offshore wind as a significant contributor to the reduction in carbon emissions, and for the economic opportunities it may bring to the locality, it would raise an objection to specific aspects of the proposals which have significant impacts onshore. The Applicants have sought to address a number of the specific concerns and objections to the projects raised by the Council. Discussions between both parties have been ongoing regarding further information, modifications, additional mitigation and compensation which would be required in order to persuade the Council to potentially move towards a neutral position in some areas. It is now recommended that Cabinet agrees that the Council can now move towards a neutral position with regards to a number of previously raised concerns with the EA1N and EA2 proposals. However, there are still areas of disagreement with regards to noise, particularly operation noise at the substations site and the cumulative impacts of future energy development that has not yet been satisfactorily addressed. We are also still of the view that further commitments should be sought in relation to the design of the substations and in relation to cumulative impacts with future projects. We therefore maintain significant concerns in those areas and are seeking additional work from the Applicants.

Cabinet is recommended to continue its support for the principle of offshore wind and move its position of objecting to the overall impact of the onshore substations of EA1N and EA2 towards a position of being neutral on both proposals having regard to the enhanced package of mitigation and compensation that the Applicants have now put forward. However, we maintain significant concerns with regard to the noise impacts of the onshore substation elements, substation design and the cumulative impacts of the proposals with future energy projects until such a time that these matters are satisfactorily addressed by the Applicants. The Council will also continue to engage with the Applicants to address areas of concerns raised within the Council’s Relevant Representation and Local Impact Report. “

### **EDF Energy DCO Sizewell C:**

EDF energy are considering the responses to their consultation on changes to the DCO, and they will then decide what to send to the Planning Inspectorate, who will then review this prior to the start of the Examination phase. 26 Town and Parish councils signed a letter asking for a Community Forum to be called. East Suffolk Joint Local Authority Group (JLAG) met on but this was not a meeting which the public could observe.

Monday 18<sup>th</sup> January is the deadline to respond to the PINS Consultation on digital Hearings for the DCO.



### **Current actions required and proposed:**

1. To agree ATC Response to SPR application for additional land acquisition. Suggest:

In general, the use of 'work number' and 'plot number' in the text was not supported by the maps which only indicated work number. Roads, streets, PROWs and buildings are not labelled or identified on the maps. This is extremely confusing and made it difficult to comment accurately without extensive additional research using other maps.

- A) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 7 with land reduced at plot 8 and new land taken to form new plot 8a to support trenchless approach.

#### Comment:

The map does not indicate the land to be reduced, and there is no plot 8 or 8a indicated. The area labelled work No 7 appears to be extended south and south-west to the road. It is not clear if this alteration may change water supply in the area or why this was not considered previously? The new land taken is close to a property (unlabelled) and its access drive.

- B) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 15 with increase at plot 31 to facilitate temporary diversion of PROW E363/027/0 (previously not included) while temporary haul road is constructed (requested by SCC).

#### Comment:

Plot 31 and the PROW are not indicated on the map provided. This is an example of the applicant's failure to previously consider a diversion, made necessary by construction of the haul road which intersects it. ATC does not understand why a haul road is necessary to be located at this point – this further illustrates that the existing infrastructure/roadways are not sufficient to support this project.

- C) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 33 with increase at plot 130 to facilitate permanent diversion of PROW E363/027/0, reintroduce historic footpath & field boundary (requested by SCC).

#### Comment:

The map provided does not indicate the new location of the historic footpath and field boundary and the PROW is not labelled.

- D) Expansion of Order limits at Work No 33 with increase to plot 104, new plot 104a, b and c for new potential surface water outfall connection (in addition to original routing to be left in consideration).

#### Comment:

The maps show an increase to Work No 33 but plot 104 which is to be significantly increased, and new plots 104a, b and c (as mentioned in the Regulation 7 Notice) are not indicated.

ATC recognises that the applicant claims this new alternative route avoids the church & chapel ruins to the East of Woodside Barn Cottages, and the potential for surface water to overflow along the track and over Church Road (which already floods) however we do not agree with this speculative change, and believe that the applicant should carry out further environmental and engineering studies prior to determining the preferred solution without additional land take.

The proposed additional land is very close to buildings. Does this change mean that the verge and track which borders properties and is the access route to properties will not be open for access by residents or the public?

We believe this is also an example of poor planning by the applicant and illustrates that more creative solutions are required if this site is ever to be considered appropriate for such a large industrialized project.

2. To agree ATC representation to speak at SPR ISHs 3, 4, 5 and 6, and OFH 6 and 7 – Cllr Fellowes is willing to attend via Zoom dates as per timeline. All other Cllrs are encouraged to let Cllr Fellowes know of specific comments they want shared, or individuals can observe via the live link or retrospectively, and/or provide written comments.
3. To agree that ATC write to East Suffolk Council regarding their proposed move to a ‘neutral’ position regarding SPR DCO without transparent discussion with Parish/ Town councils or the public. Especially as the mitigation and compensation referred to is only recently available in the public domain for scrutiny. And/or request our Ward Members call in this decision.
4. To agree ATC response to PINS digital consultation questionnaire for SZC DCO as follows:
  - Questions 1 - 6 our contact details and Interested Party number.
  - Question 7 – do you wish to be involved in the examination. [YES]
  - Question 8 - which ways do you want to be involved. [Observe via link or telephone, speak via link or telephone etc]
  - Question 9 – do we wish to speak. [YES]
  - Question 10 – are we content to participate digitally. [Not really, as there are perceived or actual barriers and difficulties, but recognise circumstances although disagree need for current timeline]
  - Questions 11 -13 confidence to participate digitally, digital and phone access etc.
  - Question 14 – do we agree this is the way to hold the examination. [As Q10]

- Question 15 - offering training.
- Question 16 is a box for further comment as to why a digital examination is not appropriate. [Breadth and complexities of the issues do not lend themselves to a digital examination, that some people could be excluded because of poor or no internet, meaning local people will be disadvantaged compared to well-resourced EDF, resource pressures on ATC & Covid-19]