MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CONEY WESTON PARISH COUNCIL

HELD ON MONDAY 15TH JUNE 2020 AT 7.00PM VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING

PRESENT P. Clarke (Chair), C. Flood, D. Haycock, J. Ladell, B. Hogg, G. Mihr, R. Salter (Clerk) and 5 members of public.

| | ACTION |
|--|--|
| 1. Apologies: S. Hindry | |
| 2. Declaration of Interest declared – Cllr Hogg regarding the planning | |
| application, agenda item 6.1. and Cllr Clarke regarding the Bowls Club agenda | |
| item 6.3. Both would be moved to the waiting room for these items. | |
| It was agreed Cllr Hogg would chair the Bowls Club item as the Vice Chair was | |
| unable to attend the meeting. | |
| 3. The 14 th May Annual Parish Council minutes were agreed, proposed by Cllr | |
| Ladell and seconded by Councillor Hogg, agreed by all and will be signed. | |
| 4. 1 A member of public to speak on the Bowls Club item, 6.3 | |
| 5. No items raised | |
| 6.1 Planning Application DC/20/0556/FUL. At this point Cllr Hogg left the | |
| meeting. This application is for a separate detached house on Rushford Road. | - Control of the Cont |
| Concerns were raised that this property would be outside the development | |
| area, the entrance is too close to the bend in the road and there are high | |
| hedges all around it. The entrance is also very close to the 30 mph limit change | A Common and a Com |
| and there have been issues with speeding around this location, police have | |
| been there with speed radar. There have been a number of accidents at the | |
| nearby junction with Norwich Road. It was unanimously agreed that the Parish | RS |
| Council does not support this application. | |
| 6.2 Cllr Hogg rejoined the meeting. | |
| Planning Application DC/20/0772/HH. This extension would not be visible from | |
| the road so has limited impact. It was unanimously agreed that the Parish | |
| Council supports this application. | RS |
| 6.3 At this point Clir Clarke left the meeting. The Bowls Club project manager | |
| gave an update on the possible purchase of land, outlining what had been | - |
| discussed and agreed at the March Parish Council meeting. This was subject to | |
| 2 conditions which have now been met. Greene King have accepted the Bowls | |
| Club offer and Sport England have agreed the land valuation. Draft heads of | |
| terms are with Greene King and the Bowls Club solicitors, with the timetable | |
| expected to be exchange of contracts in 5 weeks, with a non refundable 10% | |
| cost to be paid. Completion would take place 4 weeks later. | |
| Councillors had the opportunity to ask questions which the Project manager | |
| then answered – | |
| There was concern over what happened if the Bowls Club folds and Sport | |
| England is the majority shareholder? | |
| Do we need to conduct a village survey to get villagers views if this will increase | |
| the precept? | |
| Who owns the land, whose names are on the conveyance? Who maintains it? | |
| How is the amenity preserved? | |
| Is there to be a charge on the land? | |
| What would the Bowls Club's plans be if the Parish Council refused to give any | |
| | |
| money? Have any other grants been applied for, as there will be additional expense over | |
| | |
| the purchase price. | |

469 Peter Clarke Chair

Rowena Salter Clerk

RSaule

| • | |
|--|----------|
| Could the Bowls Club contact other Parish Councils where members of the Bowls Club live outside of Coney Weston? | |
| The Bowls Club Project Manager advised – The charge on the land will be for 21 years, and it must be kept as recreational land. The Bowls Club is in a healthy state currently and has been running for 50 | |
| years. Half the membership live in Coney Weston. All members are | |
| contributing to the Bowls Club share towards the purchase, including those who don't live in the village. They also contribute to supporting The Swan, | |
| which although a business is a village amenity. Regarding the ownership of the land the Bowls Club would have 4 trustees on | |
| the Land Registry, and there would be a trust deed. | |
| The Bowls Club have looked at other grant sources. W Suffolk District Council | |
| had some money available but the Bowls Club didn't meet the criteria. They are still pursuing Suffolk County Council for funding. If the Parish Council did | |
| not provide funding this would be disappointing but they would try to raise the | |
| money through members and fundraising. | |
| Further developments such as a roadway, pavilion etc would be some years away. The land ownership needs to be sorted out first. | |
| Councillors discussed further and it was agreed that the working group needs to | |
| meet as soon as possible to pull more information together about the cost | |
| implications, where funding comes from, if a village consultation is needed etc. | |
| This can then be presented to the Parish Council at a meeting and the way forward agreed. | |
| Cllr Hogg, Cllr Mihr and Cllr Ladell will continue to be on the working group. | |
| This was proposed by Cllr Hogg, seconded by Cllr Mihr and agreed by all, a date | |
| will be arranged. | BH/GM/JL |
| 6.4 Cllr Clarke rejoined the meeting. The Audit Report Action Plan highlighted a number of issues, either requiring compliance or are recommended for adoption. | |
| The way forward needs to be agreed. | |
| 6.4.1 Standing Orders & Financial Regulations update. | |
| Cllr Clarke raised that the Standing Orders were due for review and sign off at | |
| the July meeting but he would like to make them more specific to Coney Weston. He was willing to undertake this work and Clir Hogg and Clir Flood | |
| agreed to help with this. This will be brought to the September meeting. | PC/BH/CF |
| Financial Regulations need to be reviewed and possibly updated in light of the | |
| Internal Audit. The RFO will work on this with Cllr Hindry and aim to have these | RS/SH |
| ready for review at the July meeting. 6.4.2 Asset Register. | K3/3FI |
| It was agreed that with the Playing Field Committee in existence the playing | |
| field land, benches and play equipment could be taken off the Parish Council | |
| asset register. | |
| The Internal Audit recommended that assets should be recorded 'at their actual purchase cost. A proxy cost may be applied only where the cost/value is not | |
| known. A separate column may also be used for the insurance value if | |
| appropriate.' It was agreed a purchase cost be listed with a separate cost for | |
| the insurance cost. This should be ready for sign off at the July meeting | RS |
| 6.4.3 A recommendation from the Internal Audit report was that the Council publishes items of expenditure above £100. This spreadsheet had been | |
| circulated to Councillors and Councillors agreed it was ok for this to be | |
| published on the website. | RS |
| | |

470 Peter Glarke Chair

R Seitle

| 6.4.4 The Internal Audit recommended the following policies should be put in | |
|---|-----|
| place to meet the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulations: | |
| Audit/Impact Assessment | |
| Procedures for Subject Access Requests | |
| Procedures for Data Breaches | |
| Data Retention & Disposal Policies | |
| Policy details added post meeting. Templates are available. It was agreed the | |
| Clerk will work on these with support from Cllr Hogg, this will be due for review | |
| and sign off at the September meeting. | RS |
| 7. The new bank account had been setup but with no signatories, although this | |
| paperwork had been sent. This has been resent and a text has been received to | RS |
| confirm it has been processed. The RFO will continue to work on getting this | |
| fully setup. | 77. |
| The payment schedule was agreed and signed off and cheques will be signed | |
| for | |
| SALC Internal Audit £186 | |
| Village Sign flowers and repairs £40.00 | |
| Clerk Expenses Zoom cost at end of May £14.39 | |
| 8. No correspondence received | |
| 9. Date of next meeting Thurs 16 th July. The meeting closed at 20:20. | |



