

# MINUTES OF THE THEBERTON AND EASTBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD VIA ZOOM MEETINGS ON WEDNESDAY 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2021 AT 7:00 PM

## 1. Attendance and Apologies

### Attendees:

Cllr. Stephen Brett - Chair  
Cllr. Hilary Ward - Vice Chair  
Cllr. Stephen Morphey  
Cllr. Philip Baskett  
Cllr. Graham Bickers  
Cllr. Beth Goose  
Cllr. Paul Collins  
Cllr. Nat Bacon

### Apologies for absence:

Cllr. Julian Wallis

### In attendance:

District Cllr. T-J Haworth-Culf  
District Cllr. Jocelyn Bond  
Sharon Smith - Clerk/RFO  
No members of the public

## 2. Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interest

Cllr. Phillip Baskett declared an interest in item 10b.

## 3. Public Forum

a) District Cllr. T-J Haworth-Culf and Cllr. Jocelyn Bond referred to their previously circulated report. Cllr. Haworth-Culf said the Ward Members were busy with the Scottish Power Renewables energy projects and she congratulated Cllr. Paul Collins for his recent news article about Sizewell C. Cllr. Bond said keeping visible was the way forward and it was important to keep the issues to the forefront of people's minds. With regard to COVID-19, Cllr. Haworth-Culf reported that different GP surgeries were being treated differently with supplies of the vaccine but it hoped that all local care homes will be contacted this week and housebound parishioners will be receive home visits. She added that the public need to be wary about scams purporting to give private vaccinations for a fee.

b) The Clerk informed the Council that County Cllr. Richard Smith was unable to attend the meeting due to problems with his internet access. He agreed that the Clerk could update the Council with his report given to Yoxford Parish Council as follows:

County Cllr. Richard Smith, referring to Sizewell C, said it was likely that the Planning Inspectorate's examination process will be underway in March/April 2021. He said this may present difficulties for him facing the electorate as the four yearly elections are scheduled to go ahead on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021, following the postponement last year due to COVID-19. The purdah period will begin at the end of March and therefore he will need to be careful. He has asked the Monitoring Officer for guidance in this regard.

Cllr. Smith said that the County Council proposes to increase its portion of Council Tax by 4% from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021. He considers this increase to be far too high and last year he resigned from his post as Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources because of a similar increase. The rise represents 2% of general Council Tax and 2% for social care which, in his view, should be funded by central government. The government advocated a 5% increase which is many times higher than the current inflation rate of 0.3%. A decision will be taken at the full County Council meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

## 4. Minutes

- a) It was proposed by Cllr. Beth Goose, seconded by Cllr. Hilary Ward, and agreed that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2020 be signed as a true record. All in favour.
- b) It was proposed by Cllr. Phillip Baskett, seconded by Cllr. Beth Goose, and agreed that the minutes of the meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020 be signed as a true record. All in favour.

## **5. Matters Arising**

a) Cllr. Graham Bickers, referring to item 4a, updated the Council on the properties for sale in the parish. One property has reduced its price and the estate agent informed Cllr. Bickers that EDF's proposed plans are having a significant impact on house sales in the locality. Another property has reduced its price but this is due to the 'cattle smell' rather than the prospect of Sizewell C. It was agreed to apprise the neighbouring Parish Councils of the project to monitor property blight in the area.

**ACTION: Cllr. Paul Collins and Cllr. Graham Bickers to progress.**

## **6. Energy Projects**

a) Cllr. Paul Collins summarised his previously circulated report, attached as Appendix I. Cllr. Collins said he would respond, on behalf of the Council, to the PINS questionnaire regarding the proposed virtual examination for Sizewell C. It was agreed to object to the process being fully virtual and that an examination which has no face-to-face issue-specific or open-floor hearings is unacceptable.

b) The Council considered a request from EDF Energy to meet with the Chairman in early February to discuss the Council's Relevant Representation and response to the intra-examination public consultation. Cllr. Stephen Brett informed the Council that he had spoken with Tom McGarry of EDF. They are inviting all parishes which will be majorly impacted by Sizewell C to discuss the proposals and to identify any areas of common ground and to explore possible solutions to any concerns should the project go ahead. Cllr. Brett opined that he should attend the meeting in listening mode with a view to securing the best options for the parish. Cllr. Paul Collins replied that the timing of a meeting may not be right for the reasons set out in his report, attached as Appendix I. Cllr. Hilary Ward recommended that the Council considers the request carefully as it may be an EDF PR exercise to provide evidence to the Planning Inspectorate and the new Secretary of State that they are consulting with the community. Cllr. Ward said the Council would need to discuss beforehand the matters that may be raised at the meeting. Cllr. Brett replied that he expects this to be a series of meetings and the beginning of a process. Cllr. Nat Bacon said that EDF will need to demonstrate community engagement to the Planning Inspectorate and it was important that the Council are not seen to be obstructive. After further discussion, it was agreed, in principle, to meet with EDF but Cllr. Brett is to ask EDF about the timing of the meeting given that the changes to the DCO have not yet been accepted and the Council requires adequate time to consider the changes before discussing them.

**ACTION: Cllr. Stephen Brett to contact EDF.**

## **7. Theberton**

a) The Clerk informed the Council that the aerial runway is due to be installed during the week commencing 25<sup>th</sup> January. The Community Council are arranging access to water and welfare facilities in Jubilee Hall.

b) Cllr. Hilary Ward informed the Council that Cllr. Stephen Brett had not managed to secure a cheaper price for the aggregate for the petanque piste. She proposed that the Council accepts a quotation already received to enable her to progress with the grant application. Cllr. Brett

seconded. All in favour.

**ACTION: Cllr. Hilary Ward to progress.**

## **8. Eastbridge**

The Council noted the annual play equipment safety inspection report and agreed that there were no items for action at this time. Cllr. Stephen Morphey reported that during his recent inspection he found that vandals had prised out caps from the play equipment.

## **9. Highways**

a) Cllr. Paul Collins informed the Council that the Speed Indicator Device has been delivered to Westcotec and repairs are underway. Cllr. Hilary Ward said that vehicle speeds have increased through Theberton recently so it appears the SID is a good reminder to drivers to slow down.

**ACTION: Cllr. Paul Collins to follow-up.**

b) The Clerk reported that she asked County Cllr. Richard Smith to make enquiries as to why Highways have placed the nominated Quiet Lanes 'under review' due to the Sizewell C proposals.

**ACTION: Clerk to follow-up.**

## **10. Planning**

a) The Council discuss the planning decision for DC/20/4223/FUL which approved the demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of a new single storey dwelling at Martins, Cemetery Road, Eastbridge. Cllr. Graham Bickers expressed his disappointment and frustration with the District Council as it does not appear to listen to the Council's views. Cllr. Bickers said the Council spends a lot of time and trouble to make informed observations and the District Council arbitrarily decides not to consider applications by committee but solely by officers behind closed doors. The Council was previously informed that if it asked for a planning application to be considered by committee then this would happen but the rules appear to have been changed and applications are now decided by 2 or 3 officers. The Ward Members are also not given the opportunity to represent the Parish Council's views. Cllr. Bickers added that, at a recent SALC forum, many Parish Councils were unhappy with the planning authority's response to applications and that perhaps it was time to organise a unified response to the District Council. Cllr. Paul Collins suggested that the Council drafts a letter to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government complaining about the planning authority in this District and asks all Town and Parish Councils in East Suffolk for their support. It was further agreed to send a copy of the letter to the District Council Cabinet Member with responsibility for planning and his Assistant Member.

**ACTION: Cllr. Graham Bickers to draft a letter and circulate for comments and/or approval.**

b) Cllr. Graham Bickers proposed that the Council supports planning application DC/20/4933/FUL – steel frame cattle building – Church Farm, Pretty Road, Theberton. Seconded by Cllr. Stephen Brett. All in favour with the exception of Cllr. Philip Baskett who, having previously declared an interest, took no part in the voting.

## **11. Councillors' Progress Reports**

a) The Council received a report on Dark Skies from Cllr. Stephen Morphey, attached as Appendix II.

**ACTION: Cllr. Stephen Morphey to contact RSPB Minsmere to enquire about Dark Skies.**

b) The Council received a report about the Community Partnership Meeting from Cllr. Hilary Ward, attached as Appendix III.

## 12. Police

Cllr. Beth Goose reported that a violence/sexual offence in Theberton was reported in November 2020. The offence is under investigation. Cllr. Goose informed the Council that Suffolk's Police and Crime Commissioner has issued a survey about his proposals for the policing element of the Council Tax precept for the next financial year. PCC's have the ability to raise this by up to £15 per annum for a Band D property. If the planned proposals go ahead, the extra funding will see in the region of 70 additional police officers recruited to the force.

**ACTION: Cllr. Beth Goose to respond to the survey.**

## 13. Consultations

a) The Council agreed to review the ESC Guidance to Conserve and Enhance the Historic Environment and to send any comments to the Clerk.

**ACTION: Clerk to collate a response and submit.**

b) The Council agreed to respond to the ESC Open Space Study.

**ACTION: Clerk to complete and submit.**

c) The Council decided not to respond to the SCC Help Shape Guidance for New Housing Developments consultation.

## 14. Finance

a) The Council noted the latest financial position attached as Appendix IV.

b) Cllr. Stephen Brett explained that the Clerk contacted him to advise that Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council had approached Middleton Primary School to ask if the community could do anything to assist during the latest lockdown. The Headteacher replied that she needed financial help to buy computer tablets to loan to students who do not have access to a computer at home to enable the staff to deliver a range of online learning and live teaching. She said she needed five tablets costing approximately £200 each. Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council agreed to donate £500 and the Clerk, anticipating that the Council may also wish to help, contacted Cllr. Brett. Cllr. Brett proposed that the Council donates £200, which will buy one tablet, to support the parish school. Seconded by Cllr. Paul Collins. All in favour.

c) Cllr. Stephen Brett proposed to increase the Clerk's salary rate to SCP 13 from April 2021. Seconded by Cllr. Hilary Ward. All in favour.

d) The Clerk tabled a draft budget for the financial year 2021/2022 for the Council's approval. Cllr. Stephen Brett recommended that the parish precept is increased to £7,607.69, which is a 10% rise on the current year's precept. For a Band D property, this is equivalent to an increase of 9p per week from 89p to 98p. The increase is necessary to meet expected expenditure over the next financial year. Cllr. Brett proposed the Council accepts the budget and the precept increase of 10%. Seconded by Cllr. Hilary Ward. All in favour.

**ACTION: Clerk to request precept from East Suffolk Council and upload the budget to the website.**

e) Cllr. Beth Goose proposed a donation of £50 to support Leiston Library. Seconded by Cllr. Hilary Ward. All in favour.

f) It was proposed by Cllr. Hilary Ward, seconded by Cllr. Beth Goose, and agreed to authorise the payments listed below. All in favour.

Details	Payee	Amount	Power
Clerk's Salary	Sharon Smith	£194.50	LGA 1972 s.112
Clerk's PAYE	HM Revenue and Customs	£145.80	LGA 1972 s.112
Clerk's Expenses	Sharon Smith	£56.31	LGA 1972 s.111
Newsletter Printing	Leiston Press	£20.00	LGA 1972 s.142

## 15. Correspondence

- a) The Council reviewed the correspondence received between 6<sup>th</sup> November 2020 and 7<sup>th</sup> January 2021.
- b) Cllr. Stephen Brett read out a letter received from a number of residents about Theberton Woods. The residents raised concerns about Forestry England's plans to extract timber and the effects of this on flora and fauna. Cllr. Brett contacted Forestry England and following a discussion he received a report outlining their management plans. Forestry England are reducing the woodland by 10-15% every 10 years to open up the space to allow new growth. This maintenance is necessary to avoid the woodland falling into disrepair and to ensure public safety. Forestry England have commissioned surveys into the flora and fauna and they will ensure that wildlife is protected as far as possible. They are happy to host a site visit to explain their work when the COVID-19 restrictions permit.

**ACTION: Clerk to upload Forestry Commission report to the website and publish in the newsletter.**

## 16. Questions to the Chair/Items for Next Agenda

- a) Cllr. Graham Bickers asked for an item to be added to the agenda to discuss possible mitigation and compensation from EDF Energy if Sizewell C goes ahead.
- b) Cllr. Nat Bacon informed the Council that the Woodland Trust may not be able to provide hedging for Theberton playing field this spring but it is expected in the autumn.
- c) Cllr. Stephen Brett informed the Council that the 'no turning' sign has been erected at Eastbridge Common.
- d) The Clerk informed the Council that the pads have been replaced in both defibrillators.

## 17. Next Meeting

The Council confirmed the date and time of the next meeting which is scheduled for Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021 at 7:00 pm.

The meeting closed at 9:45 pm.

## Appendix I – Energy Projects Report

### 1 TEAGS – Stop Sizewell C

Work continues on national awareness and campaigning. Our Facebook petition is still open and accessible at [www.stopsizewellcpetition.com](http://www.stopsizewellcpetition.com).

Our response to the fifth consultation was submitted before the final date and is available on the website. Overall, the vagueness of the offerings to reduce HGV traffic were a disappointment along with a further lost opportunity to address other issues we have been raising since the beginning of consultations 9 years ago.

The Committee on Climate Change published its latest carbon assessment and carbon budget proposals on 9<sup>th</sup> December which has several strategies for meeting net zero 2050 along with the risks and likelihood of the various strategies being successful. The most likely strategy would support a single additional large nuclear project approval with one or two SMRs at some point but at least one of the strategies would not require a further large nuclear project beyond Hinkley Point but 5 or 6 SMRs.

The recent announcement by EDF that they will be pursuing a 20-year life extension for SZB, subject to appropriate ONR project approval could potentially change the assessment as the assumption in the CCC carbon assessment has SZB closing without a life extension.

The new Energy Whitepaper was published 20<sup>th</sup> December 2020 and supports one more large scale nuclear financial investment decision before the end of the parliament, subject to value for money assessment, alongside small and advanced modular reactor developments continuing.

The decision by government to enter discussions with EDF on Sizewell C financing has been much in the press prior to the Christmas break, significantly at EDF's prompting and their undoubted relief.

However, the government has also been at pains to point out that no decisions have been taken and any decision, assuming that the PINS examination of the DCO is successful, would also have to show that the project represents value for money for the consumer and taxpayer. Given the furore that surrounded the Contract for Difference agreement for Hinkley Point C that culminated in a significant lambasting by the National Audit Office, the case for large scale nuclear is not yet one that seems to sit quite so well with the Treasury and those outside of the Department for Business and Industrial Strategy.

EDF are also making significant noise and proposals to get involved in hydrogen production and district heating.

A request for proposal on a hydrogen proof of concept has been published based on power from SZB initially, but the ambition is to improve the process with post-generator steam from the SZC reactors. Any such project could not be sited immediately at the SZC site as there is insufficient room and at a recent Nuclear NGO forum, the ONR questioned whether a safety case could be made for having large Hydrogen and Oxygen gas production and storage so close to a nuclear site (even at a decommissioned SZA or SZB site). Perhaps the closest could be at the LEEIE site once EDF stop using it for SZC development.

At a recent Westminster Forum, Julia Pyke talked about using waste heat for district heating projects within 80km of the SZC site and claimed they were discussing this with ESC. Most district heating projects are much closer than 80 km and I question whether planning consent would be granted for low grade steam pipelines, above or below ground, from Sizewell to Woodbridge or Lowestoft. Then there is always the question about what happens when the reactors are on outage in the middle of winter. Whilst EDF would stagger the outages, district heating will always need

some backup in case of failure. Logistically, these sorts of systems are a significant headache and cannot be retrofitted to existing homes.

It is also significant that on 31<sup>st</sup> December, once again, the decision was taken to delay the Horizon Wylfa project approval/rejection in Anglesey until 30<sup>th</sup> April 2021. This will allow Horizon to continue to pursue a new consortium to take this project forward. This will not have pleased EDF quite as much as the decision on financial discussions with government on SZC, as Wylfa must be a direct competitor to SZC should only one further large-scale nuclear project be required. This will make the decision of this DCO application 21 months late, always assuming a decision is made in late April.

We continue to work with press and TV on coverage of SZC and were featured on both the Today program on Radio4 and BBC and ITV national news following the release of the Energy White Paper and statements about government discussions with EDF on SZC. A number of national newspapers gave coverage to all of these decisions and an article by Anthony Horowitz in The Spectator just before Christmas was hugely supportive of our efforts

<https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/building-sizewell-c-would-be-a-nuclear-sized-disaster>

We continue to work with a number of journalists and supporters to pen articles in a variety of print media supporting our efforts.

EDF is due to submit its final DCO changes and supporting information to PINS this week, but it may take some weeks before PINS agrees to the changes and makes them available for Interested Parties to submit further representations and for new IPs to register (e.g. Pakenham councils and residents).

Our next meeting is scheduled for 18<sup>th</sup> January.

## **2 T&E Parish Council**

The request from EDF to convene a meeting with T&EPC to:

3. “discuss your council’s relevant representations and responses to the recent consultation on the proposed changes to the DCO”  
and
4. “a further opportunity to raise your questions and suggestions and to identify any areas of common ground and to explore possible solutions to any concerns should the project go ahead”

reflects the need for EDF to respond to our Relevant Representation before the examination starts in earnest.

In the SPR examination, SPR was requested by the Examining Authority (ExA), in a Rule 9 letter, to have all the responses to RRs and any Statements of Common Ground between SPR and Interested Parties submitted in advance prior to the Pre-Examination starting. These are available on both SPR project websites and can be found at p210-214 in document

[https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010077/EN010077-001770-ExARR3D0V1EastAngliaONENorthApplicantsCommentsonRelevantRepresentationsVolume3Techni\\_344852\\_1.pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010077/EN010077-001770-ExARR3D0V1EastAngliaONENorthApplicantsCommentsonRelevantRepresentationsVolume3Techni_344852_1.pdf)

Unfortunately for EDF, their introduction of the additional consultation to potentially modify the DCO application means that we cannot really meet with EDF regarding our RR until after their final DCO modifications are submitted, accepted by PINS and published on the PINS website as the conditions and proposal will have changed.

From statements by the ExA, all Interested Parties will then be given time to submit Written Representations that modify and/or update our Relevant Representations against which EDF

would then be able to respond and discuss any Statements of Common Ground or Statements Where No Common Ground can be found, which oddly enough they don't mention.

We could meet EDF to discuss our consultation response in the short term but as their changes are due to be submitted this week, there seems little point until the final changes are submitted, evidenced and accepted by PINS.

Possible solutions are a reference to potential changes we require in the DCO application or for mitigation/compensation, but we cannot finally come to any conclusions until such time as all the changes are in the public domain for us to consider.

It is likely that we will have at least 28 days following PINS acceptance of any DCO changes to respond with our WR updating our existing Relevant Representation.

However, PINS may yet ask for further EIA or evidence supporting the changes before releasing the changes to the PINS website for consideration. The consultation was very light on supporting evidence particularly on some of the coastal and BLF changes.

So it is likely that final Written Representations will not be expected before late February and then it is likely to take some months before the Examination can start officially and that will be the time in which EDF will have to respond to RRs and WRs and achieve any Statements of Common Ground (or otherwise).

### **3 Scottish Power DCO Examination**

I have sent a message below to Graham Gunby at Suffolk County Council regarding some of the mitigation proposed by SPR within Theberton regarding proposed pavement and kerb improvements. So far, I have had no response.

Hi Graham,

Sorry for the delay in contacting you but I've been fairly busy dealing with EDF's consultation over the past week or so and just getting my head above water again. I managed to look at SPR's Cumulative Impact Assessment on traffic which now includes EDF's traffic assessment from the DCO application, along with a load of caveats given the speculative consultation we've just been through.

However, it does concern me that it is unlikely that the early years assessment is unlikely to change in terms of HGV volume increases although I suspect timing will still play a significant part in the actual numbers assuming both projects are approved.

43. For CIA Scenario A, there could be an increase in HGV traffic of up to 387% (777 HGVs), of which 77% (624 HGVs) would be attributable to the Sizewell Projects. The Applicants consider that the increase in HGV traffic would result in an assessed high magnitude of effect on receptors of low to high sensitivity resulting in potentially moderate to major adverse cumulative impacts

PINS Document: [https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/EN010078/EN010078-002978-ExA.AS-6.D2.V1%20EA1N&EA2%20Sizewell%20C%20Cumulative%20Impact%20Assessment%20Note%20\(Traffic%20and%20Transport\).pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/EN010078/EN010078-002978-ExA.AS-6.D2.V1%20EA1N&EA2%20Sizewell%20C%20Cumulative%20Impact%20Assessment%20Note%20(Traffic%20and%20Transport).pdf)

However, the mitigation for Theberton, whilst adding some pavement space and dropped kerbs at the B1122/Church Lane Junction also adds a dropped kerb crossing on the north side of the church, very close to the Pretty Lane corner which will be blind to both traffic coming from the Middleton direction and to any pedestrians attempting to use the crossing, especially from the eastern side.



Do you think there would be a case for pushing for a manually controlled crossing further within the village south of the Lion public house and removing the dropped kerb crossing so close to the Pretty Lane corner? Something closer to the middle of the village will be of more general use to all Theberton residents rather than the dropped kerb close to Pretty Lane which will only benefit a few of the residents.

## Appendix II – Dark Skies

Below is the information I have obtained so far from various Councils, Associations and Organisations. Unfortunately most of the associations are voluntary so COVID-19 seems to have stopped them replying to emails or telephone calls as it seems they are not staffed.

I have spoken to Darsham Parish Council and DashAstro (Astronomy organisation) who have given me this information: DashAstro have been promoting Dark Skies in the area, with the aid of Westleton Parish Council. They have had Westleton Common recognised as a Dark Sky Discovery Site, which in itself has only the kudos of telling the world what great skies the common has. DashAstro has also started conversations with the Darsham Village Hall Committee and the Parish Council to try to establish the village hall playing field as a Dark Sky Site, but again COVID-19 has shut it down. DashAstro have also been helping the Suffolk Coastal Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Committee to survey the entire coastal area from Kessingland to Felixstowe for Dark Sky levels - they are awaiting further information. Darsham village does have a Dark Skies policy, but it is on an informal basis, and most villagers seem happy with the principle.

I have also contacted BritAstro (the UK campaign for Dark Skies) and the Dark Sky Discovery Partnership for more information. BritAstro is a charity that provides a national focus, advice and advocacy on protecting Dark Skies, again I am awaiting further information.

Below is some useful interesting information from a Dark Sky website:

There is a growing interest in the UK's dark skies - how to protect and how to promote them. You have several options for how to develop and harness your area's Dark Sky potential. Reasons for developing the Dark Sky potential are often one of the following:

1. As a resource for practical science education and wider educational use.
2. As a resource for tourism activity based on the natural qualities of rural areas, providing a distinctive product - especially in the shoulder seasons.
3. As a natural resource to be protected as part of our wider natural environment.

Any or all of the above can make dark skies a good focus for community activity.

There are broadly two complementary aspects of dark sky work:

1. Protecting dark skies. In one sense, it is very simple to protect dark skies: don't shine light upwards. In practice, protecting dark skies involves a combination of lighting engineering techniques, working with local authorities and property owners and legislation.
2. Engaging people with dark skies. Whether it's education, tourism or community activities, much of dark sky development is about helping people enjoy and learn about the night sky.

One final point it might be worth checking if RSPB Minsmere could have dark skies. If our area is large and has very dark skies, and they are in a position to stimulate or coordinate an approach to dark sky protection in the area, then they could also consider bidding for status as an IDA Dark Sky Park, Reserve or Community.

## **Appendix III - East Suffolk Community Partnership**

Community Partnerships are an innovative new way for the council, partners and communities to work together to 'bring ideas to life' by taking a solution focused approach to local priorities.

The Community Partnership Annual Forum between 2nd and 6th November 2020 was a 5 day virtual programme for participants to be brought up to speed on Community Partnership priorities, share their knowledge and expertise, and work together to find solutions.

I attended the zoom meeting on 2 November. Steve Gallant, the Chair of the partnership, gave an introduction explaining that it's divided into 8 partnerships (wards)

Theberton and Eastbridge come within Aldeburgh, Leiston and Saxmundham and Surrounding Villages.

Dominic Campbell, CEO of Future Gov, gave a presentation on the different ways of doing business and modern ways of working and the changing digital world.

With COVID-19, the forum priorities have changed and the way forward in a time/field of greyness.

Subjects covered for East Suffolk during the week were:

5. Tackling Social Isolation and Loneliness
6. Travel and Transport (connecting rural communities and making travel more active and sustainable)
7. Focus on Technology (smart town's project and Innovative Technology)

I attended the zoom closing event on 6 November where Social Economic impact and the different ways of doing business was discussed.

One idea discussed was GrandPad TechSilver - an easy-to-use digital tablet specifically designed to help the older generation with connectivity that modern technology brings. 'Can we look to engage other District Councils' ESCP said. They cost £1000 each including support.

The strategic plan going forward:

- Growing our Economy
- Enabling our Communities
- Caring for our Environment.

The attendance: 208 delegates over 10 sessions.

Long term programme – each of the groups create their own track record.

### **Aldeburgh, Leiston and Saxmundham and Surrounding Villages Community Partnership**

Virtual meeting held 9 November 2020.

Cllr. Tony Cooper – Chair

Cllr. TJ Haworth-Culf - Temporary Vice Chair

Luke Bennet – Community Partnership Manager

The main areas in the initiative concentrated on were:

1. Education, opportunities and aspirations.
2. Reduce social isolation and loneliness, particularly carers, older people and men over 40.
3. Encourage and enable everyone to be more physically active and healthy

With the following being dealt with by the Community Partnership Board:

1. Social isolation and loneliness.
2. Sustaining Community Hubs and Community Resilience/Empowering/Capability.
3. Supporting the most vulnerable communities and people

This meeting was to discuss applications to put forward to the Community Partnership Board.

The Board is made up of East Suffolk councillors and other various organisations and businesses.

Application – Community Art Project

Sharon Cuthbert summarised a project proposal which, unfortunately, had not been in time for inclusion with the agenda papers. The planned project sought to run a creative arts project across the area of Saxmundham, Aldeburgh and Leiston and Surrounding Villages with the aim of connecting people who are socially isolated and who may experience loneliness over the next six months due to the impact of COVID-19 restrictions on normal social activities. Next steps for this project was to secure funding and the planned exhibition put into next year's funding.

## Appendix IV – Financial Position

### Bank Balances as at 12 November 2020

Barclays Current Account	£5,293.02
Barclays Savings Account	£4,017.40
	<u>£9,310.42</u>

### General and Earmarked Reserves

EDF Energy Grant - Work Party Tools	£132.58
General Reserves	£2,495.00
Parish Playing Areas Maintenance and Sinking Fund	£1,000.00
	<u>£3,627.58</u>

**Bank Balance less Reserves** **£5,682.84**

### Income – December 2020

Community Council – Aerial Runway **£12,972.00**

### Payments – December 2020/January 2021

Sharon Smith - Clerk's Salary	£389.00
Sharon Smith – Clerk's Expenses	£59.91
HM Revenue and Customs – Quarterly PAYE	£145.80
Leiston Press – Newsletter Printing	£20.00
Theberton Play Equipment Maintenance Package	£35.98
Aerial Runway 50% Deposit	£6,486.00
	<u>£7,136.69</u>

**Net Balance** **£11,518.15**