



Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley Community Partnership

Chair: Councillor Chris Blundell (East Suffolk Council)

Vice-Chair: Councillor Elaine Bryce (Suffolk County Council)

East Suffolk Councillors:

Councillor Chris Blundell Councillor Geoff Lynch

Councillor Tony Fryatt Councillor Debbie McCallum

Councillor Colin Hedgley Councillor Mark Newton

Councillor Stuart Lawson Councillor Ed Thompson

Partnership Organisations:

Local Town and Parish Councils

Suffolk Constabulary

Ipswich and East Suffolk Clinical
Commissioning Group

Community Action Suffolk

Business Community

Youth Community

Environment

Suffolk County Councillors:

Councillor Elaine Bryce

Councillor Patti Mulcahy

Members of the **Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn
Valley Community Partnership** are invited to a meeting to be held via
Zoom on **Monday, 11 October 2021 at 2:00pm**

This meeting will be broadcast to the public via the East Suffolk YouTube Channel
at <https://youtu.be/HijzvxPFbM4>.

Agenda

1 Welcome and Apologies for Absence

2 Notes of the previous meeting

To agree the action notes of the meeting held on 12 July 2021

Pages

1 - 6

3	Community Partnership Board Update	7 - 8
	To receive an update from the Community Partnership Board's meeting held on 6 September 2021	
4	The Road and Traffic Safety Priority	9 - 14
	a) To receive an update and the outcomes from the Road and Traffic Safety Workshop	
	b) To agree next steps and actions to address the road and traffic safety priority	
5	Any Other Business	
6	Date of Next Meeting	
	Monday 10 January 2022, 2pm, venue to be confirmed	

Filming, Videoing, Photography and Audio Recording at Partnership Meetings

The Council and members of the partnership may record / film / photograph or broadcast this meeting. Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Democratic Services Team (in advance), who will instruct that they are not included in any filming.

If you require this document in large print, audio or Braille or in a different language, please contact the Democratic Services Team on 01502 523521 or email:

democraticservices@eastsuffolk.gov.uk



The national Charter and Charter Plus Awards for Elected Member Development

East Suffolk Council is committed to achieving excellence in elected member development

www.local.gov.uk/Community-Leadership



Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley Community Partnership

Action Notes of the Meeting held on Monday 12 July 2021 via the Zoom video conferencing system

Core Membership:

ESC Councillors – Councillor Chris Blundell (Chair), Councillor Tony Fryatt, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Mark Newton, Councillor Ed Thompson

SCC Councillors - Councillor Elaine Bryce (Vice-Chair)

Town and Parish Councils – Joanna Abbott (Kesgrave Town Council Clerk), Councillor Alan Comber (Kesgrave Town Council), Councillor Stephen Denton (Martlesham Parish Council), Councillor James Wright (Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council)

Others present – Geoffrey Caryer (Grundisburgh PC), PC Sam Gilkes (Suffolk Police), Dave Harker (Bredfield Village Hall), Anne Henderson (Bredfield Village Hall), Colin Hopkins (Little Bealings PC), Andrew Jolliffe (ESC Communities Officer), Matt Makin (ESC Democratic Services Officer), Luke Merton (Suffolk Highways), Sarah Mortimer (Community Action Suffolk), Jan Pedgrift (Charsfield PC), Pauline Procter (Tuddenham St Martin PC), Jack Raven (EDF Energy)

Item	Discussion
1.	<p>Welcome and Apologies</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
2.	<p>Notes of the Previous Meeting</p> <p>The notes of the meeting held on 17 May 2021 were agreed.</p>
3.	<p>Community Partnership Board Update</p> <p>Andrew Jolliffe (AJ) referred to the written update on the most recent meeting of the Community Partnership Board, which had been circulated with the agenda and highlighted the key points in the report.</p> <p>AJ noted that the initiatives originally formulated by the Community Partnership were now being adopted in other areas.</p>



4.	<p>A Rural Proofing Approach for East Suffolk Community Partnerships</p> <p>The Community Partnership received a presentation from Sarah Mortimer (SM), from Community Action Suffolk (CAS), on a rural proofing approach for East Suffolk Community Partnerships.</p> <p>The presentation covered the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The initial meetings between CAS and the Community Partnership Chairs, to discuss rural proofing.• The rural proofing toolkit developed with the information gathered at those meetings.• How the toolkit can be applied to the work of the Community Partnerships.• The support in place from Sarah Mortimer until the end of March 2022, including tailored support for each of the eight East Suffolk Community Partnerships.• The what, why and how of rural proofing<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The definition of a rural area○ Provision of impactful projects○ The reference to rural proofing in the updated Terms of Reference• Rural proofing projects and services, including examples of questions for each stage of a project. <p>Cllr Chris Blundell (CB) invited questions to SM, where the following points were covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How appropriate it was for all initiatives to follow rural proofing:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ How projects impact on the wider area○ How projects are accessed <p>CB thanked SM for her presentation.</p>
5.	<p>Consideration of new Environmental Care Projects</p> <p>AJ outlined the progress made so far in addressing the Community Partnership's environmental care priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• £10,818 allocated to the Environmental Grant Scheme• 11 projects funded across the Community Partnership area• The workshops and working groups that had taken place in 2021 <p>AJ advised that there were three proposals for the Community Partnership to consider for funding.</p>



a) Martlesham Garden Rewilding Project

This project sought £2,030 of funding for materials.

The Community Partnership received a presentation from AJ which covered the following points:

- The project would
 - encourage residents to take positive steps for wildlife.
 - increase biodiversity.
 - encourage residents to provide opportunities for wildlife.
 - actively promote the initiative, increasing visibility and empowering people.
 - link with the Advice Hub and Climate Summit in September 2021

The project was supported by Cllr James Wright (JW) of Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council.

On the proposition of Cllr James Wright, seconded by Cllr Tony Fryatt it was unanimously agreed to fund the Martlesham Garden Rewilding Project.

ACTION – The Martlesham Garden Rewilding Project to be provided with £2,030 for materials.

b) Advice Hub

This project sought £2,000 of funding ahead of the Advice Hub's launch in September 2021.

The Community Partnership received a presentation from AJ which covered the following points:

- The project would
 - offer accurate environmental advice to residents.
 - enable residents to take positive steps themselves.
 - provide face-to-face services in Martlesham and Carlford and Fynn Valley.
 - provide volunteer training via Community Action Suffolk.
 - provide a web directory hosted via East Suffolk Council.

AJ confirmed that the project could be replicated elsewhere in the Community Partnership area in the future if there was sufficient interest.

On the proposition of Cllr Alan Comber, seconded by Cllr Ed Thompson it was unanimously agreed to fund the Advice Hub project.

ACTION – The Advice Hub project to be provided with £2,000 of funding.



	<p>c) <u>Green Communities</u></p> <p>This project sought £5,520 of funding, to be allocated as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little Bealings Churchyard - £661• Westerfield Station wildlife - £1,564• Grundisburgh Recreation Ground wildlife refurb - £1,295• Bredfield Hall Solar Panel (contribution) - £2,000 <p>The Community Partnership received a presentation from AJ which covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The project would<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ develop a variety of environmentally positive outcomes◦ collate learning to enable duplication elsewhere◦ provide local engagement <p>The Community Partnership discussed the different implementation timescales for the different projects under the Green Communities banner.</p> <p>On the proposition of Cllr James Wright, seconded by Joanna Abbott it was unanimously agreed to fund the Green Communities project.</p> <p>ACTION – The Green Communities project to be provided with £5,520 of funding.</p>
6.	<p>Presentation on Road and Transport Safety</p> <p>The Community Partnership received a presentation from Jack Raven of EDF Energy on the road and transport safety strategy, which covered the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The background on the requirement to understand transport needs in the district and the support from EDF Energy provided to achieve this via a task group.• The task group goals:<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ project timeline.◦ the aim to create short-term 'deliverables'.◦ a presentation to the Community Partnership Board to report the task group's outcomes.• Key synergies.• Progress made.• That a draft strategy will be finalised in August 2021.• The findings for the Community Partnership's area.



	<p>The discussion on the presentation raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The impact of Sizewell C on B roads and the A12 and the need for a strategy on this.• Crossings at major roads.• Engagement with local communities.• Buses routing through the Ipswich Hospital hub.• The link with East Suffolk Council's cycling and walking strategy• Quiet Lanes• The provision of bus routes in Martlesham
7.	<p>Discussion on Road and Transport Safety</p> <p>The Community Partnership received a presentation from AJ on its road and traffic safety priority, which covered the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partnership practicalities.• Road casualties in the former Suffolk Coastal district area for 2019, including percentages of types of vehicles involved in casualties for the period.• Accident hotspots.• Casualty ages.• A summary of the data presented. <p>The Community Partnership discussed the information presented; the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need for more Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) in smaller villages.• The availability of SIDs.• Safer speed limits in rural areas.• The prohibitive costs for village communities to make changes to improve safety (i.e., changing speed limits and widening roads).• The need for more PCSOs and traffic wardens to monitor parking issues.• The enforcement of speed limits.• The suggestion of scoping the possibility of early intervention work with younger drivers and linking with driving schools.• Looking for examples of good practice beyond East Suffolk. <p>AJ confirmed that he would collate and circulate the points raised during the discussion and would be encouraging relevant organisations/groups to engage with the Community Partnership.</p> <p>ACTION – AJ to collate and circulate the points raised during the discussion and encourage relevant organisations/groups to engage with the Community Partnership on its road and traffic safety priority.</p>
8.	Any Other Business



	<p>CB highlighted a recent media report about an underspend on Suffolk County Council's road safety funding and reminded everyone of the Enabling Communities budgets and Locality budgets held by East Suffolk Councillors and County Councillors respectively.</p>
9.	<p>Dates of next meeting: Monday 11 October 2021, 2pm, venue TBC.</p>

The meeting concluded at 4.07pm

Key outcomes of the East Suffolk Community Partnership Board meeting held 6 September 2021

All eight Community Partnerships are represented on the Community Partnership Board by their respective Chairs. Community Partnership Board meeting agendas / papers / presentations / minutes can be viewed [HERE](#)

1. Report from Transport Task and Finish Group

The Board received a report ([HERE](#)) and presentation on behalf of the Task and Finish Group, including input from Transport East about alignment with regional and national ambitions, and considered a revised outcome proposal ([HERE](#)) for total funding of £180,000. £80,000 was agreed in 2020/21 and therefore the request was for an additional £100,000 from 2021/22 to be allocated across five projects:

£50k for the expansion of the BACT service into the Lowestoft and Northern Parishes CP area

£50k for a further Demand Responsive Transport pilot

£10k towards marketing of the KATCH service, with a view to accessing more villages on its route

£20k for active travel pilots to complement the DRT schemes

Up to £50k for the development of a mobile app to support the DRT and active travel pilots and enable a further expansion of DRT solutions into new areas of East Suffolk.

During the meeting it was also announced that a new Katch DRT service would be launched around the Snape/Tunstall area in the next few weeks.

The Task and Finish Group reiterated their offer to meet with Community Partnerships to discuss specific transport needs in their area – please contact Jack Raven at jack.raven@sizewellc.com.

2. Focus on Community Partnerships

An updated Progress Report, which can be found [HERE](#), summarising activity in each of the eight Community Partnership areas was received by the Board. The Board then received a short presentation from the Chair and Communities Officer from two of the eight Community Partnerships – Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and villages and Kesgrave, Rushmere St Andrew, Martlesham, Carlford and Fynn Valley Community Partnership. These presentations highlighted achievements to date and examples of innovation.

3. Covid Impacts Task and Finish Group / Hoarding Outcome Proposals

The Board considered a report ([HERE](#)) produced by ESC on behalf of the Task and Finish Group which reminded the Board of the funding allocated to date in response to the Covid-19 pandemic - a total of over £300k over three financial years. The report then focussed on the priorities identified by seven strategic partners at the June Board meeting. In total the list includes nine areas of focus, including the existing Board priorities of Social Isolation and Loneliness and Mental Health and Wellbeing. Since the meeting, partners have undertaken a piece of work to identify activity against each of the nine priorities and what else could be done under the auspices of the Board. It is proposed that the Task and Finish Group should meet a final time to consider any projects that could be developed into outcome proposals to be considered at the December Board meeting.

The Board also considered an outcome proposal (which can be found [HERE](#)) around Self Neglect and Hoarding developed by the ESC Private Sector Housing Team in conjunction with Access Community Trust. The need for this project had been identified during the pandemic and the first quarter has been funded through the Councils funding to support Clinically Extremely Vulnerable people, match funding of £30,000 is available from MHCLG. The request for £22,500 of funding was agreed by the Board.

4. Focus on BT

The Board received a presentation from Lisa Perkins, Vice Chair of the Board, about the work of BT, with a particular focus on their focus on innovation and work in the community. This focussed on four key areas of activity:

- Education and Skills, including a STEM focussed education programme
- DigiTech Centre at Adastral Park linked to the University and including support for SMEs with things like marketing and promotion
- Health and Wellbeing, including the provision of PPE and loan of people and kit during the pandemic, and current trials of digital and robot solutions health and care providers
- Transport optimisation engine to match schoolchildren with transport, and EV fleet management

This is the first in a series of presentations from Board partners at each quarterly meeting.

5. 2021/22 Community Partnership Forum

An update was provided on proposals for the 2021/22 Community Partnership Forum. The report includes a reminder about the 2020 Forum which was a week-long event held virtually which included 10 separate sessions. The proposal in December 2020 was to hold a hybrid event in 2021, culminating in a face-to-face event for up to 200 people at Trinity Park on November 5th. Given the ongoing concerns about the spread of the virus (particularly the Delta variant) across the country, it was agreed that the full Forum event would be pushed back to March 25th, 2022, and to use the 5th of November slot for a face to face Community Partnership Board workshop at Trinity Park for up to 45 people which will enable us to socially distance. The focus would be on visioning for 2022, receiving a report on the LGA Peer Challenge to be held in October and any data that is available at that point.

6. Any other Business

The Chair reminded the Board that the LGA ‘deep dive’ Peer Review of Community Partnerships is taking place between 12-14 September 2021 and thanked those who were involved in interviews and focus groups for their participation.

There was also a discussion about potentially moving the meetings to Teams which will be explored further as there are pros and cons to both Zoom and Teams.

Nicole Rickard, Head of Communities, 07/09/21

Community Partnership Workshop

16th September 2021



Kesgrave,
Rushmere St Andrew,
Martlesham, Carlford
& Fynn Valley

Summary

The workshop was very well attended by representatives across the Community Partnership area. 20 attendees contributed their views and suggestions throughout the busy two hour session, 10 of which represented the smaller parishes.

Several items were discussed during the event with the aim of identifying solutions and actions to take forwards.

A summary review of the available data was provided to all attendees. This included data from traffic accidents, local speed monitoring and supplemented by SID data from Debach. The group agreed on the whole on the data and added additional comments (see below).

Details of the public survey were also discussed, particularly the sub headings and themes. The group was asked to separate the sub headings in to two groups – one that was in the scope of the Partnership, and another where the responsibility lies with another organisation such as Suffolk Highways or Suffolk County Council.

The group were asked to explore a small number of the potential options in more detail. During this discussion there were additional options highlighted as ways of progressing forwards. Exploring the options in more detail will require further discussion, potentially once the list of options has been reduced.

The following were suggestions identified by the workshop as potential options for the Community Partnership to explore further.

Walk to school scheme	Speed watch – joined up approach
School engagement	Road Safety Forums
Child education in schools	CP to lobby key people
Car pooling	Senior representation from Police, SCC, etc
Corporate responsibility promotion	ANPR
Education of all regarding road safety	Clopton – reduce speed limit
Planning department involvement	Richard Bull, EDF to be involved
Lollipop people outside certain schools	Rural sub committee
Police presence at key times, eg rush hour	Parking enforcement at schools
Speed watch – increased delivery	Briefing Councillors and MPs
Speed Indicator Device – increase provision	

Suggestions of actions that are required by Highways/SCC are recorded and saved on the documents used during the workshop for future reference.

Discussion regarding communicating findings to key stakeholders was discussed. It was agreed that the survey findings would be shared with each Parish Council as a matter good practice.

It was confirmed that AJ had already contacted Cllr Alexander Nicolls (Deputy Cabinet member at SCC for transport) inviting him to engage with the Partnership. Response is due shortly.

There appeared to be significant interest in a rural sub committee because of the difference in circumstances compared to busier parts of the area.

The meeting ended with

- significant work being completed to explore the options and issues.
- a list of options and actions to consider further and discuss at the next Community Partnership meeting.
- Clear enthusiasm to engage with key stakeholders in the future to action clear change.

Next steps

Because of the scale of the issue it is suggested that further conversation continues at the Community Partnership meeting. Agreeing actions to focus on and take forwards are recommended as the next step.

There are also ongoing consultations taking place away from the Community Partnership, including the launch of a consultation regarding active travel. It is recommended that CP members and stakeholders are made aware of such consultations and results in order to inform future decision making.

Finally, it is recommended that future discussions relating to the topic focus solely on the potential solutions and actions that can be taken. This is because significant discussion, data collection and other research has been completed to provide a strong evidence base. There is now the opportunity to pool resources and energy in to positive outcomes.

Contents

1. Parish Council comments and notes
2. Useful Website Data
3. Public Survey summary results

1. Parish Council comments and notes

Representatives from Grundisburgh and Debach Parish Councils were unable to attend the meeting, however discussed their views prior to the session.

Grundisburgh PC Notes

Key areas and issues

- Junction of Chapel Field, Meeting Lane and Upper/Lower Park Road. Narrow roads and high speed vehicles with no space to move.
- Walking to the shop from east of the village – no footpaths at some places.
- B1079 junction by bus stop – village and Burgh. Accidents, blind bend.
- Speedwatch working in silos, not sharing information with the Police or each other. Joined up approach needs to take place.
- Uncertainty about a Police contact.
- Speedwatch – low number of volunteers, many are older, have health conditions, etc.
- Hostility towards volunteers at times.
- Lack of organisers – should be the Parish Councils.
- ‘Pardon the weeds’ blocking sight lines at some junctions. Now addressed.
- Road signage defective/dirty/not being replaced when broken.
- B1079/Lower Road – not suitable for HGVs.

Possible solutions

- Speedwatch. Day of action, all working at the same time/day.
- SIDs – GC believes they do make a difference.
- Promotion and advertisement of Speedwatch to more volunteers.
- Change speed limit to 20mph in middle of village and lower road.
- Community self-help for replacing posts?

Debach Speed Indicator Device data

From 15th to 29th August, from South end of village

- Total vehicle count: 8990
- Max speed: 80 mph on 18th August at 19:25
- Average % of vehicles over 30 mph: 55%
- Average % of vehicles over 35 mph: 24%.

From 9th to 23rd May, from North end of village

- Total vehicle count: 6953
- Max speed: 60 mph on 11th May at 22:55:00
- Average % of vehicles over 30 mph: 62%
- Average % of vehicles over 35 mph: 28%

We have had vehicles entering the village at 90 mph - an astonishingly high speed! It should be borne in mind that Debach has no pavements - and has a number of bends. We have drawn the attention of the police to the problems we face, but the response has been disappointingly sporadic.

2. Useful website data;

[CrashMap - UK Road Safety Map](#)

[Suffolk County Council - ReportIT](#)

[Data – Suffolk Roadsafe](#)

3. Public Survey summary results.

A public survey was opened for two weeks during late August/early September. Promotion was done via Parish and Town Councils, social media pages for different communities and via the Grundisburgh News – reaching every household in 18 villages across Carlford and Fynn Valley.

Respondents were invited to submit information about the following;

- Which Town/Parish their issue related to
- Where exactly (if possible) – for example a particular corner or street
- What is the risk relating to? Speeding, cyclist safety, etc
- What potential solution do they suggest?

By close of play there were 230 responses received. This is an excellent number of responses.

Key points

Locations mentioned

Kesgrave	30.00%	69
Martlesham	15.65%	36
Charsfield	10.87%	25
Otley	8.70%	20
Grundisburgh	7.39%	17
Hasketon	5.65%	13
Clopton	4.78%	11
Little Bealings	3.48%	8
Great Bealings	3.04%	7
Tuddenham St Martin	3.04%	7
Purdis Farm	2.17%	5

Rushmere	1.74%	4
Debach	0.87%	2
Swilland	0.87%	2
Bredfield	0.43%	1
Burgh	0.43%	1
Playford	0.43%	1
Witnesham	0.43%	1

What is the concern relating to?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Speeding	41.05%	94
Pedestrian safety	13.97%	32
Cyclist safety	1.31%	3
Dangerous driving	7.42%	17
Areas near schools	6.99%	16
Other (please specify)	29.26%	67
Answered		229
Skipped		1

Speeding locations varied across the Community Partnership area. Helmingham Road, Otley was mentioned on regular occasions. This links with road accident data suggesting the area is a 'hotspot'.

Much of the 'Pedestrian safety' feedback was related to crossings, footpaths, and the lack of either. Within Kesgrave's responses to this question, 11 out of 12 people reported this issue being linked to Bell Lane and the Heath Primary School area.

There appeared to be very little pattern within the feedback received regarding 'Dangerous Driving'. Examples or locations did not appear linked.

The Bell Lane and Heath Primary School area again dominated the responses relating to 'Near Schools' with a small number linked to rural Primary Schools instead. Outside of Kesgrave these responses noted 'bad parking' as the concern, whilst in Kesgrave it was again the speed, volume and parking of traffic that causes concerns.

There was one response relating to 'Cyclist Safety' which requested better signage for cycle lanes.

Under 'Other' there were a mix of locations and concerns. 20% of these could have been listed under the other headings. Key themes included volume of traffic, visibility and speed.

Solutions

48 different solutions were suggested by the public respondents. Similarly worded suggestions were joined together and then filtered in to nine themes. Below are the nine themes, the sub topics and the number of suggestions each one received.

THEMES	TOTAL
PRACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	99
TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES	71
USE OF CAMERAS	44
SIGNAGE	41
MAINTENANCE	28
CYCLIST/PEDESTRAIN RELATED	27
STRATEGIC	26
ENFORCEMENT	24
EDUCATION/INFORMATION	5

Use of Cameras	44
ANPR	2
Mobile cameras	19
Average speed cameras	1
Fixed site cameras	9
SID (Speed Indicator Devices)	13
Enforcement	24
Enforcement of laws/rules	10
Speedwatch	3
Police presence	5
Lollipop people outside school	6
Signage	41
Cyclist signage	1
Signage	35
Corner warning lights	1
Quiet Lane scheme	3
Accident counter	1
Maintenance	28
Drainage	1
Clear road debris	1
Better maintenance	26
Cyclist/Pedestrian related	27
Footpath additions	2
Pedestrian crossings	4
Landowners engagement	1
Cycle priority	2
Railings at crossings	17
Pedestrian priority zone	1

Traffic Calming Measures	71
Speed bumps	46
Chicane	2
Rumble strips	3
Traffic lights	11
Intentional 'pinch points'	9
Education/Information	5
Child education/involvement	1
School engagement	2
Car pooling	1
Walk to school scheme	1
Practical Development	99
Yellow lines/double whites	14
Lower speed limit	54
Close layby	3
Higher curbs	4
New roundabout	9
One way system	4
CCTV	2
Wider roads	7
Increase grass verges	2
Strategic	26
Traffic planning	1
Corporate responsibility work	4
Planning involvement	1
Education	7
Diversion/closures	9
Weight limits on certain roads	4
Ban lorries one certain roads	2