

Correspondence sent to the Council following the 15 June 2015
Public Meeting

1

Hi David,

I was at the meeting at East Thurrock Fc on Monday evening to what turned out to be a very informative evening.

I am writing to you as I am concerned that the Parish Council committee had been seeking votes without gathering any proper facts from the Council and informing people of those facts.

How can people have been voting on a Parish Council that said each household would be contributing the same amount.

When in fact some will not be paying anything when others could be paying double what was originally proposed by the committee. this is unfair and unacceptable.

That is only one issue that came to light during the evening. There was the case of liability insurance that the Parish committee have not mentioned, plus many more that I believe would have affected the votes had this been told to all voters.

I left the meeting in disgust to the lack information the committee had failed to collect, or inform people and how naïve they have been.

The vote was always going to be 70/30 as out of the 12 roads on the estate 3 pay for their own roads repair and up keep where the other 9 don't. what kind of democratic vote is that.

I believe this voting process is not worth the paper it's written on and disagree with it totally,

I want to make you aware that I am completely against the Parish Council and do not intend to be contributing towards it.

2

Dear Mr Bull, Many thanks for the enlightening evening at thurrock Football Club.

We moved here thirty years ago, along with three young children and a large mortgage. We arrived after the current residents had had a vote to have the road adopted and made up by Thurrock Council, so we were obliged to go along with it.

We had to increase our borrowing on our mortgage in order to pay for it. We paid that mortgage off five years ago and have no intention of starting to pay for, the other roads on the Estate. You may not be aware but a lot of these homes have had expensive block paving driveways, taking their frontages right down to the road.

This would have been more than enough to cover the cost of having the road made up. None of the house down this road have had it done. Also due to our road being

made, our council tax is considerably more than these other properties, therefore in the scheme of things we would end up paying more than they are. therefore we do not wish to go down this road so to speak, and become a parish council

3

Firstly, may I say how mislead I was regarding the purpose of the Frost Estate Public Meeting.

I was lead to believe that a Parish Council was for the betterment of all the residents. This is not so and I consider it illegal that it was just the purpose of repairing the roads at the top end of the estate and wonder how many of the folk that voted for a Parish Council would do so if that was excluded.

I live in Lampits Hill Avenue and that road was adopted by the council and it's cost met by the residents of LHA and Chamberlain Avenue has been maintained and repaired by the residents living there.

We side onto Chamberlain Avenue and have just had the road resurfaced at a cost to us and our neighbours. If some were financially unable or unwilling to pay the cost was met by the rest of the residents. Further down Chamberlain the residents did the same, as did the residents in Arundel Drive.

We feel that a Parish Council will not better any of us whatsoever, as their only purpose for being elected would be the repairing of the roads for which none of us are willing to pay for as we have met a hefty cost with our own.

I would also question the legality of the questionnaire.

The introduction of a Parish Council will most definitely split the Frost Estate in two and cause extreme bad feeling amongst the residents, as we were so mislead that nothing would help or better our standard of living and wonder how any council could legally obtain money from us for nothing but to fund a Parish Council that we don't need or want.

The meeting left us little time to put our case forward or indeed when anyone argued against the Parish Council they were laughed at or shouted down.

Many of us have met since and are extremely angry at these findings and we are willing to get a resident's signed petition together from the folk in Chamberlain, Lampits Hill Avenue and Windsor Avenue.

PLEASE DO NOT LET THE FROST ESTATE BE SPLIT BY THIS.

4

Dear Mr Bull

Following on from the public meeting on 15-06-15, we would like to express our views personally to you concerning the proposed set up of a Frost Estate parish council.

- We do agree that some roads on the estate are in need of repair

- We do agree that the cross road at Central Ave and Gifford's Cross Ave are in a particularly poor state of repair.

However,

- We do not agree is that a Parish Council is the right way forward, long term or short term, for the estate as a whole.

This subject is already proving to be divisive among residents, and that can only get worse as peoples feelings and opinions get stronger, that is very sad, we have lived here for 13yrs 6mths, and in that time there has always been an atmosphere of neighbourliness and community. People take pride in their surroundings and behave accordingly. What a very sad state if that were to come to an end because people did not like others' stopping' (as they see it) them from getting their new road.

There was a view, forcefully expressed that night, concerning the route 'we all took through the estate' may I please correct this, we do NOT all travel through the estate to get out houses, people in Chamberlain, and Lampits Hill Ave in particular do not, why would we, when it is a much more straight forward for route us to travel along via Lampits Hill and enter that way??

Yes it is true that both sides of Chamberlain Ave have now made up and paid for their own roads to be renovated, but having done this, we have had to accept that people who did not pay towards this do in fact travel on those roads. People who live along Balmoral for example, cut through to Lampits Hill Ave, as do many others. We are not proposing to track them down and make them pay!!

The meeting was very interesting, not least because there were a number of points both financial and legal which came up that have not been imparted to us as residents on the estate.

- The sole reason for certain people pushing ahead with this idea is to have the junction at Central Ave repaired, this is **NOT** what Parish Councils were intended to be used for
- No one can tell us what the precept is going to cost each and every one of us every month, only **guesstimates**
- If this goes ahead, the P.C. would need to employ a clerk, with the legal implications of that, e.g.: holiday pay, sickness pay, pension set up costs and of course the cost of wages
- If this goes ahead and the P.C. purchases the roads, as was suggested at the meeting, this sounds like an answer to some of the problems, but, without taking into account the legal implications of this move, because, we then **ALL** become liable for any accidents or injuries on all of our roads, at the moment we are **NOT** because the roads are in the hands of the official receivers with no liability.
- There is another possible legal issue, because as well as any precept that the P.C. may levy, they will also be legally bound to collect money for the repair to the roads from the people who front those roads which are affected

- The P.C. would also be legally bound to employ an auditor, in order to fulfil another legal requirement and ongoing cost
- There would also be the need to purchase insurance, another ongoing cost
- If the P.C. is set up, and in time goes into liquidation/dissolves with debts, we **ALL** will still be liable for payment of the remainder of the debt. This could run into hundreds of thousands

There are no concise costing for the repair to the Central Ave Gifford's Cross junction, so how can anyone agree to go ahead blindly??

It was also interesting hear from the financial advisors at the meeting, who voiced the opinion that, the money which the proposed P.C. were talking about collecting in no way will cover the costs of bringing the roads up to a council road standard.

We feel so very strongly about being told we will pay towards something which is being set up with one sole purpose for certain people, we have taken the decision that if this proposal does get the go ahead we **will cancel our direct debit and be withholding the precept portion of any council tax which Thurrock collects.**

Having spoken to many like minded people, the withheld precept will go towards any possible legal challenge we all may need to mount against this proposal.

It is not right or fair that, although they may be a minority, a significant number of people are forced into having yet another monthly expenditure, and legal responsibilities thrust upon them.

We cannot implore you enough to try to help the present FERA, see that there must be other avenues to explore in order for them to achieve their goal.

We hope that FERA, you and Mr Kent can come together and resolve this situation fairly and justly for ALL.

Thank-you for your time and in anticipation of your success in finding a road forward

5

Dear Mr Bull,

I am writing to protest against a parish council on the Frost Estate, the implications of further outlays of money as well as the £2 a week are strong, and as I have already paid for the road outside Lampits Hill Avenue, I will refuse to pay further Tax

6

Dear Mr. Bull, I am contacting you regarding my on going cost should a Parish Council be formed for the Frost Estate. It became clear from the recent public meeting held on 15-6-15 (as council leader John Kent recognised) that the whole drive for a Parish Council was solely to get the roads repaired, with the priority being the cross-roads at Central Avenue and Giffords Cross Avenue. I live in Lampits Hill

Avenue which was made up and adopted by the Council some twenty years ago. The cost of which was met by the property owners whose boundaries bordered Lampits Hill Avenue, there being NO contributions from any other home owners on the Frost Estate. Bearing this in mind, it's fair to mention that I paid £2200 at this time. It is therefore totally unrealistic to expect me to pay for the road improvements mentioned.

I am also led to believe that the costings for a Parish Council is calculated on a percentage of the Council Tax banding. This being the case, with my property being in band F it seems likely that I would be paying more than the majority of the Frost Estate residents who will benefit from the road improvements. Which again is totally unreasonable. It is for these reasons that I would withhold any payments towards a Parish council.

I feel I had been misled by asking to complete a questionnaire highlighting the needs for the Frost Estate when it is now quite obvious that it was just about getting the roads repaired.

Taking all this into consideration I would be quite happy to be regarded as not being part of the Frost Estate.

Many thanks for your time

7

Dear Mr Bull

Following on from the residents/council meeting held at East Thurrock Football club on Monday 15 June 2015, I wish to make my personal views heard.

There are a significant number of residents on the estate who feel that a Parish Council is the only way to get the necessary repairs made to their roads. As has been pointed out over and over again, this is a private estate. Everyone that lives here was well aware of that fact when they purchased property on the estate. We all made that choice! As a homeowner, my decision to buy my home was influenced by the nature of the estate, including the roads.

Having said that, Chamberlain Avenue, where I live has been repaired to a good standard by it's residents. There were some people who couldn't pay their share and there were some people who wouldn't pay, however, our small community pulled together and got the job done!

This is an emotive subject for most, with many people not seeing the bigger picture and the spiralling future costs for all on the estate. As one who has already paid out,

I am not prepared to back any further expenditure based on approximate costs, in addition to several complicated legal implications for all.

Thank you.

8

Dear Mr Bull

I am against the setting up of a Parish Council. The residents of Chamberlain Ave have already paid to have their road resurfaced. After the meeting on 15/6/15 I believe the costs will spiral and cause more friction and divide the community. Again it's only my belief but the Parish Council option is only being pursued to get the roads repaired and people are not thinking about all the other implications.

9

Good afternoon Mr Bull,

i do not want the parish council to be formed and as i live in Lampits Hill Avenue. the road has already been made up and cost has already been paid for this, the sole reason a minority of people want this parish council to come into existence is to charge the cost of the roads to everybody on the estate regardless of whether it is fair or not..i am not willing to go blindly into a contract with anyone without knowing costs or implications regarding any financial arrangement. i strongly disagree about the parish council and feel that a few householder/residents are rail roading the entire frost estate without detailing any financial implications to best suit their own agenda which as previously stated does not suit mine....i also am not willing to take on any legal responsibilities regarding the parish council and their hair brained activities as i see this will cost everyone money that they cannot afford!..please use this letter /e-mail in any way that you wish to fight against this motion which i see as a railroad against the normal residents on the frost estate from a small amount of so called residents who want a free or cheaper ride for themselves.

10

For the Attention of Mr D. Bull,

After attending the meeting on the 15th June in respect of the above, We feel we were not given the full facts of what a Parish council entails, regarding costs and legal requirements. We do not think the vote was a legal one under these circumstances.

As there is no benefit to us we will be withholding the precept part of the council tax payment.

11

Thank you Thurrock Council for injecting clarity and common sense into this debate.

We feel that had we had all the facts and figures when asked to vote the outcome would have been somewhat different. The campaigning by the Frost estate committee was quite aggressive and we were led to believe that it was going to be utopian and affordable.

We have a very long side frontage and used a considerable lump of our savings paying for it to be made up. We feel it's grossly unfair to be made to pay for roads we never use. Please note this is not a toll road and the other residents of the estate have been using it without paying a bean.

In the past the residents have banded together to improve their area of road. Indeed, some are still doing so at their personal expense. Should they be made to pay for roads (really, it's all about one crossroad) that neither they or their visitors ever use?

We are both pensioners and will refuse to pay for the expensive farce of a parish council.

12

Dear Mr. Bull

Further to the recent debate concerning the proposed parish council, I feel I need to voice mine and my families full objection .

I believe the residents of Lampits Hill Avenue have already been charged to have the road adopted by Thurrock Council in the eighties?

Charges were made I believe based on the size of frontage to properties, therefore I believe it would be unjust and totally wrong for us to have pay again ?

I understand the need to repair and maintain the estate which has fallen into disrepair , but there must be a fairer way forward than making us all financially and legally responsible, when we have already been levied with a charge.

I would ask that much further debate take place before any decision is made, and also the looking into the legality of us residents in Lampits hill avenue being charged twice ?

If this does go ahead then I will be withholding the Parish Council precept part of any council tax payment collected by Thurrock Council.

13

Dear Mr Bull

I am writing to you as a formal complaint and oppose the proposed parish council for the Frost Estate in Corringham. There are a large amount of residents that do not wish for this parish council to be formed. Residents are being forced into something that has not be thought out properly the consequences of having a Parish Council could be a financial disaster for the residents. If this goes ahead then i will publish with TV and newspapers whatever it takes for everyone to see how some residents have been steam rolled and forced into becoming a parish council. The costs are phenomenal in setting up a parish council. I already pay my full council tax. Lets look at exactly who will be footing the bill.

If there are 387 houses on the Estate there should be 387 votes.

If there are 387 houses of which 200 are owned by OAP's for example.

Thats leaves 187 houses. Less people who rent on the frost estate and are on benefits for example lets say 10 houses. That leaves just

177 houses that are liable to foot all the bills, costs, roads, insurance costs of the parish council.

How on earth Mr Bull is this fair? Can you tell me or evidence how this is even remotely viable?

The cost of the cross roads to be repaired was a guesstimate of £30,000

That means that 177 will have to pay £180 for example.

Then on top of that the costs of setting up the PC. Of which no one really seems to know the cost so for example lets say £100,000

So 177 will have to pay £565.

I make it that the first years Parish council tax will cost me an extra £745 a year on top of my council tax.

Where do you suggest i find this extra money Mr Bull? Should i ask my employer for a pay rise? Or should i just chuck my job in and claim benefit and let you pay it?

If this does go through then I will be with holding the parish council precept part of any council tax payment collected by Thurrock Council. You potentially Mr Bull could make me homeless if I cannot pay my mortgage.

14

Dear David Bull,

Knowing the awful state the roads are in on our Frost estate tells me that something has to be done sooner than later. I therefore listened and went along with the idea that a "**Parish Council**" was a way forward just to get things moving.

Since attending the meeting last Monday 15th June with a follow up of your letter shows that a **"Parish Council"** is in my view a worrying prospect, with unforeseen liabilities which a lot of people including myself were unaware of at the beginning.

As a pensioner I certainly do not want to commit myself to any long term complex legal and financial open commitments that we can not opt out of once in place.

Having been made aware of the full implications I now feel I can no longer support the idea, therefore - please note and accept my **NO** vote for a **"Parish Council" on the Frost Estate.**

P.S

I know the need of repairs to these roads won't go away - nor do I have the answers to the problem,
but if nothing is done then access to the estate will become impossible in the foreseeable future.

15

David

Firstly thank you for providing such a concise summary of the recently held meeting to discuss the Frost Estate roads. I attended the meeting, along with many from the Frost Estate. Up until that point it's fair to say I was probably ambivalent to the whole Parish Council matter. I live in Chamberlain Avenue and have paid to have the road outside my house re-newed as have the majority of the people living in Chamberlain Avenue. Looking back to the voting for the Parish Council I recall the matter of fairness was touched upon however there was no real clear statement regards who would pay for what, something that was clearly addressed and spelt out at the recent meeting.

For me that was just one topic that, up until the meeting, was kind of floating in the air and hadn't really been addressed. More worryingly a number of other topics were raised at the meeting which certainly were not covered during the Parish Council voting process. I do feel the vote was conducted without the residents being in possession of the full facts which are summarised in your note.

Personally I do feel if the full facts were available, prior to voting, the outcome would have been very different. I'm concerned that a small group of determined individuals are attempting to railroad the residents into agreeing to a Parish Council without considering the full implications of what this may bring. I'm certainly not comfortable with the legal issues, working for a Bank I'm uncomfortable with the embryonic borrowing proposals, another angle is the overheads that the Parish Council will

incur and lastly if this was such a great way to address the road issue why is the Frost Estate the only place in the whole country that is taking this course of action. It really does seem to me a sledge hammer to crack a nut solution potentially with wide ranging and long term implications for all the residents of the Frost Estate.

At the very least I would like to see the Parish Council proposal put to the vote again now that the residents are in full possession of the facts. I would certainly be voting against a Parish Council this time around, as demonstrated in some areas of the estate I'm sure better and more appropriate solutions can be found to address the road issues as opposed to signing up to a parish council which will potentially divide the community and cause the residents headaches for many years to come.

I thank you and your council colleges for taking the time to consult and listen to all resident views for me this really isn't the way to proceed.

16

Dear Mr Bull

I am a resident on the Frost Estate and was at the meeting last Monday held at East Thurrock FC.

Having heard the details of the Parish Council proposition , I am deeply concerned on how this will be funded and with all the different concessions that will be allocated.

When you work out the approximate demographic on the estate, it appears the majority of this will be funded by hard working families. Whilst I am not against concessions, what I am against is what is appropriate funding for a particular project.

This is about certain roads on the Frost Estate and nothing else and yet we seem to have managed to get to a point of setting up an expensive bureaucratic additional layer of council , to get road repairs done.

I like many others on this estate have self funded for my road and maintenance. I knew that when I brought my property 16 years ago that this would happen , so I knew what I was signing up for.

The Frost Estate does not need a Parish Council, probably what it needs is a Club. A club that has no obligations (a constitution) but can involve and be inclusive for all residents .A club with an amateur committee that can define projects within the estate and be judged by the residents.

I am deeply worried when I hear the sums of money that need to be borrowed going forward under a Parish Council, to maintain the roads and the debt it will laden the Frost Estate residents with – plus the servicing of any debt.

For the sake of common sense, I urge you and your council to reject the Parish Council and consider other more cost effect and sensible options.

17

Regarding the above meeting. If the outcome means adding the FERA fee to our council tax we would like to ask if we could be exempt from this and not belong to the FERA.

We are pensioners who have lived here for 45 years and have always looked after the road outside our bungalow. A few years ago we paid over £1,200 to have our strip of road made up which was not easy to find

We do not like the idea of having to pay a FERA Clerk, Auditor plus Hundreds and Thousands of pounds also interest which we would have to pay for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration.

18

Dear Mr. Bull,

Further to your letter re: Parish Council. I live in Windsor Avenue and have already paid, along with my neighbours, to have my road repaired, and therefore, I would not be in agreement to have a Parish Council. I feel very strongly about this as I am a widow and a pensioner and obviously do not want to incur any more fees than I have to. I am already in a high council tax band. I am also very concerned to hear about all the other fees we would have to pay, which you have stated in your letter. I do wonder if everyone on the Frost Estate realises just what this parish council would mean, I certainly didn't until your men knocked on my door about the meeting, which I attended the other night. Do you think a bit more canvassing would be useful.

Thank you very much for all the work you are doing in this regard,

19

Dear David Bull,

I was an original member of the 'Steering Group' and therefore a supporter of forming a Parish Council.

However, since the public meeting, where I learned some valuable information, I have changed my mind to -

NO Parish Council.

Originally I believed we could raise a precept and which would be the same for each household , with even some possibility to compensate those that have already made up or had their road adopted.

Also that the precept was not a rates charge, but a separate charge that simply used the rates mechanism to collect the monies which would be passed to the PC to use at their discretion.

At the meeting I learnt that the precept would be a rates charge and therefore subject to those particular rules and adjustments, which would be out of our control.

I joined the Steering group because I believed in a community spirit, NOT JUST THE ROADS.

I believe a lot of people who voted Yes, are changing their mind in the light of more detailed information.

20

Good Morning David,

I and my husband live on Frost Estate at Lampits Hill Avenue. We are very concerned that the proposal for the estate to become a Parish Council does not consider the implications for pensioners such as ourselves. We are both retired and are limited to small private pensions and government pension. The proposal to change to a Parish Council will greatly impound on our already stretched finances and for no benefit to us.

We are already in an adopted road and pay our Council Tax to accommodate this, we in no way want someone else deciding that we should take on more financial burdens purely for the benefit of those who chose to buy in an unmade road and probably benefiting from lower priced property and lower Council Taxes.

Please consider our plight and many like us when considering this proposal.

21

Dear Mr Bull

I am writing to give my opinion of the proposed Frost Estate Parish Council.

My husband is very active in the debate, holding a very strong view against the proposal. I am aware you have had a number of conversations and communications with him, and although my view is the same, I felt I should voice my opinion on the matter independently.

I have attached the list of responsibilities a Parish Council can have (taken from the initial consultation document), and have added a column to detail each points relevance in the case of the Frost Estate proposal. In nearly all cases the responsibilities are irrelevant, and it is very clear that this proposal is being made purely to repair the roads on one part of the estate - a one off requirement that the whole estate will pay for via precepts forever.

It is also not clear that a parish council would have responsibility for the roads - it details footpaths, bridleways, and light roads - none of which apply to the Frost Estate in my understanding. Thus making the whole proposal null and void.

There are a multitude of reasons that I oppose the proposal, but I have listed the main ones below as a summary:

1) The initial communication regarding the proposal was poor, and was concentrated on the areas that are most affected by the roads. Any meetings held to discuss the proposal were not publicised, and in fact my husband attended a meeting, where the committee actively voted not to have a public meeting to discuss it.

2) There are a number of elderly people on the Estate who do not drive, and are least affected by the roads, as well as being the least able to afford the increase in Precepts. It is likely that a large number of this group of people, through lack of communication and understanding of what a Parish Council would mean, did not vote.

3) When canvassing for votes, a number of households in the areas least affected by the roads, would not even discuss the Parish Council, but said they were "not interested" and had thrown the voting slip away. Due to the poor communication strategy, it was not clear to everyone that not voting could result in a majority vote for the council to be formed - these people would have voted 'No' if they had fully understood.

4) A Parish council is expensive to run, and to date, it has still not been made clear how much the running costs will be. As such, it is not known how long it would be before the monies were available to pay for the repairs to the roads. We have recently found out the precept is based on council tax banding. The most expensive precepts will sit with the roads least affected by the roads. Once the roads are repaired, it is unfair that all residents will have to continue to pay this money over each year, with no added benefit to them.

5) To repair the roads privately is at a cost of £14,000. This amounts to £38 per head on the estate and would be a one off payment with the roads being fixed within 3 months of the funds being raised. It seems therefore ludicrous to me that we would (as a community) prefer to see our precepts go up so dramatically, and then

see no immediate benefit, as we pay for all of the other running costs of a council. I am sure if this was communicated properly to all residents, they would see the benefit of the one off payment.

6) Once the Parish Council own the roads - what is their responsibility for accidents/damage obtained on them? As I understand it no insurer will give the Parish Public Liability Insurance, as it has never been done before. Will all house owners on the Estate be responsible for any legal claims for injury or damage to cars?

7) Can a Parish Council accrue debt, and what responsibility do the home owners have? Could, in a worst case scenario, my assets be at risk for such a debt?

8) Will my property value decrease as a result? I believe it will as a potential owner will not want to be embroiled in the politics of a Parish Council, and will not be happy to pay the additional precept on their council tax.

9) Lampits Hill Avenue, has been adopted by the council. It sits on the edge of the estate and it's residents enter and exit via Lampits Hill. It is for all intents and purposes a normal road, double width, with pavement and street lighting. They have already paid a large amount of money to get the road to this condition, and I do not feel it fair that they are now being dragged into this debate - without any initial consultation. There are a number of roads on the Estate that have a significant majority that do not want the Parish Council to be formed (not least Lampits Hill Avenue). All roads should have been consulted before the boundary of the council was put forward, and as they were not, the proposal should be void.

10) The current committee is made up of people who live in the immediate area of the cross roads (the worst part of the estate), and are therefore biased in all their decision making, and strategic in how they communicate information to the wider group.

Based on the facts that have come to light since this proposal was put forward, if a Parish Council is considered the only option, it is my opinion the current proposal should be voided, and the process should be re-started with a better communication plan, and advice from councillors throughout. Individual roads should be consulted, and the boundary of the Parish Council proposed should be changed to reflect the households that are affected by the road problems, and therefore want the council to be formed. Everyone in the new boundary should have access to information, be invited to meetings, and be effectively communicated with throughout the process.

This would ensure that, should the new proposed Parish Council succeed, it will do so fairly.

I believe there must be other avenues that can be explored to effectively get the roads repaired, without the need for the Parish Council at all. These avenues should certainly be considered first.

I apologise for going over a lot of old ground here. I am sure this mirrors many other communications you have had with people on the Estate. I just felt it important to put my views across to you at this point in the process.

Many thanks for your time.

22

Dear David

May I congratulate you and other council staff, on the way all of you informed residents on what a parish council will mean to them, which is totally different to what they have been led to believe.

Since the meeting of 15th June, we, the group wholly against the formation of a parish council, have been speaking to residents and asking what their views are now, not surprisingly, many of those for a parish council, have changed their mind, and their numbers are growing.

We were promised an equal opportunity at the meeting, to give the alternative view to a parish council, instead we found that we were consigned to the stalls, with a pass around mike, while two members of the EALC, (who in our opinion, should not have been there) were given top billing on the stage.

Like the council, we have offered a number of very viable alternatives to a parish council, every one discarded out of hand, by the self appointed committee, we must come up with a solution, failing to do so, will divide this community, and the ramifications of that of serious concern.

We look forward to the meeting between councillors and yourself, and representation from both sides of the parish council debate.

23

Good afternoon

We are totally opposed to the Parish Council, although we sympathise with the condition of the private roads on the estate, their Council tax is lower than our own as we have already paid for our road to come under the council and our rates were increased accordingly.

Perhaps a proposal can be made which excludes Lampits Hill Avenue from this Parish Council, we are worried that we would be forced to ultimately pay for the rest of the estate to have their roads rebuilt, we understand that this is being voted on but we are afraid if this does go through then we would have to withhold the Parish Council precept part of any council tax payment collected by Thurrock Council.

24

I have lived on the frost estate for 56 years longer than most and for 44 years of that I have been repairing the road for myself and elderly neighbours, during this time I didn't receive any help from people near the cross roads of central and giffards cross because their roads were fine at the time where as Windsor, chamberlain and lampits hill ave were completely unmade. I don't see why that now their roads are deteriorating I should have to help them repair them when with the help of new neighbours in the last few years we have repaired our own. I wish they would just get off their asses buy some aggregate and cement and repair them themselves as I used to. If the Parrish council goes ahead I have no intention of paying for it. Because I was born here I inherited the house and don't earn a lot of money so I wouldn't know if I could afford to continue living here unlike the affluent people that have been moving onto the estate over recent years who knew what the roads were like when they moved here. Why should I be forced to move with my 89 year mother because they can't be bothered to do their own repairs. Would these people like to come and maintain my property for me ?? I don't think so.they should put their hands in their own pockets and pay for the repairs leaving everyone else out of it.

Q. Could I sign a disclaimer devoiding me of any connection to a PC

Q. If it does go ahead and I withhold payment for a PC would a charge be levied against the house, if so could I sue the instigators of the PC for this charge as I am 100% against it

Q. If the majority of people living in any particular roads didn't want this could the frost estate be split some in a PC and some not.

25

Dear Mr Bull

I am writing to you to register my support for the proposal to form a parish council to resolve the road problem on the estate.

I feel that as the recent referendum delivered a firm 70% majority for the proposal any further delay would be completely undemocratic. I know that some are not happy with the idea but I feel that a vocal minority are being given unfair consideration over the wishes of a substantial majority. Most people on the estate will have used the main crossroads at some time in the past and this will have contributed to the damage caused. I think it is not unreasonable therefore for them to contribute to the

repair costs. I would also point out that there are other roads requiring repair now and that in the future still more will require attention.

The only way we can ensure a fair spread of the ongoing costs is a formal grouping of residents with the power to collect funds from all. Unless you have an alternative to the proposal that meets these criteria I ask that you approve and implement it speedily.

26

Dear Mr. Bull

I support the setting up of a parish council for the Frost Estate.

If we don't do this, the pot holes in the roads could do serious damage to residents if they fall over them and there will be a serious amount of damage done to cars.

This is the only fair way to ensure we all contribute to road repairs on the estate.

Thank you.

27

TOTALLY OPPOSED TO THE VOCIFEROUS MINORITY WHO KEEP TRYING TO IMPOSE THEIR VIEWS ON THE SILENT MAJORITY ON THE WHOLE OF THE FROST ESTATE . THE BUNGALOWS ON THE FROST ESTATE WOULD BECOME UNSELLABLE WITH THE ROLLING COST OF THIS VENTURE. IF THURROCK COUNCIL WOULD ADOPT THE ROADS AND FOR THE RENEWAL OF THE ROADS ON THE FROST ESTATE , AND PUT A REASONABLE AMOUNT ON THE COUNCIL CHARGES UP TO THE POINT OF THE COST OF THE VENTURE WAS PAID OFF AND THEN CONTINUE AS PART OF THE THURROCK COUNCIL RESPONSIBILITY TO THE ROADS ON THEIR BOROUGH, IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.

28

Dear Mr. Bull,

I have read with interest your news letter the contents of which I completely agree .

Having lived on the Frost Estate all my life (78 years) I strongly object to a small group of people trying to force their ill conceived ideas upon myself and other like minded residents.

I attended the meeting at T.F.C. 15.6.15. and it appeared to me from the mood of the audience that the idea of a 70% majority in favour of a Parish Council fell very short of the mark.

I may appear somewhat selfish , I don't drive but I feel that those residents wishing

for repairs to their section of the road should pay for it and not expect others to subsidise them.

Living at the Brampton Close end of York Ave. I am rather worried that the bollards outside my bungalow would be removed ,turning a quiet road into a rat run through to Brampton Close.

I have read the latest F.E.R.A. news letter I was rather bemused to read of proposals to add cycle paths should their plans go forward,talk about keeping down costs!

As you no doubt will have gathered I am not at all in favour of the forming of a Parish Council , I'm sure some other solution can be found.

I am sorry , I seemed to have sent this email unfinished, my apologies.

29

Dear David,

I am responding to the Anti Parish Council Committee letter I received yesterday. Your details were attached and I can only presume you are aware of this letter?

I am a resident in Carisbrooke Drive on the Frost Estate and since the whole issue of roads and the setting up of a Parish Council has been discussed I have not engaged with any meetings. I have however voted against a Parish Council being set up for the following reasons:

- I do not see why the Frost Estate residents cannot get a reduction on their council due to the lack of maintenance carried out by the council on our estate roads? I understand the complications around the fact that the roads are not adopted, however the residents pay the same tax as other residents in Corringham who do receive local road maintenance.
- The current proposals to set up a Parish Council are not thought out from a financial perspective and are vastly under estimated, especially if once plans to repair roads are passed by your surveying department and then it deemed that suitable drainage, pavements etc may have to be included. Not only would this lead to additional expense but potentially it could result in the loss of property in the front gardens for residents to which many would object, including myself.
- There has never been any financial proposal presented by those who are proposing this council and therefore the residents have voted without knowing the true cost implications? Surely this is grounds for an investigation into the matter as I believe the residents have been misled? Should the residents know the true cost they would probably be happier spend a bit more money on a 4X4 vehicle and leave the roads as they are?

I would be grateful for your thoughts?

Kind Regards,

30

Dear Mr Bull

Following the meeting held in Corringham on the 15th June regarding the Frost Estate, we would like to confirm that we are in favour of finding a way forward just to repair the roads, rather than forming a parish council, as proposed by the resident association.

We only moved onto the Frost Estate last year and have therefore not been involved in the parish council meetings from the start. We are concerned about the roads, especially as to how bad they are going to be in the future and what problems we will face, however, we do not feel that a parish council is the answer.

We look forward to hopefully reaching some sort of agreement with Thurrock Council as suggested by Cllr Kent at the meeting.

31

dear sir, I would like to register my opposition to the frost estate becoming a parish council, many of the residents did not vote, therefore we do not have a clear picture of the residents wishes.

32

Hi David,

Just a short message to express our views on the proposed parish council for the frost estate.

Under no circumstances would we be part of this proposal.

In fact we feel so strongly about this we would withhold the parish council part of our council tax and be prepared to go to jail if we were forced into it. We would also look into taking legal action.

I am sorry David for such strong word but this reflects our feelings. For a parish to work it would require the full backing of the people involved and it has not got this that by far.

We already have a elected councillor, we wants lower council tax and there are much better solutions been put forward to solve the road problems.

And to add we do not trust the people who are pushing the parish council idea.

thank you for your time in reading

yours and best regards

33

Hi David,

I am writing to you as suggested by a letter I received from the "Anti Parish Council Committee"

I would like to see some repairs done to the Frost Estate roads, especially the Central Avenue, Giffords Cross Crossroads.

I think any money raised towards these repairs should be on a voluntary basis and would be prepared to make a one off payment of maybe £100 if some other residents were prepared to do the same just to get some repairs started.

I am not against the "Parish Council" or pro the "Anti Parish Council Committee" but I do not want any open ended compulsory amount added to my council tax, If it was a small amount ie £5 or so and capped and people could opt out if they wished then maybe.

I believe that my Council tax has always been high considering I get less services than some made up, adopted roads and there should be scope within that to make some emergency repairs, not adopting roads, but just ensuring they are safe to drive around slowly.

Regards.

34

Dear David

Unfortunately I was away when your meeting was held, but I have been informed of the outcome of the meeting.

My husband and I are against having a Parish Council, we live in Lampits Hill Ave and feel this doesn't really involve us.

I would also like to add if this does go through then we will be withholding the Parish Council precept part of any council tax payment collected by Thurrock Council.

Yours Sincerely

35

Dear Mr Bull

We are contacting you regarding the proposed set up of a Parish Council for the Frost Estate in Corringham. After attending the public meeting held on the 15th June 2015, we have some concerns regarding the Parish Council. Our main concern is the ongoing expense the Council will cost us for the future. We are both coming up to retirement and do not want to be laboured with any extra costs at this stage in our lives.

If this does go through then we will be withholding the Parish Council precept part of any council tax payment collected by Thurrock Council.

Kind Regards

36

Dear David Bull,

further to the meeting of the above 15/6/15, I wish to make my opinions known. I do not agree or give my consent to the formation of a Parish Council, for the following reasons:-

1/ I believe that the effect of forming a parish council along with their 'governance' will detract from the cohesion of the frost estate community.

2/ We have up to now been ill advised by FERA about potential costs to the residents.

3/ It appears that a parish council will only be interested in road repairs, this is not the complete function of a parish council.

4/ Parish council staff, insurances, legal, liabilities, and costings are pure guess work with too many unknowns to which the residents must subscribe.

5/ I do not give my consent to yet another form of 'governance' by Thurrock Council.

6/ I would not be in favour of a parish council having to 'beg' for grants or loans to spend inefficiently on my behalf at my expense.

7/ I do not think that a parish council could operate in a fair manner to all residents, and equality in a legal sense is paramount and mandatory.

As you will understand I am opposed to, and do not give my consent to the setting up of a Parish council.

I am however in agreement for you, and Mr John Kent to exploring other ways to move forward on this matter, to resolve the issue of road repairs in a fair and equitable manner.

37

Dear Mr Bull,

Our Grandparents and parents have lived on the estate for many decades and now we are very lucky to have purchased a property on the estate ourselves. It is a beautiful estate and always do our bit to maintain that whilst our young family is growing.

We are strongly against any form of parish council for this estate, the continual cost is unacceptable and we will not pay if this stands.

We are committed to maintaining our beautiful estate, and our property and feel an alternative route is necessary.

If this parish council does go through then we will be withholding the parish council precept part of any council tax payment collected by Thurrock Council.

Yours sincerely

38

Dear Mr Bull

I originally voted in favour of creating a Parish Council for the Frost Estate but, with so much conflicting information (and misinformation) being circulated I am no longer sure of how I feel. I understand that a meeting will be held next month to try to arrive at an amicable solution and, if this is so, will we be apprised of the result and given a fresh chance to vote? Also, can you tell me whether there is any possibility of the cycle path option solving the problem of the damaged roads. It has been suggested that a cheap option would be to employ a small driveway company to undertake the major work and I am a little concerned about this - cheapest is not always best. I would be grateful for your observations and look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

39

Hi

The idea originally was for the parish Council to be fair and equal for all of us on the Frost Estate and all pay a small equal amount.

Since the meeting on the 15th June when the facts were made clear that this is not the case, I would like to ask this.

Do those residents that were in favour of the Parish Council now believe this is Fair that some residents will pay a lot more than others, including those that have already paid for the repair of their own roads they live in.

Does the Council also think this is fair and that it only appears that the Parish Council is all about the roads and nothing else.

It appears that only some parts of the estate are going to benefit from the payment of others if this selfish idea goes ahead.

This will bring No unity to the Frost estate, only resentment.

40

75% of the residents on the frost estate want a parish council why are Thurrock council holding back .Its a democratic vote. A frost estate resident.