

03 (1) 24 133

## **PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

Held on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> March, commencing at 7.30 pm. in the Village Hall.

Full reports and supporting documents can be found on the Parish Council website under Meetings, March 2024 Meeting Pack. Paper copies are also available.

### **Present:**

Chair: Cllr Irene Mitchell. Cllrs: Alison Bourne, Frank Domoney, Lizzie Falconer, Iain Lamont, Mary Morrey, Janice Muckian and Chris Robinson. Five members of the public.

### **Opening Statement by the Chair:**

The Chair began by welcoming everyone and introduced herself.

The Chair explained to all present that this meeting is being recorded for the purpose of minute taking only and that after the minutes have been approved the recording will be destroyed.

The Chair reminded all that this is not a public meeting, but a meeting of the Council held in public. Members of the Public were respectfully asked to maintain silence during the Council's deliberations and not to approach the Councillors.

Councillors were requested not to engage with Members of the Public when Council is in session. All were asked to ensure that their mobile phone was on silent.

She informed all present that she was intending to take Agenda Item 8 (Chairman's Announcements) immediately following item 5 (Standing Orders: Motion to review and amend Standing Orders').

### **1. Apologies and approval of absences**

Apologies received from Cllrs Chick and Ranzetta. The Clerk reported that these absences had been explained.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest had been received.

### **3. Requests for Dispensations**

The Clerk reported that none had been received other than those previously reported.

### **4. To approve as accurate minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024 meeting of the Council**

The Chair introduced the minutes emphasising that these had been on the Parish Council website for two weeks. The Clerk added that he had received no questions concerning the accuracy of the minutes.

**Motion:** to approve as accurate the minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024 meeting of Council.

**Proposed:** Cllr Robertson

**Seconded:** Cllr Morrey

**Decision:** The minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024 meeting of the Council were approved as accurate with no votes against. Cllrs Domoney and Falconer abstained. Neither had been present at that meeting.

### **5. Motion to review and amend Standing Orders**

The Clerk explained that he had brought forward the annual review of these. This administrative but important task is normally conducted at the Annual General Meeting of Council but there is no impediment to this being done at any time. The review had been brought forward arising from assumptions at the December meeting that representations from Members of the Public may be delivered by third parties. Current Standing Orders do not include provision for proxy representation but neither do they prohibit it. It is appropriate, he said, that this matter is clarified explaining that the proposed changes enhance the rights of the Public in Public Participation time.

The Clerk explained each of the main proposed changes to Councillors:

- a) The matters on which Members of the Public may speak and ask questions is widened and proxy representations will in future be accepted with the consent of the absent Member of the Public. Members of the Public will continue to each have three minutes and this must include their reading out of representations made by others.
- b) Councillors may speak for three minutes not five minutes unless agreed by the Chairman.
- c) The Standing orders continue to govern the proceedings of Council meetings but where a matter is not detailed within the Standing Orders then the Chair will use his/her discretion.
- d) The custom of allowing Parish Councillors to speak in Public Time as Members of the Public is now established as a right.

The Chair added that these changes are only to sections in the Standing Orders, issued by the National Association of Local Councils, which Local Councils are allowed to vary to fit local circumstances.

**Motion:** to approve the changes to Standing Orders as recommended in this review

**Proposed:** Cllr Lamont

**Seconded:** Cllr Falconer

**Decision:** The motion was carried unanimously. Cllr Domoney abstained.

## **6. Chairman's Announcements**

The Chair began by explaining that she was delighted to announce an extended 753 bus service will commence on 26th May. This achievement, she said, is a good example of Neighbouring Local Councils working together to improve our communities.

The precise timetable is being developed, the aim is to have two evening buses in each direction meaning that people living along the route will be able to enjoy evening hospitality in all the different communities, thereby stimulating the evening economy. There will also be a new Sunday day-time service with 4 departures in each direction increasing weekend opportunities for leisure and work. Chambers, she reported, have not ruled out, varying some daytime routes to Sudbury Health Centre and are still examining this possibility. A launch event is being planned and she will report back concerning this.

The Chair reminded the community that a Speedwatch scheme was suggested at the Public Meeting held in November to discuss road traffic management. She informed Councillors that the April agenda will include a report of progress on this matter. Cllr Ranzetta, she said, apologises that she is not able to be at this meeting.

The Chair referred to Public Time at the 11<sup>th</sup> January meeting of Council. At that meeting a Member of Public had questioned remarks she had made at the December 2023 meeting during which she had asserted that 'for many years the Precept had only increased by very small amounts', had described those increases as being 'in line with the increases made by District and County Councils' and had said that 'this had led the Council with inadequate resources to become a legally non-compliant council'.

The Chair explained that during her absence from the village in January the Clerk had responded in writing to the Member of the Public. The Clerk had provided examples to confirm that the Chair's statements were accurate. Since her return she had spoken with the Member of the Public. He had confirmed that the supplied responses to his questions are satisfactory and consented to her so reporting to this meeting.

## **7. Local Authority Councillors' Reports**

District Cllr Maybury began by referring to her written report adding that she had recently learned that it is proposed that with respect to CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) certain sporting organisations and community-based shops and cafes will be able to bid for these funds and that with respect to Public Rights of Way and Cycling provisions, the £100,000 maximum and 75% funding limit (apart from the costs of feasibility studies) will be removed.

The Chair commented that the proposed changes were in line with what Babergh had said might be possible for the proposed footway near Green Willows.

County Cllr Lindsay referred to his report adding that he had very recently received from Suffolk Officers, a price from Milestone for the skirting back on the Melford Rd of £2,300. He considered this price unreasonable. Suffolk Officers have suggested that they may trial other contractors who are cheaper but this is not immediately possible. Another option is for the Parish Council to engage its own contractor. His offer to contribute from his locality budget remained.

Cllr Domoney asked Cllr Lindsay how Suffolk CC is going to notify beekeepers before Glyphosate is used for weed spraying. Cllr Lindsay responded that he did not know and would respond in due course.

Cllr Lindsay explained that the proposed change consequent of devolution, was the introduction of a directly elected leader of the County Council. This will give Suffolk Council extra funding and powers.

## **8. Public Participation Session**

The Chair reminded Members of the Public of the protocol for this session. Those who wish to ask a question or make a statement have three minutes. Matters raised must concern business on the agenda or local matters. If a question cannot be answered tonight Members of the Public should contact the clerk with their name and contact details and will receive a written response within 28 days.

A Member of the Public asked if the informal pathway between Church St and Bears Lane was going to be made safer for people to use. He also suggested that the Parish Council make representations concerning the intended torchlit procession through the village, organised by a local business.

With respect to the footpath, the Chair replied that she had spoken with a Babergh Council Officer and that the PC intends to make an application for CIL funding for this in the next CIL round in May.

A Member of the Public expressed her concern about the proposed torchlit procession reporting that about 16 people are expected to attend and suggesting that there could be health and safety issues. She asked whether the Parish Council would write to the business expressing its concerns.

The Chair responded that a number of individuals and organisations had contacted her over the last ten days or so and that since it is a District Council matter she had asked District Cllr Maybury to help in establishing with Babergh Council whether any permissions were required.

At the invitation of the Chair Cllr Maybury explained that she shared these concerns and that she had been told by the Chief Executive of Babergh Council that a Temporary Entertainment Notice had been granted for the entertainment to be provided within the property and that the Babergh Council Safety Advisory Group had also reviewed the matter. This group contains representatives from Suffolk Fire Brigade. The local business had engaged with the Safety Advisory Group providing a risk assessment etc. The Safety Advisory Group had determined that it was satisfied with the arrangements. Babergh Council Officers, she said, had told her that they had no grounds to prohibit the event.

Cllr Falconer expressed her dismay and wondered what the insurance arrangements were. Cllr Robinson asked if we could ask the business to use LED lights. The Clerk was asked to continue to work with Cllr Maybury and to work with Councillors to convey the concerns to the local business.

A Member of the Public detailed his concerns that the Village is not properly preparing for climate change. He highlighted the unprecedented recent rainfall amounts and regularity of flooding on Lower Rd. He recommended that a full survey of the River Brett be commissioned and that Council needs to investigate what can be done to reduce the flooding risk.

Cllr Robinson explained that he was talking with the Environment Agency concerning whether his land could be used as a flood storage site. The Chair thanked Cllr Robinson for his information noting that all Councillors are in receipt of the Member of the Public's detailed email and that it is for Councillors to decide whether they wish to pursue this recommendation from the Member of the Public. She noted and that in the past the County Council and the Environment Agency had not responded positively to enquires about this matter from this Council.

03 (1) 24 136

## **9. Clerk/RFO Report**

### **General Update**

- a) Babergh Car Parking Charges. The Clerk had responded on behalf of the Parish Council to the Babergh Survey. The response is on our website and was publicised via Facebook. A very small amount of correspondence had been received, with none critical of the response.
- b) 20 MPH Scheme. The Council has requested Suffolk to begin the Public Consultation. This will lead to Suffolk Highways finalising the design and issuing a cost estimate for the Council to consider.
- c) Speed Indicator Devices. The Clerk had shared the report discussed at the last meeting of Council with Suffolk Highways Officers and they have come back with alternative suggestions and some questions. It is likely, he said, that Council will be able to very shortly put applications in for a Melford facing post between Green Willows and Peek Close and for an east facing post on the other side of the road to the existing post. Council can then consider purchasing an extra SID.
- d) Lorry Watch. James Cartledge MP tells us that he is still committed to this but his Ministry of Defence commitments have forced him to reschedule and no date has yet been fixed.
- e) Prentice St Toilets. Anglian Water now refuse to clear drain blockages on this site as legally it is private land. Council employed private contractors who cleared this and recommend regular precautionary cleans. The drain was blocked with wipes etc for some thirty metres. The Clerk undertook to put up more notices up to try and deter inappropriate material being put in the toilets.
- f) Lower Rd Flood Volunteers: Only three households had volunteered and this is insufficient to operate a Voluntary Scheme. It is likely that the Suffolk County Council training requirements had discouraged volunteers. The idea cannot proceed.

### **9A) January 2024 Accounts**

**Received:** The report prepared by the Clerk containing the January 2024 Accounts.

**Noted from the Report:** The Clerk explained that the variances to the reforecast in the January Accounts are very similar to those reported and discussed with respect to the December Accounts.

To inform Councillors decision making the Clerk shared with Councillors his best estimates of the likely outturn for the whole Financial Year:

- a) Reforecast 2 surplus for whole year was £17,000. The surplus January YTD is £24,000. The latest estimate of surplus for year is £28,000. Within this estimate the annual Suffolk County Council street lights electricity and maintenance charge is the main uncertainty. The whole year estimate of this cost remains £6,000 and we will find out whether this estimate is accurate later in March.
- b) In Reforecast 2 the estimated income was £158,000. The latest estimate is £160,000. The positive variance of £2,000 is mainly Burial Income.
- c) In Reforecast 2 estimated costs were £141,000. The latest estimate is £132,000. The positive variance of £9,000 consists of £5,000 underspend on Grants, £4,000 underspend on cemetery repairs and other green maintenance costs. (Note: Councillors Morrey and Robinson are trying to assemble team of volunteers to carry out cemetery repair work), £1,000 savings on each of clerk cover costs, councillor training costs and miscellaneous items. These savings are offset by £3,000 of underbudgeted costs of the Christmas newsletter and Lavenham Life, replacement Christmas lights and defibrillator pads.

Cllr Robertson asked if the PC had the ability to negotiate the street lights charge. The Clerk explained that this cost was largely the hourly cost of electricity paid by SCC as a major purchaser of electricity and was non-negotiable. The remaining part is the PC share of the maintenance contract SCC had with Kier for the first six month so of the year and Milestone for the last six months.

Cllr Morrey asked what the surplus for the year would have been without Car Parking/Toilet donations. The Clerk responded that it would have been approximately £8,000 to £10,000.

**Motion:** to approve the accounts for the month ended 31 January 2024.

**Proposed:** Cllr Robinson

**Seconded:** Cllr Morrey

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained.

**9B) January 2024 Receipts and Payments**

**Received:** The report prepared by the Clerk listing the January 2024 Receipts and Payments.

**Noted from the Report:** The Clerk explained the larger amounts and how the report ties up to the Bank Statements. No receipts or payments required further explanation.

**Motion:** to approve the Receipts and Payments for the month ended 31 January 2024

**Proposed:** Cllr Falconer

**Seconded:** Cllr Bourne

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained

**9C) 1<sup>st</sup> Meadow Bridge**

The Clerk referred Councillors to the briefing paper which detailed the state of the bridge highlighting the comments of the contractor who maintains the nearby play equipment that:

- a) 'although the bridge is not going to collapse imminently it is not very stable in its present condition
- b) 'lifted the boards to replace the rotten planks but unfortunately found the support beams below were extremely rotten as well'
- c) there is also the option of removing the bridge completely and not replacing it, to do this would cost in the region of £2,500 as new fencing each side of the stream would need to be erected to prevent adults or children attempting to cross'

The Clerk explained that he had now obtained three quotes:

- a) Supplier A. Pressure Treated Timber construction, design as before £7,866 plus VAT or steel Bridge with wooden handrails £8,968 plus VAT
- b) Supplier B. Treated Softwood UC4 (15 year life expectancy) £6,967.50 plus VAT or Untreated oak timber (25 year life expectancy) £9,146.67 plus VAT
- c) Supplier C. Treated Softwood £3,510 plus VAT, plus Installation £9,312 plus VAT or Acoya Timber £5,375 plus VAT, plus Installation £9,312 plus VAT

The Clerk invited Councillors to rule out Supplier C on grounds of cost and to ask him to conduct further negotiations with Supplier A and Supplier B.

Councillor Falconer asked if the estimated lifespans were guarantees. The Clerk replied that they were probably not guarantees but that guarantees would be part of the discussions with suppliers. Councillor Morrey suggested that a guarantee might only be available if a steel bridge is chosen.

Councillor Robinson commented that he considered the prices high and offered his help with negotiations and finalisation of design. The Clerk responded that he would welcome any support that Councillor Robinson was able to provide.

Councillor Muckian questioned whether there was sufficient use of the bridge to justify such a spend. Councillor Lamont said that he and many others used it regularly and encouraged use of 1<sup>st</sup> Meadow.

The Chair asked if a steel bridge would be compatible with its Lavenham setting. Councillor Robinson replied that the steel would be hidden underneath and that visibly it would be unchanged.

**Motion:** Clerk is asked to have further discussion with suppliers A and B to understand differences between the quotes and return to Council with a recommendation

**Proposed:** Cllr Morrey

**Seconded:** Cllr Bourne

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained

**9D) Approve quote for spraying of the Box Bushes in the Churchyard**

The Clerk referred Councillors to the briefing paper which detailed the history of the pruning and soil improvement work done to date, the donation received to fund that work and the deferral (in October 2023) of a decision until Spring 2024 as to whether to spray the bushes.

He reminded Councillors that the use of nematodes had been suggested and that some Councillors had been fearful that the bushes might not, whatever work is done, have a long life.

Cllr Morrey expressed interest in using nematodes, Cllr Robinson said that he was in favour as long as the bushes have a reasonable life expectancy. Cllr Bourne expressed concerns over the amount being proposed. Cllr Falconer expressed concern with respect to the expected life of the bushes. Cllr Muckian expressed support for the proposal highlighting the historic significance of the bushes and that nematodes might not be a workable proposal for so many bushes. Cllr Lamont suggested that nematodes could be explored.

The Chair asked for details of the opinion expressed about the short life of the bushes. The Clerk responded that Cllr Ranzetta was not present to further explain her thoughts and that the Babergh Biodiversity Officer had also commented on the difficulties of maintaining these bushes.

The Clerk reminded Councillors that Council had recently accepted a significant donation for the care of these bushes.

Cllr Domoney asked that the sentence in the briefing paper be amended to make clear that there is no impediment to anyone speaking with Perrywood. The Clerk agreed.

An amendment was proposed to the motion so that it reads:

'Clerk is instructed to go back to the Contractor, explain that Councillors are undecided about this and ask what the price would be for a single spray and whether that would be helpful to the bushes i.e. establish what harm or progress would that achieve. Clerk is instructed to ask the Contractor what harm or progress the use of nematodes would have and a decision is deferred until the April meeting of the Council'

**Proposed:** Cllr Bourne

**Seconded:** Cllr Falconer

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained

**9E) Review and amendment of Standing Financial Regulations (including Review of Internal Controls) the Scheme of Delegation and the Authority to Commit Resources.**

The Clerk referred Councillors to the briefing paper which explained the annual requirement to review the effectiveness of the system of internal controls and that this system is documented in the Standing Financial Regulations.

The Clerk explained the proposed amendments to the relevant documents highlighting the change to the approving of Receipts and Payments and Bank Reconciliations and asked Council to approve these amendments and approve the revised documents.

Motion: The Standing Financial Regulations (including Review of Internal Controls) the Scheme of Delegation and the Authority to Commit Resources are reviewed and the amendments are approved.

**Proposed:** Cllr Muckian

**Seconded:** Cllr Falconer

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained



03 (1) 24 139

#### **9F) Approve appointment of Heelis and Lodge as Internal Auditors**

The Clerk explained that it is a requirement that each year Council appoint an Internal Auditor and that last year Council appointed Heelis and Lodge who are based locally, understand the financial affairs of this Council and charged £400.

**Motion:** to approve Appointment of Heelis and Lodge as Internal Auditors for the year ended 31 March 2024 at a cost of not more than £500 plus VAT

**Proposed:** Cllr Bourne

**Seconded:** Cllr Morrey

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained

#### **9G) Review and Approve Risk Register**

The Clerk explained that it is a requirement that each year Council review its Risk Register and displayed the updated Risk Register highlighting the changes to the previous year particularly the introduction of a cloud based storage system for council documents so that Council is no longer reliant on pieces of paper or any one computer.

Cllr Lamont highlighted the need to add that an annual review of the condition of the Water St site be undertaken.

The Clerk accepted this point. Councillor Lamont agreed to inspect the car park with the Clerk.

**Motion:** to approve the Risk Register as amended to include that a review of the condition of the Water St site be carried out at least annually.

**Proposed:** Cllr Morrey

**Seconded:** Cllr Robinson

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained

#### **10. Motion to approve rewilding plans**

The Clerk referred Councillors to the briefing paper which detailed that in Summer 2023 Council agreed that it would engage with the Babergh Council Biodiversity Officer to consider whether areas of Babergh and Parish Council land might be suitable for rewilding.

The Clerk explained that on Thursday February 29th Cllrs Robinson and Ranzetta together with the Clerk walked around the village with the Babergh Council Diversity Officer; Mr Richard Parmee.

The Clerk highlighted that Mr Parmee had explained that Babergh Council is aware that rewilding can be controversial and can often lead to complaints that maintenance standards have fallen and so Babergh Council policies include trials and surrounding newly rewilded land which is still mowed.

The Clerk detailed the proposals:

- a) Babergh maintained areas:
  - No change to Babergh mowing of the verges on roads into the village.
  - Consideration be given by Babergh to rewilding:
    - a) A central part of the grass to the south of Tenterpiece behind the Lavenham sign
    - b) Part of the bowl area in Spring St
    - c) Planting a small tree and bulbs by the grit bin at the western end of Spring St subject to checking of the services buried underground.
- b) Parish Council maintained areas:
  - Consideration be given by PC to rewilding:
    - a) The most eastern end of 1<sup>st</sup> Meadow
    - b) A strip of land near the hedge between 1<sup>st</sup> Meadow and Lower Rd, not the whole width of this land.

The Chair asked who would carry out the consultation for the Babergh maintained areas. The Clerk responded that since these are pieces of land owned by Babergh this would be Babergh Council. The Chair added that she was glad that these plans would protect the orchids.

**Motion:** These rewilding ideas are supported in principle, further discussions to take place with the Biodiversity Officer including consultation with local residents.

**Proposed:** Cllr Robinson

**Seconded:** Cllr Muckian

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained

#### **11. Report concerning fouling by dogs**

The Clerk referred to the submitted report highlighting that:

- a) Concerns had been expressed by a Member of the Public
- b) Urination by dogs in a public place whilst unsightly and possibly damaging to buildings is not an illegal act unlike the offence of failing to clear up faeces
- c) Cllr Maybury had supported the Parish Council tackle this issue and Babergh Environmental Health would shortly be putting up additional signs.

#### **12a. To receive an update on Planning Decisions received in February 2024**

All decisions received in February were consistent with the recommendations of the Parish Council.

#### **12b. Planning Applications for Consideration**

##### **DC/24/00359**

Application for Works to a tree in a Conservation Area, 28 High Street.

Reduce 1 No Bay tree in rear garden by 2m

Comments by 19<sup>th</sup> February 2024

Extension was refused by Babergh DC and application has been subsequently approved.

This is the regular maintenance of a tree in a small garden and this Council's advice would have been to recommend approval.

##### **DC/24/00360**

Application for Listed Building Consent, The Grove 5 Lady Street.

Re-build collapsed section of boundary wall along Barn Street; and repairs to remaining standing length. Reduce garden ground levels, where possible, retaining cover to tree roots.

Removal of 1 No. tree (under separate application).

Comments by 8<sup>th</sup> March 2024

The state of the historic wall was last reviewed in 2007, when it was distorted but stable. It collapsed in 2023 due to the action of tree growth. The tree needs to be removed – see DC/24/00540, to enable the wall to be rebuilt using matching materials and design. This is necessary maintenance in an appropriate manner. **Recommend Approval**

##### **DC/24/00540**

Application for Works to Trees subject to Tree Preservation Order WS41-T21 - Fell 1 No Lime (T1)

Comments by 8<sup>th</sup> March 2024

Referring to DC/24/00360, this lime tree needs to be felled in order to undertake the rebuilding of the historic boundary wall. However, the application form does not state where the replacement tree is to be located as per the requirement on the application form. **Recommend Approval on the condition that the location and type of replacement tree is identified.**

**Proposed (combined motion 00360 and 00540):** Cllr Bourne

**Seconded:** Cllr Falconer

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained



**DC/24/00332**

Application for Listed Building Consent. The Hall, Hall Road.  
Removal of ply sheets and re-roof with steel roofing sheet.  
Comments by 8th March 2024

Babergh Heritage have objected to plywood sheets, fitted in 2021, replacing damaged corrugated asbestos sheeting. The recommendation of the Heritage Officer should be supported to use traditional galvanised round corrugated steel not box type or coloured. Round corrugation can be seen on the adjacent roof and is similar to the round profile of the pantiles on the upper roof section. Plastic coated coloured sheeting was not supported. This sheeting is the same profile and material as traditional farm corrugated roofing. It will weather down and discolour naturally with time. The modern industrial box profile colour sheeting suggested by the applicant may suit new farm buildings but it not in keeping with the old barns.

**Recommend approval of application on condition that Galvanised Round corrugated sheet is used, not box section or coloured.**

**Proposed:** Cllr Lamont

**Seconded:** Cllr Muckian

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained, Cllr Domoney declared an Interest.

**DC/24/00483**

Application for Listed Building Consent, 57 High Street  
Replacement works to East Elevation first floor window, West Elevation ground and first floor windows and associated alterations and replacement render on ground floor to West Elevation  
Comments by 8th March 2024

Application seeks to change the shape and appearance of the windows to the front of the property.

The Design & Access statement shows various photographs dating back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Also included is the response from the pre-application enquiry.

We agree with the Planning Officer recommendation that the proposal for the first-floor bedroom at the rear of the property is acceptable but that the proposal to the front of the property does not reflect earlier window glazing or relate to the historic photographs which show that there were two sash windows on the ground floor at the front of the building. The proposed modern glazing does not have the smaller panes or narrow glazing bars of the current windows or those shown in older photographs. The proposed single smaller sash window on the ground floor changes the appearance of the building significantly and does not reflect its history.

We support the comments of the Planning Officer to maintaining the slim simple style of the beading on the front first floor window using slim double-glazing panels recommended on previous applications. This would be perhaps 12mm overall thickness of glass, allowing for slim glazing bars. See example below, instead of the 20mm thick panels specified in the application. We also support the Heritage Officer's recommendation of re-glazing the existing ground floor window, with slim double-glazing panes and narrow bars, so the front appearance is not changed. As the application stands, it cannot be supported by the Parish Council.

The Chair and Councillors praised the quality of the work undertaken by the Babergh Officers.

**Recommend refusal**

**Proposed:** Cllr Robinson

**Seconded:** Cllr Falconer

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained.

**DC/24/00510****Application for Listed Building Consent**

Perseverance House 47 High Street Lavenham

Internal and external alterations and single storey extension to existing ancillary outbuilding following demolition of existing extension

Comments by 8th March 2024

**Recommend approval****DC/24/00503**

Householder Application

Perseverance House 47 High Street

External alterations and single storey extension to existing ancillary outbuilding (following demolition of existing extension)

Comments by 8th March 2024

Internal alterations to the main house are minor and have little effect on the external appearance of the older part of the property. Changes to the outbuildings are more extensive but are not visible from the street and improve the layout and make the garage more practical to use. In addition, the "Studio" is converted into a kitchen space and pantry with the existing kitchen becoming a laundry room.

It has all been carefully considered in detail and is not visible from the street or adjacent properties. A large property which is enhanced by the changes with little external impact.

The Chair asked if there were any matters which should concern Council and Cllr Lamont replied that there were not.

**Recommend approval****Proposed (combined motion 00510 and 00503):** Cllr Robinson**Seconded:** Cllr Bourne**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained**DC/24/00688**

Householder Application

24 Bolton Street

Erection of single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing).

Comments by 8th March 2024

The proposed extension extends out at the rear of the property considerably further than the current extension, beyond the neighbouring properties extension. However, the proposed extension is flat roofed and single storey and so will have little impact on the surrounding properties and will not be visible from the street. It is a modern design, and this property is not listed.

**Recommend approval****Proposed:** Cllr Lamont**Seconded:** Cllr Robinson**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained**DC/24/00743**

Householder Application

The Old Rectory Church Street Lavenham Sudbury Suffolk CO10 9SA

Construction of stone portico to main entrance doorway on front elevation to replace timber pediment.

Comments by 8th March 2024

**Recommend Refusal**

**DC/24/00744**

Application for Listed Building Consent  
The Old Rectory Church Street

Construction of stone portico to main entrance doorway on front elevation to replace timber pediment.  
Comments by 8th March 2024

This building is very prominent across the road from the Grade I listed Lavenham Church. The existing wooden pediment rotted and was removed due to its very poor condition so needs to be replaced. The steps up to the door, originally Portland stone, are also in poor condition with some low quality repairs.

The proposal is to replace the steps and pediment with a stone Portico and design. Examples are shown in the Heritage Statement. However, this will look completely different to the original timber work and much grander, possibly more in the scale required for this building.

However, the existing pediment was original and reflects the history of this building and should be replicated and replaced as suggested by the pre-application advice.

Repair of the steps would be supported in appropriate material but the historic handrail should be retained.

This approach reconciles to the emerging revision of the Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan policy LAV33

**Recommend Refusal**

Cllr Robinson argued that the proposed work would enhance the building and not be visible from the road because of the hedges. Cllr Morrey argued that such change would not be welcome being the removal of original features. Cllr Falconer suggested the proposed work could make the building look too modern. Cllr Muckian commented that this will protect the front door but that this will change the appearance of the house. The Chair commented that the decision was difficult as whilst the proposed work would not be unsuitable to the property the original design was wood, perhaps because of availability of materials and cost at the time of building and is not in keeping with Lavenham. She asked if there are similar examples of the proposed work in Lavenham and no examples were offered.

**Proposed:** Cllr Lamont

**Seconded:** Cllr Falconer

**Decision:** Approved with Cllr Robinson voting against. Cllr Domoney abstained

**DC/24/00700**

Land West Of Bury Road Lavenham CO10 9QG

Application for Outline Planning Permission (Access points to be considered, all other matters reserved) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)- Erection of 6No. dwellings (with access) (re-submission of DC/23/01344). Comments by 14th March 2024

The previous application DC/23/01340 is being appealed under APP/D3505/W/23/3330345. At the same time as the appeal process is underway, the same plan has been re-submitted, unmodified, but with a new planning statement which seems to read like an appeal.

The application has been submitted before the 12th February 2024 deadline to avoid having to comply with a new regulation to give a 10% Biodiversity improvement - this is stated on the application form.

There are no material changes to the actual proposal presented in this latest application.

There is an updated planning statement which presents arguments around Policy H1 of Lavenham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016. This policy states in the 1st Paragraph that proposals shall be within or adjacent to the Built-Up Area Boundary. The arguments have been made against Paragraph 3 only, without reference to the Context set in Paragraph 1.

The Chair commented that this was a cynical attempt to exploit a time gap in planning regulations between the introduction of the JLP and the consequent superceding of the Planning Authorities core strategies and recommended that Council obtain professional advice.

**Recommend Refusal – the Planning Group to finalise the wording following professional advice.**

**Proposed:** Cllr Lamont

**Seconded:** Cllr Robinson

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained.

### **13 Planning – LNP Local Validation Lists**

The Clerk referred to the briefing note which details to Councillors, the responses made by Council to the representations made by others as part of the Second Focused Consultation and the response made to Babergh Council concerning the proposed changes to Local Validation Lists.

### **14 Date of next meeting**

Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2024 7.30 pm in the Village Hall.

### **15 Excluding the Public**

To consider excluding the public and press (for item 16) To consider excluding the public and press for item 16 because of the confidential nature of the material to be discussed.

**Proposed:** Cllr Muckian

**Seconded:** Cllr Bourne

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained.

### **16 Section 137 Local Government Act 1972 Payments 2020/21**

In the year ending 31 March 2021 the S137 Local Government Act 1972 limit (i.e. expenditure on matters which the Council is not specifically entitled by law to spend) for this Council was £12,971. Inadvertently this limit was broken by the giving of four grants in the year totalling £19,350 being £17,500 to the Lavenham Community Land Trust (LCLT), £1,000 to the Lavenham Pre-School and £850 (in total) to three other Community Organisations.

The minutes record the deliberations by Council and the intention of Council to make these payments. It is sensible to resolve any legal uncertainty surrounding these payments and so we are grateful for the most helpful response of the largest recipient.

The LCLT has agreed to refund to this Council £6,379 and then, to fulfil the will of the Council as detailed in the minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> March 2021, this Council then proposes to make a grant of £6,379 to the LCLT using the 2023/24 S137 powers of this Council. Only £1,000 has been spent of this Council's 2023/24 legal spending entitlement.

**Motion:** Council resolves to remove any legal uncertainties concerning the Grants made to Community Organisations in 2020/21 by accepting the offer of the Lavenham Community Land Trust to repay £6,379 (notwithstanding that the original grant of £17,500 was made, and received, in good faith) approving a replacement Grant to the Lavenham Community Land Trust of £6,379, of both items to be dealt with by an exchange of a statement of account detailing both items and that the items completely offset each other.

**Proposed:** Cllr Bourne

**Seconded:** Cllr Morrey

**Decision:** Approved with no votes against. Cllr Domoney abstained.

The meeting closed at 9.59pm.

*Autumn Chen*  
*4<sup>th</sup> April 2024.*