

ANNUAL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

Held on Thursday 1st May 2025, commencing at 7.30 pm. in the Village Hall.

Full reports and supporting documents can be found on the Parish Council website under Meetings, May 2025 Meeting Pack.

Present:

Chair: Cllr Janice Muckian. Cllrs: Alison Bourne, Frank Domoney, Lizzie Falconer, Iain Lamont, Roy Mawford, Irene Mitchell, Mary Morrey, Jane Ranzetta, Chris Robinson and Michael Sherman. Twenty members of the public.

Opening Statement by the Chair:

The Chair began by welcoming everyone and introduced herself explaining to all present that she was chairing the start of the meeting with the election of a new Chair, as always, the first item on the Agenda at this Annual Meeting of the Parish Council.

She explained that this meeting is being recorded for the purpose of minute taking only and that after the minutes have been approved this 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 approach 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 and were reminded to treat all present with respect.

1. Election of Chair

Cllr Mawford nominated and Cllr Lamont seconded Cllr Muckian.
Cllr Bourne nominated and Cllr Domoney seconded Cllr Ranzetta.

Cllr Muckian told Councillors that the voting would take place in the order in which nominations were received.

Decision: Election of Cllr Muckian as Chair: Carried. Councillors Falconer, Morrey, Mitchell, Mawford, Lamont and Muckian voted for Cllr Muckian to be Chair. Cllr Ranzetta abstained. Cllrs Sherman, Bourne, Robinson and Domoney voted against.

2. Election of Vice-Chair

Cllr Muckian nominated and Cllr Mitchell seconded Cllr Morrey. All Councillors voted in favour except for Cllrs Domoney and Sherman who abstained.

3. Apologies and approval of Absences

The Clerk reported that all Councillors were present.

4. Declarations of Interest

The Clerk reported that Cllr Muckian had explained to him that she has moved from the High St to Bears Lane and so needs to update her Register of Interests and Dispensation.

The Clerk reported that Cllrs Domoney and Robinson had declared interests in respect of the Allotments item. He explained that the Allotments item relates to Cllr Robinson's Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and so he will leave the room for that item and that he granted Cllr Domoney a dispensation to speak but not to vote.

The Clerk asked whether Councillors had any other interests or updates to their interests which they wished to declare. No Councillor declared an interest in anything on the agenda.

5. Requests for Dispensations

The Clerk reported that he had received requests for dispensations.



The Clerk reported that he had agreed to renew the dispensations held by Councillors Cllrs Morrey, Lamont, Ranzetta, Falconer, Mawford, Robinson, Sherman and Mitchell and to renew the dispensation held by Cllr Muckian amended to reflect her recent change of address.

Cllrs Morrey, Lamont, Falconer and Ranzetta: to speak and vote on matters concerning Water St as long as they do not relate specifically to their disclosable pecuniary interests. Cllrs Mawford and Mitchell: to speak and vote on matters concerning Water St as long as the matter for decision cannot be viewed from their disclosable pecuniary interests. Cllr Robinson and Sherman to speak and vote on matters concerning Brent Eleigh Road and Spring St respectively as long as they do not relate specifically to their disclosable pecuniary interests.

Cllr Muckian to remain in the Chair to conduct the meeting, participate in discussion and vote to exercise a casting vote where general matters concerning Bears Lane are the subject of discussion. Where matters to be discussed relate directly to her disclosable pecuniary interest or could be perceived as having a specific beneficial or negative impact on her disclosable pecuniary interest she will hand over to the Vice Chair (or another Councillor) and leave the room.

The Clerk had granted a new dispensation to Cllr Domoney to speak on all matters concerning Allotments in Lavenham, this dispensation does not permit voting on any matters where a Lavenham Allotments Association is an interested party.

6a. To approve as accurate minutes of the 27th March 2025 meeting of the Council

Proposed: Cllr Sherman **Seconded:** Cllr Falconer. **Decision:** Approved unanimously. Cllrs Robinson and Domoney abstained. Cllr Robinson had not been at the meeting.

6b. To approve as accurate minutes of the 3rd April 2025 meeting of the Council

Proposed: Cllr Lamont **Seconded:** Cllr Mawford

Decision: Approved unanimously. Cllr Ranzetta abstained having not been at the meeting.

7. Chairman's Announcements

The Chair thanked Councillors for electing her as Chair.

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. She explained that the Standing Orders of the Council are clear that this public session is for ten minutes and that it is at the discretion of the Chair whether further time is allowed or the session shortened.

A Member of the Public deplored what he described as a vicious campaign of bullying and uncalled for criticism of the Parish Council and some Councillors. He said that he considered that Parish Councillors and District Councillor Maybury had been abused on social media describing the posts about Cllr Maybury as absolutely shameful. He said that these attacks have been made by Cllr Robinson keenly supported by someone who controls a local Facebook page. He described this campaign as an attempt to put pressure on Councillors to stand aside in order to further Cllr Robinson's Planning Application. He said that Cllr Robinson had subjected a local business owner to online abuse which has been reported to the Police and that Cllr Robinson had submitted negative reviews of another local business which he had never been a customer of. He called on Cllr Robinson to resign saying that such behaviour was intolerable and that Parish Councillors should serve their community and not their own ends. He asked the Chair to give Cllr Robinson permission to respond.

The Chair offered Cllr Robinson the opportunity to respond saying that the meeting could, alternatively, move immediately to the next item. Cllr Robinson agreed to respond in writing to the Member of the Public. Cllr Mitchell said that either the Council or the individual Councillor needed to respond. The Chair explained that the Standing Orders prohibit a debate developing from a question in Public Participation time. The Chair then redirected the question back to Councillor Robinson who responded that he was not going to resign. The Chair moved to the next item.



A Member of the Public said that the proposed 20 mph scheme should be rejected for three reasons. Firstly, the proposed illuminated signs costing £10,000 are not required by Department for Transport rules as the A1141 is not a major trunk road. Secondly, Park Road is not within the proposed scheme and so speeds of up to 60mph would remain lawful on Park Road and lastly the Police will not properly enforce the limit and so the repeater signs, except outside schools, are a waste of money.

A Member of the Public echoed many of the previous speakers concerns. He also described the scheme as a waste of money saying that the proposed repeater signs would be detrimental to the appearance of the village and described the scheme as being part of a 'Green Party Agenda'. He said that he had never considered the existing 30mph to be unsafe. He hoped that all Councillors would obey the 20mph limit should it be introduced. Another Member of the Public commented that he had seen Parish Councillors not observing the speed limit.

9. Local Authority Councillors' Reports

Cllr Clover delivered his report explaining that:

- a) Babergh has a scheme to install free solar panels on Business Owner's premises.
- b) Anyone aged 16+ who wants to learn about gardening, horticulture or nature conservation is invited to attend a free 'Grow Your Future' 12 week skills course. The course commences on Tuesday 20th May and runs until Monday 5th August at Belle Vue Park with sessions taking place from 10am to 12.30pm.
- c) Suffolk County Council has launched a consultation, closing 9th June, concerning the Suffolk Local Nature strategy.

Cllrs Clover, Lindsay and Ranzetta observed that businesses occupying listed buildings may not be able to install solar panels.

County Cllr Lindsay reported with respect to the hole in the Water St pavement. He explained that because the brick culvert is listed Highways engineers have had to consult Suffolk archaeologists, Historic England and Babergh Heritage and that all three have urged that as much of the brick culvert as possible be retained. The engineers had wanted to remove a 6 metre section of the culvert to minimise the risk of future collapses. The intention is now to replace only the damaged parts with a concrete half pipe which is apparently what they did with the earlier collapse of the culvert just below the entrance to the gasworks car park. Plans are still being worked on with no schedule for the works.

Cllr Lindsay reported that it is becoming clear that the Mayor of Norfolk and Suffolk will be able to levy a precept on the council tax. In his opinion this will counterbalance any cost savings projected from eliminating some senior officers from district and borough councils in Suffolk.

Cllr Lindsay told Councillors that his discretionary budgets for the previous four years are all spent but because of the delay in the election he will have a fresh £6k for local highways spending and £6k for community "locality" grants for the next financial year.

Cllr Lindsay reported that Suffolk County Council has allocated some £30m to increasing the number of school places in the County for children and young people with Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and drew Councillors attention to the consultation concerning the Suffolk Local Nature strategy which closes on 9th June.

He urged the Parish Council to make a decision and implement the 20 mph scheme which he said was not a 'Green Party Agenda' and was consequent of a request from the Parish Council.

Cllr Ranzetta asked whether the £6k for local Highways spending could be spent repairing dilapidated road signs and markings across the village. Cllr Lindsay urged Cllr Ranzetta and others to report any such required repairs on the Suffolk Highways website explaining that Highways had repair obligations with respect to these and that the funding for these was not his local Highways budget. Cllr Ranzetta asked whether Suffolk needed to recruit SEND teachers. Cllr Lindsay he would report back.

Cllr Falconer asked for evidence that the culvert was listed. Cllr Mitchell added that there is an adjacent gas main in poor repair. Cllr Mawford asked if the County Council was going to consult about its local government proposals. Cllr Lindsay said the County had decided to 'engage' but not to 'consult'.



10. 20mph scheme Report and Motions

The Clerk explained that in late 2024 the Traffic Regulation Order was issued and the project costed. This meant that the final design of the only scheme Highways is prepared to implement is known and that cost is some £24,000 at 2024/25 prices.

The Clerk explained that Suffolk County Council rules only permit a scheme to be introduced where the current mean speed is not significantly in excess of 24 mph.

He explained that to establish the streets where the scheme could possibly go Suffolk Highways had deployed measuring equipment in four locations for a week in May 2021 and the results were:

- a) On Church St. Mean speed 25/26mph with 15% of vehicles above 30 mph
- b) On High St. Mean speed 21/22mph with 15% of vehicles above 27/28 mph
- c) On Prentice St. Mean speed 14mph with 15% of vehicles at above 18 mph
- d) On Lower Rd. Mean speed 24/26mph with 15% of vehicles travel above 30/33 mph.

He said that, in summary, on Prentice St over 85% of vehicles are travelling at less than 18mph and that the number exceeding 20mph by any significant margin is very small and that on the other streets about 15% of vehicles go above 30 mph with the average vehicle going about 25mph.

He explained that the Parish Council had questioned the number of signs proposed and received the following response:

'If the 20mph repeater signs are spaced at distances greater than 300m, then the speed limit cannot be enforced. We know that the police do not routinely enforce 20mph speed limits and for this reason they ask that we design them to be self-enforcing. However, if there was a regular issue with excessive speeding, for example if a vehicle was reportedly driving through the village daily at 70mph, then the police may be willing to carry out enforcement, as long as the repeater signs are at the agreed spacing'.

He explained to Councillors the motions on the agenda telling them that legally Council could not bind itself to accepting the result of a village poll but could declare that it would take full account of the result.

Motions:

- 1) That the Parish Council encourage electors at the Parish Meeting to be held on May 15th to require a Parish Poll to ask the question '*Should the Parish Council ask Suffolk County Council to implement the proposed 20 mph scheme at a cost of £24,065.46 + VAT at 2024/25 prices? There will be an inflationary uplift to 2025/26 prices.*'

The Parish Council to take full account of the result of that Poll at a meeting as soon as reasonably possible after the poll has been conducted.

Should Motion 1 pass then Motion 2 falls away.

- 2) The Parish Council requests Suffolk County Council to implement the proposed 20 mph scheme at a cost of £24,065.46 + VAT at 2024/25 prices. There will be an inflationary uplift to 2025/26 prices. Project to be funded by Neighbourhood CIL.

The uncommitted Neighbourhood CIL fund is, he said, £53,000.

Cllr Lamont explained that 63% of respondents to the LNP1 questionnaire voted for a 20mph speed limit along with other projects listed in LNP1. As a result, the Parish Council had started a project to develop the scheme, initiated by Carroll Reeve in 2019, described in "20mph position paper to SCC 5". This had taken place prior to LNP2 being started.

He acknowledged the support of County Cllr Lindsay funding the development work and sponsoring the application.

He reminded Councillors that the Parish Council had pushed for the scheme to cover more of the village including Melford Rd. He explained that this had not been supported by Suffolk Police and Suffolk County Council and in response the PC had installed two Speed Indicator Devices at a cost of £8,000.



Cllr Lamont explained the impact of the signage describing it, in his opinion, as being less than some feared hearing about the total number of signs.

He said that the proposed 20mph repeater signs had been positioned to limit the amount of new street furniture making use, where possible, of existing signposts and lampposts informing Councillors that within the Conservation Area there will be 12 new signage locations (but only 2 new posts) and that outside the conservation area but within the 20 mph limit there will be 10 new signage locations. The headline figure of 73 signs, he said, contained many signs placed back-to-back and so counted as being two new signs. He displayed pictures of the changes in sensitive locations.

Cllr Mitchell expressed her disappointment at the limitations placed on the scheme placed by Highways commenting that the streetscape has already been much compromised by motor vehicles, lampposts, wheelie bins etc. She expressed concern at the speeds of vehicles on Melford Rd and speculated that the Governments Housing Target might lead to further houses being built on the Melford Rd making further measures to control the speed of vehicles on the Melford Rd possible at some point in the future. She concluded that a partial scheme is better than not at all commenting that she feared that a low turn out in any village poll and that she considered Motion 1 had not addressed that possibility.

Cllr Morrey thanked Cllr Lamont for all his hard work on the project, Cllr Ranzetta concurred. She said that considered it not reasonable or fair that a Council consisting of less than a dozen Councillors make a decision of such magnitude. She said that she supported a village poll saying that Councillors should work to encourage a high turn-out.

Cllr Domoney asked who would advise Garmin and others of the new limits. The Chair responded that she did not know.

Cllr Ranzetta said that she agreed with Cllr Morrey commenting on the number of new residents since 2016 and that these new residents of the village should be given a chance to express their opinion. Cllr Robinson concurred.

Cllr Sherman told Councillors that one of the questions in the upcoming Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire will ask Members of the Public whether they want a 20mph scheme. He said that this would avoid the £1,000-£2,000 cost of a village poll.

Cllr Mitchell reiterated her concerns about the possibility of a low turn-out. Cllr Lamont reminded Councillors that the motion was to take 'full account of the poll' and so a low turn-out could be considered at that time. Cllr Mawford spoke of the difference between a poll and a referendum.

Motion:

That the Parish Council encourage electors at the Parish Meeting to be held on May 15th to require a Parish Poll to ask the question '*Should the Parish Council ask Suffolk County Council to implement the proposed 20 mph scheme at a cost of £24,065.46 + VAT at 2024/25 prices? There will be an inflationary uplift to 2025/26 prices.*' The Parish Council to take full account of the result of that Poll at a meeting as soon as reasonably possible after the poll has been conducted.

Proposed: Cllr Ranzetta **Seconded:** Cllr Morrey.

Decision: Carried. Cllrs Ranzetta, Morrey, Bourne and Robinson voted in favour. Cllrs Lamont and Mawford voted against. Cllrs Sherman, Falconer, Mitchell and Domoney abstained.

11. The Paddocks Allotments: Report and Motions

Cllr Robinson left the room as the matter concerned his Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

The Clerk summarised the published paper explaining that the Parish Council is under no legal obligation to accept the Paddocks Allotments but is under a statutory duty to provide allotments should a) there be sufficient demand and b) land available at a reasonable cost taking the interests of the community as a whole. This is generally taken to exclude from consideration land designated for residential or other development.

He explained that the Lavenham Allotments Society had rejected the site as unsuitable for a number of reasons informing the Parish Council that it would search for appropriate sites.



He reminded Councillors that the Parish Council has for some time considered a community-based allotments association to be the most appropriate guardians and curators of such a site explaining that this has been the views of Councillors expressed at previous meetings rather than a formal policy. Parish Council policy has therefore traditionally been that it would only accept the site if the Lavenham Allotments Association considered the site acceptable and was prepared to manage the site.

Recent developments included:

- a) Hartog Hutton Ltd had told the Parish Council that they will 'soon be putting the allotments in'.
- b) The Chair and Clerk had contacted the leading figures in the Lavenham Allotments Society and they had either confirmed that the site remained unsuitable or had not responded.
- c) The Lavenham Woodland Project had explained that should it not be possible to find an Allotment Association it would be prepared to take on the site as a community amenity space.
- d) At the 3rd April 2025 Meeting of Council Cllr Domoney told Councillors that he and Cllr Robinson are together investigating a further possible site and will discuss this with Council in due course.
- e) Following advertisement by the Parish Council 4 other people have come forward expressing an interest in helping run an Allotments Association and a further two in having an Allotment.

The Clerk told Councillors that Cllr Domoney has, since the last meeting, informed him that a local landowner (Cllr Robinson) is prepared to offer a part of his land at Second Meadows to the Lavenham Allotments Association on a long term lease at a nominal rent. He had informed him that, unlike the Paddocks site, he considers this site to be suitable with susceptibility to flooding part of this assessment.

Cllr Domoney explained to Councillors why he considered the Second Meadows suitable for an Allotment site and The Paddock site unsuitable. Reasons he considered The Paddocks site unsuitable included the weight limit on the Bridge, Environment Agencies restrictions, the lack of toilets, shading of the site, the prevalence of local wildlife (and the consequent fencing requirements) and distance to the nearest defibrillator. Reasons he considered the Second Meadow site suitable included the proposed use of raised bed allotments meaning that the risk of disruption from flooding minimised with topsoil retained by the surroundings and not washed away. He explained that there are two forms of access, vehicular via A1141 and footpath by the river without weight limit. Vehicles, he said, are already on site for distributing tonnes of Topsoil etc. He added that toilets are on site, shading is less, wildlife is less prevalent and the concerns of the Environment Agency very much lower. He reported that a defibrillator and solar and battery powered security cameras can easily be installed on that site.

Cllr Ranzetta said that she had never heard of an Allotment having a toilet or a defibrillator and questioned the accuracy of a number of the other reasons given. She told Councillors that the Second Meadow does flood with many occasions horses there requiring rescue by the RSPCA. She said that the allotments, unless on ten feet high stilts, would be washed away as the area floods very severely.

Cllr Mawford suggested that it might be appropriate to defer consideration of the matter until these differences of opinion are resolved or more clearly understood. Cllr Sherman told Councillors that there is a defibrillator near the proposed Paddocks site.

Cllr Falconer concurred with Cllr Ranzetta describing access to Second Meadows as difficult noting that a resident of The Paddocks is one of those who have come forward expressing an interest in forming a new Allotments Association. She described this offer as 'very useful'. She suggested that in the context of the opinions raised by the first Member of the Public who spoke in Public Time that the Second Meadows site might not be very popular and that The Paddocks site should be progressed.

Cllr Mitchell reminded Councillors that there has been an understanding for many years that the Developer would provide Allotments to replace those lost consequent of The Paddocks development highlighting that terms with Hartog Hutton are yet to be fully established. She said that, before consideration of Second Meadow, the Hartog Hutton offer needs to be finalised. She said that it might be that both sites might become allotments recognising differing opinions.

Cllr Domoney told Councillors that he is the Chair of the Lavenham Allotments Society with Cllr Robinson and Ms Pippa Mullan fellow Board Members. He told Councillors that he has decided to use the Second Meadows for Allotments and has assigned the first plot. He said that what Council wanted to do with The Paddocks site was up to Council.



Motions:

The Clerk is asked to contact all those who have expressed an interest in being part of an emerging Allotments Association or having an allotment at The Paddocks to contact the Membership Secretary of the Lavenham Allotments Association (Cllr Domoney) to discuss whether they would be interested in having an allotment at Second Meadows and joining the Lavenham Allotments Association. The Clerk to write to Hartog Hutton informing them of recent developments.

Proposed: Cllr Domoney **Seconded:** None

Decision: Rejected

Cllr Mawford proposed an amendment to Motion 2 so that it read:

'The Parish Council has for some time considered that a community-based Allotments Association to be the most appropriate guardians and curators of Allotment sites and so the Council agrees that it will accept an Allotments site if a resilient community-based Allotments Association considers this site acceptable and is prepared to manage this site along the lines set out in the Council's recent Allotments flyer.

The Clerk is asked to contact all those who have expressed an interest in being part of an Allotments Association and encourage them to form an Allotments Association and to write to Hartog Hutton and to Babergh Council informing them of the emerging Allotments Association.

The Clerk is asked to discuss with representatives of the emerging Allotments Association and Hartog Hutton possible arrangements for the Association to manage the site adjacent to the Railway Walk as Allotments. If the proposed arrangements can be agreed then they should be brought back to the Parish Council for approval. Should it not be possible to take forward the site adjacent to the Railway Walk for Allotments for whatever reason then the Clerk is asked to discuss with the Lavenham Woodland Project and Hartog Hutton the use of the site as community open space. If proposed arrangements can be agreed then they should be brought back to the Parish Council for approval.

Cllr Robinson is thanked for suggesting that part of his land at Second Meadow be used as an Allotments site'.

Proposed: Cllr Mawford **Seconded:** Cllr Morrey

Decision: Amendment approved unanimously. Cllrs Sherman and Domoney abstained.

Proposed: Cllr Mitchell **Seconded:** Cllr Ranzetta

Decision: Amended Motion approved unanimously.

Cllr Robinson returned to the room.

12. Planning Applications for Consideration

The Clerk reported that no significant decisions have been received since Council last met.

DC/25/01435 The Great House Hotel, Application for Listed Building Consent, Like for like replacement of 11 windows on front façade.

Cllr Lamont explained that The Great house is Grade II* listed and located inside the Conservation Area in the same views as Grade I listed buildings, such as the Guildhall, and that this application involves removing all the front windows and replacing with newly made sash windows, visually the same.

He told Councillors that the Babergh Senior Heritage Officer has consulted the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) who have written that 'The Site/Heritage Statement (S/HS) states that the existing single glazing is crown glass and that this will be replaced like-for-like. Crown glass is increasingly rare and has become an extinct craft, therefore it is very unlikely that the replacement windows would include crown glass. The survival of crown glass significantly enhances the historical and architectural importance of the windows and glazing and it is vital that this historic fabric is protected. We therefore strongly object to the loss of these historic windows and recommend that the application be refused'.

Cllr Ranzetta suggested that the advice of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings be heeded.



Motion: that the Parish Council recommends refusal of Application DC/25/01435

Proposed: Cllr Lamont **Seconded:** Cllr Robinson **Decision:** Approved. Cllr Mawford voted against. Cllr Mitchell abstained.

Motion: that the Meeting be extended until 10.15 pm and no longer

Proposed: Cllr Mitchell **Seconded:** Cllr Domoney **Decision:** Approved. Cllr Sherman voted against.

DC/25/00541 Howletts of Lavenham, Variations to approved plans

Cllr Lamont explained that these variations will have little impact on the street scene, apart from the visual splay for the new entrance onto Sudbury Road. The House Designs for plots 4 and 5 have not changed significantly, other than inserting a gap between the two properties to create two detached dwellings. The turning and parking area and footpath details in front of plots 4 and 5 have been amended as part of this application. The application also includes a summary document detailing a request to retain an emergency access route, controlled by posts, to Melford Road.

Cllr Mitchell told Councillors that an enforcement issue has been issued with respect to required landscaping not being carried out. Cllr Mawford suggested that Council object to the deletion of the previously proposed footpath.

Amendment to Motion so that it reads: that the Parish Council recommends approval of the variations subject to the retention of the previously proposed footpath

Amendment Proposed: Cllr Mawford **Seconded:** Cllr Morrey **Decision:** Approved. Cllr Lamont voted against. Cllr Mitchell abstained.

Motion Proposed: Cllr Mitchell **Seconded:** Cllr Falconer **Decision:** Approved unanimously

DC/25/01816 Glenholm Brent Eleigh Road, Erection of 3-bay cartlodge with annex to first floor and construction of a new vehicular access

Cllr Lamont explained that this application does include a full risk assessment for Glenholm, including risk mitigation provisions.

He told Councillors that the construction of a garage would be permitted development except that it is in a Flood Risk Zone 2 and partially in in Zone 3, and also due to its size. He described the inclusion of a living area as unusual for a cartlodge explaining that the design incorporates a lounge bedroom with living area kitchenette and separate bathroom which could constitute creating a separate dwelling.

He told Councillors that it should also be considered that a large cartlodge with accommodation above located outside and not adjacent to the Settlement Boundary is the creation of an annex that could be considered a separate dwelling contrary to LNP1 Policy H1 and should not be accepted.

Cllr Falconer told Councillors that a Member of the Public had told her that it is possible that a Parish Councillor is involved in this property or owns the property next door or has recently bought that property perhaps with someone else and asked if any Parish Councillor has a conflict of interest. No Councillor reported that they had an interest in this property or the adjacent property next door.

Cllr Mitchell told Councillors that the application is contrary to the JLP Policy LP02.

Motion: that the Parish Council recommends refusal of Application DC/25/01816

Proposed: Cllr Lamont **Seconded:** Cllr Mawford

Decision: Approved unanimously. Cllr Robinson abstained.

Babergh Survey concerning the publication of Planning Notices.

Motion: The Parish Clerk is instructed to submit the survey as drafted including the late amendments in red italics.

Proposed: Cllr Lamont **Seconded:** Cllr Mitchell

Decision: Approved unanimously. Cllr Robinson abstained.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'J' followed by a series of loops and a horizontal line extending to the right.

13a. Motion to approve a Grant of £350 to the British Legion to support VE Day barbecue.

The Clerk reminded Councillors of the discussion at the previous meeting of the Parish Council.

Motion: The Parish Council approve a Grant of £350 to the British Legion to support VE Day from the Street Fair Fund. Power to make Grants under S137 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Proposed: Cllr Mitchell **Seconded:** Cllr Muckian **Decision:** Approved unanimously. Cllr Domoney abstained.

13b. Motion to approve a Grant of £150 to the Community Council to purchase a parasol.

The Clerk referred Councillors to request letter included in the Working Papers.

Motion: The Parish Council approve a Grant of £150 to the Community Council. Power to make Grants under S137 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Proposed: Cllr Robinson **Seconded:** Cllr Morrey **Decision:** Approved unanimously.

14. Lavenham Neighbourhood Plan 3: Report.

Cllr Sherman outlined the key details of his report. In answer to a question from Cllr Mitchell Cllr Sherman explained the skill sets of the Group Members explaining that he was not aware of any missing skill sets and that they would recruit into the vacant positions should any such needs be identified.

Motion: David Theobald, Tracey Brinkley, Andrea Norman and Savannah Bourne are invited to join the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

Proposed: Cllr Robinson **Seconded:** Cllr Sherman **Decision:** Approved unanimously. Cllr Mawford abstained.

15. Clerk and RFO Report

The Clerk explained to Councillors the key reasons for the changes in Income and Expenditure between Budget, final Forecast and Actual as detailed in the Working Papers.

Motion: to approve the Accounts for the month ended 31 March 2025.

Proposed: Cllr Robinson **Seconded:** Cllr Bourne **Decision:** Approved unanimously.

Motion: to approve Receipts and Payments for month ending 31 March 2025.

Proposed: Cllr Lamont **Seconded:** Cllr Mitchell **Decision:** Approved unanimously.

Motion: to approve the proposed changes to the Standing Orders required by NALC

Proposed: Cllr Ranzetta **Seconded:** Cllr Sherman **Decision:** Approved unanimously.

16. Motion to sign EV Cluster Agreements

The Clerk explained that these are standard agreements which all Parishes will need to sign to transfer their EV Points to Suffolk CC. Connected Kerb have agreed to take over all the chargers including the ones so far not commissioned. There have been no changes to the proposed arrangements.

Motion: to sign the EV Cluster Agreements


Proposed: Cllr Robinson **Seconded:** Cllr Mawford **Decision:** Approved unanimously.

17. Motion concerning Local Government Reorganisation

Motion: The Parish Clerk is instructed to ask the leaderships of Suffolk CC and Babergh DC if (and, if so, when) they intend to engage or consult with Lavenham Parish Council, before they complete their Local Government Re-organisation Final Plans for submission to central government.

Proposed: Cllr Sherman **Seconded:** Cllr Robinson **Decision:** Approved unanimously

Date of next meeting: Thursday 5th June 2025 7pm in the Village Hall. Meeting closed at 10.13pm.

Janice Muckian

9/6/25