

**PARISH COUNCIL MEETING**

Held on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021, commencing 7.30 pm. in the Village Hall.

**Present** Mr I Lamont, Chairman.

Mrs M Morrey, Mr T Sheppard, Mr R Macro, Mr M Chick.

Mr R Lindsay, Suffolk County Councillor. Mrs M Maybury & Mr C Arthey, District Councillors for Lavenham.

8 members of the public.

**Public Forum**

Questions asked under Public Forum:

When would the minutes of the Annual Parish Meeting and the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> June be available.

Had the responses to individuals who had provided feedback to the ‘Towards Sharing Space’ consultation come from the Parish Council or were they replies from the Chairman.

Why was the election of the Vice Chairman put on the agenda for 24<sup>th</sup> June and not on this agenda, for 1<sup>st</sup> July.

Would the Parish Council support the extension of the 30 mph speed limit on the Sudbury Road to include the 7 dwellings and Farm Shop, as traffic tends to speed up past these properties having left the limit of the speed restriction and reverted to the national speed limit of 60 mph. There had been no accidents but many near misses. This request was supported by all residents of the properties.

**Police Matters** – Go to:

[https://www.suffolk.police.uk/sites/suffolk/files/ceo\\_constables\\_county\\_june.pdf](https://www.suffolk.police.uk/sites/suffolk/files/ceo_constables_county_june.pdf) for the June 2021 copy of the County newsletter, Constable’s County.

The summary of crimes reported within the parish of Lavenham, listed on [www.police.uk](http://www.police.uk), has been updated recently to show crimes reported in May, there had been 7 crimes: 2 x violence & sexual offences; 1 x Anti-Social Behaviour; 1 x Public Order; 1 Drug offence; 2 x Shoplifting.

**County Councillor’s Report, Mr R Lindsay** *(report forwarded and circulated, follows these minutes)*

Mr Lindsay saw no reason why, with support from the Parish Council, he should not request a buffer zone, especially in the case of Sudbury Road. The original request was for a 20mph limit on all roads within the existing 30mph signs, a buffer zone of either 30 or 40 mph would make the switch from the new limit of 20 mph to 60 mph more gradual.

Water Street scheme – Graham Rankin has not yet sent his report following the meeting, Mr Lindsay would remind him.

**District Councillor’s Reports, Mrs M Maybury & Mr C Arthey** *(reports forwarded and circulated, follow these minutes)*

In addition to Mrs Maybury’s report, Mr Arthey updated the Council in respect of:

New BDC commercial workspace development off the A1071 at Hadleigh.

WRAP (Waste & Resources Action Plan) Govt consultation. Proposals for consistency in materials and collection. Particular concern for Suffolk if glass has to be included in household collection, also financial implications for BDC if a weekly food waste collection has to be introduced in less densely populated rural areas.

New project to further reduce the Council’s carbon emissions (following change of waste freighter fleet to Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil) by saving and treating back-wash water.

Tree Canopy survey to be carried out this summer, including both Suffolk Wildlife Trust surveys and satellite imaging. The comprehensive survey results will be publicly available online.

Joint Local Plan Examination hearings have had to be postponed due to problems with participation in the 'hybrid' format. Stage 1 sessions had been scheduled for June/July and Stage 2 for September/October. We are now expecting Stage 1 and Stage 2 to take place in a more concentrated schedule in September and October. This should not delay the Inspector's report and we are still looking to adoption early in 2022.

Default of CIL payments is in the hands of the Legal department at present.

### **The Minutes**

Several omissions/corrections were noted to the minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> June.

Minute ref: 06(i)/21 p.105, heading Towards Sharing Space – review consultation suspension. Line 5, insert 'how' after 'Market Place, how many'. Line 13/14, should read, 'It was pointed out that this had been a consultation 'and not a firm plan.' It had not been intended to make a decision based on the 'feedback' not 'plans'. Lines 23/24/25/26, should read, 'A new working party needs to be formed 'consisting of representatives' from the Parish Council, the community, Suffolk County Council (as Highways Authority), anyone else who would be useful and support the work. 'Terms of reference would be set by the Parish Council'.

Minute ref: 06(i)/21 p.106, heading Review of Policies etc. line 3, insert 'FRs' (Financial Regulations) after 'the at the start of the line.

Minute ref: 06(i)/21 p.110, heading Matters to be brought to the attention of the Parish Council, final sentence should read, 'Although there was support for a report back to the Planning Group on the cumulative assessment 'it was agreed that Mr Ranzetta should go ahead with the housing needs assessment independently, not connected to the NDP.'

With these amendments agreed and recorded it was prop. by Mr Macro, sec. by Mrs Morrey, that the minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> June are approved. Carried.

**Declarations of Interest** – Mr Macro felt that he had a non-pecuniary interest in the Water Street development and would not take part in any vote on the matter.

**Apologies for absence** - Mrs Mitchell

### **Matters arising and update of outstanding issues**

Election Timetable- Electoral Services have advised the date of the Election for five vacancies as Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> August. Notices of Election will be posted from 8<sup>th</sup> July and nominations have to be received by 16<sup>th</sup> July. There will be a ballot only if there are more candidates than vacancies. Both the 2015 and 2019 Parish Council elections for Lavenham had been uncontested due to there being insufficient candidates. Parish Councillors, whether elected following a ballot, returned after an uncontested election or co-opted, all share the same status as Councillors.

### **Lavenham Neighbourhood Development Plan revision group update**

Two weeks ago an extremely successful 'pilot' was carried out where ten individuals were provided with a copy of the Guide to Completion of the Questionnaire and a covering letter explaining how to access the actual Questionnaire online, together with a unique code for each individual completing it. Thanks to the highly constructive feedback we have been able to carry out a few amendments and 'tweaks' so we are now sending the final version of the Guide and covering letter to the printers. Even more interesting – we have been able to analyse the replies – which again enable a final revision of the Questionnaire itself. The Guide drew many compliments and it has indeed been written, drawn up, designed and laid out to a very

high standard.

We go to print on Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> June and have booked the Village Hall for a session to marry the Guides with the covering letter with a view to distributing on 12/13 July. The closing date will be 10<sup>th</sup> August and the access to the online version will be blocked from 13<sup>th</sup> August.

Hard copies of the Questionnaire will be available on request and details for arranging to receive one are included in the covering letter. There will be two collection points – in the Visitor Information Centre and in the Village Hall.

We will then be taking each hard copy and transferring to an on-line copy with a unique code and all the results will then be analysed by the CAS software. The results will be published at a later date.

The evidence garnered from the Questionnaire will contribute to the Revised Plan and govern whether a Housing Needs Survey will be carried out.

The Revised Landscape Assessment is completed in draft form and we will be scrutinised later.

Mr Sheppard commented that the original Neighbourhood Plan had produced a very high turnout from the village, this had been good for the Inspector's report. A good turnout for the revision would be very helpful and support its standing as a key document in planning decisions.

### **Review of Policies, Financial Regulations and Standing Orders**

Deferred to August meeting agenda.

### **Operations**

#### **Project Updates**

Prentice Street car park & toilets - UKPN have been paid for the connection and Jane is waiting for their confirmation of receipt. An additional fee will arise to UKPN for the toilet block connection which they have yet to quantify.

The supplier of the toilet block has been asked to attend site as the manual door locks are very stiff and we are loath to force them in case the key is broken in the lock. The lights to the rear of the block will be disabled as where the block is now situated they serve no useful purpose.

Once the electricity supply is made to the block the front area will have a plinth erected to the front with safety rails. BDC has already agreed to fund this. Other small works will be carried out at the same time, including the repair to the wall opposite the disabled car spaces.

Church Street block - the date for completion of these works is 9th July. There has been a hold-up on getting the toilet hand rails and disability fittings.

The office space is more or less completed and Jane has seen this. A formal postal address has been requested. Consideration as to how this will be furnished can now be focussed on.

Tenter Piece - completion date is scheduled for 23rd July. Materials have been difficult to source as larger contractors appear to be hoarding and buying complete shipments when they arrive at the likes of Build Base and Ridgeons. This causes continuing delays. The window to the front bay will not arrive for another three weeks. The costs of the extra works in respect of the firewall will be claimed from Babergh.

As reported previously the so-called emergency door to the rear of the suite is to be removed tomorrow by Babergh - that is 8 weeks after it was reported to them. It takes between 3 and 5 weeks for officers to deal with any enquiry. This has added to the time lost and any frustration level.

CIL payments -these receipts have been applied for based on stage payments. At least one payment has been paid late but are now all up to date with claims made.

Gas Works site - seven companies have been invited to submit competitive tenders for the main construction. The return date for submissions means that the next LPC meeting will have the figures before them on the 1<sup>st</sup> July.

UK Power Networks have supplied a quote for supplying power to the site sufficient to provide for 2x7.2 kwh chargers connection along with some lighting. They have also been asked to provide a figure for further power supplies as the take-up of Electric Vehicles increases over the coming years. We are not restricted to using UKPN for the electricity supply and alternative suppliers will be explored once we have the figures to hand for the construction of the site.

Contact has been made with 3 companies that can supply the charge points. There are many such suppliers but there is no common scheme or business model among such suppliers. Detailed discussion has not yet taken place until we have a confirmed start date. Information has been sought from BMS regarding the charging regime in place for the Church Street carpark, as has Carroll Reeve in respect of the Prentice Street carpark, but without success. The cost at Church Street is 50p per connection and 36p per kwh. What is not known is the percentage claimed by BMS. I have also asked them what is the level of usage but again despite promises they have not been forthcoming.

We have encountered some tardiness on the part of Birketts solicitors in progressing the acquisition of the site, pressure has been applied. The project is still on target to complete within the required timeframe.

National Grid have proposed to use the new boundary fence that will be erected along the south side of the site for attaching information panels on the heritage element of the site. They have not yet shared with us the amount of restoration that they will do to the gas holder, but have completed a feasibility study although not yet committed to a specific programme of works.

Water Street traffic scheme & 20 mph limit – both covered in County Councillor’s report.

Car Parks cashless donation boxes – Mr Chick is pursuing a quote for the same spec for Church Street car park as in Prentice Street.

## **Finance and Strategy**

### **Cheques for payment:**

idverde, Church St toilet cleaning 01/04/21 to 18/04/21 £540.00: Kinex, phone a/c June £40.22: Zoom, monthly fee for remote meetings £14.39: Floral Fayre, bedding for planters at Sudbury Road junction (reimbursement to Mr Lamont) £16.00: British Gas, electricity to Church St toilets £12.28: Sicher Technic, site management/design services for EV point Prentice St car park £1,705.00; Heelis & Lodge, internal audit fee £310.00: Lavenham Community Council, Village Hall meeting rooms on 27/05 & 03/06 £46.25: Karzees Limited, hire/cleaning of temporary toilet units Church St/Prentice St £1,245.60: Cartridge Discount, printer inks £48.96: Payroll £747.28: JPB Landscapes Ltd. , (June grasscutting/maintenance £928.75, street cleaning £1,253.33) + VAT £2,618.50: NFU Mutual, insurance cover for WC cabins Prentice St car park £9.07: Petty Cash £100.00: Lavenham Press Ltd, printing guide for NDP review questionnaire £80.00: Lavenham Woodland Project, annual donation (agreed at June meeting ref. 06(i)/21 p.107) £300.00.

Public Works Loans Board, notice of loan repayment of £3,759.79 due on 16/07/2021.

Direct payments to Bank: Babergh District Council, Claim 2, Prentice St CIL bid B20-05 £6,367.13: Claim 2, Church St CIL bid B20-15 £18,750.00: Claim 1, Tenter Piece CIL bid B20-04 £15,000.00. Total £40,117.13.

A letter to the Bank requests the transfer of £11,000.00 between accounts.

Prop. Mr Macro, sec. Mr Sheppard, that the financial transactions are approved. Carried.

Amended invoice for April checked as correct. Due to late cancelling of the contract they had suggested that the Parish Council pay 30 days PILON (payment in lieu of notice), we refused. They have now amended the invoice to show 18 days cleaning at £25 per day, which was actually the service we received.

Anglian Water required a photograph of the meter to prove the reading and re-calculated the bill. This showed an overpayment of £3,150.74 which will be refunded to the Parish Council.

Inspection of Aerial Runway ordered from Playdale, site visit charged at £105 plus VAT, total £126.00. Parish Council will be invoiced. We will not know until the equipment has been inspected whether basic maintenance or replacement part required to return it to working order.

From Emma Paris of Forest School, following the Parish Council's donation to the School to enable more children to attend Forest School sessions. 'I would like to thank you for your kind and generous contribution toward the School being able to offer 'An Introduction to Forest School' to the whole school for six weeks. It has been such a delightful privilege to deliver these sessions within our community. I am always so grateful for the opportunity to work with our children and know that this couldn't have gone ahead without the support from Lavenham Parish Council, Lavenham Woodland Project and Lavenham Primary School.

From John Knight of Lavenham Woodland Project an email thanking the Parish Council for its continuing support following the donation of £300 agreed at the last meeting.

### **Planning**

DC/21/03101 12 Market Place, Lavenham

Application for Listed Building Consent - Repairs to brick chimney entailing carefully taking down approximately the top 2m of the stack to expose the defective brickwork, removing any loose brickwork remaining and rebuilding salvaged/matching brick.

This application concerns essential repairs to prevent further damage to the chimney.

Recommend Approval

DC/21/03358 & DC/21/03359 Horseyards, Bridge Street Road, Lavenham

Householder Planning Application & Application for Listed Building Consent - Erection of lean-to extension to front elevation. Infilling of two garage bays and conversion to habitable accommodation

The new extension is subservient and is modest in size. Recommend Approval

DC/21/03401 7 Church Street, Lavenham

Application for Listed Building Consent - Removal of external render from gable end and front elevation, and replace with lime render, associated works including repairs to timber frame, installation of wool insulation, fix breathable membrane, fix counter and cross laths, application of lime and fibres, apply dubbing out coat if required and lime topcoat. Repainting of whole exterior with lime wash.

This is for essential repairs and is sympathetic. Recommend Approval

DC/21/03342 12 Spring Street, Lavenham

Householder Application - Erection of a front and side wraparound extension and rear

Recommend Approval.

Prop. Mr Marco, sec. Mr Chick, recommend en bloc approval of the above applications.

Carried.

DC/21/03557 Robin Hill, Park Road, Lavenham

Householder Application - Erection of two storey linked extension to provide garage at ground floor and additional bedrooms (following removal of cart lodge)

This application was received at short notice, defer decision until meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> August.

DC/21/03185 Lavenham Press, 47 Water Street, Lavenham

Planning Application. Demolition of existing unlisted buildings and structures and erection of retirement living accommodation to include associated amenity space, landscaping, parking and vehicular access

The observations and notes made at the meeting of the Planning Working Group were debated at some length.

It was proposed by Mr Sheppard, seconded by Mr Chick, Recommend Refusal. Carried.

Reasons:

- 1) The proposed 35 houses exceed the maximum limit given in Policy H1 of the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan of 24 houses. This policy has worked successfully for Lavenham since 2016. We are determined not to set a precedent by approving any development exceeding 24 houses.
- 2) No provision has been made for 35% affordable homes as required under policy H3 of the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3) As required by Policy H3, No open book assessment viability statement has been provided for proposing less than 35% affordable homes. There is no proposal for any S106 provision.
- 4) Parking is very limited for the number of properties. Suffolk County Council recommends 44 spaces for 35 properties, McCarthy & Stone are proposing 31 based on their formula used on other sites. The 31 spaces includes only 4 spaces for guests, and needs to account for spaces for visiting carers and staff as well as residents
- 5) These houses are not allocated as part of JLP long term housing plan and are not identified in the draft JLP currently under consideration. Lavenham has already exceeded its housing requirement in the draft JLP with approved applications and the LA069 allocated site.
- 6) Number 47 Water Street needs to be considered in the proposal so that it is not left to become isolated by its setting adjacent to the proposed development. Sufficient space around the property has not been provided to ensure this Grade II listed building has an appropriate setting.
- 7) There will be impact on defined views as described in ENV1 of the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan
- 8) Loss of privacy has been raised by some residents
- 9) There will be an impact on the setting of listed buildings
- 10) The design of the building appears to be a corporate style with little reference to the Lavenham Vernacular and the design is inappropriate for the location.
- 11) The density of the building within the site is too dominant (see No.1 above)

It is noted that the Parish Council recognises the positive benefits of developing this site **with an appropriate proposal:**

- 12) Policy H6 of the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan supports homes for elderly people
- 13) The site should be developed for housing rather than industrial use.
- 14) Reduction of noise from the site, and heavy traffic noise from deliveries etc.
- 15) Reduction of commercial traffic in the village
- 16) This is an opportunity to improve the street scene in this part of Water Street.
- 17) Note: Employment of Lavenham residents by the Lavenham Press is low. So the loss of this employment in the village is not considered a significant factor.

**Planning Decisions Received:**

DC/21/02503 The Dandy Cottage, Brent Eleigh Road, Lavenham – planning permission granted for Installation of rolling door to front of cart lodge

DC/21/01316 . The Guildhall Of Corpus Christi, Market Place, Lavenham – Listed Building Consent for Internal works to provide high grade fire protection, upgrading of doors and walls improving the compartmentalisation of the property and protection of high risk rooms

DC/21/02684 3 Priory Farm Court, Water Street, Lavenham – Planning Permission for Erection of flue

DISCHARGE OF CONDITION(S) TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

The Priory, Water Street, Lavenham

Discharge of Conditions DC/21/00602- Condition 3 (Details of Repair)

DISCHARGE OF CONDITION(S) TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

The Priory, Water Street, Lavenham - Discharge of Conditions DC/21/00602 - Condition 4 (Details of kitchen floor)

DC/21/02751 91 Church Street, Lavenham – No objections raised to works to trees in a Conservation Area, raise crown of 1No Walnut tree, removing 3 lower branches to the South, 2 to the East and then reduce and raise 1 branch to the West. The works are being carried out to maintain the tree,

DC/21/02561 9 Green Willows, Lavenham – Planning Permission granted for Erection of first floor side extension over garage and utility room

DC/21/02681 10 Osier View, Lavenham – Planning Permission granted for Erection of a two storey side extension

DC/21/02894 3 Green Willows, Lavenham - Householder Planning Application - Erection of two storey side extension and front porch. Application withdrawn, will no longer be determined by the District Council

DC/21/02449 De Vere House, Water Street, Lavenham – Listed Building Consent for Replace existing cement render with lime render to rear gable end of property.

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE

DC/21/02613 . Land At Slough Farm, Bridge Street, Lavenham – Refusal of Application for Permission in Principle. Town and Country Planning Act 1990. (Amendment) Order 2017 - Demolition of existing building and erection of 3No dwellings

DC/20/04545 Bungalow, Weaners Farm, Bears Lane, Lavenham -Application for Non Material Amendment determined to be approved. Amendment details: Change approved Front Elevation Bedroom Window to French Doors.

**Housing & Social**

Covid Vaccination Programme update – as reported at last month’s meeting the voluntary task force has been stood down until the Autumn booster programme.

**Correspondence had been received from:**

Resident of Brent Eleigh Road concerned about the dangers of cars parking on the pavement in Brent Eleigh Road blocking the way for pedestrians.

Also resident of Brent Eleigh village concerned at the dangers of the growing trend for a number of householders on Brent Eleigh Road parking vehicles on the roadside instead of on their drives. This is understandable if tradesmen are carrying out works on the houses but it now appears to be almost continuous on that stretch. The road from Brent Eleigh forms a slight curve, and vision is obscured of vehicles coming out of Water Street and heading east on the A1141. Often there are no spots to pull into along the stretch of vehicles, or very few.

It was agreed that both problems would be monitored and photographs taken if possible as it was thought that this is an issue for the police..

A trainer at a nearby personal training studio asking if they could provide a group fitness class

on the First Meadow as due to the current Covid rules they are unable to run a class within their studio. This would be a 30 minute class once or twice a week, around 10 members per session. Many of the clients are local to Lavenham.

There were some concerns should permission be given for this. The grass on the First Meadow is quite rough and the surface often disturbed by animals raising the fear of injury, also the possibility of further pressure on parking in the area. It was suggested that application should instead be made to the Community Council for use of the recreation ground in Bridge Street Road where the grass is cut to sports standard and there is ample parking.

A resident of Sudbury Road, Lavenham (B1017) on behalf of the residents of the road, writing to raise the question of the 60mph speed limit along the stretch of road leaving the 30mph limit of the village up to and including Bridge Farm and the adjacent cottages. In view of the 8 driveways directly off of the road; the emergence of a footpath; children and elderly residents; the 60 mph limit is not appropriate and although there have not been any accidents requiring the emergency services, there have been a great many near misses. Vehicles do not travel at an appropriate speed to allow for cars entering or leaving the driveways. Could consideration be given to extending the 30 mph speed limit to include this area.

(already covered in Public Forum)

A resident of Artesian Close pointing out that Byway 20, Peek Lane has been closed since 19<sup>th</sup> January with no sign of being repaired. Can anything be done to speed up the reopening? Enquiries to be made with Suffolk County Council as to the present status of Peek Lane. Also raise the problems of deep ruts and mud on Clay Lane.

#### **Matters to be brought to the attention of the Parish Council/future agenda items**

Mr Chick mentioned that although Mr O'Mahony's resignation had been raised in the June minutes it was considered that there had been no acknowledgment of his service to the community. Mr Lamont recorded the thanks of the Parish Council and the community for the work Mr O'Mahony had put into the various projects during his time as Councillor, and his support for the Chairman and Council in his role as Vice-Chairman. We are fortunate in that he has agreed to see through the work he had started, and continues, on the old Gas Works site.

The Peek Close development is being opened officially by James Cartlidge MP tomorrow. Mr Lamont has been invited to attend.

**Date of next meeting:** The next meeting will be held on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> August 2021.

The meeting closed at 9.35 pm.