

DRINKSTONE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

of an Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on

Monday 5th October 2020 via Zoom

Page | 2044

Present: Cllrs Edmondson, Elnaugh, Hembra, Holborn, Moss, Schofield, Selvey
Clerk & RFO Hilary Workman
SC Cllr Penny Otton (part), Mr G & Mrs D Youngs

20.10.01 **Noted:**
When apologies for absence were invited there were none.

20.10.02 **Noted:**
When Member's Declarations of Local Non-Pecuniary Interests and/or Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in subsequent Agenda items were invited, the following:

- Cllr Janet Elnaugh **20.10.12.4**

20.10.03 Resolved:
That the Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 3rd August 2020, as tabled, be agreed as a true record.

20.10.04 **Noted:**
Correspondence to this meeting not dealt with as an Agenda item or in the Clerk's report.

- 4.1 SALC Updates & Diversity & Equality Statement (*previously circulated*)
- 4.2 Suffolk County Council: electric charging points & testing for critical key workers (*previously circulated*)
- 4.3 Babergh Mid Suffolk district Council: (*previously circulated*)
 - Trees & Hedgerows
 - Thank you letter to volunteers
 - Public realm – respecting the outdoors
 - Woolpit Neighbourhood Plan
- 4.4 Healthwatch Suffolk – digital services survey (*previously circulated*)
- 4.5 Rookery Meade Farm – Planting & Travel Plan
- 4.6 Local Government Boundary Commission (*previously circulated*) and

The clerk drew the meetings attention to correspondence received that evening from Mid Suffolk District Council advising the parish of a CIL payment to the parish of £8731.43.

20.10.05 **Noted: 8:05pm**
That when public comment or question on any agenda items was invited, the following, there were none, members of the public having been invited by the chair to speak at the relevant items on the agenda.

20.10.06 **Noted:**
Reports to this meeting from District and County Council Ward Member Cllr Penny Otton, from Portfolio Holders or other agencies and any actions identified.

6.1 **Suffolk County & Mid Suffolk District Councils:** A written report (*previously circulated*) from Cllr Penny Otton, who further

- advised that the proposed number of County Councillors would be likely to result in a significant increase in workload for Cllrs, which could impact on the local communities they represent.
- Asked Cllrs or residents to get in touch with her if any problems were experienced with works to A14
- Kindly offered to send a copy of the full MSDC response to planning consultation to the clerk and

Signed: Haslett Schofield

Date: 18/01/2021

- Advised that recent CIL money in Stowmarket had been used to put in electric charging points in the town.
- 6.2 **Allotments:** - A written report from Cllr Richard Edmondson (*previously circulated*) who updated the parish council on the recent approach by a couple of tenants on Gedding Road allotments for plaque (funded privately) to be put up in memory of Ivan Crick, who had worked an allotment there for over 40 years. The proposal was to put a small plaque on the Allotment Shed. The meeting noted that something similar had been done to mark the contributions of two other residents and had no objection to the proposal. It was agreed that Cllr Edmondson would check whether the widow had any objections prior to raising formally with the allotment trustees.
- 6.3 **Planning & Community Engagement:** A written report by Cllr Elnaugh (*previously circulated*) who further reported that she had met with Play-dale who had suggested that, if a zipwire were to be installed, the best position would be to run it from Cross Street down toward the existing play area and that the slope would not present an issue. A 30m length was recommended 30m. The company used steels sunk into ground with wood attached, which increased the longevity by reducing risk of rot. Most estimates received had been between £8k - £10k.
- 6.4 **Playing field and play equipment:** A written report by Cllr Hembra (*previously circulated*), who further reported that dog fouling was not such a problem at present and that the equipment now Covid-19 friendly – one swing had been taken down & and advice signs posted. Moles were a problem on the field now. The Eucalyptus tree on the edge of the field had been taken down and wood contributed for chippings for footpaths. Cllr Holborn very kindly offered to help with spreading the chippings.
- 6.5 **Tree Warden** – A written report from Cllr Holborn who further advised that
- he had received a very good response from local landowners and managed to get some of Rattlesden allocation of trees and hedging for planting which had not been taken up.
 - County Farm, Rattlesden re tree planting.
- 6.6 **Phone Box & Village Hall Ctte:** An oral report from Cllr Moss who advised that all leaflets have been taken out of the phone box, which appeared to be well used.
- 6.7 **Footpaths & Byeways:** An oral report from Cllr Schofield who advised that
- A bridge at footpath 23 had been repaired; and
 - That generally the footpaths were in a good condition
 - The chippings donated from the Eucalyptus would be spread on FP4
- 6.8 **Highways:** A written report from Cllr Selvey (**DPC.20.10.01** *previously circulated*) who further
- Advised that drainage in the vicinity of the church onto the road was still an issue. The meeting asked the clerk to write to residents asking them to address the drainage such that it did not overflow onto the road.
 - The CPRE initiative encouraging the designation of Quiet lanes Suffolk was seeking expressions of interest by 30th November. The initiative was not controversial, but appeared a bit confused in its objectives (for example, identifying speeding and traffic as issues in rural lanes, but stating that Quiet Lanes were not a substitute for traffic calming measures, which should be kept distinct. It was difficult to see how the parish would benefit, other than funding from SCC. Cllr Otton advised that it would be harder in very rural parishes than in semi-rural parishes to evidence a benefit from Quiet Lanes, as most roads were direct access routes to somewhere. The meeting asked the clerk to record an expression of interest and establish what funding might be available through the scheme.
 - Updated the meeting that four of five posts applied for as part of the SID/VAS project had now been approved by SCC, namely:

- Rattlesden Road
- Village Hall
- South of church,
- Junction of Rattlesen Road & Gedding Road.

6.8.2 Resolved:

To authorise the cost of funding the installation two posts for SID/VAS technology, as approved by Suffolk County Council, at a cost of £380 plus VAT under s.137 LGA1972 and

Page | 2046

The meeting asked the Clerk to notify Suffolk County Council that the parish wished to proceed with installation of all four posts (two of which would be funded by the parish as above. Cllr Selvey undertook to renew quotations from last year, a full report and proposal to be brought to the next meeting.

20.10.07

Noted: The Clerk's report that:

- 7.1 The 2nd instalment of the Parish Precept has now been received.
- 7.2 The Parish Council's Insurance has been renewed (**Min. 20.08.7.3 refers**)
- 7.3 The VAT126 claim for quarters 1 & 2 of this financial year had been submitted.
- 7.4 The NALC advice of the 2020 pay award for clerks (*previously circulated*) which included an additional day leave (pro-rata) per annum and confirmed the revision to annual leave in the clerk's contract.
- 7.5 The clerk had received confirmation that DPC's response to the planning appeal (reference **app/w3520/w/20/3253883**- Land North of Greyfriars) had been received.
- 7.6 Work to remove debris from the ditch at the Cricket had commenced, with heavier items to be removed by a contractor.

20.10.08

Noted:

- 8.1 Cllrs considered a report on review of the Parish Council's policies (*previously circulated* as **DPC.20.10.02**) and

8.2 Resolved:

That this Council approves its policies as tabled below,

- **Complaints policy**
- **Document Retention**
- **Equality and Diversity**
- **Freedom of Information**
- **Health & Safety**
- **Media Policy**

20.10.09

Noted:**9.1** the following income:

	Description	£
9.1.1	Mid Suffolk District Council – Parish Precept	£4460.00

Signed: Haslett Schofield**Date:** 18/01/2021

9.2 the following payments for authorisation:

	Description	£
9.2.1	Parish Online	£90.00
9.2.2	Rewts Trees & Gardens	£150.00
9.2.3	Suffolk Assn. of Local Councils #23650 – Birketts Planning 10/09/20	£30.00
9.2.4	Suffolk Assn. of Local Councils # 23593 – Birketts Planning 26/08/20	£30.00
9.2.5	Clerk Expenses Quarter 2	£62.15

Page | 2047

9.3 **Resolved:**

That the expenses listed above (9.1-9.3) be authorised for payment.

9.4 the following payments previously authorised:

	Description	£
9.4.1	Clerk Salary Period 5	£247.63
9.4.2	Top Garden Services #17 (9 th & 23 rd July)	£75.00
9.4.3	Top Garden Services #18 (6 th & 20 th August)	£75.00
9.4.4	Clerk Salary Period 6	£280.74
9.4.5	HMRC Tax/Ni Period 6	£5.80

9.5 the current account balances and reconciliation to 30 September 2020, as scheduled, and the Chairman's confirmation that they were supported by relevant Bank Statements.

9.5 Cllrs considered an update to the move to internet banking (previously circulated as **DPC.20.10.03**) and

9.5.1 Resolved:

To authorise the addition of Cllr Elnaugh to the Parish Council's authorised signatories for Unity Trust bank (View & Authorise).

9.5.2 Resolved:

The parish council apply for a Unity Corporate Multi-pay Card from Unity Trust Bank and set a single transaction maximum value of £500 (unless authorized by the council in writing before any order is placed).

20.10.10 Noted:

The clerks Quarter 1&2 Budget Report (previously circulated as **DPC.20.09.04**).

20.10.11 To note the following Planning results as notified by MSDC:

11.1 **DC/20/02308** – Full Planning Application
Erection single storey, timber framed out-building for use as cattery.
Parkfield, Beyton Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP30 9SS

BMSDC; Granted

DPC:

11.2 **DC/20/02225** - Planning Application

1. Construction of new track and hardstanding area for current pig breeding/rearing. New track and hardstanding area to serve relocation of firewood.

2. **Land Adj Ticehurst Farm (in The Parish Of Drinkstone) Road Near Ticehurst Farm Tostock Suffolk**

BMSDC: Application Withdrawn

Signed: Haslett Schofield

Date: 18/01/2021

- 11.3 **DC/20/02085** – Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/00747 Condition 3 (Historic Environment Record) and Condition 4 (Materials) Drinkstone Mills, Woolpit Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SP
BMSDC: Approved Do not consult with parish on this type of application
- 11.4 **DC/20/02552** – Application for works to trees subject to TPO
T1 Willow – Pollard back to pruning points
4 School Meadow, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds
BMSDC: Granted **DPC:** no comment
- 11.5 The chair having proposed, and the meeting moved a motion to change the order of business on the agenda to consider the planning application **DC/20/03889** (item **12.4** on the agenda), Cllr Elnaugh left the meeting whilst the application was considered (decision recorded at 12.4).
DC/20/02959 – Householder Application
Erection of a single storey rear extension
Rookery Farm, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds, IP30 9SZ
BMSDC: Refused **DPC:** Supported (Min.20.07. refers
DC/20/02960 – Application for listed Building Consent
Erection of a single storey rear extension
Rookery Farm, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds, IP30 9SZ
BMSDC: Refused **DPC:** Supported (Min.20.07. refers)
Cllr Elnaugh returned to the meeting.
- 20.10.12** 12.1 **DC/20/03413** - Application for Listed Building Consent
Application for Listed Building Consent - Erection of glazed link between the main house and studio to create additional living space and replacement of 2no rear first floor windows on dormas from sash to casement as per Schedule of Works
Tanwood, The Street, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP30 9SR
No Objections:
- 12.2 **DC/20/03665** - Application for Outline Planning Permission. (Access to be considered) Erection of 1no detached single-storey dwelling and garage. Construction of new vehicular access.
Ivy Cottage, Rattlesden Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9TN
Report DPC.20.10.05 (circulated)
The meeting considered the application and report DPC.20.10.05 and determined to object to the application for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development is outside the settlement boundary as defined in the MSDC local plan, which whilst 20 years old has now been reviewed by the Neighbourhood Plan which has been approved by MSDC and now carries significant weight in determining planning applications.
The proposal does not comply with the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan **NP DRN1 – Spatial Strategy** ‘Proposals for development located outside the Settlement Boundary will only be permitted for that which is essential for the operation of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other exceptional uses, where i) it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that there is an identified local need for the proposal’ Whilst NP Housing objectives (7) consider development outside the boundary this is regarding conversion of redundant or disused

Signed: Haslett Schofield

Date: 18/01/2021

agricultural buildings. **Policy DRN2** – Housing development states ‘Proposals for the conversion of redundant or disused agricultural barns into dwellings outside the Settlement Boundaries will be permitted’.

The NP has identified planning consents for eight additional homes that have been granted within Drinkstone and has therefore exceeded the housing requirement for the village as required by Mid Suffolk’s Emerging Local Plan.

2. The proposed development is adjacent to Ivy Cottage which is identified within the Neighbourhood Plan (Appendix B) as a Building of Local Significance.

NP Policy **DRN10** states ‘The retention and protection of local heritage assets and buildings of local significance, including buildings, structures, features and gardens of local interest must be appropriately secured. Proposals for any works that would lead to the loss of, or substantial harm to, a building of local significance should be supported by an appropriate analysis of the significance of the asset to enable a balanced judgement to be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset’.

3. Access

The proposed development sits within approximately 20 metres of the change of speed limit from the national speed limit to the 30mph limit, therefore it is unlikely that a vehicle will have adjusted its speed to 30mph within that distance. The proposed development is located on a bend where there have been road accidents.

4. Biodiversity

The proposed development falls within the Drinkstone Area of Local Landscape sensitivity, the proposed new access would appear to require the removal of ancient roadside hedges as well as impacting upon a veteran willow tree. The hedge and tree are outside the applicant’s ownership and if there were agreement between the two parties it would be impossible for MSDC to impose a condition on a 3rd party for its replacement.

NP DRN9 – Biodiversity states Development proposals should avoid the loss of, or substantial harm to, important trees, hedgerows and other natural features such as ponds and watercourses. Where such losses or harm are unavoidable i) the benefits of the proposal must be demonstrated clearly to outweigh any impact.

‘Where new access is created, or an existing access is widened, through an existing hedgerow, a new hedgerow of native species shall be planted on the splay returns into the site to maintain the appearance and continuity of hedgerows in the vicinity.

5. Sustainability

This application represents an unsustainable form of residential development in the countryside. The proposed development will be located in a private residential garden NPPF para. 70 states ‘Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area’.

Drinkstone has no amenities in the village. The nearest amenities are in Woolpit, 4 km away and Rattlesden around 3 km away, along unlit

country roads with no pavements. There is no bus service in Drinkstone, thus access to work, educational, leisure and entertainment facilities in nearby towns is only possible by private car. The proposed application shows a double garage facility in addition to the dwelling.

This development does not constitute a sustainable development, Drinkstone Parish Council references an appeal decision by the Planning Inspectorate APP/W3520/W/16/3162070 dated 8 February 2017 against the development of a single dwelling in Drinkstone. In it the inspector concluded that on balance the proposed development does not constitute a sustainable development *"...the harm caused from conflict with the development plan, reliance on the private motor car,...are capable of significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of the provision of a dwelling...I find that the proposed development would therefore not amount to sustainable development when applying the Framework as a whole, and as such the balance lies against the scheme."*

The inspector also pointed out that the road conditions *"...rural in character and largely unlit along much of its length, are such that it is highly unlikely that anything other than use of the private motor car would be the desirable means of transport, particularly having regard to those persons carrying shopping or taking and collecting children from school,...particularly at time of inclement weather or dark conditions."*

The proposed development will, like these, inevitably involve a heavy reliance on the private car.

Paragraph 3 of the proposed development Planning Statement says 'It is intended that the dwelling will be a single-storey property in order to ensure that there is no overlooking of Ivy Cottage'. The point here being the word intended, this would allow for future changes to the outline plan.

The planning statement regarding Planning Policy makes no reference to the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan which has been approved by MSDC and now carries significant weight in determining planning applications.

- 12.3 DC/20/03754** - Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission DC/19/01959 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for Erection of a single storey dwelling and garage
Land West Of, The Street, Drinkstone, Suffolk - No Objections
- 12.4 DC/20/03889** Application under S73 for removal or variation of condition relating to DC/19/05778 and DC/19/05779 - Condition 2(approved plans and documents) Alterations as drawing 4027-13C received 04/09/2020.
Rookery Farm, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SZ No Objections
- 12.5 DC/20/03981** - Full Application - Erection of 1No two storey dwelling (following demolition of existing bungalow) amended scheme to approved DC/19/05714.
Hammond Lodge, Rattlesden Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9TL - No Objections
- 12.6 DC/20/04101** - Householder application
Erection of glazed link between the main house and studio to create additional living space and replacement of 2no rear first floor windows on dormas from sash to casement as per Schedule of Works
Tanwood, The Street, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP30 9S No Objections

12.7 Resolved:

That the Clerk makes known the Council's comments on Planning Applications on this agenda to the Corporate Manager, Growth & Sustainable Planning at Mid Suffolk District Council.

20.10.13**Noted:**

The following Planning matters for information, to be noted or for inclusion on a future agenda.

Page | 2051

13.1 No Extraordinary Meeting deemed necessary

13.1.1 **DC/20/03474** – Application for Listed Building Consent - Replacement of the chimney stack at ground floor level. replacing flue and lining.

Parkfield, Beyton Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9S

13.1.2 **DC/20/03495** – Full Planning Application
Creation of conservation lake.

The Old Rectory, The Street, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SR

13.2 Cllrs considered the Council's proposed responses to the consultation on the planning white paper and (previously circulated as **DPC.20.10.06**) and asked the clerk to report the responses as set out in the report.

13.3 Cllrs considered the parish council's approach when its attention is brought to breaches of planning consents or conditions. Cllr Holborn expressed his concern that, particularly in respect of issues relating to trees, it was important for the council to be able to act quickly (for example, to limit damage to a tree which might cause its death), and for this reason he considered it important that Cllrs should be able to ask the clerk to take action between meetings.

Cllr Schofield reported the advice of SALC that Cllrs could report any planning breach as an individual to Mid Suffolk District Council, but that any report on behalf of the parish council should be from the clerk, following a meeting of the councillors.

Cllr Holborn raised his concerns as to whether the conditions imposed on Birch House (plot 1) had been discharged by MSDC, and set out his concerns with respect to the infilling of the pond (plot 2) which in his view would be likely to be a breach of planning consent.

The meeting asked the Clerk to write to MSDC setting out its concerns about the protection of trees and the impact of the infilling of the pond on drainage on its neighbouring allotment lands.

20.10.14

Cllrs noted an update on Registration of Parish Lands (previously circulated as **DPC.20.10.07**). Cllr Schofield invited Mr Youngs to outline the concerns he had raised in recent correspondence.

Mr Youngs stated that he was concerned that the parish lands not yet been registered. He reported that several parish lands had disappeared over the years (those held in trust by charities) and that although he had raised his concerns with the relevant charitable trusts, they had not taken action to register the lands held in trust by them.

Cllr Schofield advised that he had sworn the depositions, which had been deposited with the parish council's solicitors. Unfortunately, the solicitors had not advised the clerk that the solicitor dealing with the registration of parish lands was on furlough, and this had contributed significantly to the delay. He further reported that one of the charitable trusts had indicated that it would consider registering lands held in trust were there to be financial support from the Parish Council and that the matter could be considered at the Annual Parish Meeting.

Cllr Holborn queried whether the verges alongside the allotments at Gedding Road and Rattlesden Road had been included in the plan submitted with the depositions. In answer to this question, Mrs Youngs advised that the extent of the land to be registered

Signed: Haslett Schofield

Date: 18/01/2021

in respect of Rattlesden Road was that indicated on the lease between Drinkstone Parish Council and the Lessee of the allotment lands to the east of Rattlesden Road Allotments.

20.10.15 **Noted:**

Cllrs noted an update on the Neighbourhood Plan (previously circulated as DPC.20.10.08). Cllr Schofield invited Mrs Youngs to outline the concerns he had raised in recent correspondence.

Page | 2052

Mrs Youngs explained that, as reported in the press, it appeared that MSDC was overriding Thurston's adopted Neighbourhood Plan. She had spoken to Drinkstone's Neighbourhood Plan planning consultant who had advised that Thurston's plan did not specify the number of houses Mid Suffolk District Council had allocated to Thurston under the joint local plan. In the case of Drinkstone, its NP references the numbers of properties required under the joint local plan, and identifies the sites and numbers allocated to each site. The required allocation for Drinkstone had already been exceeded.

Mrs Youngs recommended that the parish council should scrutinise the next iteration of joint local plan for consultation and submit a reasoned response to any proposed changes by BMSDC to the allocation for Drinkstone in its joint local plan. She further advised that BMSDC had reclassified Drinkstone as a hamlet village.

- 20.10.16 **16.1** Cllrs considered an update on GDPR and ICT connectivity (previously circulated as **DPC.20.10.09**). Following a discussion, Cllrs acknowledged the need for the laptop used by the clerk to be appropriately licensed for business use, but considered that licence options other than 365 were available which would serve the purpose. Cllrs further decided that the purchase of a domain name and business essentials for Cllrs use was not proportionate to the size and needs of the parish.

16.2 Proposal: Cllr Schofield

To authorise the cost of a Microsoft Business Standard 365 licence for the Clerk, 7 Microsoft Business Essential 365 Licences, and the purchase of a domain name for Drinkstone Parish Council at a total cost of £500.40 (paid monthly).

The substantive proposal having not been carried, the meeting Resolved:

To authorise the cost of a Microsoft Business licence for the Clerk, at a cost of not more than £112 plus VAT.

- 16.3** Cllrs further considered the proposal to migrate the Parish Council web pages to a WCAGs compliant website. Cllr Edmondson reported that a brief look at the current website analytics indicated very low levels of traffic on the Parish Council websites, and that he considered the financial burden of migrating to a new website was not proportionate to the size and needs of the parish. Cllr Edmondson further reported that Suffolk County Council was using the "Disproportionate Burden" argument in their accessibility statement as a reason for not undertaking detailed checks of their website, and that he considered that it would therefore be appropriate for the Parish Council to use the Disproportionate Burden in respect of its website.

The clerk explained that the parish council had a legal obligation to undertake a detailed audit of its website under the regulations and advised the parish council that in her view, the proposal to move to a new WCAGs compliant website was the most proportionate and cost effective way of meeting its obligations under the regulations.

Proposal: Cllr Schofield

To migrate the Parish Council web pages to Suffolk Cloud, at a cost of £110 for the financial year 2021-22 to ensure the parish council, and an upfront cost of £95 for the provision of a domain name, personalised e-mail addresses and training.

Signed: Haslett Schofield

Date: 18/01/2021

The substantive proposal having been withdrawn, the meeting asked the clerk to liaise with Cllr Edmondson to review the accessibility of the parish website and report back to the next meeting.

20.10.17

Noted:

That when public comment or questions on any matter of Council business were invited, the following:

- Mrs Youngs reported that the drainage ditch to the north of the Rattlesden Road Allotments had been blocked by the landowner to the north, whose riparian responsibility it was to maintain the ditch. The likely impact of the blocked ditch was that the allotment lands would be more prone to flooding during the winter months and heavy rainfall.

Page | 2053

20.10.18

Noted:

That when any other Council business for information, to be noted or for inclusion on a future agenda was invited:

- Cllr Holborn requested that the development of the four year workplan for the parish be included on the agenda.

20.10.19

Noted:

Confirmation that the scheduled date for the next meeting was Monday 7th December 2020 either at the village hall, or by remote zoom meeting at

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84872671655?pwd=cnhpUXNVSmVZcjNhME9COXBtMmQrZz09>

Meeting ID: 848 7267 1655

Passcode: 931387

Dial In

[+44 203 481 5240](tel:+442034815240)

[+44 131 460 1196](tel:+441314601196)

[+44 203 051 2874](tel:+442030512874)

[+44 203 481 5237](tel:+442034815237)

20.10.20

Noted: Close of meeting 22:10

Signed: Haslett Schofield

Date: 18/01/2021