

DRINKSTONE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

of an Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on

Monday April 12th via Zoom

Page | 2078

Present: Cllrs R Edmondson, J Elnaugh, P Holborn, T Moss, & P Selvey
Clerk & RFO Hilary Workman, Jane Hill
Cllr Otton (part), 5 Members of the Public

Minutes silence for the Late Prince Philip

21.04.01 **Noted:** That there were no apologies for absence to be noted or approved

21.04.02 **Noted:** That

- 2.1 There were no Members' Declarations of Local Non-Pecuniary Interests and/or Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in subsequent Agenda items
- 2.2 There were no declarations of lobbying for planning matters on the agenda their nature, including gifts of hospitality exceeding £25
- 2.3 There were no requests for dispensations
- 2.4 There were no additions and/or deletions to the Council's Register of Interests

21.04.03 Resolved

That the Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 1st March, 2021, and the Extraordinary Parish Council meeting on 8th March 2021, be agreed as a true record.

21.04.04 Noted:

To consider the co-option of two Councillors to the Parish Council and to take action as appropriate

4.1 **Resolved**

That Miss Emily Elnaugh be co-opted on to Drinkstone Parish Council to serve forthwith.

Signed declaration of acceptance

21.04.05 **Noted:**

To consider correspondence to this meeting not dealt with as an Agenda item or in the Clerk's report.

5.1 SALC Updates

5.2 Suffolk County Council – Automatic Number Plate Recognition

5.3 BMSDC

- Sport & Physical Activity Survey
- Local Plan Update
- Patient & Public Survey – West Suffolk Hospital

5.4 Drinkstone Educational Charity

5.5 Suffolk Constabulary – Constables Country

21.04.06 **Noted:** 8:06pm

That when Public comment or question was invited on any Agenda item, there was none.

Signed: *Richard Edmondson*

Dated: 10th May 2021

21.04.07 **Noted:**

Reports to this meeting from District and County Council Ward Member Cllr Penny Otton, from Portfolio Holders or other agencies and to take action as appropriate.

- 7.1 Cllr Penny Otton - Suffolk County & Mid Suffolk District Councils (*circulated*)

Cllr Otton further advised of the new ANPR scheme which may be worth applying for additional inclusion in this scheme.

- 7.2 Cllr Richard Edmondson - Allotments (*circulated*)
 7.3 Cllr Janet Elnaugh - Planning & Community Engagement (*circulated*)
 7.4 Vacancy - Playing field and play equipment
 7.5 Cllr Peter Holborn - Tree Warden & DNP Environment Grp (*circulated*)

Cllr Holborn further summarised the Queen's Green Canopy Project, which would need the support of both the parish council and local landowners. Cllr Edmondson noted that the project would fit well within the proposed five year plan for the parish under Environment and Sustainability and the meeting agreed to look at the project in more detail at a subsequent meeting.

- 7.6 Cllr Tim Moss - Village Assets & Hall Ctte Rep (*circulated*)

A request had been received to use the phone box as a seed exchange. Following a brief discussion the meeting agreed that it had no objection to the phone box being used for this purpose, the organisation of the exchange to be co-ordinated by Mr Giles Youngs with the Lynn Hannant as Chair of the Gardening Club. Cllr Edmondson reported that he had some staging which could be donated to create shelf.

- 7.7 Vacancy - Footpaths & Byeways
 7.8 Cllr P Selvey - Highways (*circulated*)

The meeting agreed with Cllr Selvey's suggestion that SID data be published in the parish magazine, noting that it was anonymised.

21.04.08 **Noted:** the clerks report that

- 8.1 The VAT126 claim for Quarter 4 had been submitted (£2465.55).

8.2 **Resolved**

That Jane Hill be appointed as Clerk to Drinkstone Parish Council with effect from 13th April 2021 and Responsible Financial Officer (RFO) for the financial year (2021-2022), with effect from 17th May 2021.

- 8.3 SALC had advised that as a sole Trustee of the allotments, VAT on items purchased for the allotments should not be reclaimed.
 8.4 The Charity Commission had contacted the parish council with respect to a charity registration for the Recreation Ground (previously circulated as **DPC.21.04.01**). The meeting noted that there were no assets held in respect of the charity, and agreed that the charity should be lapsed in accordance with any requirements of the Charity Commission.
 8.5 Preparation of documents for the Annual Audit was underway, and that in accordance with recent guidance from SALC and 2020 Practitioners Guidelines, draft Reserves and Internal Control policies had been tabled and circulated as **DPC.21.04.02**.

Resolved

To adopt the draft reserves & internal control policies attached at Appendices A & B to DPC.21.04.02 and make provision for any necessary actions arising from adoption of those policies.

- 8.6 the schedule of meeting dates had been booked with the Village Hall.

21.04.09 **Noted:**

Signed: Richard Edmondson

Dated: 10th May 2021

9.1 The following income:

	DESCRIPTION	£
9.1.1	Allotments Rents	£69.00

The clerk further reported that the VAT claims and first half precept had now been paid.

Page | 2080

9.2 The following payments for authorisation:

	DESCRIPTION	£
9.2.1	Suffolk Association of Local Councils – Annual Subscription	£268.76
9.2.2	Clerk - Expenses Q4 2020.21	£29.05
9.2.3	Refund to Haslett Schofield – Plaque for Defibrillator	£37.99
9.2.4	Refund Shell Energy allotment electricity overpayment of refund	£452.24

9.3 **Resolved**

That the expenses listed above (9.1-9.4) be authorised for payment.

9.4 The following payments previously authorised:

	DESCRIPTION	£
9.4.1	Clerk Salary Period 11 (Feb '21) (Min. Ref. 20.06.7.2)	£279.19
9.4.2	Playdale Playground (Aerial Runway) # (Min. Ref 20.12.6.3.2)	£6091.34
9.4.3	Playdale Playground (Nest Swing) # (Min.Ref 21.01.6.3.2)	£1997.84
9.4.4	Unity Trust Bank – Service Charge	£18.00
9.4.5	Clerk Salary Period 12 (March '21) Min Ref. 20.06.7.2	£251.69
9.4.6	Elancity UK – SID Evolis Radar Speed Sign (Min. Ref. 20.12.6.8.2)	£2272.74

9.5 To note the current account balances and reconciliation to 31st March 2021, as scheduled, together with the Cash Book summary, and the Chairman's confirmation that they are supported by relevant Bank Statements.

9.6 To note and approve a summary of direct debits on the following accounts for the 2021-2022 financial year, as set out below:

Lloyds Bank – Allotments Account

PAYEE	PURPOSE	AMOUNT	DUE DATE
WAVE	Water: Gedding Road	Variable	Quarterly
WAVE	Water: Rattlesden Road	Variable	Quarterly

Unity Trust – Current Account

PAYEE	PURPOSE	AMOUNT	DUE DATE
UNITY TRUST BANK	Service Charge	£18.00	Quarterly

9.7 The meeting considered a schedule of due payments on a regular basis for the financial year 2021.22 (previously circulated as **DPC.21.04.03**) and **Resolved**
To authorise the schedule of due payments arising on a regular basis, as identified in report DPC.21.04.03 for the financial year 2021-22.

9.8 **Resolved**

Signed: Richard Edmondson

Dated: 10th May 2021

To update the banking mandates for Unity Trust Bank and Lloyds Bank accounts to add Jane Hill as administrator.

9.9 Resolved

To add Emily Elnaugh as an authorised signatory to the Unity Trust Bank.

21.04.10 Noted:

12.1 The meeting considered the Financial Risk Assessment previously circulated in report **DPC.21.04.04** for approval and

Resolved

That this Council receives and approves the Risk Assessments (circulated & tabled as DPC.21.04.04) as being a proper assessment of the risks facing the Council and that they demonstrate that appropriate management of those risks is in place and that the Chairman of this Meeting should sign the Financial Risk Assessment thereby tabled as properly reflecting the assessment of the Council's financial risk.

Page | 2081

21.04.11 **Noted:** the following Planning results as notified by MSDC:

11.1 **DC/21/00043** – Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/20/05201
Condition 3 (Eaves and Verges)
Condition 4 (Materials)
Condition 5 (Fenestration) and
Condition 6 (Manufacturer's Details)

Rookery Farm, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SZ

BMSDC: Accepted

11.2 **DC/21/00323** - Householder Planning Application
Erection of a single storey lean to extension to front and side, insertion of first floor window and alteration to driveway.

High Gables, School Meadow, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SW

BMSDC: Granted **DPC:** No Objections

11.3 **DC/21/00491** – Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/20/03413
Condition 3 (Brickwork Details), Condition 4 (Details of Lime Mortar),
Condition 5 (Fenestration Details), Condition 6 (Glazed Link Details),
Condition 7 (Eave Details) and Condition 8 (Rainwater Goods).

Tanwood, The Street, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SR

BMSDC: Accepted

11.4 **DC/20/00466** – Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/20/03889-
Condition 3 (Eaves and Verges),
Condition 4 (Materials), Condition 5 (Fenestration) and
Condition 6 (Rooflight)

Rookery Farm, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SZ

BMSDC: Accepted

21.04.12 **Noted:** the following Planning applications notified by MSDC for comment.

12.1 **DC/21/01259** - Householder Planning Application
Erection of two-storey extension;
Erection of garage and improved main entrance access including covered structures for bin storage and delivery shelter.

Drinkstone Hall, Gedding Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9TG

Report DPC.21.04.05 refers

The meeting noted that this application had been withdrawn

Signed: *Richard Edmondson*

Dated: 10th May 2021

- 12.2 **DC/21/01339** - Full Planning Application
 Erection of detached dwelling and creation of new vehicular access;
 Erection of cart lodge serving Abbots Lodge (re-submission of withdrawn application DC/20/02952)
Abbots Lodge, The Street, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9SX
Report DPC.21.04.06 referred

The meeting considered the application, report DPC.21.04.06, and the following points raised in discussion:

- That the proposed development was disproportionate to the size of the plot, being still significantly larger than the original 170 square meters approved in outline planning permission, and reaching both boundaries, which the original proposed development did not.
- That the proposed development was still not sympathetic to other properties, being still a very contemporary building.
- That the proposed development would be likely to have a severe impact on trees and hedgerows

And determined to object to the application for the reasons set out below:

1. The original approval was specifically conditioned to be for a single storey structure, to minimise any adverse impact on the listed building in whose curtilage it is located.

The proposal does not comply with the following Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan policies, which, following approval by MSDC, are now deemed to carry significant weight in determining planning applications.

2. The proposed development is disproportionate with regards to its mass in relation to the plot size extending to the boundary on the east side. Drawing 762-1C 009, site block plan, shows the existing approved outline plan and the proposed scheme, the proposed scheme is far larger than the original outline plan. Whilst the proposed plans incorporate the cartlodge into the dwelling building, the outline planning that was granted detail a design more in keeping with regard to neighbouring properties by having separate dwelling and cartlodge which if positioned carefully would have a low impact upon neighbouring properties.

The proposed planning application includes an additional cartlodge for Abbots Lodge, a similar layout/design for the proposed new dwelling would be in keeping with other properties.

DRN11 - Heritage assets

3. While the proposed dwelling has taken note of and detailed the use of materials that are used in neighbouring buildings (brick plinth, rendered walls, clay tile roof) the design (particularly fenestration) is not sympathetic to neighbouring properties which are listed or buildings of local significance (Church Pyghtle) and would not blend harmoniously within existing buildings and landscape.

The streetscape will also be impacted, as the increased mass of the building brings it closer to the boundary and therefore more visible from the highway. Thus it does not comply with DRN12 - Design Considerations.

4. The proposed dwelling will result in increased water run off onto the highway in an area where there are existing problems with excess water run off. Even with a gulley, water would be fed further along the road to an area which is prone to flooding. This does not comply with DRN12

5. The application shows excavation of the site in order to incorporate lower level parking, with a lift and lobby area as well as the removal of trees to the

east side and streetline. The excavation will result in damage to the roots of trees which could have an impact upon the health of the remaining trees and hedgerows. The loss of trees and hedgerow screening would impact significantly upon the streetscape, the visibility of the building, and its bearing on neighbouring properties. Thus it does not comply with DRN9 – Biodiversity

The site lies in an area of archaeological potential, near the medieval church of All Saints and close to a medieval moated enclosure. Recent archaeological investigations close to the site have identified medieval occupation remains, there is high potential for the discovery of below-ground heritage assets of archaeological importance within this area, and groundworks associated with the development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains that exist.

DRN11 Heritage assets

1. Planning History

The outline planning application DC/18/04841, approved in 2018, was for a single storey dwelling of 170m² with a three bay cart lodge.

Approval was specifically conditioned on the proposed new dwelling being a single storey structure.

Reason - to secure an orderly and well designed development sympathetic to the significance of the neighbouring listed building and in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area"

The Parish council did not submit a comment with regard to the original application as the outline plan detailed a single storey development of a mass that appeared appropriate for its setting.

The current application, DC/21/01339, is different from the original outline plan in terms of size, mass and detailed design with a lower level incorporated parking.

2. Compliance with Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan

The Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan (DNP) has been approved by MSDC and now carries significant weight in determining planning applications. The DNP has been referred to throughout the Parish Council's consideration of this planning application. The relevant policies are:

DRN3 - Housing Allocations

DRN11 - Heritage Assets

DRN12 - Design Considerations

DRN9 - Biodiversity

2.1 Policies DRN1 and DRN3

The site is an Allocated Site in the DNP

2.2 Policy DRN11 - Heritage Assets

To ensure the conservation of the village's heritage assets, proposals must:

DRN11 c. contribute to the village's local distinctiveness, built form and scale of its heritage assets as described in the Landscape Appraisal and Built Character Assessment, through the use of appropriate design and materials

DRN11 d. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing and detailed design which respect the area's character, appearance and its setting, in line with the AECOM Design Guidelines for Drinkstone

This also touches on Policy DRN10 - Buildings of Local Significance. The neighbouring property, Church Pightle is such a building and is included in the NP Appendix B - Buildings of Local Significance

Signed:

Richard Edmondson

Dated: 10th May 2021

The specific design issues under DRN11 overlap with those in DRN12, and are dealt with there.

It is the Council's view that the size mass and design of the proposed dwelling is disproportionate to neighbouring properties within whose curtilage it will be located.

2.3 Policy DRN12 - Design Considerations states:

Page | 2084

"Proposals for new development must reflect the local characteristics of Drinkstone and create and contribute to a high quality, safe and sustainable environment.

Planning applications should, as appropriate to the proposal, demonstrate how they satisfy the requirements of the Development Design Checklist in Appendix C of the plan and take account of the AECOM Design Guidelines for Drinkstone." Specifically designs should:

"DRN12 a. recognise and address the key features, characteristics, landscaping/building character, local distinctiveness and special qualities of the area and/or building as identified in the Built Character Assessment and, where necessary prepare a landscape assessment appraisal to demonstrate this

DRN12 d i. taking mitigation measures into account, do not affect adversely any historic character architectural or archaeological heritage assets of the site and its surroundings, including those locally identified Buildings of Local Significance listed in Appendix B and subject to Policy DRN10

DRN12 f. produce designs that respect the character, scale, height and density of the locality."

The Street area of Drinkstone contains 15 listed buildings which is the highest concentration in the parish. The site is within the curtilage of a Grade II listed building, with a further 6 listed buildings and a Building of Local Significance within 300m

DRN12 i "not result in water run off that would add to or create surface water flooding"

The site is elevated above the road and will require the construction of a metalled sloping driveway. The immediate area is already subject to regular water run off in winter from a nearby pond and water course. Additional runoff from the proposed site would exacerbate this issue.

2.5 Policy DRN9 - Biodiversity

Development proposals should avoid the loss of or substantial harm to important trees, hedgerows and other natural features ponds and watercourses. Where such losses are unavoidable:

- i) The benefits of the development proposal must be demonstrated clearly to outweigh any impacts; and
- ii) Suitable mitigation measures that may include equivalent or better replacement of the lost features will be required

Page | 2085

The application shows excavation of the site in order to incorporate lower level parking. The excavation could have an impact upon the health of the remaining trees and hedgerows. The loss of trees and hedgerows would impact significantly upon the streetscape and the visibility of the building, and its bearing on neighbouring properties.

Parish Council Objection

12.3 DC/21/01345 Application for Planning Permission without Compliance of Conditions

Application under S73a for Removal or Variation of a Condition following grant of planning permission DC/19/02836 dated 23/08/2019 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the Erection of 1No dwelling - Vary Condition 2 (approved plans and documents) To include extension to garage.

Block Plan - Proposed 579.19.01.C

Proposed Plans and Elevations 579.19.02.C to replacement drawings

Block Plan - Proposed 579.19.01.D

Proposed Plans and Elevations 579.19.02.D

which show a garage extension & replacement of garage door with window

Land Adjacent Greyfriars (Plot 2) Rattlesden Road, Drinkstone, Bury St Edmunds IP30 9TL

Report DPC.21.04.07 refers.

The meeting considered the application, report DPC.21.04.07, objections submitted to BMSDC by two local residents and copied to the parish council and the following points raised in discussion:

- the proposed development is about:
 - 1.5 times as large as the neighbouring house currently under construction
 - 6 times as large in floor area as the detached house next door but one and
 - 12 times as large as the neighbouring bungalow
- The proposed additional extension would result in a property of a similar size to the withdrawn and opposed application.
- There did not appear to be a 6m gap between elevations and the boundary which would mean it would be likely not be possible to complete landscaping and environmental works.
- The neighbouring development had not been completed in accordance with its conditions.
- At present, there was still a view out east to open countryside from Rattlesden road. If the application were to be approved, this would be lost.

And determined to object to the application for the reasons set out below:

The application for an additional extension to consist of additional garaging, toilet facilities and study area of approximately 133m² would increase the footprint of the property by at least another third.

Signed: *Richard Edmondson*

Dated: 10th May 2021

An original application DC/19/01715 which was withdrawn, details a property of similar proportion to this application, this was opposed by the parish council (see below)

The Parish Council takes the view that the proposed development does not harmonize with the adjacent properties, when considered in the context of the height, mass and general proportions of adjacent buildings. For example, the proposed development is about:

- **1.5 times as large as the neighbouring house currently under construction**
- **6 times as large in floor area as the detached house next door but one and**
- **12 times as large as the neighbouring bungalow**

The proposed additional extension would result in a property of a similar size to the withdrawn and opposed application.

With regard to the granted application DC/19/02836, there appear to be discrepancies regarding the position and measurements of distance to boundaries between the proposed site plans submitted in Jan 2019 drawing 579.19.01 Rev C and drawing 579.19.01 Rev D

The boundary to the NW on drawing Rev C states there is 10.4 metres between the far corner of the dwelling and the boundary to the adjacent property. However drawing Rev D shows the boundary substantially greater, in fact it allows for the proposed additional garage extension of 6 metres, a walkway to the dwelling (dimensions not detailed but approximately 4 metres) with the distance to the boundary from the proposed garage remaining 6.5 metres.

The site plans also detail the planting of native hedging, installation of bat and bird boxes and planting of trees, indeed tree planting is indicated where the proposed extension is sited.

To date there has not been any planting of native hedging on the site or the adjacent site which was completed by the applicant. Nor have the bird and bat boxes been erected despite these proposals forming part of the details that were submitted and approved.

This does not conform to Neighbourhood Plan Policy DR9 – Biodiversity.

This was highlighted on the 15/07/2019 by the Parish Council in their response to the application. *The applicant is proposing to plant or reinstate hedging around the site, with native species or those of ecological value. This is to be commended, but the only planting to date has been partial laurel hedging on the road side to replace the native hedge the applicant removed. The Parish Council is concerned that planting and re-instatement of native hedges on site might not take place on completion of the development.*

In granting permission the planning officer commented

The proposed dwelling by way of its siting, scale, form and detailed design is consistent with the approved dwelling to the north (ref: DC/18/01727) and with existing buildings surrounding the area. The proposed design, materials, form and scale are considered to respect the character of the area, not constitute over development of the plot and not harm local distinctiveness.

Due to the position of the dwelling within the site and the distances from the neighbours to the north-west and west, it is not considered that the proposal would result in demonstrable harm to the amenities currently enjoyed by occupants of these neighbouring properties.

The addition of the proposed extension would increase the scale of the building further and therefore it would not be consistent or in keeping with the surrounding area. Policy DRN12 - Design Considerations of the Neighbourhood Plan

Parish Council Objection

Signed: Richard Edmondson

Dated: 10th May 2021

12.4 DC/21/01524 - Planning Application

Erection of domestic cartlodge/garage with new resin bound gravel finish to hardstanding area

Land North Of, Cross Street, Drinkstone, Suffolk**Report DPC.21.04.08 refers**

The meeting considered the application, report **DPC.21.04.08**, and the comment of a member of the public at the meeting, who agreed with the content of report DPC.21.04.08, and determined to object to the application for the reasons set out below:

This application follows previous application DC/20/05531 which the council objected to.

Whilst the design of the proposed garage has been altered, concerns highlighted by the parish council remain the same.

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 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 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 proposed development is adjacent to Stotts Cottages which are Grade II listed, the proposed site is adjacent to Number 1 Stotts cottages, not number 2 and would therefore compromise privacy for future residents of number 1.

Cross Street has three Grade II buildings and two buildings of local significance. The proposed development is situated immediately beside two of the Grade II buildings, which will change the setting of the buildings by the loss of the space, setting and wider build environment.

There is sufficient space adjacent to number 2 Stotts Cottage that would be within the settlement boundary (providing the any development is not too far back, towards the north) however the impact upon the listed buildings would remain the same.

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'.

The proposed cartlodge/garage is 5.25m tall at its highest point, this could provide the opportunity for future change of use to additional residential use which the Parish Council would object to.

Whilst the applicant has highlighted an issue with fly tipping there have been no reports of such issues to the parish council.

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.

Parish Council Objection

12.5 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.

12.6 The recent Consultation on Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Beyton Parish Council, and the draft response set out at Appendix B to report **DPC.21.04.09.**

Cllr Holborn noted that there were only two significant things

- flooding in Beyton outside the school and coming off a14 and underpass wanted to see a stronger commitment in NP to resolve those issues. Highways due to be working on this week, and Amanda Mayes looking at area in vicinity of school, and highways England.
- The other one concerned secondary and tertiary impacts on development of Thurston on Beyton and Drinkstone local traffic (particularly to and from Beyton campus).

12.6.1 Resolved.

That the Clerk makes known the Council's responses to the Beyton Parish Council, as set out in Appendix B to report DPC.21.04.09

Page | 2088

21.04.13

Noted:

That when Planning matters for information, to be noted or for inclusion on a future agenda were invited, the following:

- DNP concern, raised by Clls Elnaugh and Holborn, with respect to Babergh Mid Suffolk District Council's failure to reference the Drinkstone Parish Council settlement boundary in reaching their decisions on planning applications – with exception of one application they had overlooked this.

Cllr Holborn reported that the DNP Steering Group had drafted a letter to Philip Isbell that DNP carries significant weight and should be referenced by BMSDC when giving reasons on planning decisions. This was a matter of particular concern for the parish council as many local government electors in the parish would be likely to be voting in the referendum on the adoption of the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan, on the basis of it carrying significant weight.

Cllr Holborn noted that the latest version of joint local plan had amended the settlement boundary addressing some oversights reported by Drinkstone Parish Council in its response to the consultation on the local plan. Those had now been corrected by BMSDC, in effect agreeing the DNP settlement boundary as published. The concern raised was that some of the planning officers did not seem to be referring to it, and as a result applications were being determined against the District Council's own policy. Cllr Holborn further noted that contentious planning issues should be called in and considered by planning committee.

Cllr Otton advised that she had not been aware that this was an issue. Cllr Elnaugh suggested that this might be a training issue for planning officers.

The meeting asked the clerk, in consultation with Cllr Elnaugh & Cllr Holborn, to write to Philip Isbell at BMSDC, to raise the parish council's concerns as set out above. Cllr Otton advised that the letter should be sent to Tom Barker, the director, (who was very involved and supportive of Neighbourhood Planning) with a copy to Philip Isbell, and requested that she be copied in on the correspondence.

21.04.14

Noted:

The proposed Strategy Document for Drinkstone Parish Council (previously circulated as **DPC.21.04.10**). In developing the strategy, Cllrs had considered items identified in NP which hadn't yet been actioned. The Strategy Document did not specifically reference the DNP community actions, as they fell within the priority work areas.

14.1 Resolved**Signed:***Richard Edmondson***Dated: 10th May 2021**

To adopt the Strategy Document for Drinkstone Parish Council set out in DPC.21.04.10

21.04.15 **Noted:**
An update on the progress of the Drinkstone Neighbourhood Plan had been discussed and action agreed under 21.04.13 on the agenda.

21.04.16 **Noted:**
That when public comment or questions on any matter of Council business was invited, the following:

- A member of public who had joined the meeting thanked the parish council for all the work it did, particularly the new speed indicator signs.

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

- Cllr Selvey proposed a rota for SID support (ideally 2 for each) moving signs and changing batteries, noting that he would develop a risk assessment and method statement

21.04.16 **Noted:**
That the scheduled date for the next meeting would be **Tuesday** 4th May 2021 by remote zoom meeting

Annual Meeting of Drinkstone Parish Council

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82244185136?pwd=OER5emx0c2ZVZzdDMjlqRTJTdUE4Zz09>

Meeting ID: 822 4418 5136

Passcode: 093815

You can also dial in direct from your mobile or landline on the numbers below:

[+44 203 481 5240](tel:+442034815240), [+44 131 460 1196](tel:+441314601196), [+44 203 051 2874](tel:+442030512874), [+44 203 481 5237](tel:+442034815237)

21.04.17 **Noted:** Close of meeting. 9:29pm

Signed: *Richard Edmondson*

Dated: 10th May 2021