BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

The Minute of the meeting held at 7.30pm on Monday 14th December 2020 via Zoom video call due to Covid 19 restrictions.

Present: *Councillors Aitchison, Baker, Fletcher, Locke, Mitson-Woods (Chair) and Summers. Also present County Councillor West, four member of the public and Clerk Catherine Bacon.*

9/20-21/1 Welcome from the Chairman

Chairman Cllr Mitson-Woods welcomed Councillors, SC Councillor Paul West and the members of the public to the meeting. The Chair thanked Nick Hayward and David Russell for their hard work clearing the village triangle and taking saplings for Kathy Churchill and Victor Scott to plant on Brook Farm.

9/20-21/2 Apologies were received from East Councillor Cook *(prior work engagement)* and Cllr Williams *(work).*

9/20-21/3 There were no Declarations of Interest.

9/20-21/4 Public Forum With the village triangle tidied, it was suggested that there should be more regular maintenance of the site allowing for a break during the growing period for the wild orchids to flower. Another resident stated that work to protect wildflower verges continues and stated that a meeting was arranged with Andrew Reid (Highways Department, SCC) and Cllr Locke to discuss issues further.

9/20-21/5 It was resolved that the Chairman should sign the Minute of the Meeting held on 12th November 2020 as a true and accurate record. *(Circulated and on website)*

9/20-21/6 County Councillor West stated that SCC were waiting to find out whether Suffolk would be changing its COVID tier restriction banding. SCC is also awaiting confirmation on the Government Financial Settlement; there is a confirmation that council tax will increase by 2-4% but actual figure to be finalised. Currently three quarters of the SCC budget goes on adult social care and childcare; COVID has increased pressures on this by 15%. Funding for all services has to be budgeted and acquired through council tax or central government.

9/20-21/7 There was no report from East Suffolk Councillor Cook. Key points from the most recent East Suffolk newsletter are financial support is available for businesses, residents urged to shop local this Christmas, East Suffolk Council's leisure centres have re-opened and further funding is available to tackle social isolation. Finally, the New Environmental Guidance Note has been approved. The Guidance Note was produced after the Council declared a climate emergency and aims to support the Council's environmental vision in building the right environment for East Suffolk and its commitment to be carbon neutral by 2030.

9/20-21/8 Financial Matters

a) The RFO reported the PC account had been reconciled and the current balance is £3596.26 (of which £290 is 100+ prize money).
b) The RFO reported the 100+ account has been reconciled and the current balance is £83.33.
c) It was resolved that payment of SALC invoice 23899; Planning Webinar 14th October 2020 (£25 + £5) was authorised.
d) The RFO explained that through a combination of administration error relating to a cheque and the restricted limit of £500 for online banking led to an increased timeframe of paying

an invoice of £3000. The invoice was paid online over six days in instalments of £500. The RFO explained that the PC account can contain £3000-4000 and that when the HSBC account was opened, the internet banking limit was set at £500 to help reduce the risk of high proportions of the account being removed if there were problems with the online banking. The RFO asked the Parish Council to discuss the option of increasing the limit to help pay future large invoices more easily.

Cllr Locke asked whether the limit could be increased in order to pay the invoice and then reduced again afterwards. The RFO stated that two signatories are required to go into a branch to change the limit and may be difficult if needed to be done regularly. She also said that it took two weeks for a new signatory to be added once the paperwork has been submitted and so wondered whether the changing the limit could take too long if it followed the same process.

Cllr Fletcher asked whether there could be a holding account that could have an increased limit. The RFO did not know.

Cllr Summers asked why invoices could not be paid in multiple instalments. The RFO stated that with the invoice in question, the service provider wished the funds in their account before ordering materials and so it potentially held up work by delaying ordering materials.

Cllr Summers proposed, and Cllr Locke seconded raising the online banking limit to £1500. **It was resolved the RFO would arrange for the online banking limit to be increased to £1500.**

9/20-21/9 Budget 2021/22 The Chairman reminded Councillors that the Clerk had been in position for 18 months now and proposed that she should be awarded a one SCP raise from SCP3 (£9.39 per hour in 2020/21) to SCP4 (£9.84 per hour in 2021/22) from 01/04/2021. The Chair also proposed increasing the Clerk's hours from 4.5 to 5 per week. **It was resolved that this should be reflected in the budget before it is finalised at the January meeting.**

The budget headings were scrutinised line by line; some items such as IT and Software were amalgamated to one cost centre.

Discussions were held on the following options: -

- Cllr Fletcher reported that the cost of a new SID with writing or faces would be approximately £3000. **It was resolved that would increase expenditure by too much to add to the budget.** The Chair suggested that this could be an item bought with a grant application at a later date. Suffolk County Councillor West said that there were some Councils that didn't like these devices because they do not always have a lasting impact. Cllr Summers also questioned whether signed gateways to the village may have an impact in reducing speed. The Chair also asked whether the current SID would have a second-hand value to offset the cost of updating. Cllr Fletcher said that the provider understandably didn't provide these figures and also raised the point that technology always progresses and would have a natural lifespan.
- One outstanding item on the budget is the costing of posts/parking deterrent on the Low Street triangle. A member of the public suggested this could be achieved cheaply by creating concrete blocks. Cllr Aitchison would like this option to be developed for financial reasons. Cllr Baker thought that the posts, such as those at Earl Soham were smart. Cllr Summers proposed wooden posts with a horizontal railing. The chair asked whether the location of placing any street furniture could be discussed when Cllr Locke and the resident met with Andrew Reid (Highways Department, SCC) when discussing changes to verges to preserve wildflowers. **It was resolved to obtain costings of the various options before deciding upon the best option and allocating a figure to the budget.**

It was resolved that the RFO should calculate the revised figures and bring the Budget paper back to the meeting of 11/01/2021 for final approval and adoption. It was further resolved that the final approved budget would guide the setting of the Precept for 2021/22.

9/20-21/10 Cllr Locke reported that she had attended meetings regarding the Quiet Lanes. She stated that approval for the quiet lanes had been validated. The next stage will occur in May as Cllr Locke felt that the January timeframe for the first wave would be too soon to arrange discussion with the village. The May timeframe will provide Cllr Locke with time to circulate leaflets to the village. A decision will also need to be made where to have the Quiet Lane posts. The Chairman thanked Cllr Locke for taking on the project and working hard on it.

9/20-21/11 Planning

a) **DC/3535/QK1LPWQX06O00, Proposed new vehicular access, Red House Barn The Street Brandeston Woodbridge Suffolk IP13 7AB**

The applicant attended the meeting to state why he had submitted an application for a new entrance. These were:

- The current entrance is 15m inside the 30mph sign and vehicles approach the village fast which makes it difficult when exiting, particularly when towing trailers.
- Having a separate entrance would prevent the applicant driving past the holiday accommodation and disturbing holidaymakers when in residence.
- The future construction traffic now and in the future will continue to disturb the holidaymakers if the new entrance is not approved.
- The site of the proposed entrance is where the hedging is currently poor and there would be no detrimental damage if it was removed.
- The applicant does not believe that the site of the planning application is within the conservation area, as stated in an objection on the Planning Portal.
- The applicant believes that the new driveway provides better/clearer visibility for entering and exiting the property.

One resident felt that the site of the proposed driveway would mean cars adjoining the road where traffic travelled faster. The applicant's response to this was that the visibility was better and made it safer.

Another resident stated that the drawings were misleading. On the plans, the current access is stated as having shared ownership rather than being owned by Lord Cunliffe with a covenant held by the applicant. The resident stated that large farm machinery uses the current entrance and has never had an issue with access. Planning permission for the Red House Barn conversion was approved 15 years ago with certain conditions; this was reiterated by a Cllr. The resident stated that he was disappointed that the applications have had so many errors in them which are noticeable to anyone with experience in the construction industry which both he and the applicant have. A further resident supported the resident's statement.

The Chair asked the councillors for their views on the proposed planning application.

Cllr Summers stated that she objected the planning application with the following Material Reasons for Objection:

1. The property forms a key part to the gateway of the village, preservation of this gateway is key to the nature and environmental setting of Brandeston village.

2. The original access serves an historic farmyard cluster of buildings, access being between the Red House and the Red House Barn. Creation of a new and supplementary driveway will

materially detract from the appearance and the way in which the original cluster of buildings functions.

3. A new and supplementary access would encourage the extension of domestic use towards the countryside.

4. A new and supplementary access would encourage separation of the use of the Holiday Accommodation annexe to the main Red House Barn.

5. Traffic approaching Brandeston from the Earl Soham direction and turning right into the proposed entrance, does not have adequate forwards vision to allow a safe turning manoeuvre into the proposed entrance against on-coming traffic. This is traffic which will be accelerating out of the 30mph zone.

6. There is no justification for creation of another entrance onto the Street where the site already benefits from adequate access.

Cllr Summers also made reference to:

Planning Validation of Application C12//1626 dated 26th July 2012.

1. The use of the accommodation within the granary/annexe/holiday accommodation building as a dwelling is permitted only during the construction of the development permitted by C12/0736 and the use as a dwelling shall cease upon completion of the main barn/dwelling permitted under C12/0736 or on 9th January 2016 (which-ever is the earlier). After which, the use shall be in accordance with that permitted by Condition 4 of C12/0736 (as garaging and an annexe to the main barn or as holiday accommodation).
   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved, in the interests of amenity, the protection of the local environment and because the permission is allowed as an exception to countryside and housing policies to facilitate site security and construction of the development permitted under C12/0736.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended the General Permitted Development Amendment (No2) Order 2008) or any Order revoking or re-enacting the said Order] no development of any kind specified in Part 1, Classes A, B, C and D of Schedule 2 of the said Order shall be carried out unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. (Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D and E refers to refer to refer to extensions, external alterations, outbuildings etc).
   Reason: Residential use is permitted only for a temporary period; to protect the character of the building and impact upon Brandeston Conservation Area and the designated Special Landscape Area.

There was an agreement from Cllrs regarding Cllr Summers points raised though many did not agree with material objection point 5. Cllr Fletcher stated that he would agree to a temporary entrance for construction traffic. Cllr Baker questioned why extra access was needed and agreed with both Cllrs Summers and Fletcher. Cllr Locke agreed that cars do leave the village fast but agreed with Cllr Baker. Cllr Aitchison had viewed the site. She thought there was good visibility from the new entrance but thought the old access was fine. She agreed with Cllr Fletcher regarding a temporary entrance for construction traffic.

The Chair asked for a vote and it **was resolved that the Parish Council recommend DC/3535/QK1LPWQX06O00, Proposed new vehicular access, Red House Barn The Street Brandeston Woodbridge Suffolk IP13 7AB be refused.** Feedback on the Planning Portal shall include the Material Objections stated above, excluding point 5, and also referencing Planning Validation of Application C12/1626 dated 26th July 2012.

b) To discuss general planning matters arising

The Chair has been approached by an applicant of a planning permission that had been refused by both the Parish Council and East Suffolk Council. The subject of the refusal was a construction in the front garden which was ordered to be removed by the planning officer. Since erecting a fence in front of the construction, the applicant stated that neighbours are now saying that they would not object had they known the new fence would hide the construction. The applicant asked the Chair if the Parish Council had any influence on the planning decision previously enforced. The Chair had informed her that the Parish Council did not and advised the applicant to speak to the planning authorities directly.

9/20-21/12 Heritage Signs

a) The Chair reported that the clerk had requested quotes from companies regarding heritage signs with round posts. The clerk had a response from one whom stated that "the cost of making them is probably going to be prohibitive." Cllr Fletcher queried why we were asking companies that didn't specialise in heritage signs and the clerk responded that the website showed that they produced the signs we wanted. The Chair had assisted the clerk by chasing a second of these companies. The company asked how the request for a quote was submitted and when the Chair said it was through the website was informed that the website doesn't always work. The clerk also reported that she was informed by Highways at SCC that if we chose the SCC design of sign SCC would have access to spares and would maintain the signs; whereas if the Parish Council chose an independent supplier the cost of repairs and maintenance could fall to the Parish Council. Councillors pointed out that the current signs have not been maintained by SCC. The Chair asked SC Cllr Paul West if he knew more about this and but he was not aware of the information. The Chair recommended that we progress with the designs provided by Highways at SCC.

b) **The Chair proposed that the designs provided by Highways at SCC should be used. This was unanimously agreed.**

c) **It was resolved that the Clerk is authorised to order the installation of 3 Heritage signs with payment via grants from East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council.**

9/20-21/13 Mary Revett Trust The trustees have recently met via Zoom and they still await a response from the Charity Commission. The report is due imminently.

9/20-21/14 Low Street village triangle

a) The implementation of parking deterrents was discussed in item 9/20-21/9 and will be discussed again once pricings have been confirmed+ for the various options.

9-20/20/15 Date of next Meeting Monday January 11th 2021

11:01:21