## **BARROW cum DENHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

# MINUTES OF MEETING HELD VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM ON MONDAY 12<sup>th</sup> April 2021

# Present: Cllr Pearson Cllr Holmes Cllr M Howard Cllr Wesley Cllr Cousins Cllr Kronbergs Cllr Bragg Cllr Rawlings

Minute Ref		Action
5773	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE None	
5734	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS</b> Cllr Kronbergs declared a potential interest in agenda item 24 – Farthing Cottage as the applicant is a near neighbour and friend.	
5775	<b>PUBLIC FORUM</b> The public were asked if anyone wanted to bring anything to the attention of the council.	
	A member of the public gave an update on the change of use of the Town Estate Room. The proposal to sublet the building to Colourbox Montessori nursey has enraged a significant number of people in the village. The building was renovated to be used as a community hub. The current vicar was unaware of the plans to sublet the building to Colourbox who, going forward will have control of the building and decide who can use it and when. It appears that the trustees are in breach of the charity's objectives. There is no longer a management committee as everyone resigned.	
	The trust deeds have been altered and the controllers of the TER are now the current trustees. It was stated that nothing has been signed. The Parish Council have no ability to influence or control the building. The only people who have control are the trustees.	
	The resident providing the update has offered to become a trustee and try to put things on an even keel as it would be a huge loss to the village if the TER is no longer a community hub. The main focus would be to organise ownership, so individuals do not have control of the building. The current trustees can ignore the request to become a trustee.	
	Colourbox is planning to expand and use the TER as a baby room allowing more pre-schoolers in the existing building. The room will probably be used by children from outside of the village.	
	The resident was thanked for the update.	

	A second resident addressed the Parish Council. It was stated that RV2031 identified land next to the school as a potential business park. If it is proved that this is not viable the land could be used for residential property. The resident asked if the business park didn't' go ahead is residential being considered and was interested in what benefits the school would see. Cllr Pearson responded by drawing attention to the loss of business premises/businesses in the village in recent times including Green Wellie and	
	The Old Cow Shed who both searched for additional business premises within the village. Even with COVID being considered Cllr Pearson thinks the land should be considered for business use. The results from the NHP questionnaire showed that 70% of respondents wanted businesses in the village. The school would benefit from additional land either way.	
5776	Presentation from a Representative from Hill re land near the School (Barrow Business Park).	
	Hill Residential are jointly promoting land near the school with Fleur. The land has been submitted to both the NHP call for sites and WSC's call for sites. The land currently has B1 allocation in RV31 and allows for 1 hectare of land for the school.	
	The 5.4 hectares of land is well located in terms of proximity to village amenities, approximately a 15 minute walk to the centre of the village and a 35 minute cycle to the nearest train station. After allowing the school 1 hectare there would be just over 4 hectares left for residential, approximately 90 homes.	
	Work has already been completed on habitat ecology and the proximity to listed buildings has been considered. The land is well screened on most boundaries.	
	Site access would be via Colethorpe Lane, and plans would include extending the pavements, maybe inside the development. Colethorpe Lane and Church Road would be joined for pedestrians and cyclists. They are keen to include sustainable construction methods and gave examples of water management, sustainable buildings, air source heat pumps.	
	Fleur have completed developments in Risby and Saffron Walden.	
	The Clerk was provided with a copy of the presentation.	
	It was confirmed that this is a fresh allocation, business use had not been considered as Hill and Fleur are house builders. Discussions have taken place with the Education Authority regarding gifting land to the school with minimal costs to the taxpayer.	
	Cllr Howard asked if the work completed on traffic included how many cars are likely to turn left or right out of the development. This data was not currently available.	
5777	COUNTY COUNCIL REPORT Not present	

5778	<ul> <li>To receive the Community Police Report</li> <li>Cllr Rawlings confirmed there were 389 reported crimes in the Bury St</li> <li>Edmunds area and none in the Parish. There was one recorded crime in</li> <li>Lower/Upper Green. One message was cascaded, SPCC were conducting a survey about dog theft.</li> <li>Suffolk Police have appointed a new engagement officer PC Lee Andrew</li> <li>Pierce. Cllr Rawlings has sent an email introducing himself.</li> <li>Minutes of the last meeting</li> </ul>	
	Having been previously circulated, the minutes of the planning committee meeting held on Monday 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2021, were proposed by Cllr Hudson and seconded by Cllr Holmes with all Councillors in agreement. The minutes from the full council meeting held on Monday 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2021 were proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Rawlings with all Councillors in agreement.	
5780	Village Infrastructure a) Footpath between Watson Way and Ley Road The footpath ends suddenly and gets very muddy in wet weather. This was reported to the Public Rights of Way Team who have assessed the situation and are not prepared to extend the path. They are happy for the PC to do so at their own cost. Clerk has requested quotes.	Clerk
	b) Roadside Nature Reserve Denham Cllr Holmes is concerned the small RNR in Denham is being destroyed. Clerk to speak to Highways about having it kerbed. Cllr Holmes has spoken to the people who use the stables and asked them to be more careful when towing horse boxes. Clerk to investigate signage. Cllr Holmes to speak to the landowner.	Clerk/ DH
	c) Post Box to serve the southern part of the village. A resident has suggested installing a post box in the south of the village. The post-box has not yet been returned to the Green after the telegraph pole was replaced. Cllr Bragg suggested asking for the old box to be replaced and an additional box which could be cited on the corner of Johnson Road. Cllr Bragg to provide Cllr Pearson with contact details.	JP
	d) Footpath change The Parish Council have been made aware of a change to a footpath, the field has become difficult to manage due to the size of machinery. The Parish Council has no issue with the proposal which isn't likely to happen until the Autumn.	
	e) Churchyard maintenance Cllr Cousins confirmed he is liaising with Suffolk Wildlife Trust and a plant and species survey is being completed. The plan is to make the church yard more wildlife friendly. The contractor has been informed. The areas around the graves will be cut short.	
5781	Comments made at March Meeting by Councillor Howard regarding the ability of fellow Councillors. Cllr Pearson expressed his surprise at Cllr Howards comments at the previous meeting, that the parish councillors were not capable of making a	

	decision. Cllr Howard stated he was responding to Cllr Fords question and he didn't think the Parish Council were up to the task of site selection for the NHP. When the Parish Council were asked to respond to the WSC SHEELA the parish council did not come to an agreement on site specific feedback which made it easy for WSC to ignore the comments made. Cllr Howard confirmed he stands by his comments.	
5782	Quiet Lanes Nomination A representative from Dalham kindly gave a presentation about the benefits of the Quiet Lanes. Quiet Lanes are designated rural lanes with low traffic to make people aware of other road users (walkers/cyclists/horseriders). It does not mean a reduction in speed limit.	Clerk
	<ul> <li>To designate a lane is more work than parish councils were led to believe, in summary:</li> <li>Plot signage</li> <li>Leaflet residents</li> <li>Record feedback</li> <li>Public meeting</li> <li>Formal notice of designation</li> </ul>	
	Existing signs can be used to limit the amount of street furniture. There is a template for the leaflet that has been sent to the clerk. The representative was thanked for the work she had carried out and for her	
	time. Agenda item for next meeting to decide whether to progress.	
5783	<b>Town Estate Room Change of Use</b> Cllr Ford applauded what the local resident is planning to do and felt the Parish council should get behind it.	
	Cllr Houlder stated that the grants for the refurbishment would not have been given if it was for commercial use.	
	Cllr Kronbergs gave his support to the resident and hopes the trust deed can be changed.	
5784	<b>Section 106 Monies</b> The section 106 money is due from the Woodland Rise development. The Parish Council have to decide what to spend it on. The money is ringfenced for recreational/community projects. This will be an agenda item at the next meeting where a subcommittee will be formed.	Clerk
5785	<b>Pond Quotes</b> The clerk met with a contractor who confirmed in order for the pond to be emptied the outfall pipe which is currently blocked would need to be cleared by Highways.	
	Cllr Soons joined the meeting.	

	Cllr Soons believes the landowner is responsible for clearing the pipe. Cllr Soons was asked to check and report back.	Clerk
	Clerk to send photos to Cllr Soons.	
	The quote received was for £8,900 plus VAT. The second contractor asked the Parish Council to do traffic management and to be in charge of health and safety. This quote was discounted.	
	Clerk to obtain additional quotes.	
5786	Highways a) Flooded roads to Barrow CR No: 305919 The drainage issues on Colethorpe lane have been put forward for inspection.	
5787	<b>Fishing signs and permit</b> Cllr Pearson has the signs, Cllr Ford to amend them with additional information regarding the permit. Cllr Ford, Pearson and Howard to liaise.	JP/RF/ MH
5788	Annual Parish Meeting The annual meeting will be via Zoom on 29 <sup>th</sup> April at 7pm.	
	Agenda to be the same as 2019.	
5789	<b>Date of May Meeting</b> The May meeting will be on 17 <sup>th</sup> May in the Village Hall unless regulations for virtual meetings are extended.	
5790	Neighbourhood Plan     a) Habitat Regulation Assessment	
	See appendix 1	
	The AECOM report made reference to a wastewater report from 12 years ago. Cllr Howard recommended removing this part of the report due to the age and questioned whether it would still be valid. Cllr Pearson challenged Cllr Howard and suggested the removal was because it potentially would not support development in sector 4 which appears to be the preferred sector. Cllr Howard disputed this stating conclusions drawn in 2009 may not be valid and may be misleading. He did not feel it was based on solid evidence. AECOM to be asked for up to date data. Cllr Howard to reword. Second draft will be sent for comment.	
	Cllr Cousins did not see it as an issue. The report was prior to the Barrow Hill/Simpson Way developments.	
	b) Site selection criteria & draft policies	

Clir Howard recommended putting site selection on hold until draft policies have been agreed.       c)         ave been agreed.       c)         ave been agreed.       c)         ave been agreed.       c)         begins.       d)         d)       4. Financial year admin.         Clir Howard will work the Clerk to return the unspent element of the grant.       The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.         e)       Housing Needs Assessment Number       Clire Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number is the innimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Suffolk Council's number is 294 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure its being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         f)       Response to resident email re NHP covered with the local plan is in prog			
have been agreed.       c)       3. Site presentations         It was agreed site presentations could continue until the site selection process begins.       d)       4. Financial year admin.         Clir Howard will work the Clerk to return the unspent element of the grant.       The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.       c)       Housing Needs Assessment Number         Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number is the selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number is equets to 4 houses per year. Clir Howard confirmed the housing needs number is equetes to 4 houses where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Sulfolk Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         ()       Response to resident email re NHP covered in the public forum         5791       Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July         It		See appendix 1 for detailed report.	
It was agreed site presentations could continue until the site selection process begins.       d) 4. Financial year admin.         Clir Howard will work the Clerk to return the unspent element of the grant.       The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.       c) Housing Needs Assessment Number         Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Sulfolk Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard confirmed that the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         1) Response to resident email re NHP         Covered in the public forum         5791       Fairground request 9*/10*/11* July         It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Clir Wesley and seconded by Clir Hol			
begins.       d) 4. Financial year admin.         Clir Howard will work the Clerk to return the unspent element of the grant.       Clerk/ MH         The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.       Clerk/ MH         e) Housing Needs Assessment Number Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number equates to 4 houses per year. Clir Howard confirmed the housing needs number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is 234 with 77 in pipeline. West Suffolk Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         (1) Response to resident email re NHP Covered in the public forum       1         5791       Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July       1         It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable.		c) 3. Site presentations	
Clir Howard will work the Clerk to return the unspent element of the grant.       Clerk/ MH         The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.       e)         e) Housing Needs Assessment Number Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number equates to 4 houses per year. Clir Howard confirmed the housing needs number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Suffolk Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         f) Response to resident email re NHP Covered in the public forum         5791       Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July         It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Clir Wesley and seconded by Clir Holmes.			
MH         The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.       •)         •) Housing Needs Assessment Number       Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number equates to 4 houses per year. Clir Howard confirmed the housing needs number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Suffolk Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         f)       Response to resident email re NHP covered in the public forum         5791       Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July         It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Clir Wesley and seconded by Clir Holmes.         5792       Approval of policies and procedures		d) 4. Financial year admin.	
The Planning Direct invoice of £3217.80 was approved, this was proposed by Clir Howard and seconded by Clir Kronbergs.       •)         •) Housing Needs Assessment Number Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Suffolk Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         f) Response to resident email re NHP Covered in the public forum         5791       Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Clir Wesley and seconded by Clir Holmes.         5792       Approval of policies and procedures The following policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting.		Cllr Howard will work the Clerk to return the unspent element of the grant.	
Clir Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once         delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP,         the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial         review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number         equates to 4 houses per year. Clir Howard confirmed the housing needs         number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order         to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Clir Howard confirmed that         there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is         solid.         The housing needs number is currently 154 with 77 in pipeline. West Suffolk         Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster         compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not         approved. Clir Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the         final arbiter.         The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years         to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site         allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is         in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.         f) Response to resident email re NHP         Covered in the public forum         5791       Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July         It			
Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Cllr Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the final arbiter.The plan period is to 2040 and will undergo a periodic review every 3/5 years to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.f) Response to resident email re NHP Covered in the public forum5791Fairground request 9th/10th/11th July It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Holmes.5792Approval of policies and procedures The following policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting. <ul><li>Asset inspection list</li></ul>		Cllr Pearson raised concerns over the Housing Needs number. Once delivered, where does that leave the NHP? Woolpit tried to complete a NHP, the site selection did not agree with the District Council. It went to judicial review which cost a further £15k and failed. The housing needs number equates to 4 houses per year. Cllr Howard confirmed the housing needs number is the minimum number of houses. This must be exceeded. In order to exceed it the NHP would rely on windfall/infill. Cllr Howard confirmed that there are plenty of examples where a NHP has been upheld, providing it is	
<ul> <li>to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is in progress WSC can not ignore the NHP.</li> <li>f) Response to resident email re NHP Covered in the public forum</li> <li>5791 Fairground request 9<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> July</li> <li>It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Holmes.</li> <li>5792 Approval of policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting.         <ul> <li>Asset inspection list</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Council's number is 234 with 77 in pipeline, this would not be a disaster compared to the hundreds that the parish could have if the NHP is not approved. Cllr Howard recommended sticking with the 154. The UKPI is the	
<ul> <li>Covered in the public forum</li> <li>5791 Fairground request 9<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> July</li> <li>It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Holmes.</li> <li>5792 Approval of policies and procedures meeting.         <ul> <li>Asset inspection list</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		to make sure it is being delivered. The NHP can not disagree with WSC site allocation. If the Barrow cum Denham NHP is approved with the local plan is	
It was agreed the funfair could come back this year providing the weather is favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Holmes.         5792       Approval of policies and procedures The following policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting.         • Asset inspection list		, ,	
<ul> <li>favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Holmes.</li> <li>5792 Approval of policies and procedures         The following policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting.         • Asset inspection list     </li> </ul>	5791	Fairground request 9 <sup>th</sup> /10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> July	
<ul> <li>The following policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting.</li> <li>Asset inspection list</li> </ul>		favourable. The cost to remain £100. This was proposed by Cllr Wesley and	
	5792	The following policies and procedures were circulated prior to the meeting.	
Committees terms of reference		Committees terms of reference	

	Compl	aint's procedure			
	•	rotection policy			
		inary policy			
		nent retention policy			
		nce Policy			
		and safety Policy			
	Hedge				
	Media	•		1	
			plaints an	d correspondence policy	
		anning policy	المربح مراد		
		y Notice for Members of	the public	;	
	•	y notice for staff sts for information policy			
		media policy	y		
		Code of conduct			
	These were	proposed by Cllr Rawl	ings and	seconded by Cllr Kronbergs	5.
5793		DUNCIL REPORT	bolow the	e Local Plan and confirmed	
		ays be differences in nu		E LOCAI FIAN AND CONTINNED	
	The Hopkins	Homes site had to halt v	while Angl	ia Water sorted out the	
	sewage.				
	Meetings hav Elections).	e been cancelled due to	) Purdah (	County Councillor Local	
	£650 of the lo allotment proj		given to B	arrow Primary School for thei	r
5794	Financial Ma	tters			
		eive the council's curr			
				r Wesley seconded by Cllr	
	Ford with all 0	Councillors in agreemen	t.		
	b) To cor	nfirm payments			
Payments were proposed by Cllr Wesley and seconded by Cllr Holmes wi all Councillors in agreement.					
	2020/2021 Ad	ccounts			
	EXPENDITURE				
	Cheque No.	Payee	Amount	Notes	
	BACS	Paul Squirrel – 1&1 Internet	£87.58	Annual domain fee	
	c) SALC	Invoice			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	The annual S		was agre	ed. This was proposed by Cll	r Clerk

	d) Grant Applications It was agreed to give £50 to Headway. This was proposed by Cllr Kronbergs and seconded by Cllr Hudson. It was also agreed to give £50 to Suffolk Rescue, this was proposed by Cllr Rawlings and seconded by Cllr Holmes.	Clerk
5795	<b>Risk Assessments</b> The following risk assessments were circulated prior to the meeting.	Clerk
	There were proposed by Cllr Kronbergs and seconded by Cllr Rawlings	
	<ul> <li>Car park risk assessment</li> <li>General parish risk assessment</li> <li>Parish Clerk risk assessment</li> <li>Village cleaner risk assessment</li> </ul>	
5796	PLANNING DC/21/0309/HH Farthing Cottage 39 The Green Barrow IP29 5AA Householder planning application - Single storey rear extension	
	No Objection	
	DC/21/0246/LB Barrow Primary School Church Road Barrow Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP29 5AU Application for listed building consent - replace window to rear elevation	
	No Objection	
	DC/21/0432/LB 3 Denham Barns, Lewkenors Granary Barrow Road Denham IP29 5EF Application for listed building consent - forming of external ancillary area to store oil tank and bins with pergola sitting area	
	No objection however the clerk was asked to note that the three immediate neighbours have objected as building proposed for open land.	
	DC/21/0431/HH 3 Denham Barns, Lewkenors Granary Barrow Road Denham IP29 5EF Householder planning application - a. forming of external ancillary area to store oil tank and bins with pergola sitting area b. fencing to western boundary c. storage building d. garden building to form covered sitting area	
	No objection however the clerk was asked to note that the three immediate neighbours have objected as building proposed for open land.	
	DC/20/2192/HH 3 Hudson Way Barrow IP29 5DS Householder planning application - detached car port	
	Object on DM24, not in keeping with the local area. This was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Ford.	
5797	To note the following planning determinations DC/21/0052/FUL	

	Grove Farm Colethorpe Lane Barrow IP29 5BE Planning application - partial change of use of farm building and external area to offices (class E), workshop and storage and distribution (class B2 and B8) Approved	
5798	Correspondence 05/03/21 Karen Soons Covid Election information from the Election team at West Suffolk For information	
	05/03/21 Local Resident Comments on the 1 March PC meeting For information	
	05/03/21 SALC West Suffolk area forum - summary notes For information	
	07/03/21 Local Resident Hopkins site, Barrow Hill Clerk to arrange site meeting with Hopkins Homes.	Clerk
	07/03/21 Local Resident Parish Council Meeting 01/03/21 Public Forum For information	
	12/03/21 SALC Suffolk Community Awards 2021 For information	
	16/03/21 West Suffolk Council Message from Cllr John Griffiths, Leader of West Suffolk Council to Town and Parish Councils - Grant Applications For information	
	22/03/21 West Suffolk Council How to deal with speeding concerns For information	
	23/03/21 Local Resident The Village For information	
	25/03/21 Barrow Church Owl box For information	
	29/03/21 West Suffolk Council Census information For information	
	29/03/21 SALC Council meetings For information	
	01/04/21 SALC Intro to Safeguarding - Community Action Suffolk event For information	
	06/04/21 Karen Soons April 2021 Parish Newsletter For information	

	Various SALC E-Bulletin For information	
5799	DATE OF NEXT MEETING The Annual Parish Meeting will be held via Zoom on 29 <sup>th</sup> April at 7pm. The next Parish Council meeting is to be confirmed. The meeting was closed at 10:01pm	

Appendix 1

Mark Howard 12 April 2021

Neighbourhood Plan Report

Habitat Regulation Assessment

Previously we received a draft report on the Habitat Regulation Assessment from AECOM. The draft was circulated to councillors and comments were sent back to me by email. I have collated the various comments and have drafted a letter to AECOM, summarising our feedback which has been circulated to councillors. Are there any further comment before I send it off to AECOM?

## Site Selection Criteria & draft policies

At our previous PC meeting, Richard Ford asked me if the PC could do site selection and I answered that I didn't think that we were up to the job. As I mentioned earlier, this appeared to be a difficult task - particularly based on the relatively small number of (arguably) subjective selection criteria that we had used for the SHELAA feedback. I judged that it would need some planning qualifications, skill and judgement to complete the task. Richard Ford's question was a good one and my answer spurred me to reconsider my answer to him. A set of selection criteria that requires gualifications and judgement to complete would be, by definition, a poor set of selection criteria. I did some research and have found various methods that Local Authorities use to select sites in their own Local Plans. I found some authorities using a far larger number (typically around 40 or so) of selection criteria that were largely based on objective measurements. For example, these include a site's relation to the settlement boundary – whether it was inside, adjacent to our outside; distance to centre of the settlement; distance to public transport; distance to listed buildings; distance to wildlife sites; distance from designated protection areas; tree preservation orders on the site and so on. I also found some guidance notes from Locality about site selection. They recommend a similar method using a relatively large number of mostly objective selection criteria and a simple scoring mechanism. Zigurds and I have worked to produce a draft list of 41 selection criteria. I spoke to Planning Direct and they are recommending that before starting on site selection, we should at least make a start on drafting some policies. I understand a key requirement from UK Planning Inspectorate is that gathered data, parish consultation, planning policies and site selection are consistent. So before proceeding further with site selection, I have asked Planning Direct to produce a draft set of policies which I hope to circulate before the next PC meeting, so that we can discuss and develop them.

### **Developer Presentations**

At a previous PC Meeting I was asked when developer presentations should stop. Rather than a date, I propose that we continue to allow developers to make presentations until site selection begins in earnest.

### **Financial Year Admin**

Councillors may recall a peculiar set of admin arrangements for the Locality Grant, with regards to the financial year end. Effectively we have to stop the project, write an end of project report, return any unspent money and reapply for the grant for the next financial year. I will work with the Parish Clerk to carry out the necessary admin.