



NEWTOWN LINFORD PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

You are summoned to attend the meeting of the Newtown Linford Parish Council Meeting at the Village Hall on Wednesday 27th March 2024 at 7.15 p.m. at which your attendance is required.

Signed by the Clerk *Hannah Shaw*

1. **Record of attendance.**
2. **Apologies for absence.**
3. **Confirm and sign minutes of the February Meeting.**
4. **Declaration of Parish Councillors' personal and/or prejudicial interests on agenda items.**
5. **Public Participation.**

To receive representations from the public on items on the agenda.
6. **Police Matters and NHW Update.**
7. **Bradgate Park.**
8. **Newtown Linford Biodiversity.**
9. **Report by County Councillor Deborah Taylor.**
10. **Report by Borough Councillor David Snartt.**
11. **Village Governance and Residents.**
 - To note, CBC have supplied Newtown Linford Parish with 3 boxes of Hydrosnakes 11/03/24.
 - To note, Duty of Care Tree Inspection now due. Last inspection carried out April 2021. Clerk has written to Symbiosis for a quotation and awaits a response 20/03/24.
12. **Planning: Buildings and Tree Issues - report by Tree Warden if in attendance.**
 - **Decisions**
 - a) P/23/2204/2- 482 Bradgate Road Newtown Linford - Proposed erection of detached garden room, installation of external pool in rear garden with pergola, front boundary wall with vehicular gates (Resubmission of Planning Application ref: P/23/1279/2) - Withdrawn 15/03/24.
 - b) P/24/0093/2 - 241 Markfield Lane, Newtown Linford - Erection of two storey side extension and ground floor porch extension to front - Grant Conditionally 19/03/24.

- c) P/24/0052/2 - 520B Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford - Erection of single storey pitched roof open fronted double car port – Withdrawn 08/03/24.

- **Comments submitted through Planning Explorer**

- d) P/24/0093/2 - 241 Markfield Lane, Newtown Linford – Erection of two storey side extension and ground floor porch extension to front – No Objection 15/02/24.
- e) P/24/0052/2 - 520B Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford - Erection of single storey pitched roof open fronted double car port – Objection as follows 15/02/24:

“Councillors are concerned regarding the potential impact on the neighbour, due to possible restrictions resulting from the narrowed width of the driveway and wish to object to this application.”

- f) P/24/0166/2 - 486 Bradgate Road Newtown Linford - Erection of part two storey and part single storey rear extension, new render and cladding – No Objection 15/02/24.
- g) P/24/0190/2 - Charnwood, 28 Groby Lane, Newtown Linford - Replacement of existing flat roof dormer on side elevation with new dormer with tiled hipped roof – No Objection 15/02/24.

Cllr. Porte has recused himself from the following application

- h) P/24/0205/2 - 15 Cravens Rough, Markfield, LE67 9PF - Demolition of Existing Dwelling; Erection of Replacement Dwelling and Detached Garage – No Objection 15/03/24.

- **Discuss**

- i) P/24/0197/2 - Grey Lady Restaurant, Sharpley Hill, Newtown Linford - Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of two storey detached replacement dwelling including modifications to site access (TO BE CONFIRMED).
- j) P/24/0303/2 - 88 Main Street, Newtown Linford - Erection of detached garage with landscape alterations and gate to be extended.

- **Trees**

There are no tree applications to discuss.

- **Other**

- k) CBC Local Plan hearings to resume on 20/02/24.
- l) Parish Council Response to Plans Committee Decision re P/23/0645/2 Lady Jane Grey Park 21/02/24 and correspondence thereafter (see **Schedule One**).

13. **Bob Bown Memorial Field**

14. **Village Magazine.**

15. **Parish Council Website/Facebook Page.**

The Parish Council Facebook group has increased to 501 members.

16. Village Hall.

- To note, a 70s themed event, Disco Inferno, raised £350 for the Village Hall. Further profits are expected from bar sales TBC. The next event will be held on Friday 1st November.
- To note, the Village Rummage Sale held on 02/03/24 raised over £1900 for the Village Hall, Preschool, Coffee and Cake, Jolly Tots and Brownies.

17. Highways, footpaths, street furniture, traffic, transport.

- To note, concerns of speeding in the Parish reported to LCC Highways 19/03/24 and passed to the Traffic and Signals Team for further investigation and a response. Clerk has requested costings for Average Speed Cameras along Bradgate Road and Main Street and for advice/guidance regarding existing VAS and possible MVAS unit. Enquiry number enquiry 948149.
- To note, blocked culvert under the road at Main Street/Sharpley Hill reported 20/03/24, reference HMS 948059.
- To note, blocked drains at Bob Bown access track and garages reported to CBC 13/02/24.

18. Churchyard and Cemetery.

- To note, new ash plot area now complete and plots available to purchase 16/02/24.
- To note, 60 hedgerow saplings received from the Woodland Trust and planted at the Churchyard 07/03/24.
- Councillors to consider increasing Cemetery Fees for the 2024-2025 financial year, effective from 1st May 2024 (see **Schedule Two**).

19. Correspondence.

Anstey Draft Neighbourhood Plan - Statutory Consultation period - 12 February - 25 March 2024 received by email 12/02/24 and cascaded to Councillors for comments.

Legislative change to postal vote handling and secrecy received from CBC 14/02/24 and sent to Councillors for information.

New Monitoring Officer and Deputy Monitoring Officer - Charnwood Borough Council received 26/02/24 and cascaded to Councillors. Karen Widdowson is the new Monitoring Officer and Nicola Ford is the new Deputy Monitoring Officer.

PCC's Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel - Applications Open received by email 04/03/24 and forwarded to Councillors.

20. Reports on Meetings and Trainings by Clerk and Councillors.

Clerk attended LRALC training on Agendas and Minutes 06/02/24.

Clerk attended LCC Budget Webinar 13/02/24.

Clerk attended LRALC training on Confidential Closed Sessions 04/03/24.

21. Items of interest or for future meetings.

22. Finance.

- To note, Vat Refund Claim to be submitted 31.03.24, total to date £1797.06
- To note, LRALC Internal Audit to be carried out on 16/04/24 by Stuart McDonald.

Authorisation for payment of invoices: -

Ledger Date	Payee	Payment Description	Amount	Legal Power	Notes
15.02.24	Newtown Linford Village Magazine	Donation towards production costs 2024	£700	LGA 1972 S142	
15.02.24	Firetree	Grave levelling and returfing x 11 graves	£699.60	LGA 1972 S214(6)	
16.02.24	Firetree	Grounds Maintenance 2023/24 Inv 12 of 12	£1230.55	LGA 1972 SS 19, 214 & 215	
16.02.24	Firetree	Clearance and turfing of new ash plot area	£790.78	LGA 1972 S214(6)	
28.02.24	HS	February Broadband & Out of Plan Calls	£66.32	LGA 1972 S111	
28.02.24	HS	February Salary and back pay	£1426.53	LGA 1972 S112	
04.03.24	NEST	Pension Contributions	£81.60	LGA 1972 S112	
07.03.24	Firetree	Hedgerow planting at the Churchyard	£118.92	LGA 1972 S215	
07.03.24	Cuttlefish	Website License, Hosting, Support and Domain	£552.00	LGA 1972 S142	
14.03.24	APB	Village Hall Rent April 2024 to June 2024	£750.00	LGA 1972 S133	
15.03.24	CBC	Bob Bown Lease Q4	£75.00	LGA 1972 S19	
19.03.24	Firetree	Grounds Maintenance 24/25 Inv 1 of 12	£1323.18	LGA 1972 SS 19, 214 & 215	1 st cut of the 2024-

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

					2025 season
19.03.24	Firetree	Grave levelling and returfing x 1	£63.60	LGA 1972 S214(6)	
21.03.24	HS	Travel & Miscellaneous Expenses Oct 23 – Mar 24	£136.99	LGA 1972 S111	
Total			£8,015.07		

Bank Balances:

Business Current Account @ 21/03/24	£ 2,010.58
Business Reserve Account @ 21/03/24	£60,000.00
Total	£62,010.58

Bank Reconciliation:

Carry Forward figure		£69,799.32
Expenditure	-	£ 8,015.07
Income	+	£ 226.33
Balance		£ 62,010.58

23. Date of the next Parish Council Meeting.

Wednesday 1st May 2024 7.15pm Annual Parish Meeting and Annual Parish Council Meeting.

.....
Schedule One - Parish Council Response to Plans Committee Decision re P/23/0654/2 Lady Jane Grey Park

Lady Jane Grey Park P/23/0654/2
From: Susan Pritchard
Sent: Wed, Feb 21, 2024 at 11:35 am
To: Karey Summers, David Snartt, Cllr. Deborah Taylor
Cc: parish council

Dear Ms Summers,

Following our Parish Council meeting -subsequent to your most recent planning meeting -I have been mandated by my council to communicate our profound dismay and disappointment regarding application P/23/0654/2 Lady Jane Grey Park, off Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford. The original 2019 application for the proposed development of this site contained a design and heritage statement that emphasised the desirability of the proposed bungalows, both in limiting the visual impact of the development from

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

surrounding properties, the conservation area and Bradgate Park and also, more importantly in meeting the demands for such housing within the community of Newtown Linford. Our Parish Council and your planning department agreed with these statements and no objections were raised. Our community welcomed the opportunity for our older residents to be able to downsize whilst remaining in our village and there was great interest in seeing this development completed. The Parish Council has been repeatedly asked when building would commence and reservations could be made. A mere 4 years later we see this design and access statement cynically overturned as our communities' requirements are ignored. Last year a cross boundary application for 93 houses on land between Ashby Rd and the A50 (on the outskirts of Markfield) was only passed on appeal because the planning committee at Charnwood had passed this application. I was at the planning meeting where this Charnwood decision was made and noted the comments 'we can pass this because Hinckley and Bosworth can always deny access'. As a result of this successful appeal Newtown Linford parish is now due to have an additional 93 houses (despite being classed as a 'small settlement suitable for minor infilling') so the requirement for the small dwellings originally proposed for the Lady Jane site is only increased if the balance of housing stock is to be maintained.

Quite frankly we are coming to the opinion that the time and trouble taken by our council to assess and comment on proposed developments is a totally futile exercise. We have previously been denied access to planning meetings due to our status as a single member ward, planning decisions have allowed existing properties within the village to double in size, and now a developer has been allowed to run roughshod over their own original arguments and increase the size of dwellings in this modest site. We do not accept your argument that refusal to grant this variation of planning would have led to a derelict unused site. The site could have been sold with the existing planning permission for bungalows, Newtown Linford has premium housing value and these bungalows would have readily sold providing the developer with a healthy profit.

In summary the Parish Council feel that the planning committee has missed the opportunity to ensure our community could benefit from this development and our housing needs have been ignored.

Yours sincerely

Dr Susan Pritchard

(Chair Newtown Linford Parish Council)

RE: Lady Jane Grey Park P/23/0654/2

From: Karey Summers

Sent: Tue, Feb 27, 2024 at 2:14 pm

To: susan pritchard, Cllr. David Snartt, Cllr. Deborah Taylor

Cc: Newtown Linford Parish Council

(Dear Ms Summers,

Thank you for taking the time and trouble to reply to my original email. I wish to address some of the points that you have made and, for clarity, comment directly on the relevant sections.)

Dear Dr Pritchard

Thank you for your email regarding application reference P/23/0645/2 for Demolition of No. 532 Bradgate Road and erection of 7no. dwellinghouses at Lady Jane Park, Bradgate Road, Newtown Linford (just in case needed for future, the reference P/23/0654/2 quoted relates to land to the Rear of 87 Leicester Road Shepshed). I have now had

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

opportunity to discuss your comments with colleagues and can provide a response to the matter you have raised. **Apologies for the transposition of two numbers but this obviously didn't cause you any great difficulty.**

I am unable to locate, in either the Design and Access Statement or the Heritage Statement for the 2019 application (P/19/2119/2), the content that is described in your e-mail as 'meeting the demands for such housing within the community of Newtown Linford'. The former offers limited insight into the purpose of the housing in these terms except a single line claiming it was a "suitable mix for the local housing market" (Design and Access Statement para. 4.3) and the Heritage Statement was silent on the matter, as would be expected given its function. It would be helpful therefore if you could direct me to the part(s) of these documents being referred to. **The original Planning Officers report recommending granting of planning permission in 2019 clearly states 'The provision of 7 bungalows would also contribute towards meeting an identified local need for bungalows'**

Both, however, did address the scale and design of the buildings, particularly their height, as factors which would affect surrounding properties, the Conservation Area and Bradgate Park. The Design and Access Statement explains how through the pre-application process that the original concept of 7 x 2 storey dwellings were replaced by bungalows (except Plot 1 on the street frontage) for these reasons and given the proximity of the adjacent bungalows along Bracken Hill. This approach was carried forward into application P/23/0645/2 where again 2 storey housing was also avoided (except again for plot 1) with maximum heights of 6.4m and 6.5m, as opposed to 6.26m previously within P/19/2119/2. **Again, when granting the original application the planning officer stated 'it is not considered that the presence of these bungalows would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area'. Additionally, 'due to the perpendicular orientation and single storey scale of the proposed dwellings It is not considered that there would be an adverse impact on existing residents'. But there is a great deal of difference in these planned bungalows which would not have windows in the roof and the proposed 1 ½ story dwellings which do have 2nd story dormer windows. The effect on the privacy of the adjacent bungalows on Bracken Hill and the adjacent houses on Bradgate Rd is obviously more than the 0.24m increase in height would imply.**

Planning application P/23/0645/2 (and planning applications more generally) are not determined against a benchmark of what we may prefer to see or whether they compare favourably to previous permissions. It is a requirement of law that they are considered on their own merits, and approval of one scheme does not mean or infer that all other(s) are necessarily unacceptable. It is quite permissible that numerous, very different, schemes could be found acceptable on any given site. The requirement in law, for all applications, is that they must be determined having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations at the point at which they are decided.

I am not aware of any up-to-date assessment of housing needs in Newtown Linford (the 2017 study, which concluded the need for 1 x 4 bedroom property, having now expired). The Parish Council has declined to advance a Neighbourhood Plan within which such evidence may have been collated. The site was not promoted as an 'exception site' or similar and does not purport to meet the needs of the established community, but is market - led and information was provided on the strength of the market within the application, from the applicants. **Neighbourhood plans are a heavy load on small councils such as ours who have neither the manpower or the funds to go through such a process. As Newtown Linford is designated a 'small settlement' the development of the Lady Jane Grey site would have and indeed should have fulfilled the requirements of the current Charnwood Development Plan.**

In the current Development Plan Newtown Linford is categorised as an 'Other Settlement' which are identified as providing at least 500 new homes and where small-scale opportunities within defined limits to development are encouraged (Policy CS1). The development obviously falls into the latter part of this description. There appears to be a belief that there is a requirement for this site to contain small dwellings. No basis for this is provided so I cannot comment further, other than to say I am not aware of one. Whilst your message says that the villages housing needs have been ignored, I cannot see in your submission any assessment of housing needs. The representation included the single line "Provision of yet more 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings is not what Newtown Linford needs" but the basis for this not explained. Planning decisions have to be based on evidence, none more so than if refusal is proposed – an inability to do so is amongst the circumstances described as 'unreasonable behaviour' within planning guidance, against which costs can be awarded at appeal. The Parish Council should not realistically expect a refusal could be

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

based solely on such an assertion, unsubstantiated by any evidence or information. I refer to my comments above quoting from the original Planning Officer's document granting permission for 7 bungalows. The housing balance in Newtown Linford has not been changed in the intervening years and (see below) the number of modest dwellings has actually been decreased.

I apologise that I do not understand how the appeal decision at Markfield has any bearing on the policy reference 'small-scale opportunities within defined limits to development' of Newton Linford. This decision brings 93 extra houses, not bungalows, into Newtown Linford Parish (the bulk of this development is in fields within the Parish). Markfield was, however, the service centre quoted in the application.

I am assuming that 'access to planning meetings' is with reference to speaking at Plans Committee. There is provision for the Parish Council to address the Committee for applications within its Parish quite separate from those for Ward Councillors and they are not affected by whether the Ward is represented by one Member or more. So far as I am aware these have been in position for a very long time and as such I do not fully understand this reference. I am not aware of any occasion that the Parish Council has been denied the opportunity to address the Committee, on these applications or any other. Please note the correspondence at the end of this email (APPENDIX 1) where our request to 'call in' the application in order to speak at the Planning meeting (ref P/22/0503/2 - 51 Markfield Lane, Newtown Linford, LE6 0AB) was denied as our single ward Councillor was recused. Also the correspondence between myself and Rob Mitchell regarding this subject where he agrees that this situation needs to be reviewed.

There is nothing to prevent, in principle, houses doubling in size, though design, amenity, biodiversity or access issues can make it impractical or unacceptable. Outside these factors, it is not clear to me why this is considered objectionable, why the Parish Council would wish to deny householders the opportunity of developing their property to satisfy their aspirations, or indeed any basis on which it could be resisted. Our Parish council rarely objects to the extension of existing properties except in those cases where the design leads to substantial degradation of the street scene, is overbearing or drastically affects the neighbouring properties eg loss of amenity and privacy. However, the effect of all of these extensions has been to further reduce the number of modest properties within the Parish and hence the balance of housing stock. This is why the proposed development of the modest bungalows was positively welcomed by our residents.

As discussed above, the 2019 application was not to the exclusion of all others and I do not understand the view that because the developers have devised an alternative scheme it undermines the arguments for the original. The information supporting the 2019 application identified demand for bungalows but made no comment on other house types, and the information with the 2023 application sought to demonstrate demand for the house types proposed but did not deny (indeed it recognised) demand for other house types too. This information was supplied by the developers and unchallenged by the Plans Committee...

I am sorry to learn that you consider commenting on applications can feel futile. However, if this application is representative, there appears to be the need for greater understanding of the requirements of decision making within the planning system. The comments made on this application made no reference to the Development Plan or other policies, there was an absence of substantiation of objections lodged and evidently an expectation that perception (or opinion) is adequate evidence for decision making. In short, it didn't address the basis for decision-making: 'the Development Plan and other material considerations' as explained above. We have arranged some training for Parish Councils that will provide training on these requirements to assist with this, with a view to improving the Council's ability to influence decisions in future. If you have not already booked on these sessions I would encourage you to do so.

From your comments above it does seem that any views from Parish Councils will be ignored unless there is a Neighbourhood plan in place. However, in the case of the 93 houses adjacent to Ashby Rd, Markfield's neighbourhood plan was also totally ignored by Charnwood Planning committee. Such events do not provide confidence that, even if we could muster the resources to create a neighbourhood plan, it would fulfil its function given the current pressure on Charnwood to fulfil its housing quota. Our function as a Parish council relies on us to represent the views of our residents (and at some meetings discussing particularly contentious issues we have had in excess of 100 attend).

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

In this case our residents were strongly in favour of the original planned bungalows- and the developers were aware of this both prior to the original application and during this whole process and so was Charnwood Planning Committee – and this was verbally acknowledged at the most recent Planning meeting....

All of our Councillors have been on the training you describe and we endeavour (and also encourage our residents) to limit submitted comments to material planning considerations. However, the material considerations in the original application for this site appear to have been overridden 'second time around'. It would be naïve to think that this was not a deliberate process by the developers to circumnavigate the original (2019) reservations of the planning officers.

In summary, despite your response (which we unfortunately found rather terse and patronising) we remain extremely disappointed in the decisions of Charnwood Planning regarding this unique site.

Regards

Dr Susan Pritchard (Chair Newtown Linford Parish Council)

APPENDIX 1 Emails exchanged with Charnwood regarding Single Ward 'Call ins' and ability of Parish Council to speak at Planning meetings.

DAVID SNARTT

From: clerk@newtownlinford.org.uk <clerk@newtownlinford.org.uk>

Sent: 13 May 2022 12:36

To: David Snartt

Subject: Procedure Query re Plans Committee

Good afternoon David,

I hope this email finds you well.

As discussed at the April Parish Council Meeting, the Chairman, Sue Pritchard, has enquired whether there is an alternative mechanism in place at CBC for 'calling-in' a planning application for discussion at Plans Committee, in the event you, as Borough Councillor, recuse yourself?

The Parish Council would very much appreciate knowing if there is an alternative procedure in place in such a situation please.

Thank you in anticipation.

Best wishes,
Hannah

Dear Hannah,

Thank you for your e-mail about the 'call in' procedure.

I have again recently asked if there is any alternative way to overcome this issue.

The only way it seems is the Head of Service for Planning could escalate to a plans committee if he is of the view that the application is potentially controversial, likely to be of significant public interest or would have a significant impact on the environment.

May I suggest, if the Parish Council is minded to have a clearer explanation about this specific application and whether the Head of service is minded to refer this application to a plans committee, email Richard Bennett, richard.bennett@charnwood.gov.uk. Perhaps you could also copy in the Monitoring Officer, Adrian Ward, adrian.ward@charnwood.gov.uk so he is also aware of the Parish Council's concern.

I hope this helps.

Have a good weekend.

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

Kind regards,
David.

RICHARD BENNETT

From: clerk@newtownlinford.org.uk <clerk@newtownlinford.org.uk>
Sent: 16 May 2022 19:32
To: Richard Bennett
Cc: Adrian Ward
Subject: Procedural Query regarding 'Call-in' to Plans Committee

Dear Richard,

I hope this email finds you well.

I write on behalf of Newtown Linford Parish Council regarding planning application P/22/0503/2 for 51 Markfield Lane, Newtown Linford - Single storey rear extension, 2 storey front and side extensions, single storey front extensions, roof extension and loft conversion.

Councillors strongly object to this application as outlined in the comments submitted via Planning Explorer and hoped it would be 'called in' for consideration at a meeting of the Plans Committee. However, we are aware that Borough Councillor, Cllr. David Snartt, has recused himself and is therefore, unable to request to 'call-in' the application.

The Parish Council Chairman, Cllr. Sue Pritchard, is very concerned about the situation and has asked if there is any other mechanism in place to request this application be called in please?

Many thanks.

Best wishes,
Hannah Shaw

-----Original Message-----

From: "Richard Bennett"
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 7:52pm
To: "Newtown Linford Parish Council" <clerk@newtownlinford.org.uk>
Cc: "Adrian Ward" "Joe Davies" "Helen Knott"
Subject: RE: Procedural Query regarding 'Call-in' to Plans Committee

Dear Hannah

The constitution provides the rules on call ins. Parish Council have no right to call in applications I'm afraid.

It is possible for me to refer applications to committee if I believe them to be controversial or likely to be of significant public interest or would have a significant impact on the environment. I am waiting for the officer's report before I come to that judgement.

I trust this is of assistance.

Best regards

Richard

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

APPENDIX 2 REPLY FROM R MITCHELL TO SUSAN PRITCHARD

Rob Mitchell

To: You; Cllr. David Snartt

Cc: Newtown Linford Parish Council

Mon 29/01/2024 08:48

Dear Dr Pritchard,

Thank you for the email and I note that the Parish has considered this further.

In regard to the Parish being disenfranchised I am not sure I follow the concern fully. Parish Councils will always have the opportunity to comment on planning applications and if that application goes to committee, then they can register to speak. The starting point in our constitution is that all applications are delegated to the Head of Planning unless they meet certain criteria. This is also the thrust of the recent direction from Government which is clear that very few applications should go to committees. Ward Members can only call in an application where there are material planning concerns. So, in the event that the single ward member is recused but the application is contentious then it is likely that the Head of Planning would take it to committee anyway. This to my mind means the risk of an application which warrants calling in but cannot be called in because the ward Councillor is recused is already mitigated. **That said I recognise the concerns and that there is a difference between single and multi member wards. We have agreed to consider the issue further as part of the annual review of the constitution. I will feed your concerns into those discussions.**

In regard to the changes relating to the Chair and Vice Chair and the veto I have for ease copied/paraphrased some information provided in response to a Councillors enquiry. I hope this provides reassurance in regard to that issue.

If you require more information or further clarification it may be easier to speak on the phone or have a Teams meeting.

Regards

Rob

Schedule Two - Proposed Cemetery Fees effective from 1st May 2024

Item	Current Fee	Proposed New Fee from 1 st May 2024
Interments		
Earthen Grave Interment – of the body of a still-born child, or a child whose age at the time of death did not exceed four years	NIL	NIL – no change
Earthen Grave Interment – of the body of a child whose age at the time of death exceeded four years but did not exceed sixteen years	NIL	NIL – no change
Earthen Grave Interment – exceeded sixteen years	£280.00	£300.00
Ash Interment – cremated remains in an ash plot	£120.00	£150.00
Exclusive Rights of Burial		
Earthen - For the ERoB for a period not exceeding 100 years	£300.00	£350.00

Date of publication: Friday 22nd March 2024

Ash - For the EroB for a period not exceeding 100 years	£210.00	£240.00
Monuments & Inscriptions		
Earthen - Erection of a monument	£100.00	£120.00
Ash – Erection of a monument	£100.00	£120.00
Additional Inscription	£75.00	£75.00 – no change
Other Fees & Charges		
Transfer of Ownership	Price on Application (usually £75.00)	Price on Application (usually £75.00) – no change
Preparation of Statutory Declaration	Price on Application (minimum £40)	Price on Application (minimum £40) – no change
Issue of Deed Grant under Same Terms	£150.00	£150.00 – no change
Memorial Tree & Plaque	£150.00	£150.00 – no change

In addition, the current Cemetery Regulations state:

“8.2 The interment fee will be doubled where the deceased is not a resident of the Parish. If the deceased lived in the Parish for the majority of their life but took up residence outside the Parish to receive full-time care, within 5 years of their death, resident status will be granted. The executors or other representative of the deceased must provide the Council with the relevant information for claiming resident status.”

Proposal – Councillors to consider tripling fees where the deceased is not a resident of the Parish.