

# Letheringham Parish Council

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held  
on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> May 2018 at Easton & Letheringham Village Hall

## In Attendance

Terry Carlin (TC) (Chairman & Financial Officer)  
Jean Barker (JB)  
Maurice Finch (MF)  
Matthew Bickerton (MB)  
Richard Gooding (RG)

David Allan (DA) (Clerk)

## Public Attendance:

Jan McNeill, Alister Kerr (in part)

The Meeting commenced prior to the Annual Parish Meeting to facilitate the attendance of Emmet Klipalo (EK) and Chris Finbow (CF) of the Environment Agency to address the Meeting.

## Public Forum commenced at 7.45pm

EK and CF provided a 'Frequently Asked Questions' document that addressed relevant issues (reproduced at Annex A).

TC referred to references regarding natural waterways and queried whether account had been taken of the fact that the Deben in Letheringham was man-made and that the River had originally followed a different course further over before being re-directed. TC also referred to barges being used to navigate and clear the River.

CF stated that he had worked on the River for 30 years and had been part of the gangs that had worked on and driven the barges. CF commented that the way in which Rivers were managed had changed, in part due to funding issues but also due to a better understanding of flood risks, ecology and environmental improvement. CF stated that dredging was not beneficial in terms of flood risk, and that, while it could provide benefits this was often not the case, and also was the cause of environmental damage. There had been a significant reduction in funding and manpower, with the forty operatives working the River previously now reduced to about twenty, and these focused on flood warnings and River maintenance generally.

TC queried whether reference to environmental issues was a sop, and CF stated that their had been a change in the way that River maintenance was considered, with trapezoidal dredging no longer considered appropriate and an emphasis of the benefits of slowing down the flow of water. Channel roughness was encouraged to hold water in the system and to create a more natural channel. CF commented that most Rivers were man-made, with meanders, pools and glides arising from human intervention, and referred to the need for habitat to encourage the migration of fish and eels. There had been a focus on work around the area of bridges, for example in the area of Debenham, with the creation of meanders that slow the flow of water.

TC referred to the significant flooding in Letheringham this year, which was far more extensive than in previous years. AK commented that the floods were caused largely by snow-melt, with the water level higher on other fields.

CF stated that there was now better modelling regarding flood risks, based on ground levels taken by aircraft resulting in incredible survey data. The flood risk focused on dwellings and not on outbuilding and fields.

RG referred to concerns about flooding at Letheringham Mill, which comprised a mixed dwelling and business location, with floods affecting parts used by guests. CF acknowledged that the Mill was located in a flood-risk area, but stated that works had to create a demonstrable benefit and that the cutting of weeds does not reduce the flood risk by more than approximately 3mm given the very wide flood plain in and around Letheringham. Making the channel deeper would have little impact without creating very large reservoirs upstream, which would be prohibitively expensive.

AK commented that the channel depth affected summer flows and noted that duckweed was a massive issue in the summer months' in particular.

CF acknowledged the potential impact on oxygen levels but referred to the supplementary bore hold at Earl Soham, which was activated when there was reduced oxygen levels in the River, and the benefit of meanders on oxygen levels. With regard to duckweed CF suggested that this simply floated on top of the water and dissipated over time.

TC commented that the issue was not flooding in summer but the de-oxygenation of water, with RG noting that the duck-weed simply looked bad and unsightly. CF noted that there were also benefits, with the water being shaded and the proliferation of algae blooms reduced due to the presence of duck-weed. This was endorsed by EK, although MF noted that fish appeared to like the sunshine, and that the presence of duckweed had led to the loss of Kingfishers in and around the River.

AK observed that large stretches of the River were covered with duckweed for several months, and JM noted that the proliferation started earlier in the year since the cessation of cutting. CF agreed to speak to the Ecology Team regarding these concerns but believed that as duckweed was a native rather than an invasive species it would not be removed by the Environment Agency simply on the grounds of appearance.

TC suggested that a balance was required, to ensure that the flow of the River was not slowed to the extent that duck weed built up to an excessive degree. CF stated that duckweed was not a flood hazard, but acknowledged that there was often a trade-off between flood-risk and Ecology factors.

AK noted that there was a health and safety issue, as the River at Easton Grange looked like grass and children who approached it on the lawns were at risk of falling into the water if it was not cleared. CF responded by stating that Riparian landowners had the right to remove and treat duck-weed and similar plants forms in the River, and observed that he had not previously considered the issue regarding the impact on Kingfishers.

JM observed that the Kingfishers used the River until the duckweed became too thick, and CF stated that he had a personal belief that fallen trees should be removed, in contrast to the Ecology policy, but reiterated that this was ultimately the responsibility of riparian landowners. EK commented on the responsibilities of the Environment Agency and those of landowners, and CF confirmed that fallen trees, for example, were the responsibility of the owner of the

land on which the root-ball was located, with ownership extending from the River bank to the middle of the channel.

MF raised the issue of the sluice at Letheringham Mill, and its role in maintaining the height of the water upstream, which EK referred to as a level retention structure. MF queried the use for assistance in irrigation, and CF stated that there were some aspects of this, but that the land above the sluice had become accustomed to the existing water levels and any changes would have an impact on biodiversity. MF commented on the side of the River which was free flowing and less deep, and CF referred to projects on the River Waveney involving the removal of structures, which had created enormous issues with land-owners and had been running for fifteen years but had resulted in the removal of only two structures. CF notes the friction between Ecology Teams, who wanted barriers removed, and other agencies concerned with the management of water resources.

MF raised the issue of fish migration, and CF observed that this included eels, but the difficulties in fish getting past barriers in Ufford and by Rackhams. CF referred to a project involving Gipping and Waveney involving fish ladders and other structures, and observed that there were Sea Trout in the estuary which could potentially migrate upstream. RG noted that large fish were visible on the flood plain during recent floods.

CF commented that the Deben was very healthy diversity-wise, with the bore hole at Earl Soham helping to support a rich habitat, albeit at considerable financial cost.

MF raised the issue of bulrushes at Sanctuary Bridge, which had grown very high and were spreading and restricting the flow of the River. CF noted that this was an example of features creating meanders, slowing the flow of water and heightening oxygenation, with levels being monitored at that location. MF queried the stage at which the River would become choked, and CF confirmed that it was a flood-risk issue and that the size of the flood plain served to make the case for expenditure on digging out uneconomic in the absence of a demonstrable change in flood risk. This highlighted the fact that rules were driven by demonstrable changes to flood risk, although there was some funding for ecology issues beyond that.

RG commented on the possibility of hydro-electric power generation at the sluice, but CF observed that there was insufficient height difference and drew a comparison with a scheme at Boxford, which involved a far greater differential and used an Archimedes screw, but was not fully operative due to difficulties in maintaining a continuous head of water, resulting in it being turned off during the summer period.

CF reiterated that Riparian Landowners were at liberty to take steps to address issues, and RG queried the status of the Environment Agency ('EA') as a landowner, although CF stated that, at the Mill, the EA only owned the sluice gate which was used to manage the water, and any installation of an Archimedes screw would not change the flood-risk. RG referred to a successful project at Frome in Somerset run by the EA, involving a complex but successful structure, although CF stated that the EA's involvement was, like Boxford, to provide support to a separate company responsible for the scheme, and that the EA's responsibility was to maintain water levels, although assistance could be provided in relation to permits, modelling and other issues regarding proposed schemes where appropriate but would not include any construction. Returning to the Boxford scheme mentioned previously, CF noted that the head difference there of around three to four metres far exceeded that at the Mill, which was no greater than 1½ metres.

TC returned the subject back to duckweed, stating that this was the key issue for residents in and around Letheringham. An email received from David Holborrow regarding this issue was read out, including the following extracts:

As we discussed, Ruth and I are very concerned about the problems associated with the build-up of duck weed, which we expect may well be worse this year than last.

The trees that are blocking the river between Cooks Hill and the Mill will certainly hold back surface floating weed and debris, and we hope that a solution can be found to have these obstructions removed or at the least reduced. Debris and sludge has already started to accumulate upstream of the fallen trees.

As I understand it, duckweed will grow to several inches thick in slow moving water, and will only stop growing when water temperature reaches 33 degrees C (unlikely in the Deben) or water temperature falls below 6 degrees C. They grow quickly where there are high concentrations of nitrogen and phosphates in the water, not uncommon in agricultural areas such as ours.

The weed cover will, if extensive, create anaerobic conditions, affecting large leaf (oxygenating) plant growth and fish and other aquatic organisms.

We had a situation a few years ago when the river became so depleted in oxygen that many fish died including mature pike which were seen washing over the sluice at the Mill. The river had to be re-stocked.

Those of us that live along the river should be able to enjoy what is a beautiful stretch of river, we have water voles, otter, kingfishers amongst other animals and fish species which we would wish have conditions to allow them to thrive.

JM commented on the number of fallen trees in the River, some substantial, and the build-up of algae behind these. JM stated that she believed that Fiona Siddell was looking into this and queried whether anything could be done.

CF stated that there were powers to enforce owners to clear trees and other obstructions, and agreed that there were enormous trees on the Deben. Matters were considered on a case-by-case basis, and was reliant on reporting my residents and members of the public, in response to which an Enforcement Officer would write to land-owners where appropriate and depending upon the flood-risk arising. CF confirmed that any concerns should be reported to EK at first instance, who would come out to inspect the River before deciding on further action.

JM noted that the River also provided an amenity for local residents and businesses, including rowing which was prevented by the presence of duckweed and obstructions. TC endorsed this, stating that many businesses relied upon the environment for sales and that an overgrown river had a negative impact on tourism. AK observed that the Deben was a non-navigable river, but TC maintained that there were real tourism issues arising.

EK confirmed that, with regard to rowing, the fact that the Deben was designated as non-navigable was relevant, but that rowing could be done with permission of landowners.

CF observed that the Deben was subject to policies applied on a national level to all rivers across the country, and that many arguments raised would simply be met with the response that the prevailing policies were in accordance with National Guidelines.

RG queried whether tourism funding was an issue for the County Council. RV referred to the River Deben Holistic Group, which worked with the County Council to secure funding and address issues that were beyond the EA remit, including one project in Ufford where, in association with local farmers, solar-powered watering stations had been installed to prevent cattle from trampling river banks and causing erosion and damage. RV stated that Chris McArthur in Monewden, and June Birch, the local Councillor, were instrumental in this Holistic Group.

TC returned to the central issue regarding duckweed and algae, and CF reiterated that this was an issue for the riparian landowner to address within the relevant guidelines. The EA had no issue with removal of vegetation, and there is a permit system on the EA website enabling the reporting of activity, the confirmation of permission, and the facility to print off a

permit at no cost, with no adverse consequences provided that the activity was within the proper remit. EK commented that total removal was unwise and that the margins should be left undisturbed to provide shade, CF confirmed that manual removal was best for duckweed, although some species such as mares Tail, found in the area around Rackham's, required spray in order to exert control. However, it was not possible to eradicate such a native species. MF referred to previous policies involving cutting, which removed lily-pads and therefore got rid of something that the duckweed could anchor on to.

TC enquired about contractors available to undertake work and whether these utilised only manual removal, or also used machines. CF confirmed that the EA Operational Team still used boats and could be instructed on a contractual basis, and there were other companies or organisations, including the GAP Fishing Group, that also had weed-boats. EK agreed to provide details of potential contractors who could be contacted.

CF reiterated that duckweed would have a negligible affect on dissolved oxygen within the river, and that oxygen levels were closely monitored at various points, along with regular spot checks throughout the river. Although there had been an incident involving large scale fish deaths about ten years ago, the use of aerators and, in particular, the bore hold at Earl Soham, mitigated against any repetition – with the bore hole having a licence to pump water on up to 100 days every year albeit at staggering cost.

CF confirmed that he would inspect the bulrushes by Sanctuary Bridge but suggested that any flooding onto roads would not amount to a flood-risk issue in the absence of any impact on dwellings. TC stated that the Parish Council took a different view regarding the River, and queried the benefit of submitting a report regarding the economic impact of the issues raised. CF confirmed that this could be useful, and reiterated his suggestion to confer with Jane Birch and Chris McArthur.

### **The Public Forum closed at 8.45pm**

The Annual Parish Meeting then commenced and closed at 9.10pm.

### **The Meeting opened at 9.10pm**

#### **2018.23 Apologies**

Apologies received from Carol Poulter, and also from Robin Vickery, who had attended and addressed the APM but had had to leave before the LPC Meeting opened to attend another Parish Council Meeting elsewhere.

#### **2018.24 Declaration of Interests**

None.

#### **2018.25 Approval of Minutes & Matters Arising**

Minutes of LPC meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2018 were approved unanimously and signed by TC

## **2018.26 Matters of Report**

None beyond matters addressed in the Annual Parish Meeting.

## **2018.27 Planning & Licensing Applications and Issues**

The Application relating to the fencing and paving of the car-parking area on Cooks Hill, associated with Pip's Cottage (DC/18/1724/FUL) was raised.

It was noted that the development involved the replacement of grass with paving, although it was unclear when this had been done, together with the erection of fencing panels and posts with cross-beams at the road-side front of the area.

The work had been completed and queries raised resulting in the District Council confirming that Planning Permission was required. According an application for retrospective permission had been lodged and the documents associated with this had been circulated and considered by all Councillors prior to the Meeting.

It was noted that the paving itself was subject to specific application, and a concern was raised regarding the posts and cross-beam, and whether these were necessary in the absence of an intention to add a roof at a later stage if permission was granted for the work already completed.

TC advised that the application should be considered on the basis of the work already completed without undue speculation regarding possible future and further development, and asked JM to clarify the position regarding drainage and damp issues at Boatmans that had been raised. JM referred to the paving in the car park area – which may have been put in some time previously – together with paving installed between the cottages, which resulted in significant run-off and had caused damp. In addition, JM referred to the strip of land purchased from the previous owners of Pip's Cottage, which had been intended to facilitate an extension for which an application had been approved. This included a right of access that was prevented by the current development and the fence panelling in particular.

RG queried whether this right of access and Land Registry entry was a contractual issue, and TC commented that planning and ownership issues were separate, as anyone could apply for planning permission on land that they did not in fact possess.

The development was considered in the light of existing planning policies, and in particular those requiring developments to accord with the existing nature of street scenes and to reflect the scale and appearance of adjacent properties, which did appear to be in conflict with the work already completed, although the provision and development of off-road parking did also have a potentially beneficial impact in comparison to vehicles being parked on the side of the road in that area.

RG reiterated concerns regarding creeping development, and that an addition of a roof could result in a garage or workshop.

MF queried the mechanics of the run-off, and JM clarified that the paving was on an incline towards Boatman's, resulting in water accumulating by the patio and in the area of the proposed extension. JM confirmed that her concerns and objections were not about what

could be added, but in relation to the work that had already been completed, particularly given its very close proximity to Boatman's.

The Council discussed the issue of access and the apparent easement granted by the Land Registry record, with concerns raised and acknowledged but a consensus that this was more properly a contractual and legal issue and not a specific matter that the Parish Council could address.

MB acknowledged the concerns raised and, in particular, considered that the posts and cross-beam were unnecessary and added unnecessary weight and impact on the appearance of the street scene. TC concurred with concerns regarding appearance and in particular the fencing panels and the posts, which were not in keeping with the street scene, as well as acknowledging concerns regarding these being a precursor to something more detrimental. The issue of drainage and the impact of the street scene and building line was raised.

After lengthy consideration, the Parish Council unanimously resolved that a response should be sent to the Planning Department raising concerns regarding the structure and impact of the development, as well as the issue of drainage and run-off, and confirming the Council's opposition to permission for the development. This response was to be drafted in accordance with the matters discussed in the meeting and was to be circulated and agreed prior to submission prior to the deadline for responses on the 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018.

## **2018.28 Financial Report**

### **2018.28.01 Monthly Financial Report**

TC presented the Monthly Financial Report and Accounts, which included receipt of a Precept payment totalling £600 which, after taking account of anticipated payment of £48 for Village Hall Hire in relation to LPC Meetings in March and May 2018, brought the Community Account balance from £5,067.89 to £5,619.89.

The balance on the Business saver Account remained £267.28, resulting in an overall closing balance of £5,887.17 after taking account of the Village Hall payments.

TC raised the need to consider Audit requirements and proposed that an additional Meeting be scheduled in June to consider this once David Holborrow had had an opportunity to consider the accounts and associated documentation. This proposal was agreed, and a date and time is to be fixed in due course.

### **2018.28.02 Invoices for Payment**

Two invoices had been received from the Village Hall for hire fees in relation to the LPC Meetings in March and May 2018, totalling £48. Payment was unanimously authorised and cheques (100264 and 100265), each for £24, were completed and signed in relation to these. The completed cheques were handed to DA to be sent to Lorna Edwards of the Village Hall Management Committee.

The amended Invoice scheme regarding the Hall hire was raised and discussed. Previously, payment had been required in arrears at the end of the year, but Invoices were now issued on an ad hoc basis, requiring payment to be considered and cheques at each meeting. The possibility of making a single yearly payment in advance was considered and approved

unanimously in principle if this could result in a discounted rate to reflect the cash-flow issues and administrative savings to the VHMC arising. DA to make enquiries in relation to this.

### **2018.29 Phone Box & Defibrillator**

The issue of the VETs scheme was re-visited, with a brief discussion about its operation and merits. PL had provided documentation confirming that the initial fee of £100 was waived by CHT, although a set-up charge of £45 plus VAT was applicable for the initial 12-month period.

There was a general agreement that the VETs scheme was potentially useful and important in the event of an emergency situation arising, and it was resolved by majority, with one dissenting vote, that payment to CHT for the initial set-up should be made, albeit with the scheme reviewed prior to the completion of the initial 12-month period to consider renewal at that stage.

Accordingly, a cheque for £54 (£45 plus VAT) was completed and signed (cheque number 100266), and this was given to DA to be sent to CHT directly or via Paula. TC will include this payment in the accounts for the next meeting.

There was general appreciation and praise for the work completed on painting the phone-box by Pauline and Matthew Bickerton, which had been done to an amazing standard and had transformed this asset. The Council expressed its gratitude for the work completed, which was done over a five-day period.

### **2018.30 BBQ**

Arrangements for the Annual Village BBQ were discussed, with MB stating that Pauline was keen to host this event again, although RG also offered to have it at the Mill.

It was provisionally suggested that the BBQ could take place at Letheringham Lodge this year, with the Mill hosting it in 2019, subject to confirmation.

Dates on the 29<sup>th</sup> July and the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2018 were considered, with a provisional agreement reached that the BBQ would be held on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2018, again subject to confirmation that this was convenient.

JB requested that food be served earlier than on previous occasion, by around 1.30pm, and it was agreed that this would be taken into account when fixing a definite date and time for the event.

**The meeting closed at 10.05pm**

Signed..... Date: 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018

**Next Meeting: Scheduled for the 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2018 at 7.45 pm in the Village Hall**

**Appendices follow:**

- A: FAQ Document from the Environment Agency
- B: Financial Report as at 21<sup>st</sup> May 2018
- C: Letheringham Parish Accounts as at 21<sup>st</sup> May 2018





## Frequently asked questions

### - **What is the Environment Agency's policy with fallen tree management?**

If our inspecting operatives deem the offending fallen tree to be increasing flood risk to people and property, then we will ask the riparian landowner to remove trailing limbs if these are causing an 'obstruction to flow' or the whole tree depending on the situation. Each circumstance is based on a case by case approach.

If third parties wish to retain fallen trees as woody debris within a channel, a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) will be required. Proposals should be discussed with the relevant Agency contacts provided to you.

### - **What is 'Woody debris'?**

Branches, large limbs, root boles or entire trees that have fallen into rivers have commonly been referred to as large woody debris.

This nationally recognised programme states that we will aim to retain woody material in rivers where possible and consider using large woody material in rivers as a first option when improving or restoring rivers.

Large woody material can be beneficial to rivers because it helps to vary the flow diversity and shape of the channel, creating physical habitat for many species of plants, invertebrates and fish. It can improve the resilience of river ecosystems to the impacts of climate change.

Accumulations of large woody material in critical locations can increase flood risk, for example by blocking the flow of water upstream of culverts or multi-arched bridges in channels with high velocity flows. These are assessed on a case by case basis and action taken based on the risk of flooding to people and property.

**- How does the Environment Agency work to reduce flood risk in my area?**

The Environment Agency holds permissive powers to undertake maintenance activities on main river channels and Environment Agency assets and to construct new assets using public funds to defend people and property against fluvial and tidal flood risk.

As the Environment Agency is governed by treasury rules we can only allocate and spend money where we can clearly demonstrate a reduction in flood risk to people and property.

Our Asset Inspectors perform inspections of the river channels and structures all over the county to assess their condition. Any defects or damage is reported back to the Asset Performance Team.

**- What is the Environment Agency's strategy regarding river management techniques?**

The Environment Agency only has permissive powers to undertake works that either reduce flood risk or improve habitat and biodiversity.

**- Duckweed presence on the river**

Duckweed found on the River Deben is a native non-invasive aquatic species that forms on the surface of slow flowing sections and thickens over the late summer. It will die back in winter and the same annual cycle will repeat, the presence of this weed does not directly cause flood risk and some animals will happily feed on the duckweed. It is not something the Environment Agency is able to manage under its permissive powers.

**- River Navigation**

The fluvial River Deben is not designated as a navigable river, permission should be obtained from all relevant landowners along the stretch you plan to access.

**- Dredging of river channels**

The Environment Agency no longer promotes dredging of river channels and for a number of years has installed a policy of natural river flood management. This has proven to be a sustainable method of managing flood risk while maintaining diversity. However there are some instances where unconsolidated silts can cause issues, these are assessed on a case by case basis and can be removed under our permissive powers, where it reduces flood risk to people and property.

Riparian landowners can also choose to undertake in-channel works, more information regarding this can be found under the following link:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/owning-a-watercourse#get-permission>

- **What is the Environment Agency's policy on Natural River/Flood Management?**

Natural flood management aims to protect, restore and emulate the natural functions of catchments, floodplains and rivers. We can use a wide range of techniques to reduce flood risk by attenuating flow whilst achieving multiple benefits. Woody material placed in the right locations in rivers and streams can be an important mechanism in slowing, storing and filtering the flow.

The Environment Agency aims to manage river catchments in an effective and sustainable fashion to safeguard the health and wellbeing of habitat and biodiversity.

- **What are your responsibilities as a riparian landowner living adjacent to a main river?**

Your responsibilities as a riparian landowner are set out under the following 'Owning a watercourse' web link below:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/owning-a-watercourse>

- **Flood risk in my area**

You can find out if you're in an area that's likely to flood in the future - check your properties long term risk of flooding and view your area's flood maps using the following link:

<https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk>

Explanation of flood risk from rivers or the sea:

- **High risk** means that each year this area has a chance of flooding of greater than 3.3%. This takes into account the effect of any flood defences in the area. These defences reduce but do not completely stop the chance of flooding as they can be overtopped, or fail.
- **Medium risk** means that each year this area has a chance of flooding of between 1% and 3.3%.
- **Low risk** means that each year this area has a chance of flooding of between 0.1% and 1%.
- **Very low risk** means that each year this area has a chance of flooding of less than 0.1%.

- **Who and how can we contact you?**

Emmett Klipalo, River Deben Catchment Lead on:

Tel: 07799 340701

Email: [emmett.klipalo@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:emmett.klipalo@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Alternatively, you can contact our National Customer Contact Centre on **03708 506 506**

Or our Incident Hotline on **0800 80 70 60**

Or our Floodline on **03459 88 11 88**

Or for general enquires [enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)

**Letheringham Parish Council****Financial Report as 21<sup>st</sup> May 2018****Cheques presented for payment at this meeting**

village hall hire	26/03/2018	100262	£48
-------------------	------------	--------	-----

**Income received**

SCDC precept	27/04/2018		£600
--------------	------------	--	------

**Current position before cheques are paid**

Community Account	£5,067.89
-------------------	-----------

Business Premium Account	£267.28
--------------------------	---------

TOTAL	<u>£5,335.17</u>
-------	------------------

**Current position after cheques are paid**

Community Account	£5,619.89
-------------------	-----------

Business Premium Account	£267.28
--------------------------	---------

TOTAL	<u>£5,887.17</u>
-------	------------------

Expenditure approved minute 2018.28.01 refers  
Date 21/05/2018

## ANNEX C

## Letheringham Parish Accounts

Statement of Account as at 21<sup>st</sup> May 2018

COMMUNITY ACCOUNT #50571423				(2018-2019)					
	date	Cheque no	debit	credit	total	vat	account statement	statement date	
C/F from 2017-2018	05/04/2018				£5,067.89				
SCDC precept	27/04/2018			£600.00	£5,667.89		£5,667.89	21/05/2018	
village hall (march)	21/05/2018	100264	£24.00		£5,643.89				
village hall	21/05/2018	100265	£24.00		£5,619.89				
SALC membership fees									
Community action Suffolk ( web site)									
Insurance ( came & co)									
SCDC precept									
Community action Suffolk ( web site)									

BUSINESS SAVER ACCOUNT #50571431							
transaction	date	Payments	Receipts/ interest payments	Balance		Bank statement	statement date
c/f 01/04/2018				£267.28		£267.28	21/05/2018

Total account balances			
date	Community Account	business premium account	Total funds available
C/F from 2017-2018 final accounts	£5,067.89	£267.28	£5,335.17
21/05/2018	£5,619.89	£267.28	£5,887.17

LPC ASSET REGISTER		
Capital asset	Value (£)	Comment
Village sign	£1,469.00	Sign insured for public liability and replacement cost £4000
Phone box	£1.00	Replacement value £1000
Salt Box	£67.00	Replacement value £100
Millennium seat	£485.00	Replacement value £500
defibrillator	£2,130.00	replacement value £2130
village notice board	£500.00	replacement value £500
Total	£4,652.00	total replacement £8230