

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.30pm  
on Wednesday 1 April 2015**

**Present:** Mrs F Rogers (Chairman), Mr D Hunter, Dr C Rowe, Mr D Wilson and Mrs M Wilson

**Also present:** Mr T Fryatt (Suffolk Coastal District Councillor) and 9 residents and a planning application agent (all for part of the meeting)

**In attendance:** Mrs C Ramsden, Clerk to the Council

**1 Apologies and Declarations of Interest**

Apologies were received from Mr B Rufford and Mrs T Cornish.

Mr Hunter declared a pecuniary interest in planning application DC/15/0366/FUL: Demolition of the existing High Rigg dwelling. Replacement with a new five bedroom country house with a new driveway and highway access

**2 Period of Public Participation**

Residents raised and spoke about two matters:

**The Admiral's Head:** The resident who spoke at the previous meeting advised that a flyer outlining his proposal had now been distributed to properties in Gt and Lt Bealings. He has submitted an application to SCDC for outline planning permission for the site of the two proposed dwellings in Gt Bealings. He had attended a Gt Bealings Parish Council meeting and spoken about his proposal, but it had not been well received. He felt that there was vocal opposition, but also significant support for the scheme.

Mr Fryatt advised that the Council would be included in consultation on the application, as clearly Little Bealings had an interest in the matter.

**DC/15/0873/FUL: Erection of a two storey detached dwelling at Bealings Holt, Martlesham Road**

The applicant explained that he had lived in Lt Bealings for 20 years and his property comprised some 20 acres. He had applied to SCDC to build a 'state of the art' additional property. It would be very economical to run. He was aware that other similar applications had been refused but he considered this application had merit as:

- The new house would not be seen from the road or from the surrounding SLA countryside
- No new vehicular access on to Martlesham Road would be created
- The site of the new dwelling had previously been used as a caravan site

The agent advised that the design was of very high quality, but was not a 'NPPF paragraph 55' development (ie permissible as housing in the countryside on the grounds of outstanding architectural merit). It was a development in a large cluster of dwellings which were outside the development envelope of the village - but most properties in the parish were in fact outside the envelope. The development would have no impact on the countryside and was justifiable as SCDC did not have a five year

supply of housing identified. It was sustainable development and was therefore to be supported by SCDC.

**DC/15/0366/FUL: Demolition of the existing High Rigg dwelling. Replacement with a new five bedroom country house with a new driveway and highway access**

A resident from a neighbouring property advised that he was happy with the proposal, so long as the new access did not lead to further development in the bottom of the Fynn Valley.

The period of public speaking ended.

### 3 Planning

**DC/15/0873/FUL: Erection of a two storey detached dwelling at Bealings Holt, Martlesham Road**

It was considered that previous applications for new properties on Martlesham Road and Playford Road had been rejected in recent years because no extra traffic was to be generated. The application proposed four new parking spaces. While the property would not be seen from the road or Cedar Lodge to the north, it was noted that two similar previous applications had also failed as they constituted new development in the countryside and were contrary to LDF policy DM3. After discussion it was **RESOLVED** that:

- There was objection to the development as:
  - It set a precedent in allowing more traffic to access Martlesham Road
  - There was no footpath and the development was not therefore sustainable
  - The infill constituted a new development in the countryside and was contrary to LDF policy DM3.

**DC/15/0366/FUL: Demolition of the existing High Rigg dwelling. Replacement with a new five bedroom country house with a new driveway and highway access**

Mr Hunter left the meeting in accordance with his declaration of a pecuniary interest in this matter.

The applicant stated that the proposed was a replacement dwelling, not an additional house in the countryside. It was within the residential curtilage of the previous property, although at the other end of the site. He had been involved in five other properties which had been built along Martlesham/Playford Road. He advised that the existing access from Martlesham Road would be closed.

It was noted that the new access from The Street would involve a change of use of agricultural land to domestic curtilage. The proposed house was significantly bigger than the existing dwelling and would generate noise and light pollution. The location would make the house very obvious, sitting above The Street. The proposed new access adjacent to the level crossing was not considered to be safe. After discussion it was **RESOLVED** that:

- There was objection to the development which breached the following policies: SP15, DM23, DM21, DM8 and DM3. Specifically:
  - This would be a development outside the physical limits boundary of the village and the existing property curtilage, and partly on agricultural land
  - It would be development in the countryside, and within the SLA
  - The new house would be a massive increase in size over the existing property and the new position would mean it dominated the countryside and the centre of the village, being very visible from The Street
  - Noise and light pollution were both of concern. Noise would be an issue in view of the 'bowl' like shape of the land here, meaning that noise reverberates around the valley. Light pollution would be an issue in this dark part of the parish and in the SLA
  - The location of a new access adjacent to the level crossing would be of concern on safety grounds; visibility for other traffic using the crossing was limited.

Mr Hunter returned to the meeting.

#### **4 Highways**

##### **20mph Limit for The Street**

The County Council had advised that, following its assessment of the traffic and the application of its policy criteria, The Street met the criteria for either a '20's plenty' designated area or a 20mph speed limit.

A '20's plenty' area was advisory only and may be ignored by drivers. It included additional signage, road markings and buff surfacing. It would exist for 100m – 150m centred on the junction of The Street with Sandy Lane. The design and construction could take six to nine months.

A 20 mph would be mandatory and so may have more respect from drivers, but it was thought that the police would not enforce it. There would be no extra signage, markings or surfacing beyond 20mph roundels. As a legal process was involved and review by the County Council speed limit panel, it could take 15 to 20 months to put into effect.

Either proposal would need to find funding of around £5,000, which could not be match funded from the highways budget.

A representative from the residents' group initiative advised that the group was keen to have some speed control between the Village Hall and Bealings School. A petition was continuing in case there was a need to lobby for funding. The residents' preference was for a 20mph speed limit as it would apply all year around, not just at school times. It was understood the police endorsed the proposal. It may be possible for the school to contribute to the funding via a new initiative in the autumn.

Mr Bellfield had advised the Council that he would support the proposal as far as his locality budget enabled him to. Mr Fryatt suggested that, after the elections on 7 May, the Council approach the new District Councillor for support from his locality budget. He also thought that funding could be

provided from the 'minor highways improvements budget' and that meeting the costs would not be an issue; the petition was unnecessary.

The extent of the 20mph limit was of concern, to ensure that it included the route walked between the School and the Village Hall car park.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- The County Council be advised that a 20mph speed limit was preferred by the Council, but that the extent of it needed further consideration. In order to address the blind summit at the junction with Holly Lane and the Village Hall access, the limit should start by Brimar. The other end should be by the Bowls Club entrance.

### **PARKING AT HALL ROAD CROSSROADS**

Mr Wilson advised that he had been contacted by a resident expressing concern that the verge on the north side of Martlesham Road by the cross roads was used for parking, including by lorries, which made it impossible to see traffic coming along Martlesham Road.

A resident advised that a condition of building High Rigg, the adjacent property, was the provision of an area of lay-by at this location.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To ask the County Council what action it could take to prevent vehicles parking and waiting on the verge, in view of the danger which the limited visibility posed to traffic coming from The Street

## **5 Correspondence**

A request from the PCC was considered, regarding the Council's support for its applications for funding for repair of the Church roof. Some £35,000 needed to be raised and external funding applications needed to show community support for the project. It was noted that the Parish Plan had identified that, as well as being a place of worship, residents considered the Church an important historic building and a focal point for the community.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that the Council would provide such support as was required to evidence the importance of the building to the community and that the repair was therefore strongly supported.

## **6 Date of Next Meeting**

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- in view of the receipt of a consultation regarding another planning application the next meeting would be held at 7.30pm on Wednesday 15 April 2015.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.40pm. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 15 April 2015.