

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.15pm
on Friday 2 October 2015**

Present: Mrs M Wilson (Chairman), Mrs T Cornish, Mr C Hopkins, Mr B Rufford and Ms J Shaw

Also present: The applicant for the planning application to be considered

In attendance: Mrs C Ramsden, Clerk to the Council

**Councillor
Actions**

1 Apologies, Declarations of Interest and Dispensation Requests

Apologies were received from Ms D Head, due to work a commitment, and Mr D Hunter, due to a pecuniary interest in the planning application to be discussed.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to accept the apologies.

There were no declarations of interest.

There were no dispensation requests.

2 Public Participation Session

The applicant for the planning permission did not wish to make any statement but said he was happy to answer any questions from Councillors.

The Chairman advised of the initial views she had received from Ms Head, in which she did not object to the application, as not being detrimental to the village as a whole. The site was in need of development and light pollution was not an issue given the distance from other properties. However, the proposed new vehicular access was of concern given its proximity to the railway level crossing and the character of The Street at this point and she asked if the existing access could continue to be used.

In response to questions from Councillors the applicant said:

- There was no plan to mark out new boundaries for the curtilage of the property within the application site. The stock proof fencing by the footpath would be replaced with similar new fencing.
- The existing boundaries with The Street and Martlesham Road would remain as at present, but would be tidied up and then maintained by the new owner.
- There would be a new gate at the proposed vehicular access, which would be automated and set back from the road.
- The existing access on Martlesham Road is difficult, with a tree protected by a TPO on the left side which restricted visibility. The proposed new access was closer to the village centre and therefore more sustainable. It gave better visibility on to the road, with a good

view up the hill, and SCC Highways were supportive of it.

- While he agreed the existing property was not visible from The Street, the proposed site was further down the hillside and the roof height of the property would be lower down than appeared from the plans. It would be below the level of the existing property.
- The SCDC planning officer had advised him that the main reason for refusal of the previous application had been the provisions of SCDC Development Management Policy 3 (DM3), rather than the increase in size of the dwelling over the existing High Rigg. However, now the proposal was reduced she considered that it passed the test for intrusiveness and would be approved. The new proposal was not intended to be visible from The Street and would be hidden by existing foliage.
- The drive surface would be gravel.
- There would be no more noise from the property than any other, and any party events would be likely to be at the rear of the property.
- There were no lights on the front of the property. Lights on the driveway would shine downwards. Any patio lighting would be at the rear of the property.

3 Planning

Application

DC/15/3667/FUL: Demolition of High Rigg dwelling. Replacement with a new six bedroom country house, new driveway and highway access: High Rigg, Martlesham Road

A copy of an objection sent to SCDC in respect of the development by a local resident had previously been circulated to Councillors.

Councillors discussed the application as follows:

- The proposed new access was at a potentially hazardous point, especially in bad weather. The proposed new access would provide a pull-in point and there was already an existing access opposite it.
- The slate roof was preferred and the use of good, traditional materials for a new house was welcomed.
- The development was outside the physical limits boundary of the village and, although the application was for a replacement dwelling, and the proposal was for a smaller property than the previous proposal (DC/15/0366/FUL), it was still over twice the size of the existing property. It was also still very imposing and in an elevated position - although it was noted that there was no one design character for the village and that the dwelling had been re-sited to be nearer the current property footprint. However, the current property was not visible from The Street.

- SCDC policy DM3 required that replacement dwellings in the countryside would be allowed where they are no more intrusive in the countryside than the building to be replaced. It was noted that there was no longer any policy which put a specific limit on the percentage increase over the size of an existing property which may be allowed. The size of a property in relation to the size of its plot was of relevance, as was the visual impact. The siting would not result in the obstruction of any existing view from The Street.
- SCDC policies SP15, DM23, DM21, DM8 and DM3 were considered in respect of their relevance to the application.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- Previous issues regarding the principle of the new house, the proposed new access, noise and lighting were no longer of concern.
- There was objection on the grounds that the development was contrary to SCDC policy DM3: the increase in size of the proposed dwelling, compared with the size of the existing High Rigg dwelling, would result in its visual dominance of the area.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.50pm.