

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at  
7.15pm on Wednesday 10 August 2016**

**Present:** Mrs M Wilson (Chairman), Mrs T Cornish, Ms D Head, Mr C Hopkins and Mr D Hunter.

**Also Present:**

Mr J Ogden and Mr K Archer (Kesgrave Town Councillors), Mrs J Metcalfe (Chairman of Playford Parish Council), Mr T Llewellyn, Mr A Melrose and Mr T Herrington (Playford Parish Councillors), Mrs B Richardson Todd (Rushmere St Andrew Parish Councillor), Mr I Ransome and ten residents/members of the public

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

**Councillor  
Actions**

**1. Apologies, Declarations of Interest and Dispensation Requests**

Apologies were received from Mr Rufford, who was working. It was **RESOLVED:**

- To accept these apologies.

It was noted that County Councillor Robin Vickery and District Councillors Colin Hedgley and Robert Whiting had also apologised that they were unable to attend.

There were no declarations of interest or requests for dispensations.

**2. Co-option of Parish Councillor**

The vacancy caused by the resignation of Mrs Shaw had been advertised. SCDC had not received notice from electors requesting an election and co-option was therefore appropriate to fill the vacancy. It was **RESOLVED:**

- that Mr Ian Ransome be co-opted to the Council.

Mr Ransome signed the Declaration of Acceptance of the Office of Councillor.

**3. Public Participation Session**

**Neighbourhood Development Plan for Kesgrave: Area Application Consultation**

The Chairman invited Mr Ogden to speak first, in respect of the application it had submitted to SCDC for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area, for the purposes of producing a Neighbourhood Plan (NP), in view of concerns that the proposed Area included land in the parishes of Little Bealings and Playford.

Mr Ogden explained that the purpose of a NP was to add a more

detailed local view to the SCDC Core Strategy and Development Management Policies. It only dealt with development. It did not change boundaries. The proposal for a NP followed the creation of the 'Ipswich Eastern Fringe' policy area, but consultation with other parishes had resulted in the idea being taken forward just by Kesgrave Town Council (KTC) and Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council. Applying for the designation of an Area was the first stage in the NP process. The Area proposed had been arrived at on a geographical basis, as Playford Road and Hall Road made a 'natural boundary'. It was not intended that the NP would propose any development in Little Bealings or Playford.

Points made by others present were:

- That Little Bealings Parish Council not been consulted by KTC regarding the production of a NP or on the inclusion of any land in the parish in the proposed Area at any time prior to the submission of the Area designation application to SCDC, and had only become aware of it on commencement of the public consultation by SCDC.
- That Playford Parish Council had been consulted, but had advised that it did not want land in its parish included in the Area. The KTC NP Steering Group notes of the meeting held on 13 June 2016 were incorrect in item 4 in stating 'Playford Parish Council has formerly objected to the Neighbourhood Plan boundary'. This should have recorded that Playford Parish Council objected 'formally' not 'formerly'.
- That the boundary proposed was not deduced on the basis of a 'natural boundary', for example the boundary did not include Deben Avenue, which would have been logical on this basis.
- That assurances that there was no current intention to include development on land outside Kesgrave were no guarantee against future proposals, especially given that it is known that Kesgrave wishes to expand, as exemplified by its recent rejection of 300 proposed houses and proposal that 1,200 houses and appropriate infrastructure should be built instead.
- Kesgrave currently has 1,400 houses and is bigger than Woodbridge. The suggestion of a further 1,200 houses would effectively double the size. It has already expanded towards Rushmere St Andrew and the inclusion of land north of the A1214 in the Area application implies it now wishes to expand in this direction.
- That consultations with residents in 2009 and 2013 in Little Bealings had established that no development was wanted in this area. The area between Playford/Bealings and the A1214 is to stay as a green area.
- Why is land in Little Bealings and Playford included if it is not intended to suggest any development on this land? If there is no intention to propose development in Little Bealings or Playford, it is

logical to take that land out of the proposed Area. The area proposed should either reflect the parish boundaries or, if a more 'natural boundary' is required, this should be the A1214.

- That the Kesgrave Area designation application letter dated 18 March 2016 was inaccurate in stating that KTC “works in partnership with Parish Councils in close proximity to Kesgrave for sharing and pooling of resources and service.” There is no partnership working with Little Bealings Parish Council. The parish looked to Woodbridge for resources and services. This is exemplified by bus routes and current policing arrangements.
- The SCDC Core Strategy does not propose any development in Playford; the suggestion of development at Kiln Farm was not pursued by SCDC. The inclusion of land in Playford suggests that KTC wishes to annexe Playford land due to the “significant constraints for growth in terms of development sites and open green spaces” in Kesgrave, as stated in its Area designation application letter.
- Does KTC have the resource to take a NP forward, given the number of missing attendees at Steering Group meetings to date, and previous Councillor vacancies on KTC?
- That S61F(2) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 states: “If that neighbourhood area also includes the whole or any part of the area of another parish council, the parish council is authorised for those purposes to act in relation to that neighbourhood area only if the other parish council have given their consent”. Is KTC aware of this and how does it interpret its power to develop a NP affecting land in Little Bealings and Playford parishes, if consent is not given by those Parish Councils? Will it withdraw the current application?
- That during the Inspector’s examination of the case for an Ipswich Northern Bypass, the land north of the A1214 had been identified as to be kept as countryside.
- That development at Sinks Pit affected Little Bealings, not Kesgrave residents. Little Bealings residents therefore want some say in what happens on the site.
- That all of the land north of the A1214 was in Playford/Bealings at one time. The Kesgrave Cemetery is a recent development on land still in Playford.
- Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council was in favour of the KTC proposed Area, but the parish was in fact divided on whether it wished to be included, with differing views in its two wards, the more urban (Tower) ward and the more rural (Village) ward.

In response to the points made, and questions from attendees, Mr Ogden and Mr Archer stated:

- The policies in the completed NP would apply to development in the whole of the designated Area.
- SCDC policies also did not allow for any development on the north side of the A1214.
- Every house included in the Area would be consulted on the NP.
- That a Committee would be needed to take the NP forward and no one had been appointed to lead at present. Mr Ogden was a member of the current Steering Group.
- That 50% of those voting, plus one, was sufficient for the NP to be approved by local residents.
- That the Area included in the designation application had been deduced from mapping, not any consideration of the nature of the land.
- That KTC wanted to identify and examine the key issues and the current consultation was the beginning of a wish to pursue development and have input into the SCDC planning process.
- The current Area did include developed land: Sinks Pit and Kesgrave School. They were consulted on Sinks Pit proposals as the entrance was within Kesgrave.
- That they were not aware of the provision of S61F(2) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and if SCDC advised them they could not act in other parishes without consent, they would withdraw the Area designation application.
- That they were unaware of the lack of consultation with Little Bealings, or of the strength of opposition from Little Bealings and Playford to the proposed Area until this meeting.
- That they did not know if they could withdraw the application now the consultation was running, and it could be difficult for KTC to meet in time to make this decision before the end of the consultation period.

Mr Ogden and Mr Archer requested time to discuss the matter privately and left the meeting. When they returned they:

- Offered sincere apologies for the lack of consultation or knowledge of the two parishes' views on the inclusion of land in the parishes in the Area designation application
- Advised that they would consult with Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council, as a party to the Area designation application, with the intention of obtaining their agreement to the withdrawal of the application, if this was possible.

- Advised that they would be contacting SCDC for advice on their options, including whether the application could be withdrawn.

Mr Ogden and Mr Archer were asked to advise quickly if the application was to be withdrawn, as Playford Parish Council did not have a meeting arranged to enable a response to be made to SCDC within the consultation deadline.

The members of Kesgrave Town Council were thanked for attending. They, and Rushmere St Andrew and Playford Parish Councillors, left the meeting.

### **Development at Sinks Pit**

A resident advised that there had been more noise in recent weeks and new plant had been installed. On occasion the noise level was appalling. The new plant was visible above the height of the bund.

The new plant had been referred to SCC by the Council and SCC had advised that it was a soil washing machine. It did not require planning permission. It was not known to be noisy and so it was considered that any increase in noise had been due to its installation not its operation and so would be temporary.

SCC Waste had provided a note for the Council which advised that an action plan had been developed with the owner of the Kesgrave Quarry/Trucks R Us sites to improve day to day operations. Additional plant at the site was currently being installed and it had been agreed that an acoustic consultant would be appointed by the owner and a survey would be carried out thereafter. SCC Waste was also working with the owner in respect of the relocation of the flare equipment to the existing water treatment plant site in Hall Road. It was premature to provide details on any sound attenuation solution, but the Parish Council would be updated again.

Residents commented that relocating the flare would not be an easy matter, but was presumably proposed to avoid a conflict with possible future bunding.

Mr Hunter advised that a meeting with the site owner and residents was proposed for September, and would include a tour of the site. Ms Head expressed interest in attending.

The residents/members of the public left the meeting.

## **4. Planning**

### **Neighbourhood Development Plan for Kesgrave: Area Application Consultation**

It was noted that SCDC had refused to extend the time for response to the consultation, despite being made aware that the Council had no prior knowledge that land in Little Bealings was included in the application.

SCDC had advised the Council that the development of land in the parish was governed by the provisions of SCDC's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies and that these served to

protect the land included in the KTC Area Designation Application from development. The inclusion of the land by Kesgrave should not be taken to mean that Little Bealings had to produce its own NP to counter the KTC proposal.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To respond to the consultation and advise SCDC as follows:
  - That Little Be
  - alings Parish Council objects most strongly to the inclusion of any land in its parish in the designated Area. The land in question forms a natural green corridor between the A1214 and the rural character of the village and residences in Playford Road. Its inclusion is wholly inappropriate in consequence. Joint Parish Planning undertaken with Gt Bealings and Playford in 2009 established a strong demand to retain green fields between Kesgrave and Playford/Bealings. There is no also no demand for development identified from a Village Review undertaken in 2013.
  - That the appropriate boundary for a Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan Area is the A1214.
  - That Little Bealings Parish Council has had no consultation whatsoever from Kesgrave Town Council prior to the submission of its application to SCDC for the designation of an Area for a Neighbourhood Plan. In respect of inaccuracies in the application letter dated 18 March 2016 these are as follows:
    - Paragraph 3: The village of Little Bealings does not rely on Kesgrave for basic services. It looks to Woodbridge for services, as exemplified by bus routes and current policing provision
    - Paragraph 4: Kesgrave Town Council does not work in partnership with Little Bealings Parish Council. There is no sharing or pooling of any resources or services.
    - Paragraph 5: There can be no continuation of engagement when none has taken place to date.
  - That, in the event the application is not withdrawn and is approved by SCDC, Little Bealings Parish Council will not give consent for Kesgrave Town Council to act in its parish in respect of a Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **Development at Sinks Pit**

The comments of SCC were noted. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To request a further update from SCC prior to the Council meeting on 5 September 2016.

## 5. Correspondence

Items received were noted and it was **RESOLVED**:

- That the following items would be circulated to Councillors:
  - EAOW 3 copy of application
  - The Zone

## 6. Date of Next Meeting

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.25pm. The next meeting will be held on Monday 5 September 2016.