

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.15pm  
on Thursday 11 February 2016**

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

**Also present:** Mr C Hedgley (Suffolk Coastal District Councillor), and six residents for part of the meeting.

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

**Councillor  
Actions**

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

Apologies were received from Mr B Rufford and Mrs T Cornish due to work commitments and Ms J Shaw due to illness. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To accept the apologies.

There were no declarations of interest or requests for dispensations.

**2 Public Participation Session**

It was noted that the agent for planning application PL\0008\16 – Laying of block paved hard standing (retrospective) increase in height of the screen bund, erection of flood lighting, and temporary stockpiling of aggregate material to assist in reorganisation of stockpiling at Sinks Pit, Main Road, Kesgrave, had not responded to the invitation to attend the meeting.

Residents raised questions and concerns about the application as follows:

- The implications of the application were totally unclear and the applicant still had not provided a clear strategy for the whole site
- The main issue is noise from the site and there is no information on whether the current application would increase or decrease noise
- It had been expected that the applicant would be attending the meeting
- The lighting was originally intended to be low level, but this application proposed 7.9m high lights which would bathe the whole site in light and plague the houses even more than at present
- Bats will be affected by the lighting and are a protected species; can they prove there is no impact on them?
- There is no clarity regarding use of the block paved area
- Any other applicant would be required to remove unauthorised development and cease the activities which had disturbed residents significantly last summer
- There must not be a repeat of the noise this summer
- There is no confidence that the applicant will adhere to the content of the application and the Parish Council should take action
- The press should be involved to ensure that notice is taken of the current situation
- The impact on the natural environment and the public footpath is unclear
- It is doubted that the applicant has ownership of the site and can carry out the proposed bunding works.

In response Mr Hunter advised residents of his consideration and understanding of the planning application, and residents were advised of the Parish Council's role, as follows:

- The application proposed lights on timers which would reflect the operating hours for the site: 7am – 6pm Mondays to Fridays and 7am to 1pm on Saturdays. The lights were to address 'poor natural light' at the site for safety reasons, and were not security lighting. The current temporary lights were brighter.
- The application for the block paving is a retrospective application, to seek to retain the area already constructed.
- It is up to SCC to determine the application and residents should submit their objections and representations in writing to that Council as individuals.
- It is the role of the Parish Council to receive and record residents' complaints and to comment on the planning application as a consultee. The Council represents the whole parish, not individuals.
- The Council has objected to previous applications for development at the site and Mr Hunter has been active in trying to resolve the matter.
- The press were welcome to attend Parish Council meetings if they wished to do so.
- Natural England had concluded that the development did not impact adversely on the SSSI and so did not object.
- Protection for the bats had been considered and approved before.
- There was no impact on the recorded alignment of the public footpath, the proposed bunding work being on the other side of the bund from the route.
- Ownership of the site was not a relevant issue; the grant of planning permission did not give any right to develop on land not within the applicant's control.

## 5 Planning

### Application

#### **PL\0008\16 – Laying of block paved hard standing (retrospective) increase in height of the screen bund, erection of flood lighting, and temporary stockpiling of aggregate material to assist in reorganisation of stockpiling at Sinks Pit, Main Road, Kesgrave**

Mr Hunter advised that, while he had not been in favour of previous development applications at the site, he considered that the current application addressed the issues of noise and light in a more imaginative manner and was in the interests of residents.

It was noted that operations at the site meant that the current bund was inadequate for the larger scale use. The application proposed raising the bund by about 10 metres in height on the north side, and profiling on the south side. Both would better attenuate noise. The effective height of the new bund would be about 42 metres.

The proposed new lighting would be 21 poles, each 8 metres tall. Each pole would have two LED lights directed directly downwards. and they would not therefore be 'scanning' property. The increased bund height would shield the lighting.

Mr Hunter also advised that he considered that the current stockpiles of aggregate were too high and they should be required to be reduced, to lessen their visual impact on the area.

It was noted that there was no standard established for lighting and noise at the site and there was concern that it would not be audited in future. However, there were provisions for residents to complain of noise nuisance to SCDC Environmental Health Officers. In addition, SCC had conducted noise assessments at the site, including requiring the plant to be operated while readings were taken. SCC had concluded that the levels were within those approved previously at the site.

It was understood that a 'noise shroud' was to be installed around one crushing machine, which should help to ameliorate what was still a very loud noise level.

Other noise came from vehicles at the site, but this application did not propose any change to previously approved vehicle numbers.

It was noted that, as a private company, the applicant was not open to scrutiny by the Parish Council and was not obliged to provide any information about a strategy for future use of the site.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- That, taken as a whole, the proposals were of benefit to nearby residents and should resolve existing problems with noise and light pollution if fully implemented
- That there was therefore no objection to the application, subject to conditions which set:
  - Commencement and completion dates for the bunding works
  - Commencement and completion dates for the installation of the lighting
  - A period of 5 months for reducing the existing stockpile of aggregate
  - That no additional processing of aggregate material was to take place at the western end of the site
  - That the whole of the permission was to be implemented, to avoid either the lighting or temporary stockpiling being undertaken without the additional height bunding.

#### **4 Arrangements for Annual Parish Meeting**

It was noted that Community Action Suffolk had confirmed that it was able to undertake a Village Review at the Annual Parish Meeting on 14 March. It was **RESOLVED**

- That the format for the evening would be:
  - Annual Parish Meeting
  - Village Review – Part 1
  - Serving of Refreshments
  - Village Review – Part 2

#### **5 Correspondence**

There was no correspondence to be considered.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 8.10pm.