

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.15pm
on Tuesday 3 October 2017**

Present: Mrs M Wilson (Chairman), Ms D Head, Mr D Hunter, Mr I Ransome and Mr B Rufford

Also present: Mr C Hedgley (Suffolk Coastal District Councillor) and eleven local residents all 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 Mrs T Cornish and Dr C Hopkins, who were working. It was **RESOLVED:**

- To accept the apologies for absence.

There were no declarations of interest or requests for dispensations.

2 Public Participation Session

2.1 Planning Application DC/17/4012/FUL at The Orchard, Holly Lane

Residents made the following points in respect of the application:

- The application was not materially different to the previous application, which had been unanimously opposed, merely amended to include Holly Close within the red line site boundary.
- The application was still objectionable on the grounds that:
 - It would ruin the character of a rural lane
 - It would ruin the hedgerow
 - It would ruin the outlook for Nos 3 to 7 Holly Close
 - The junction with Holly Lane was dangerous, with a restricted view
 - Construction traffic for the development would be a major hazard in Holly Close
 - It would destroy the rural character and amenity value of the area for generations to come
- A resident had been told the bungalow previously on the site of The Orchard was water damaged and had to be demolished and replaced with a new house, but they had not expected the house to be so big. The owners had been upset at the opposition to their application for this, and had promised Holly Close residents that they would not touch the orchard trees or hedgerow to secure support. They could continue with further applications after this one and this was not right.
- Access along Holly Close was only available to houses on the north side and there was no access to the southern side. This development site therefore has no access.
- The development would be violation of rich, verdant land and would ruin the lane.

- The site entrance was at the narrowest point of Holly Close, and there had always been children living in Holly Close who had played and ridden bikes in the lane. This access would be dangerous for them.
- The development was totally out of place, being too big and a 'town' house. There was no infrastructure to support it and the proposed space for three cars showed how impractical the site was.
- There was no justification for the development that could overrule the aesthetic and practical reasons for the retention of the land in its current state.

Planning Application DC/17/3903 at The Bear Cave, Martlesham Road

A neighbouring resident said that in principle he had no objection to the development but he was aware that some works had already been carried out to build a retaining wall, and he was concerned that work was compliant with the application. He agreed that the development would improve the property. The extensions were large, but he thought that the location meant he would be shielded by trees and not overlooked.

He was advised to contact SCDC if he had concerns about unauthorised development.

3 Planning

3.1 Application DC/17/3903/FUL Woodside, Martlesham Road: Proposed 4 bay cartlodge with studio above

It was noted that there was no known objection from neighbours and **RESOLVED**:

- That there was no objection to the development.

3.2 Application DC/17/3873/FUL Pine Lodge, Playford Road: Single storey rear extension and new detached outbuilding, new pitched roof to replace existing flat roof

It was noted that the property was quite isolated, the development was unlikely to be seen from Playford Road and it was not out of character with the property. There was no known objection from neighbours and it was **RESOLVED**:

- That there was no objection to the development.

3.3 Application DC/17/3903/FUL The Bear Cave, Martlesham Road: Proposed two storey extensions

The views of the neighbouring property were noted, and that the development would not be visible from Martlesham Road and was a 'smart' design and it was **RESOLVED**:

- That there was no objection to the development

3.4 Application DC/17/4012/FUL The Orchard, Holly Lane: Erection of detached dwelling and garage. Formation of vehicular access to Holly Close

It was noted that ownership of Holly Close had become an issue and that the existing residents had rights of way over it and maintained it. The red line boundary now proposed access over land to which the owners of The Orchard had no rights.

It was objectionable that the applicants had not taken any notice of the objections made to the previous application by local residents.

The reference in the application to the development being below the threshold for Affordable Housing was considered in the context of national and local planning policy Affordable Housing requirements.

It was noted that there was no change to the application from the previous application, DC/17/3528/FUL, which had been withdrawn after SCC had advised that it was invalid, having not included a proposed access to the highway. The previous application had erroneously assumed that Holly Close was public highway and a press notice had therefore been published to notify any party with an interest in Holly Close that the land was to be included in the red line site boundary of the replacement application. As there was no material change to the application it was **RESOLVED**:

- to maintain the Council's objection to the development, on the same grounds as in respect of application DC/17/3528/FUL.

3.6 Previous Planning Applications: Updates

There were no updates.

3.7 EAOW Construction Update

It was noted that archaeology surveying was due to finish on 4 October, and the applicants had been asked to repair damage to the verge in Holly Lane when closing the access point. They intended to carry out some work and reseed the area. They had advised that some Gt Bealings residents had asked for a meeting about the next stage of the project and asked if a joint meeting would be appropriate.

Playford Parish Council had complained about incorrect temporary speed limit signing in Playford, and this had been corrected.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that a meeting with the site manager for the next stage of the project would be useful, and that Playford Parish Council should be asked if they wished to attend.

3.8 Sinks Pit Update

A report from SCC Waste had been circulated to Councillors. There had still been no response to the Council's enquiries to the planning officer. The ongoing noise pollution was a matter for residents to raise directly with SCDC Environmental Health Officers at the times when noise levels were unacceptably high.

4 Finance

4.1 Authorisation of Expenditure

It was **RESOLVED** that the following expenditure be incurred:

- T Fear: replacement cheque for Happy Gardening Services for Footpath Cutting: £166
- Business Services at CAS Ltd: insurance premium: £186.09

14 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Council will be held on Thursday 19 October.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 7.45pm.