

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.15pm
on Monday 4 September 2017**

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

Also present: Mr R Vickery (Suffolk County Councillor), C Hedgley (Suffolk Coastal District Councillor), thirteen local residents (including one from Great Bealings) and two agents for planning application DC/17/3538/FUL, 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 Dr C Hopkins, who was away. It was **RESOLVED:**

- To accept the apologies for absence.

Mrs Cornish declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application DC/17/3528/FUL. There were no requests for dispensations.

2 Public Participation Session

2.1 Planning Application DC/17/3528/FUL at The Orchard, Holly Lane

Residents made the following points in respect of the application, and photographs of Holly Close and the view into site from a house across Holly Close were passed to Councillors by a resident:

- The application showed base regard for neighbours and breached promises made to them by the owners of The Orchard, and conditions in the planning permission for The Orchard, which required the hedge in Holly Close and trees to be kept.
- It also breached 10 SCDC planning policies, including:
 - SP1: this is not a sustainable development. The development makes no social, economic or environmental benefit as claimed. The only benefit is financial gain to the owners of The Orchard. There is no local need for it, and no support for it – only very strong opposition. The application's comparison with Grundisburgh is incomprehensible given the very different facilities in the two villages.
 - SP29: It would be a development in the countryside, and there is no special circumstance to allow it. It would destroy the character of Holly Close. It is only special in being especially objectionable.
 - DM3: This is a site outside the physical limits boundary. Holly Close is rural. The land is rural land; it is not an urban plot to be divided up.
 - DM4: The site does not meet the definition of a 'cluster', there being no houses on this side of Holly Close. There are no footways.

- DM22: There is no provision for access for people with disabilities, who could not access the bus stop from the site. The layout allows for three cars, but shuffling is necessary and would block Holly Close.
- The Parish Plan carried out in 2009 did not identify a need for this type of development, only some support for smaller homes and sheltered accommodation for the elderly. The Village Review carried out in 2013 did not identify any need for new housing.
- A review of the SCDC Settlement Hierarchy would see Little Bealings classified as an 'Other Village' not a 'Local Service Centre' in view of the loss of the Admiral's Head.
- It is contrary to the SCDC Local Plan, which has not allocated any housing to Little Bealings.
- Holly Close is a beautiful, rural lane and very narrow. It has a dangerous junction with Holly Lane, where the speed limit is 60mph and visibility is restricted. It is a cul-de-sac, but there is no room to turn around within it and vehicles have to reverse into private driveways or over private land to do so. It is bounded on the southern side by a mature hedge, which has rural amenity value.
- Use of a car is essential for residents, for shopping and commuting, and to add three more cars is irresponsible, increasing the highway hazard at the junction with Holly Lane and decreasing the amenity value of Holly Close. It is a private road, used as a walking route and so provides no vehicular access to the site.
- Holly Close is already sometimes obstructed by vehicles; one resident parks in Michael's Mount temporarily and walks home when this happens. It is not feasible to carry shopping and luggage this way, given the distance and nature of the footpath.
- The land is rich in diversity and is green and lush. Many years ago it was glebe land, and the District Council was given permission by the Church Commissioners to build the Council houses. It was also used as common land and was free for everyone to use, for animals and bees. A four-bedroomed town house will stifle the existing houses and have no view. The adjacent land is being used for bees again.
- The owners told residents they would not be building on or developing the rest of the land, but have gone back on this. It will feel like a built-up area, not a village.
- The Orchard used to be a small bungalow. It was replaced with a large house, only reduced a little in size during the planning process. It was allowed in view of the size of the site. It has since been extended to the maximum permitted development. This proposal is massive, and is excessive on the site.

The agents said they had no comments to make in response.

In response to a question from Ms Head, one agent said that they had not considered the previous permission granted, and were not aware of residents' previous comments about the site, only planning policy. The only planning history for the site existed under different policies and different development plans. Last week a decision by the Secretary of State concluded that SCDC did not have a five year supply of housing and there was therefore a presumption in favour of development. If SCDC decides the development is sustainable socially, economically and environmentally, SCDC must then grant permission.

A resident advised that she had contacted SCDC as land which was partly in her ownership was included in a document as potential land for development, and she had no intention of it being developed. She had been advised that all sites which had ever been proposed had been included in the document, and that SCDC now had more housing sites than it needed. In consequence there were no grounds for SCDC to grant permission for this application.

2.2 Community Asset Listing – the Admiral’s Head

A resident asked if the Council could consider also seeking this status for the Angela Cobbold Hall. SCDC had already listed the Hall as a non-designated heritage asset.

The Chairman advised that this matter was not on the current agenda, but it would be considered at a future meeting.

2.3 Public Sewer for The Street

A resident was aware of the need for a new sewer for The Street and asked if this would affect the Church and provide new drainage, especially given the plans for the CafeHub at the Church.

2.4 Highways

A resident asked what parking arrangements there were for the CafeHub, given current problems with School parking, and that extra parking in The Street could be dangerous and impeded local traffic. The Chairman advised that it had been agreed that parking could be available at the Village Hall, but this was subject to the parking needs of hirers of the Hall. The resident commented that this would be difficult access to the CafeHub, especially for the elderly on the hill between the car park and the Church.

3 Minutes of the meetings held on 3 and 12 July and 15 August 2017

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To approve the minutes of these meetings as written.

4 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no matters arising.

5 Planning

5.1 Application DC/17/3528/FUL The Orchard, Holly Lane: Erection of detached dwelling and garage. Formation of vehicular access in Holly Close

Eleven emails objecting to the development had been circulated to Councillors. Mr Hunter commended the residents for their energy and attention in responding to the application consultation, but he was aware that determination by SCDC would be as a result of the application of relevant national and local planning policies. It was noted that three other applications for development outside the physical limits boundary of the village (at Wychwood, Woodside and Bealings Holt in Martlesham Road) had been refused in recent years.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- to object to the application on the following grounds:

- The application breaches policies SP27, SP29, DM3 and DM4, being an isolated site in the countryside, outside the physical limits of the village. There is no access via Holly Close, access along Holly Close having been denied when permission was granted for The Orchard (C/11/1312)
- The application does not fulfill the criteria in paragraphs 7 and 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework of contributing economically, socially and environmentally. The application is especially negative in respect of the environmental impact, and makes no economic contribution to any housing needs.
- The comparison with Grundisburgh is totally spurious, Little Bealings being a much smaller village, which, on the basis of its facilities following the closure of the pub, should be designated an 'Other Village'. Mallard House is not a place of employment.
- The access at the junction of Holly Close and Holly Lane is dangerous, with the speed limit along Holly Lane being 60mph.
- The development breaches policies DM21, DM22 and DM23, being detrimental to the character of Holly Close, which is private and maintained by the current residents. Holly Close provides no access for vehicles to turn around. The development would adversely affect the established hedgerow, and would place a large house looking directly at Nos 5 and 6 Holly Close. This is also over-development of The Orchard site, precluded by the conditions of C/11/1312.

5.2 Previous Planning Applications - Updates

It was noted that:

- the following applications had been approved by SCDC:

DC/17/2605/FUL: Single storey extension to create new study and ensuite at Beacon Ridge, 24 Beacon Lane

DC/17/3126/FUL: Two storey rear extension to existing dwelling – The Chestnuts, Martlesham Road, Lt Bealings

- the following application had been refused by SCDC:

DC/17/2734/FUL Rear first floor extension over existing ground floor extension at Marydene, Martlesham Road

- the following application had been considered by the SCDC Referral Panel for determination by the Planning Committee, as material planning considerations had been raised by the Council, but the Panel had granted authority to approve the application to officers, subject to officers negotiating a suitable form of boundary treatment to the site frontage:

DC/17/2772/ARM: Approval of Reserved Matters of DC/14/1125/OUT – Demolition of existing two dwellings, workshop unit and associated outbuildings. Erection of four dwellings with garages at Acacot, The Street

5.3 EAOW Construction Update

It was noted that archaeology surveying was continuing and a new vehicular access to the site had been created in Holly Lane for this. The developers had advised that the archaeology survey was not subject to the Development Consent Order in respect of access or traffic management. A local resident had complained about the noise of traffic over a temporary road surface early in the morning, and that there had been damage to an adjacent oak tree. The developers had stated that the access would be closed and restored when the work was complete, but they did not know when SCC intended to do this.

5.4 Sinks Pit Update

A report from SCC Waste had been circulated to Councillors. There had been no response to the Council's enquiries to the planning officer, following the refusal of SCC Waste to allow bunding work unless the owner of the site agreed to accept full financial liability for any impact on the landfill site. It was noted that noise levels at the site had been intolerable for nearby residents recently and **RESOLVED**:

- to continue to press SCC planning officers for a response on how the unacceptable noise levels were going to be addressed.

5.5 Community Asset Listing: The Admiral's Head

SCDC had agreed to the Council's request to list the pub as a Community Asset on 26 November 2012, but this would expire on 25 November 2017. Mrs Cornish referred to the consultation in the current Fynn-Lark Magazine on the creation of a CafeHub at the Church and concern that if this proceeded it could affect future viability of the pub. The re-opening of the pub was supported in the 2013 Village Review. It was noted that the pub had not been for sale on the open market and **RESOLVED**:

- to ask SCDC to extend the listing for a further five year period
- to consider Community Asset Listing for the Angela Cobbold Hall at the next meeting.

5.6 SCDC and IBC Local Plan Review – Determination of Response

Mr Hunter queried the accuracy of the data in the SCDC consultation document, given that the estimated population growth and need for new dwellings were a mismatch and seemed to propose that more than one new dwelling per additional person was required. Mr Hedgley advised that District Councillors had also found the document difficult to understand and had asked for it to be re-written.

Issues which were likely to be relevant when responding to the consultation included:

- the status of the parish as a Local Service Centre
- the Ipswich Northern Bypass proposal
- the impact of development on rural roads and traffic
- the need for faster broadband
- the re-opening of the Admiral's Head

It was noted that three sites were included for potential development in the parish, as a result of nomination. All three were outside the physical limits boundary and had previously been rejected by SCDC.

SCDC had offered a 1:1 meeting to discuss the future needs of the community and this would be attended by the Chairman, Mr Ransome and the Clerk on 25 September.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to undertake an e-consultation within the parish on resident's wishes for the future of Little Bealings before responding to the SCDC consultation
- that the next meeting of the Council would take place on 19 October, at which the Council's response to the SCDC consultation would be agreed
- that no response would be made to the IBC consultation.

6 Public Sewer for The Street

No decision had yet been received from the Environment Agency. It was noted that the Church currently had only one toilet and that the CafeHub proposal would require more facilities to be installed.

7 Highways

7.1 20mph for The Street and School Parking

SCC had advised that it hoped the works for this would be completed by 29 September. It did not supply or condone the use of 20mph stickers on wheelie bins.

No reply had been received from the School in response to the request for a copy of the Travel Plan and it was noted that previous attempts to meet with the School to discuss parking had failed. The new 'respect' green cone initiative required the School to appoint junior road safety officers.

7.2 White Lines

No work had yet been carried out, nor had reported graffiti on the village sign or sunken drains in Playford Road been dealt with.

7.3 Application to SCC for SID/TVAS Poles

Two poles had been erected by SCC in Martlesham and Playford Roads and they would be used for two weeks by the SCC TVAS every six weeks from the end of September.

7.4 SAVID/SID

Ms Head reported on the recent SAVID meeting she had attended, at which it had been reported that there was no funding available for the new SAVID SID. Mr Vickery apologised for this, and said that he had been advised by SCC officers that he had sufficient local highways budget available for the purchase of a new SID for £3,000. However, they had subsequently advised him that this was no longer the case, and the only SID which was available was a second hand one. Mr Vickery considered that funding a new SID which would be shared by six parishes was very good value for money, but at present there was no funding he could allocate. His locality budget for this year had also been cut.

It was noted that the matter of ownership and insurance for a new SID still remained to be resolved, and that the Council's insurers had said that it could not be added to the Council's policy unless the Council had sole ownership. Ms Head reported that SAVID had an agreement drafted to address the

issues of ownership, insurance claims and payment of any claim excess. It was not clear if there were volunteers to collect and erect the SID when it was in the parish. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to remain on the SCC schedule for use of the TVAS until the provision of a SAVID SID was resolved.

7.5 Footpath Cutting

The second cut had been completed. The Council's brushcutter had been serviced and was now stored by the Clerk.

7.6 Road Closures

It was noted that The Street had been closed for 10 days by Network Rail for track works and, although it had been said that access would be available for pedestrians and cyclists, this had not been the case. SCC had not responded to queries about this.

A closure of Martlesham Road at the A12 bridge was currently in place, for emergency bridge repairs.

8 Reports from Local District and County Councillors

Mr Hedgley's report had been circulated to Councillors. He also referred to a new consultation by SCDC on Dog Control Orders, which he would send to the Council.

Mr Vickery provided a written report to be circulated to Councillors and advised that a new SCC CEO was being appointed. He explained recent changes in the management of SCC Highways, with the Saxmundham Area Office being closed and officers being transferred to Halesworth, Ipswich and Rougham. There would be new Customer Co-ordinators and Community Wardens, but he did not have individual phone numbers or email addresses.

9 Police

First Tier Meeting held on 20 July

Ms Head had attended and reported that it had been suggested that the Council involve the School, police, SCC Highways and SCDC in a meeting to discuss School parking. However, the police officer concerned had now left the area. The minutes of the meeting had been circulated and the next meeting would be held on 14 September. Mrs Cornish was not available to attend

10 Finance

10.1 Bank Reconciliation for First Quarter

This had been completed by Mr Hunter.

10.2 Authorisation of Expenditure

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

- Annual Subscription to Suffolk Preservation Society: £30 (replacement cheque)
- Clerk's net salary for August and expenses: £404.11
- PAYE for August: £65.20
- Clerk's net salary for September: £261.46
- PAYE for September: £65.20

- Clerk's net salary for October: £261.46
- PAYE for October: £65.20
- BBDO for external audit: £120
- Happy Gardening Services for Footpath Cutting: £166
- SCC for 20mph Speed Restriction for The Street: £5,500

A schedule of the above payments was signed by the Chairman and cheques were signed by Ms Head and the Chairman.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To authorise payment of the Council's annual insurance policy premium as soon as the invoice was received.

10.3 **Income Received**

None

10.4 **External Audit – Update**

The external audit had been completed and no matters of concern had been raised. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To accept the Annual Return and the external auditor's certificate
- To advertise the Notice of Conclusion of the Audit

11 **Matters Arising from Circulated Items**

It was noted that no one was available to attend the SALC area meeting on 18 September.

12 **Correspondence**

12.1 **Reform of Data Protection Act – Training**

In view of changes to data protection legislation it was **RESOLVED**:

- that the Chairman and Clerk would attend training in due course

12.2 **Councillor Training**

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- Mr Ransome would give further consideration to attending SALC Councillor training during September/October, at a cost of £100 and for which there was budget provision if he wished to attend **IR**

Circulation 2017/06 (the SCDC Local Plan Review Document) was passed to Mr Rufford. It was **RESOLVED** that:

- the following correspondence be circulated to Councillors:
 - Clerks and Councils Direct
 - SALC The Local Councillor

14 **Date of Next Meeting**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that, in view of the need to determine a response to the SCDC Local Plan Review consultation by 30 October, the next meeting of the Council will be held on Thursday 19 October and not Monday 6 November 2017.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.15pm.