

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.15pm  
on Monday 8 January 2018**

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

**Also present:** Nineteen local residents/members of the public, including Mrs J Shaw, the Council's webmaster, for all/part of the meeting

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

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

There were no apologies for absence from Councillors. Apologies were received from District Councillor Colin Hedgley and County Councillor Robin Vickery.

Mrs Wilson and Ms Head declared non-pecuniary interests in item 7.3 Bealings Village Hall Window Replacement as Trustees of the Village Hall.

There were no requests for dispensations.

**2 Public Participation Session**

**2.1 DC/17/4940/FUL: Erection of New Dwelling Adjacent to Bealings Holt, Martlesham Road**

In response to the applicant's question, Councillors confirmed that they had not visited the site, it being private property, but that they were aware of the location, the application documents and paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The applicant distributed copies of paragraph 55, CGI photographs of the proposed dwelling and a statement 'What is Para 55?'. He commented:

- Paragraph 55 had replaced 'Gummer's Law', whereby buildings of great architectural value were permitted on sites where development did not otherwise comply with planning policy.
- He and his wife wished to build a home for their retirement and had spent a long time consulting with SCDC planners and the Suffolk Design Review Panel before applying.
- He was aware of SCDC policy DM3 regarding new housing in the countryside. The design of the house was such that in fact it would not be financially viable to build commercially and therefore it set no precedent for other development in the area.

In response to a Councillor's question regarding the inclusion of a swimming pool and 10 parking spaces, he confirmed that there was no intention to rent out the pool and it would be available for use by the dwelling only.

A resident of Martlesham Road commented that he had no objection to the application, but he was aware that, even where an existing vehicular access was proposed, SCDC had advised strongly in the past that the only development in this area would be on a 'one for one' basis. This had been reflected in the refusal of another application for an additional dwelling and

the dismissal of the appeal. It was reflected in the recent decision requiring a 'one for one' replacement for High Rigg. He wondered if SCDC is now more 'fickle' and whether this application will set a precedent for other development along Martlesham Road.

## **2.2 DC/17/5043/FUL: Change of Use of a Former Pub to Residential Use: The Admiral's Head, The Street**

A local resident said that times had moved on since the closure of the pub. It had not been possible to buy and run it as a community asset due to the financial demands of the owners. There had been no applications from any breweries to take over the pub since it closed and it was therefore time to be pragmatic and agree to it becoming a dwelling for the owners living there. The site was an eyesore and focusing on new properties would be to the betterment of neighbouring properties. The pub car park should be bought and run as a community car park. It is not a matter of 'what could have been' but of what is now the best for the village.

A local resident said that he and his wife had moved into the village only a few weeks ago, and on that day he had been invited to object to the change of use application by a resident. He has first-hand experience of such applications and so considered the application documents, and consulted with his son, a professional surveyor. He was appalled by the content of the application and information stated by the agents. His son's submitted objection sets out their full reasons why the application should be refused by SCDC. He urged the Council to take advantage of the three minute speaking opportunity if the application was considered by an SCDC Planning Committee. He has some sympathy for the applicants, but their competency has been queried by others and it was important to disassociate them as individuals from the application.

He said that he had offered to buy the pub at the price which resulted from an independent professional valuation of the business, but the agents had not returned his call to discuss this. He was of the view that the application must be refused.

## **2.3 Proposed Footpath from Beacon Lane to The Street**

A local resident reiterated his and his wife's strong objection to the proposed route over his property (Suncroft), The Chestnuts, through a railway tunnel and over farmland, as contained in his email to the Council. He added:

- There were fully functioning drainage ditches which would be affected and works would be very costly
- Oak trees protected by a TRO would need to be felled
- There were sometimes cattle in the field proposed for the route and legislation prevented some bulls being kept in a field crossed by a public right of way. The field would need to be fenced.
- It was not possible to put a footpath on the railway embankment as proposed without using their land and land at The Chestnuts. It had not been explained how the route would cross their land.
- Network Rail would be extremely unlikely to agree to any route which affected its land.

Notwithstanding these points, if the proposal proceeded it would be against

their wishes and an attack on their property rights. They would take advantage of the procedure in S31.6 of the Highways Act to prevent any route being dedicated. They hoped not to have to take this action.

The local resident who had proposed the footpath and carried out some local consultation on it before the meeting said that he lived in Beacon Lane and his three children attended Bealings School. It was too dangerous to walk along Martlesham Road: 17,000 vehicles a week had been shown to use it during a recent survey. This number was bound to increase with the proposed developments at Martlesham and Kesgrave. He wanted to make walking to the village possible; some residents south of the railway line cannot access the centre. He wanted to explore the options for this and did not intend to attack any property owners. Other options included a pavement along Martlesham Road or another crossing point over the railway. He wanted to make walking safer.

Another local resident supported this, saying that in Beacon Lane they felt remote. They used to walk to the village along Martlesham Road, but now drove as they felt this was too dangerous. A pavement would make them less isolated.

Another resident said that the properties along Martlesham Road owned the land up to the edge of the metalled road – ie there was no space for a pavement. The answer was for the police to be more aware of how many vehicles speed along Martlesham Road and take more action to enforce the speed limit. He doubted that any compulsory purchase of land for a pavement would proceed due to the cost.

#### **Noise at Trucks R Us/Sinks Pit**

- 2.4** A resident of Martlesham Road said that he was aware of a great whining noise on the site when he was walking nearby. He had contacted SCDC to ask if this had been taken into account when noise assessments had been carried out. SCDC had advised that the proposal to build a bund to contain the noise had been prevented by SCC who were concerned about the impact on the gas venting at the former landfill site.

The resident was advised that the noise came from gully suckers, piping out waste and washing down, and that the proposed bunding had been prevented by the conditions imposed on the site owner by SCC. The noise had been taken into account during assessments, which had deliberately seen all of the equipment operated at once to obtain the most useful data. It was a matter still in need of resolution.

### **3 Minutes of the meetings held on 19 October and 27 November 2017**

#### **3.1 It was RESOLVED:**

- To approve the minutes of these meetings as written.

### **4 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

#### **4.1 Angela Cobbold Hall and CafeHub Projects**

It was noted the minutes referred to there being only seven regular worshippers at the Church, who were elderly. However, the recent Fynn-Lark News had reported the confirmation of a young Little Bealings resident, so perhaps there was cause for optimism that numbers may rise.

### **DPA Training**

- 4.2 The Chairman reported that she and the Clerk had attended training run by SALC, which had promoted the appointment of an external Data Protection Officer to satisfy the requirements of the new General Data Protection Regulations. The Regulations will take effect in May and would result in a cost being incurred by the Council to comply. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To circulate information about the new Regulations to Councillors
- To await further information from SALC, with a view to opting for the cost efficient service offered.

## **5 Public Sewer in The Street**

It was noted that the Environment Agency had found in favour of the Council's appeal against Anglian Water's refusal to provide a sewer, in respect of five properties in The Street/Sandy Lane. It was expected that Anglian Water would include the sewer in plans for works between 2020 and 2025. It was understood that other nearby properties would have the right to connect to it, at their own cost.

## **6 Community Asset Listing Update**

### **6.1 The Admiral's Head**

SCDC was currently consulting on the application and was due to make a decision by 1 February.

### **6.2 The Angela Cobbold Memorial Hall**

SCDC had advised that, as the building was an ecclesiastical asset, owned by the Church, it did not meet the definition of being a building with primary use for the benefit of the community. It could not therefore consider the application. It was considered that this decision may be erroneous, given that the Hall was built to benefit the community and, if sold, the income would not be available to the Church, but would go to the local community. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To investigate the deeds for the property and the basis of the Trust to see if SCDC's conclusion was correct.

It was noted that the CafeHub proposal plans awaited a decision by the Lord Chancellor.

## **7 Planning**

### **7.1 Previous Planning Applications - Updates**

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

**DC/17/4766/FUL 9 Holly Close: Extension of existing single storey rear extension, and provision of new flat roof form over**

It was noted that these applications had been approved by SCDC.

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

It was understood that the refusal of permission by SCDC was being appealed but no details had been received.

**DC/173873/FUL Pine Lodge Playford Road: Single storey rear**

**extension**

This application had not yet been determined.

**7.2 Planning Applications****7.2.1 DC/17/4940/FUL Bealings Holt, Martlesham Road: Erection of New Dwelling Adjacent to Bealings Holt**

It was noted that a previous application for an additional dwelling had been refused in 2015. However, it was considered that the application complied with NPPF paragraph 55 in being sustainable development. It was also noted that the size of the plot could accommodate another dwelling and that what was proposed was in keeping with the scale of other properties in Martlesham Road and would not set a precedent for other development. It was **RESOLVED**:

- That there was no objection to the application.

**7.2.2 DC/17/5034/FUL: The Admiral's Head, The Street: Change of Use of a Former Pub to Residential Use**

It was noted that:

- The applicant had intended to attend the Council meeting, but had decided not to as a result of comments made in respect of the application
- The agent had advised that the difference in the value of the pub given in the Land Registry title and the application was accounted for by the price of fixtures and fittings and stock in hand at the time of purchase.
- The decision of the Environment Agency in respect of the provision of a sewer for some properties in The Street could mean that pub should be able to connect to the public sewer in due course
- Great Bealings Parish Council had resolved to object to the application.

Councillors made the following points during discussion:

- The closure of the pub had been a great shame and the loss of a huge asset to the village.
- Since it had closed it had not been marketed for sale to see if it was a viable business – ie viable at the correct price.
- There was sympathy for the family living in the building, but it had been purchased as a business and 'due diligence' should have been carried out at that time. The recession and drains problems were acknowledged, but it was also noted that, since the closure, the car park had been left to deteriorate and internal equipment sold - making it less likely that it would be attractive to a buyer as a viable business.
- There was a need for the pub; the proposed CafeHub project at the Church showed a local demand for a venue, and there was no reason why the pub could not cater for a breakfast trade, given the

location of Bealings School.

- It was untrue to state in the application that the pub was sited where it lacked visibility. In fact it was in a prominent position on the main road in the village and well placed. It was on the route of the promoted Fynn-Valley Walk to attract lunchtime trade.
- In the past the pub had been successful. For example, a very successful event to celebrate the Royal Wedding had been so well attended that both food and drink supplies were exhausted.
- The marketing for sale of The Greyhound pub at Pettistree at this time by the same agents showed a completely different assessment of the local market for a very comparable pub, in terms of covers, parking and local demographics.
- The success of The Greyhound, The Turks Head at Hasketon and other local pubs showed that it was potentially viable and it should be marketed at a realistic value. It had never been placed on the open market since it had been closed.
- The owners had attended the Village Review in 2011 and had listened to what local residents wanted. At that time they had seemed interested in continuing to run the pub.
- The application was in breach of SCDC policy DM30 and Development Plan paragraphs 5.7.9 – 5.8.1, which sort to retain local facilities, including village pubs, and especially where there were no other facilities in the village.
- There was a strength of feeling in the village for the keeping of the pub. The comments in support of the application on the SCDC planning application website were from people who lived outside of the village and did not understand local feeling.
- The provision of new parking spaces within the site indicated that, if granted, the application would be followed by a further application to develop the pub car park for dwellings. The current condition of the car park was an eyesore to facilitate such an application.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to object to the planning application on the grounds the pub had not been put up for sale on the open market as a business and the application did not comply with paragraphs 5.7.9 – 5.8.1 of the SCDC Local Plan Development Plan Document; approval would be in breach of SCDC policy DM30.

### 7.2.3

**DC/17/5356/TPO: The Chestnuts, Martlesham Road: T1/T2 Oaks Reduce Canopy**

It was **RESOLVED**:

### 7.3

- Not to comment on the application.

**Bealings Village Hall – Window Replacement**

It was noted that the Village Hall Trust wished to replace some windows with

double glazed units, for which it needed planning permission. When some of the windows had been replaced previously Gt Bealings Parish Council had supported the project and made the planning application.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To support the project, which was for the well-being of the community, and make the planning application for the Trust.

#### 7.4

##### **EAOW Construction Update**

Notes of the public meeting held by the developers on 9 December had been circulated to Councillors. It was noted that lighting at the construction site in Playford had been altered and the working area would soon be further from the road.

#### 7.5

##### **Sinks Pit Update**

Notes received from SCC Waste Team had been circulated, but no bunding works had been carried out by the owner, due to the Council's liability requirements. No response had been received from SCC planners in respect of the Council's enquiries about breach of the planning permission as a result of the noise levels. It was noted that SCDC and SCC had not taken any action to resolve the ongoing noise issues and **RESOLVED**:

- To contact the new Head of Operations at the site in May – ie once he had had time to assess the situation.

### 8 Highways

#### 8.1 SAVID/SID

Ms Head reported that SAVID was appointing a permanent Secretary and Chairman, which should mean it was better placed to consider issues. No progress had been made on the purchase of a SID and the identified funding had now been used elsewhere. New funding would be sought from SCDC or CAS in due course. The intention was currently for one parish to be gifted the SID by SAVID and to own and insure it, with a rota for its use in the member parishes. It was noted that the owning parish would have responsibility for administering the rota, storing, moving and operating the SID and that this would require further consideration once the SID was purchased.

#### 8.2

##### **TVAS Data**

In response to the Council's enquiry, SCC had advised that the TVAS equipment used in Martlesham and Playford Roads did not record speeds, only displayed them.

#### 8.3

##### **20mph Sign in The Street**

It was noted that one of the new 20mph signs had been demolished by a sugar beet vehicle using the Manor Farm track. There was also a significant amount of mud left on the road by the farmer, but he considered he had cleaned the road sufficiently. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to report the sign to SCC and suggest that a different location for the sign would avoid a recurrence

#### 8.4

##### **Proposed Footpath From Beacon Lane to The Street**

Comments received from local residents, both in support and against the proposed route, had been circulated to Councillors. It was noted that

Martlesham Road was too narrow for the option of a pavement to be viable.

It was noted that SCC and SCDC had powers to create public footpaths, either by agreement with the affected landowners or if there was a public need for a route. The latter was likely to be expensive and compensation would be payable which may stop any creation. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to ask the resident who proposed the footpath to carry out consultation with the other affected landowners to ascertain their views on all three options he had identified
- to ask SCC to consider further traffic calming measures on Martlesham Road, the previous white lining having faded.

## 8.5

### **Future Road Closures Notifications by SCC**

It was noted that details of these would not longer be sent to Councils, but were available via alerts set up on the roadworks.org website.

## 9 **Reports from Local District and County Councillors**

Mr Hedgley's report had been circulated to Councillors, and the Council's condolences sent to him following his recent bereavement.

No report had been received from Mr Vickery and it was noted that he was unwell.

## 10 **Police**

Mrs Cornish reported that she had been unable to attend the last 1st Tier meeting and to date the minutes had not been received. She would attend the next meeting due to be held on 25 January.

## 11 **Finance**

### 11.1 **SCDC Budget Liaison Meeting Report**

Mrs Cornish had attended the meeting on the Council's behalf and the slides and her notes had been circulated to Councillors.

### 11.2 **Appointment of External Auditors for 2018/19**

It was noted that PKF Littlejohns had been appointed.

### 11.3 **Bank Statement/Cheque Book Reconciliation for Third Quarter**

The bank statement for December had not been received and so this was pending completion by Mr Hunter.

### 11.4 **Transparency Code Funding: Purchase of Council Computer and Scanner**

It was noted that the Council's application had been approved and the items would be purchased shortly.

### 11.5 **Authorisation of Expenditure**

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

- Tony Fear: Repair of Noticeboard: £12.50
- SALC – DPA Training: £52.80
- Clerk's net salary for January and expenses: £261.46
- PAYE for January: £65.20
- Clerk's net salary for February: £261.46

- PAYE for February: £65.20

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

#### **Income Received**

- 11.6** Income of £9.63 had been received from Gt Bealings Parish Council, its contribution of 50% of the premium for the insurance of the shared wooden village sign.

**12 Matters Arising from Circulated Items**

There were no matters arising. It was noted that previous circulations had not yet reached all Councillors.

**13 Correspondence**

**13.1 Boxing Day Shoot**

It was noted that a resident had advised that a Boxing Day shoot on the field behind the houses in Holly Close had resulted in shot hitting some house windows and the police had been called. The outcome was not yet known.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to circulate the The Local Councillor and Councils Direct to Councillors.

**14 Dates of Council Meetings Until March 2019**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that the Council would meet on 12 March 2018 and not 5 March as previously arranged
- that SCDC be asked to run a Village Review at the Annual Parish Meeting to be held on 5 March 2018, to identify any housing needs in the parish, and other issues of importance to residents
- that the Council would also meet on 21 May (Annual Parish Council Meeting), 2 July, 10 September and 5 November in 2018 and on 7 January and 4 March (also the Annual Parish Meeting) in 2019.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.25pm.