

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at 7.30pm  
on Monday 12 November 2012**

**Present:** Mrs F Rogers, Mr P Carr, Mrs T Cornish, Mr B Rufford, Mr D Wilson and Mrs M Wilson

**Also present:** Mr T Fryatt, Suffolk Coastal District Councillor, for part of the meeting and 7 residents for all/part of the meeting

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

During the period of public participation before the meeting the following matter was discussed:

**The Orchard, Holly Lane: C12/2189: Variation of Condition of retention of dwelling without compliance with Condition 2 of Planning Permission C12/0571 seeking the variation of this condition to remove Class E from the restriction, allowing householder permitted development rights to be reinstated for developments falling within Class E of the Town & Country General Permitted Development Order (2008) for (outbuildings, enclosures and pools)**

The applicant stated that they merely wanted the same Permitted Development Rights as everyone else as at present they required planning permission to erect a trellis. A neighbouring resident (the Clerk) said that this was not the case as the Class E restriction did not include trellis. The applicant said that it did if the trellis was over a certain height, although they did not know how high they wished to erect trellis. The neighbouring resident advised that in the circumstance of a high trellis it would be necessary for them, as every other property, to obtain planning permission and the Class E restriction was irrelevant. The applicant said they did not know why the Condition had been imposed and the neighbouring resident read the full content of Condition 2 of the planning permission and of the reasons given on the planning permission for Permitted Development Rights being removed. The removal of Class E permitted development rights was stated to be "...and in the interests of protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents". The neighbouring resident also advised of the content of the SCDC Committee Report in respect of C11/1312/FUL which stated "Given the rural location and the fact that this replacement dwelling will be larger than the current property which occupies the site, Permitted Development Rights should be removed for extensions, dormer windows, roof lights and outbuildings to give the Local Planning Authority control over any further enlargements", and of the minutes of the Committee meeting which recorded that the applicants' agent had said that they accepted all the conditions imposed.

The applicant asked if the Clerk, as neighbouring resident affected by the application, would be declaring an interest in the matter and was advised that this was not appropriate as the Clerk does not vote on Council matters.

**Councillor  
Actions**

**1 Apologies and Declarations of Interest**

Apologies were received from Dr C Rowe. County Councillor Peter Bellfield was also unable to attend but had sent a report (see item 12 below).

Mrs Wilson declared a prejudicial pecuniary interest in item 5: EAOW Cabling Route and Construction Depot, having a beneficial interest in land in the parish affected by the route.

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Cornish to her first Council meeting.

It was **RESOLVED** that the order of the Agenda be changed to deal with Planning as the next item.

## 2 Planning

### Applications

**C12/2189: The Orchard, Holly Lane: Variation of Condition of retention of dwelling without compliance with Condition 2 of Planning Permission C12/0571 seeking the variation of this condition to remove Class E from the restriction, allowing householder permitted development rights to be reinstated for developments falling within Class E of the Town & Country General Permitted Development Order (2008) for (outbuildings, enclosures and pools)**

Councillors were aware of written objections from four neighbouring properties and another objection from a resident of an adjoining parish.

Councillors were also aware of the advice from SCDC in respect of Class E permitted development rights, that the site was outside the village envelope and of the large increase in size of the house compared with the previous dwelling for which permission had been granted (C11/1312), the addition of a balcony not in accordance with that permission (C12/1634), and that the condition was in place in the interests of the amenity of the neighbouring properties. They noted the applicants had agreed that they were content with the condition when permission was granted; there was no reason to change the current permission.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- That there was objection to the application on the grounds there was a need to ensure that SCDC retained control over any further development which may be intended by any future owners, as well as the current owners.

**C12/1806: 10 Holly Close: Erection of First Floor Rear Extension**

It was noted that SCDC had refused this application.

**C11/2768 Land Adjacent to Wychwood, Martlesham Road – Erection of one dwelling and garage together with construction of new vehicular access**

It was noted that the appeal in respect of SCDC's refusal of the application had been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate.

**C12/2214: Demolition of Nos. 1&2 Wood Barn Cottages and a redundant agricultural building together with the erection of two No. replacement dwellings and cartlodes and associated private drainage system.**

It was noted that the revised application (to C12/0484) retained some of the original buildings, but that the development still constituted new housing in the countryside. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To object to the application as before on the grounds it breached LDF policy DM3 by being new housing in the countryside.

### **Kesgrave School: Lighting for Multiple Use Games Area (MUGA)**

It was noted that a neighbouring property had been adversely affected by lighting from the development. In 2010 the local planning authority which had granted permission (SCC as the School was a County Council school) had not carried out any consultation with the neighbouring property. At that time SCDC had been a statutory consultee but had not objected, subject to hours controlling use of the lights. As a result of the School becoming an Academy (and therefore independent of SCC) it had been necessary to obtain a new planning permission from SCDC in 2012. SCDC had confirmed that it had been appropriate for it to arrive at the same conclusion in respect of the application and permission had therefore been granted in 2012 (C11/2813).

Councillors were aware of previous concerns about the impact of light scatter as a result of development, including at the Park and Ride site in Martlesham. It was noted that SCDC'S decision was beyond the period for appeal and **RESOLVED**:

- To write to Kesgrave School drawing attention to the situation and asking for mitigating action to be taken to lessen light pollution from the MUGA.

### **East Anglian One Offshore Wind Farm Cabling**

Mrs Wilson left the meeting in accordance with her declaration of a prejudicial pecuniary interest in this item.

Mr Carr had been unable to attend the Gt Bealings PC meeting on 11 September.

Councillors noted the outcome of the joint meeting with Gt Bealings, Playford and Grundisburgh and Playford parish council representatives held on 22 October as follows:

1. "To draft a joint letter from the Parish Councils to EAOW, to be considered at the Councils' respective meetings in November. The letter to state that the Parish Councils:
  - 1) Objected to the POCC and supported AOA
  - 2) Objected to the depot at Playford
  - 3) Objected to traffic routing via Grundisburgh and proposed use of the A1214 instead.
  - 4) Notwithstanding support for AOA, objection to POCC could be ameliorated by the provision of a Community Enhancement Scheme for the parishes.
2. To ask SCC, SCDC and SPS if they had considered AOA and for their views of it
3. To ask about future proofing of the project
4. To investigate whether EAOW would fund representation for the Parish Councils in the same way it was funding individuals' professional costs in respect of compensation payments.
5. To ask SCDC if its Project Officer, Bob Chamberlain, would attend a second meeting of the Parish Councils to be held in the first week in December"

It was noted that Playford PC had not discussed formalising a joint Parish Council committee at its recent meeting as expected. Grundisburgh & Culpho PC was mainly concerned about proposed traffic routing through the village, but would support AOA.

As regards 2. SCDC had supplied its view (response to the consultation dated 3 August 2012) and District Councillor Tony Fryatt had advised that SCDC preferred the POCC as there was less environment impact than AOA. SCDC was of the view that 'any disruption' could be addressed by using HDD to cross Lodge Road. It also did not intend to object to the Playford depot and haul routes, subject to the receipt of satisfactory Travel and Transport Plans. At present there was insufficient information on the traffic, and consultation had not been adequate.

SCC had not yet finalised its view but was inclined to support the POCC, with HDD for the route across Lodge Road to reduce potential disruption. It asked for more information about grounds to oppose the depot in Playford.

No view was available from SPS.

The applicant's response concerning future proofing (3.) was noted. This was likely to happen, but there was no certainty in view of current legislation.

As regards 4. this was still being investigated.

As regards 5. SCDC's Project Officer was not available during the first week of December, but could attend either the week before or the week after.

As regards 1. there was concern at the inclusion of point 4), although it was noted that this was included wholly to accommodate Gt Bealings stance and their request for community funding.

SCDC's support for HDD for crossing Lodge Road was noted, as was Gt Bealings PC's. However, there was concern that the reasons for Gt Bealings support related to less tree loss (of which no details were available) and the impact on three adjacent properties, than to a wish to secure community funding for Neighbourhood Planning. It was noted that the adjacent properties were in Lt Bealings in any event and that one property (at least) preferred OCC to HDD. It was not known if the properties had been in discussion with Gt Bealings PC.

It was **RESOLVED** to adjourn the meeting at 8.14pm to enable a resident to speak about the EAOW cabling application.

The resident suggested that the Council had not carried out adequate consultation with local residents, although it was pointed out that a leaflet about the project had been sent by the Council to every resident. This had been before the current detail on the project had been available and the resident suggested the Council should contact the affected properties directly.

The meeting commenced again at 8.15pm.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- That the Council would sign the joint letter to EAOW as drafted, but that point 4) should only be included if otherwise Gt Bealings

PC would not sign

- The merits of HDD and OCC at Lodge Road would be further considered following circulation of the powerpoint presentation given to Gt Bealings PC in August.
- The affected properties in Lodge Road would be asked for their views on HDD and OCC
- That a further joint meeting of the Parish Councils should be held during the week commencing 10 December, at which the Clerk, Mrs Rogers and Mr Wilson would represent the Council

### **Neighbourhood Planning**

It was noted that no interest had been expressed by any resident as a result of asking if anyone considered a part of the parish – or an economic, social or environmental issue – would benefit from inclusion in a Plan, or wished to be involved in a Working Group to develop a vision into an effective Plan.

It was noted the Dr Rowe had attended a Community Led Planning Event and concluded that a Plan was not appropriate.

It was noted that Gt Bealings PC was proceeding with a Plan, 'to protect and enhance'. However, advice from Suffolk ACRE had confirmed that there was no benefit to producing a Plan merely to protect the parish from development as Plans could only be positive documents which promoted development. They needed to conform to LDF policies and so could not protect against development which complied with the LDF.

Suffolk ACRE had also advised that, if the Council wished to explore any issues of concern for residents, an appropriate way forward would be by way of a Village Review. This would update the Parish Plan and could be held over one evening.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- To seek further advice from Suffolk ACRE with a view to holding a Village Review at the APM to be held on 4 March 2013
- To update the Council's Planning Statement (as approved at the meeting on 9 February 2009) once the Inspector's examination of the LDF was complete

#### **4 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 3 September 2012**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2012 were amended and then signed as a true record.

#### **5 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

##### **Community Wind Turbine in Great Bealings**

It was noted that there had been opposition to the proposed location from neighbouring properties. A new location was being sought.

#### **6 Police**

There was uncertainty over who was the officer responsible for the parish after recent staff changes. A report had been received by email but could not be opened.

It was noted from the minutes of the last 12PT meeting that a letter was to be sent to the Council concerning its decision not to appoint a new 12PT representative.

A shed had been burgled in The Street.

## 7 Highways

### Footpaths

SCC had now repaired the gate on the playing field path. Mr Ball had carried out extra cutting after a report that the sleeper bridge on Footpath No 18 was difficult to discern.

### Flooding in Lodge Road

This had been reported to SCC, but more details of the location had been requested.

### Sand Spreading

SCC had confirmed that where the parish council kept a list of volunteers who spread sand on the road during the winter months, the volunteers were covered by their insurance. It was noted that Mr Norman Finch was willing to continue to do this as in previous years.

## 8 Closure of the Admiral's Head Public House

Councillors were aware that the owners had intended to tidy up the site in respect of the overgrown plants in September, but that no work had been carried out. The owners had stated that they were upset at the mention of an 'Untidy Site' notice and had no further plans at present for the pub. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To advise the owners that, partly because of safety concerns for traffic at Sandy Lane, the condition of the site would be taken up with SCDC

It was noted that the power of 'Community Right to Bid' in the Localism Act had now come into effect. This enabled the Council to nominate a building or land as an asset of community value. If a nomination resulted in the asset being added to the List of Community Asset, the asset could not be sold without the community having the opportunity to bid for the asset. It was **RESOLVED**:

- To advise the owners that the Admiral's Head would be nominated by the Council as a community asset.

## 9 Queen's Diamond Jubilee: Tree Planting at Sinks Pit

It was noted that, despite the involvement of County Councillor Peter Bellfield in the matter, SCC would not agree to further planting at the site. It was therefore **RESOLVED**:

- Not to enter into any Licence with SCC for tree planting at Sinks Pit.

## 10 Finance

### Income and Expenditure

The Chairman reported the following income and expenditure:

#### Income:

The second half of the precept, £3,000, had been received from SDC. £172 had been received from SCC for P3 cutting.

#### Expenditure:

A cheque was signed: BDO: £144 for the external audit for 2011/12

Bank balance after the above expenditure would be £2,977.97

### Budget for 2012/14

Councillors considered the draft revenue, project and donations budgets and **RESOLVED**:

- To approve the budget as drafted, including funding for tree planting in case future opportunities arose

## 11 Matters Arising from Circulated Items

It was **RESOLVED**:

- Not to respond to consultations in respect of a review of Suffolk Fire Services and Sizewell C.

## 12 Correspondence

### Councillor Training

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that Mrs Cornish would attend SALC Councillor Training on 3 and 10 December at a cost of £98 plus VAT

It was noted that the Village Hall hire charges had increased, but not for hire of the Committee Room.

County Councillor Peter Bellfield's report was noted in respect of Council Tax, a review of the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service, the demise of the Customer Service Direct partnership with BT and MSDC, a reorganisation and re-siting of Suffolk Records Office, the appointment of Care UK to run care homes and day centres, and future expenditure savings.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- that the following correspondence would be circulated to Councillors:
  - Clerks and Councils Direct
  - Suffolk Hedgerow Survey
  - Directory of Resources of Voluntary Organizations
  - SALC AGM papers

The next scheduled meeting of the Council will be on Monday 7 January 2013.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.30pm.