

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at  
7.30pm on Monday 9 January 2012**

**Present:** Mrs F Evans Rogers, Mr P Carr, Dr C Rowe, Mr B Rufford, Miss D Williams and Mr D Wilson

**Also present for part of the meeting:** Local residents and an owner of property in the parish

**In attendance:** Mr P Bellfield (County Councillor) Mr T Fryatt (District Councillor) PC Richard Wright and Ms G Benjamin (Suffolk ACRE), (all for part of the meeting), and Mrs C Ramsden, Clerk to the Council

During the period of public participation before the meeting the following matters were discussed:

**Development of High Rigg, Martlesham Road**

The owner of the property attended to seek an informal view from the Council on proposed development of the site; the existing property was derelict. She advised that the site comprised some 12 acres on which four 'passive' and two affordable houses were proposed, wooden clad to fit in unobtrusively. The existing woodland would be retained and there would be further planting. The site was outside the Village Physical Limits (VPL) boundary and had a public footpath across it. It was noted that the proposal was contrary to LDF policy DM4 'Housing in Clusters in the Countryside', as it was more than 150 metres from the edge of the VPL. The development would also interfere with the Fynn Valley landscape and so be detrimental to the character of the village which residents wished to preserve. The applicant was advised that the Council would rather see one new family home built on the site than several properties and that there was no demand for affordable houses within the Parish Plan. Any development should be in accordance with the LDF and Local Plan saved policies.

There was also concern that, although no new vehicular access points on to Martlesham Road were proposed, the development would also result in increased traffic at a location where there were already concerns about traffic speed and volume.

**Community Speed Watch Scheme (CSW)**

A resident advised the Council that the old road which comprised Playford Road, Martlesham Road and Bealings Road and had been safe when he had moved to the village many years ago, was now a rat run and very dangerous. There were narrow points as a result of the mature trees, blind spots and the route was used by cyclists. He believed there were a number of accidents which were not reported – such as car wing mirror damage – and that there was a significant speeding problem. He pointed out that, although the recent speed survey data collected by SCC showed a mean speed of 29.7 (westbound) and 30.7 (eastbound) miles per hour, in fact the westbound data showed that 33% of the sample (4,345) exceeded the speed limit of 30pmh, with 15% travelling over 40mph, and the eastbound data showed that 40% of the sample (6362) exceeded the speed limit with 21% travelling over 40mph. He did not consider that any effective action to kerb speed had been taken to date and supported the parish forming or joining a CSW. It was ironic that, for health and safety reasons CSW could only operate at locations considered safe by the police and that the only approved location was near the track to Colonel's Farm Cottage in Playford Road. He considered his own driveway in Martlesham Road was also a suitable location and that this should be reassessed by the police for use after the parish had joined the CSW.

A second resident supported this view and that traffic was only forced to slow down at narrow points in the road. He was aware of two accidents at the Hall Road crossroads within the last year, at least one of which had resulted in injury. Traffic coming from The Street was forced on to the far side of the road when turning into Martlesham Road due to the design of the junction. He was also concerned about the speed of acceleration away from the junction along Hall road,

especially by motorcyclists. He would be happy to participate in the CSW, but had been told by the police that the crossroads location was also not a safe place to operate a speed gun.

PC Richard Wright advised that it was notoriously difficult to carry out speed measuring on the road and the officer responsible for operating the CSW, PC Shaun Brett, had advised that it was difficult to find sites where vehicles could be pulled in and stopped, as well as finding a safe spot for pedestrians to stand and operate a speed gun.

Mr Bellfield advised that he was a supporter of the CSW but it was necessary for insurance reasons for it to operate only at sites approved by the police.

It was noted that traffic calming measures had been achieved several times in recent years and, as it was now a radial road for traffic to and from Ipswich, there was only a limited amount which could be achieved. A site meeting had been held with SCC and further improvements had been made recently.

PC Wright agreed that he would speak further with PC Brett with a view to revisiting the road and assessing whether any site for the operation of the CSW equipment could be identified. He would contact the residents concerned directly about this in due course.

**Councillor  
Actions**

### **1 Apologies and Declarations of Interest**

Apologies were received from Mrs M Wilson.

There were no declarations of interest.

### **2 Minutes of the Meetings held on 7 November and 2 December 2011**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 November were amended in respect of clarifying that any SCC funding for SNT meetings would be sought via Locality budgets and then signed as a true record. The minutes of the meeting held on 2 December were signed as a true record.

### **3 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

#### **Sinks Pit Closed Landfill Site: Notification of Determination by SCDC of Contaminated Land**

SCDC had confirmed that it had met with SCC and agreed that SCC would produce a Remediation Statement for the site within three months. This would set out actions to be taken and identify responsibilities and timescales. SCDC will review the Statement and ensure it is implemented. It will advise the Council and local residents further in due course.

#### **Community Wind Turbine for Bealings Village Hall**

The VHMC had advised that this was not proceeding as no site in Holly Lane was now considered to be viable. Another location nearer Woodbridge was being researched.

#### **Security Light at Bealings Village Hall**

The light had been installed and was fully operational. The invoice for £1225.71 plus VAT (£1470.85) had been paid by the Council and Gt Bealings PC had been asked to forward the Open Suffolk Weekend funds and their Parish Plan fund share as previously agreed. It was noted that Gt

Bealings PC had now agreed that it would meet 50% of the funding shortfall and a cheque for £805.38p will be sent. The VH has paid for the installation of a 24 hour timer and isolation switch. The electrical installation certificate had been received by the Council. The VAT would be reclaimed shortly.

It was **RESOLVED** that the order of the Agenda be amended to consider Police as the next item.

#### **4 Police**

PC Wright reported that there had been one reported crimes in the parish since the last meeting: theft of a generator from a building site.

He had recently visited to assess School parking and considered that this was working reasonably well.

He passed a copy of the CSW Briefing Pack to the Council for further consideration should a suitable location be found in Martlesham Road.

In respect of the establishment of a 'no cold calling' zone (NCCZ) it was noted that guidance on the Suffolk Trading Standards website stated that an NCCZ was a specific geographical area within which local residents had identified that they did not want visits from unsolicited or 'cold' callers. However, the core purpose in setting up a NCCZ was crime prevention, reduction or reducing the fear of crime, and that there must be an already identified problem of doorstep crime and a real prospect that establishment of a NCCZ would assist in achieving the core purpose. It was noted that, while there were some vulnerable residents in the parish, there was doubt as to whether the parish would meet the criteria for establishing a zone. PC Wright agreed to investigate this and advise the Council further.

#### **5 Neighbourhood Planning**

Gillian Benjamin from Suffolk ACRE circulated details of the Neighbourhood Planning Process. Plans were to be prepared in respect of a 'neighbourhood area' which could be a whole parish. The District Council was charged with supporting the process and a Plan needed to develop full strategies which would fit with the LDF, planning and European legislation (eg in respect of sustainability and environmental impact assessments) and the anticipated National Planning Policy Forum guidance. A vision and objectives for the Plan area needed to be drafted and a Scoping Report produced. It was unrealistic to produce a Plan without consultants' help as Plans had to be robust and capable of independent examination. However, funding for this was not established. Public examination of the Plan would be followed by a local referendum, after which (assuming approval) the Plan was adopted and, like the LDF, became planning policy.

As the Parish Plan showed that the parish had no wish to promote any development Ms Benjamin doubted that the complex process and the cost were appropriate. The LDF contained policies which protected the parish from development as, as a Local Service Centre, the parish was only considered suitable for limited development by means of minor extension to the village, consistent with its scale and character, and, within the VPL boundary, in the form of groups or infill. Only two new houses had been built in the parish in recent years. It was considered that a Neighbourhood Plan was only appropriate in areas where a Council wished to promote development.

Mr Fryatt pointed out that the Parish Plan was not a robust document which could protect the parish from development, whereas a Neighbourhood Plan would stand scrutiny at a planning inquiry. However, he advised that a review of SCDC Planning Services was proposed, which would provide new support for communities. In addition the NPPF guidance would not now be introduced before the LDF was in place and there was therefore much less concern that the parish would be unprotected from development without a Neighbourhood Plan. It was noted that this was a significant change from the previous situation, when there had been a threat that a presumption of approval for development proposals would exist unless policies were put in place by the parish. It was noted that SCDC was discussing the Localism Act on 10 January and was likely to issue guidance to Town and Parish Councils in due course.

Ms Benjamin suggested that it may be more appropriate for the parish to consider a refresh of the Parish Plan. This could be effected in various ways, including by a Village Review, and would renew the Council's remit in respect of development. A youth survey could also be included.

It was noted that two local residents present had been supportive of a Neighbourhood Plan, their concern being to protect the village from development, but, bearing in mind the expense and the protection which would now be afforded by the LDF, were now in favour of a Village Review.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- Mr Carr would represent the Council at a presentation Ms Benjamin was giving to Gt Bealings Parish Council on 10 January, as this would also be attended by a Planning Policy Officer from SCDC, and SCDC's advice on the relevance of a Neighbourhood Plan to the future development of Lt Bealings could be established **PC**
- there would be further consideration of a Village Review at the next Council meeting.

Ms Benjamin was thanked for her advice.

## 6 Highways

### Footpath 1A

It was noted that the School had reported a problem with dog fouling on this path behind the School and that children were walking dog mess into School. SCDC had been asked to provide some signs reminding dog walkers of their responsibility to clear up and the School advised to appeal to residents to do so via the enews group. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to include an appeal for dog walkers to clear up on all footpaths in the Benefice Magazine
- to forward the request to SCDC to Mr Fryatt in order that he could pursue a response for the Council

## 7 Planning - Applications and Enforcement

### East Anglian Offshore Wind Farm

It was noted that this pre-application had been accepted by the Infrastructure Planning Commission, which would determine the full

application in due course. It was necessary to register to comment on the application, but not yet possible to do so. Mr Fryatt advised that SCDC would inform the Council when the public consultation process started and which of the possible two routes through the parish the applicants had chosen. Once more information was available consideration would be given to inviting the applicants and others to speak about the application and its impact on the parish at a public meeting for residents.

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

Mr Fryatt advised that he had spoken to the Planning Officer dealing with the application, who had confirmed that the pre-application advice she had given was that, as the site was outside of the VPL boundary, there was little chance of planning permission being granted.

It was noted that there was currently significant clearance work going on at the site.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- to object to the application as:
  - the development would be a new dwelling outside the village physical limits boundary
  - the site is more than 150 metres from the boundary and not close to the main village settlement area
  - there would be light pollution across the Fynn Valley; site clearance work is already removing vegetation/trees
  - the new entrance, and parking for three cars, would bring more vehicles on to the Martlesham Road where residents already have concerns about the speed and volume of traffic on a narrow country road
- to advise the Landscape Officer at SCDC of the clearance work, especially as the site is protected by a Tree Preservation Order

**C/12/0006 – Finches Hill, The Street – Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a swimming pool enclosure**

It was noted that SCDC had asked the Council if it had any evidence about the length of time the site had been used as described to assist it to determine whether a LDC should be granted. However, it was noted that the application was not made on the grounds of the length of time of use but on the grounds that the change of use was not development which required planning permission. It was **RESOLVED** to advise SCDC that:

- as the applicant stated, the development had been carried out in 2010
- the Council was not in a position to advise SCDC as to whether planning permission was required but, as it had advised in respect of application C10/0554, the Council objected strongly to the swimming pool and enclosure on the grounds it was too large, out of keeping with the surroundings and too prominent in the landscape.

**C/11/2433 - Little Bealings House, Martlesham Road – Installation of ground mounted solar photovoltaic system on grassed area sited on edge of residential cartilage**

**C11/2232 – Blewbury, Playford Road – Erection of first floor extension, one and a half storey rear extension and detached cart lodge/garage block**

It was noted that SCDC had granted permission for these developments.

#### **Motorbikes at Sunfield Farm**

SCDC Planning Enforcement had advised that it would investigate and report to the Council within 56 days. Environmental Protection Officers had advised Mr Fryatt that they were unable to take any action unless residents returned Noise Complaint Record Forms.

### **8 Annual Parish Meeting**

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- the Annual Parish Meeting would be held in the Angela Cobbold Hall on Monday 5 March 2012 and that Mr Carr would arrange tea and coffee refreshments **PC**
- Local groups and clubs should be asked if they wished to present a report at the meeting via the Benefice Magazine

### **9 Finance**

#### **Income and Expenditure**

The Chairman reported the following income and expenditure:

**Income:** Nil

**Expenditure:** A cheque was signed as follows:

- Clerk's salary (net of PAYE) and expenses: £698.03 and £6.99

Bank balance, following payment for the Village Hall security light (see item 3 above) was £546.70p.

It was noted that a letter had been received from the Benefice Magazine requesting an increase in the Council's annual donation to £150, as anticipated at the last meeting and in view of a loss of £331 being incurred during 2010.

### **10 Matters Arising from Circulated Items**

#### **Queen's Diamond Jubilee Celebrations**

The options of erecting either a bonfire beacon or a church tower beacon to celebrate the Jubilee were considered and it was **RESOLVED**:

- not to erect any beacon in the parish
- to investigate whether it would be possible to arrange for tree planting and/or the creation of a copse or managed woodland area in

the parish to celebrate the Jubilee

**Other**

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to circulate to Councillors an article in Clerks and Councils Direct Issue 78 by Paul Clayton on The Role of Councillors

**11 Correspondence**

It was **RESOLVED** to circulate to Councillors:

- Mr Bellfield's report on County Council matters
- The Suffolk Foundation Annual Report

**12 Dates of Parish Council Meetings**

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- between May 2012 and March 2013 the Council would meet on 14 May 2012 (Annual Parish Council meeting), 2 July 2012, 3 September 2012, 12 November 2012, 7 January 2013 and 4 March 2013 (Annual Parish Meeting).

The next meeting of the Council will be on 5 March 2012, immediately after the Annual Parish Meeting.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 10.00pm.