

**Minutes of Little Bealings Parish Council meeting held at Bealings Village Hall at
7.30pm on Monday 4 July 2011**

Present: Mrs F Evans Rogers, Mr P Carr, Mrs F Hopkins, Miss D Williams, Mr D Wilson and Mrs M Wilson

In attendance: Mr T Fryatt, District Councillor and Mrs C Ramsden, Clerk to the Council

Also present for part or all of the meeting: Local residents and an owner of property in the parish and his agent

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

The Orchard, Holly Lane (formerly Windy Ridge, Holly Close) (revised scheme)

Residents from Holly Close and Holly Lane attended to view and discuss the application for planning permission received from SCDC for The Orchard, Holly Lane, for the erection of a detached dwelling, alteration/extension to the existing outbuilding and formation of a new vehicular access from Holly Lane (existing dwelling to be demolished) (reference C/11/1312). The owner of the property who was the applicant for the permission and his agent also attended. Comments were made by residents as follows:

- The proposal is better than a row of terraced houses or social houses along the site.
- Current planning policy and the location of the site outside the village envelope mean that more than one property or social housing would not be permitted on the site.
- The retention of the barn is welcomed.
- The increase in dwelling space is still significant: 80m² to 107m²
- The new proposal fits better on the plot and is further from the north/west and south/east boundaries
- The new proposal is as high as The Hollies which will lose sunlight as a result.

In response to comments and questions the applicant and his agent stated:

- Planning policy may change in the future which may then permit more housing on the site.
- Few trees will be cut down.
- The barn will be extended but only modestly.
- The new design tried to address the concerns which had been raised before and it was hoped the parish would support it.
- A pedestrian access to the property from Holly Close would be retained.

**Councillor
Actions**

1 Apologies and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Dr C Rowe. The Chairman declared an interest in planning application C/11/1312. See also item 4 below.

2 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 16 May 2011

These were signed as a true record.

3 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Visit by Dr Poulter, MP

Dr Poulter had advised that unfortunately he would not be able to attend the Tri-Village Challenge. He would be pleased to visit if another suitable occasion could be found.

The Prince's Countryside Fund

The application for funding for the village hall security light had been unsuccessful. Gt Bealings Parish Council had yet to decide if it would meet 50% of the outstanding funding shortfall.

Parish Plan

Gt Bealings and Playford Parish Councils had agreed that the AMG had completed its work. It was not yet known if Playford Parish Council was happy to hold the outstanding funding.

4 Planning

Applications

C/11/1312: The Orchard, Holly Lane – Erection of detached dwelling. Alteration/extension to existing outbuilding and formation of new vehicular access from Holly Lane (existing dwelling to be demolished) (revised scheme)

The Clerk declared an interest in this item as owner of an adjoining property and offered to leave the meeting. It was **RESOLVED**:

- that the Clerk should not leave the meeting.

The Chairman drew Councillors' attention to the correspondence they had received on this matter from two local residents.

The applicant's agent and two residents indicated that they wished to speak on this item in accordance with Standing Order 1(f).

The applicant's agent stated:

- The previous application had been refused and he had taken into account the views of SCDC, the Parish Council and local residents in producing a new design. He hoped concerns had been addressed and the Parish Council would support the proposal.
- The footprint was smaller and the height lower than before.
- The barn would be retained and refurbished as a garage and store.
- An access from Holly Lane was still proposed but in a new location which was supported by SCC.
- Improvements to the junction with Holly Close were proposed, which would give better visibility.
- The benefits of the new proposal were:
 - The existing bungalow would be replaced with a property which will sit comfortably on the site
 - The design is from the SCDC design handbook for properties in the countryside
 - The materials would be 'familiar' to Suffolk: brick, render and pantiles
 - The siting is a significant distance from The Hollies
 - Many trees would be retained and more hedging was proposed
 - The distance from the property to others nearby was such that they would not impose upon each other.

The first resident stated:

- The new proposal was somewhat smaller than the previous one but it was important to compare it with Windy Ridge, not the previous application
- Better figures were now available which showed that it was 2.4 times the size of Windy Ridge as originally built and was therefore still a significant increase in size
- The height may be lower than the previous proposal, but it is still the same height as The Hollies and so will take sunlight from The Hollies
- The shape and position is far more sympathetic to the neighbourhood
- The new vehicular access is quite reasonable and better for the Holly Close junction.
- It is important that there is no road widening as a result of the new access as this would cause passing traffic to speed up along Holly Lane to everyone's disadvantage.

The second resident stated:

- He was strongly in favour of the new proposal
- The current property is unattractive.
- This replaces it with a single family home and retains most of the plot with careful design
- Concerns about the size and siting and space between properties have been addressed, including the removal of the balcony overlooking Holly Close
- It could enhance the area.
- It could be a much worse proposal.

In response to questions it was confirmed that:

- the proposed improvement to the Holly Close junction would be as a result of a better visibility splay. The bank fronting Holly Lane would be retained and the hedgerow would be replanted.
- the increase in size of 2.4 times Windy Ridge referred to the total dwelling area not the footprint.

The applicant's agent further stated that new permitted development rights would mean that a significant extension of Windy Ridge would be possible without any planning permission. This would result in a similar size floor area to the proposal, but would be piecemeal and unattractive. A drawing was available if anyone wished to see it.

Councillors commented on the application as follows:

- A lot of the issues raised before had been addressed.
- The size and outlook were a vast improvement and the view from Holly Lane would be very pleasant.
- The width is much better.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- that there was no objection to the development, subject to a condition being imposed requiring retention of the bank fronting the property on to Holly Lane, in order to prevent any widening of Holly Lane as a result of the proposed vehicular access changes.

The applicant, his agent and some of the residents then left the meeting.

C11/: Kesgrave Quarry, Kesgrave Road, Kesgrave, Suffolk - A variation of conditions 14 (vehicle movement times) and 15 (hours of operation) of planning permission ref no.: C97/1501 (granted for the extraction of sand and gravel; consolidation and reorganisation of the stockpiles and recycling arrangements; retention of the aggregate processing facilities and formation of bunding) to extend the operating hours for 24 hours Monday to Fridays and Saturdays until 23.59pm

District Councillor Tony Fryatt advised that:

- The grounds for the application were stated to be a need to supply materials for road building programmes
- There were concerns about the need for increased lighting for night time operation and increases in noise from vehicles being loaded and reversing on the site
- The application would be determined by SCC as the minerals authority and SCDC was a consultee. SCDC was considering the application at its Development Control Committee meeting in mid-August, and SCC would therefore need to extend its consultation deadline

It was noted that a group of local residents and Milson's Hotel were very concerned about the impact of increased noise and lighting and were preparing objections to the application.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- that there was objection to the proposed extended operating hours and vehicle movement times, as the increase in noise and extra lighting which would result was unacceptable in close proximity to domestic properties. Conditions 14 and 15 should be retained as imposed when permission was granted; there are more dwellings in the area now than at that time which make these conditions even more necessary.

C/11/1044: Marydene, Martlesham Road – Application to extend time limit to commence planning permission C08/0889 for ground and first floor extension

It was noted that SCDC had approved this application.

C/11/0662: Blewbury, Playford Road – Erection of building to enclose swimming pool

It was noted that SCDC had refused this application.

C11/0940: 3 Richards Drive - Erection of single-storey side extension (partial demolition of existing flat roof additions) and erection of lean-to extension

It was noted that SCDC had approved this application.

C11/0765: Grove Farm, The Street – Application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission in order to extend the time limit for implementation: use of land for the construction of B1 industrial and commercial units (revised scheme)

It was noted that SCDC had approved this application. Mr Carr reported that he had attended the meeting and given the Parish Council's reasons for

objecting to the application: that a modest housing development was preferred on the site. There were also concerns about wildlife. It was perceived that policy did not permit refusal of the application.

Designation of the Parish as a Local Service Centre (LSC) and Bus Services

Councillor Fryatt reported that he had discussed the designation with both a SCDC councillor and an officer. It was felt that the changes in bus service made only a marginal difference to the facilities. Many parishes which had fewer facilities than Little Bealings were also designated as LSCs – for example they did not have any employment opportunities. Mr Fryatt had been told that he could raise the matter at the forthcoming Council meeting considering the LDF, but was advised to let the matter run for the present and be raised when the LDF was under review.

He advised that the LDF was due to be approved by SCDC at the forthcoming Council meeting, although there was still strong feeling about the proposed significant housing development at Martlesham, including the impact on the surrounding transport infrastructure. It was possible that there would be an impact on Hall Road and its junction with the A1214. The possibility of a Northern Bypass for Ipswich may be raised again.

Mr Fryatt advised that, once the LDF was approved, SCDC would consider landowners' suggested site specific development proposals, one of which was within the parish.

He would be exploring the continued relevance of the Ipswich Eastern Policy Area.

It was noted that:

- two parishioners had written to express support for a change in the LSC designation to 'Other Village', one stating that he knew other residents shared his view. The meeting was adjourned briefly for one of them to outline his reasons: the parish plan had established that residents were against development in the parish. He questioned why SCDC had advised that a re-designation was possible if it was not a matter for the parish to determine after all. It was clarified that this misunderstanding had arisen as a result of reporting a Councillor's attendance at a SCDC consultation event on the LDF.
- SCC had advised the Parish Council as follows in respect of the request for redesignation:

"The criteria used for assessing the designation of a settlement are set out in Policy SP19 and the associated table (Table 4.1) of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy & Development Management (adopted as interim planning policy).

A Local Service Centre is defined as a settlement providing a smaller range of facilities than Key Service Centres, but at least 3 of the following:

- * Public transport access to town,
- * Shop(s) meeting everyday needs,
- * Local Employment opportunities,
- * Meeting Place,
- * Post Office,

* Pub or licensed premises.

Please note: a settlement does not need to have all of the above to be classed as a Key Service Centre. It only needs to have at least 3 of the above facilities (even if this does not include public transport access to a town).

The parish of Little Bealings contains at least 3 of the above facilities including:

- * Local Employment Opportunities (e.g. Mallard House Business Centre)
- * Meeting Place (e.g. Village Hall)
- * Pub or licensed Premises (e.g. The Admirals Head).

There are also a number of other facilities within the parish including the Primary School, the bowling green and associated pavilion, the church room, All Saints Church and 2 playing & sports areas.

Although I appreciate that your parishioners may wish to reassess the settlement designation, in my view the parish is relatively well served by facilities and therefore probably too well served to be classed as an 'Other Village'. It has significantly more facilities than the settlements designated as 'Other Villages'. For example the village of Boyton only has a parish hall and a church.

Although Little Bealings does not have a village shop, in my informal view it appears to be more closely related to 'Key Service Centres' than 'Other Villages'. This is because of the number and type of facilities available including the Primary School. A 'Key Service Centre' is defined in Table 4.1 of the Local Development Framework.

There are no immediate plans to review the settlement hierarchy, however if the parish can provide evidence to support their request for the settlement to be reclassified then this will be looked at. It is proposed to conduct a review of the Core Strategy in the future, once we have a clearer picture of the economic position in the district and the latest census data. It is considered that it would be appropriate for any proposed amendments to the hierarchy to be considered at that time."

- the revised bus timetables still provided a peak time return service to Ipswich on Mondays to Saturdays, and an off peak service three days a week. There was no longer a return service to Woodbridge.
- to date two parishioners had contacted the Clerk to express support for a Woodbridge bus service, although one would use it as a connecting service and wished to travel to Ipswich. It was noted that further responses may result from a request for information about demand in the recently published Benefice Magazine.
- Great Bealings Parish Council had advised that it had several residents asking for a Woodbridge bus service and that that Council would consider the matter at a forthcoming meeting.
- enquiries by the WI had established that perhaps six residents would use a service which went to Woodbridge on Thursdays (market day) at about 10.00am and returned at about 12.00 to 12.30pm.
- that SCC had recently published a Toolkit to help communities explore solutions to transport issues.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- not to pursue LSC redesignation at present, but to take the opportunity to make representations at the next appropriate review time.
- to consider any further information about the demand within the parish for a bus service to Woodbridge at the next meeting of the Parish Council, with a view to then working with Great Bealings Parish Council using the SCC Toolkit

5 Highways

Playford Road

It was noted that a resident had queried the quality of the work carried out recently to resurface Playford Road. SCC had been asked if it was satisfied with the work.

The traffic calming works were still to be carried out.

Martlesham Road

It was noted that SCC had made an order to remove the section of 40mph limit along this road, meaning that a speed limit of 30mph would result along its entire length.

It was noted that a parishioner had written about speeding on Martlesham Road and was of the view that the white lines had not slowed traffic down. He had written to the police offering his entrance as a suitable site for speed enforcement work. He would also be forwarding photographs of flexible bollards which he said had been successful in slowing down traffic elsewhere in the country by creating a slalom effect. He also suggested two fixed speed cameras between the Beacon Lane junctions of Martlesham Road.

The meeting was adjourned briefly to receive the comments of two residents on this issue as follows:

- The white lining had been successful in slowing down traffic.
- The white lining had narrowed the road but it was necessary to travel down the middle of the road only. This was because there was a danger of damage to wing mirrors and taller vehicles as residents had allowed side growth to intrude into the road.

After discussion it was **RESOLVED**:

- to consider the flexible bollards once more details were to hand, although it was known that there was a minimum width below which it was not possible to narrow the road
- to ask SCC to consider whether the side growth of vegetation into the road was an issue which needed addressing to prevent damage to vehicles.

6 Police

A report had been received which stated that there had only been one reported crime in the parish during May and June: driving with excess alcohol in Playford Road. It was noted that cold calling was an issue and **RESOLVED**:

- To include a note in the Benefice Magazine drawing attention to installing 'no cold calling' signs and advising residents to contact Suffolk Trading Standards with any concerns.

It was noted that a new police website was being prepared and **RESOLVED** that:

- there would be a link to it from the Parish Council's website.

The next SNT Police Community Engagement Meeting would be in Culpho on 7 July.

7 Finance

Barclays Bank Account Signatories

It was noted that the new mandate was in place.

Income and Expenditure

The Chairman reported the following income and expenditure:

Income:

- Nil

Expenditure:

Cheques were signed as follows:

- Clerk's Salary and Expenses: £872.43
- PAYE due to HMRC: £174.40
- Phil Holmes for the Walks Leaflets: £137.49

Thank you letters for donations had been received from the Benefice Magazine and Mrs Gosling.

Hire of Village Hall

It was noted that the cost of hire would increase to £5 per hour from 1 September 2011. A new lock had been installed on the Committee Room, which prevented the door being left closed but unlocked when the room was in use. The VHMC was considering any need to put a noticeboard on the door to welcome visitors to meetings.

8 Matters Arising from Circulated Items

Circulation 2011/04 had been returned to the Clerk. Changes to street lights elsewhere in the county were noted. It was **RESOLVED**:

- to ask SCC to consider either turning off or reducing the evening and night time lighting at the Park and Ride at Martlesham.

In respect of items circulated by email it was **RESOLVED**:

- to support a proposal from Leiston Town Council, and agreed by the

Suffolk Coastal SALC Area Committee, as follows:

“To ask the current Minister at the Department of Communities and Local Government (Greg Clark MP) to make the following planning policy/guidance to apply to large planning applications in the area of a Town or Parish Council

1. That any applicant or representatives of any applicant who submits such an application that will have a significant effect on an area must, if requested by the Town or Parish Council attend a meeting of
 - (i) that Council to answer questions from elected councillors; and
 - (ii) a Town Meeting, should one be duly called, to answer questions from all electors.

2. That any applicant who submits such an application that will have a significant effect on an area must, if requested by the Town or Parish Council, or a Town Meeting, pay for the Council or Meeting to get an independent assessment carried out as to how the proposed development will affect the sustainability of the local communities.”

9 Correspondence

Brochures concerning play equipment were passed to the Village Hall and information on an SCDC Magical Marshes event would be displayed on noticeboards.

It was **RESOLVED**:

- to circulate to Councillors the following correspondence:
 - SALC Training Information
 - Leiston and District CAB Annual Report
 - Suffolk ACRE: AGM Papers and Annual Report
 - Clerks and Councils Direct
 - Suffolk Coastal Resource Network Newsletter
 - Viridor Credits – to Dr Rowe

10 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Parish Council would be on 5 September 2011.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 9.00pm.