

ELMSWELL PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of full Council held on
Monday 17th June 2019 at 7.30pm
at The Blackbourne, Blackbourne Road IP30 9UH**

Present: Cllrs Barker, Burch, Edmonds, Friend, Osborne, Pallett (Chairman), Mrs Roots, Schofield, Shaw

Attending: Parish Clerk Mr Peter Dow
4 members of the public

- 19.06.01 **Noted:**
1.1 An apology for absence was accepted from Cllr Mrs Mansel as she had a work commitment
1.2 An apology for absence was accepted from Cllr Hawes as he was in hospital

19.06.02 **Resolved:**
That the Minutes of the Annual Parish Council Meeting held on 20th May 2019, as tabled, be agreed as a true record.

19.06.03 **Noted:**
That there were no Members' Declarations of Local Non-Pecuniary Interests and/or Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in subsequent agenda items and no additions, deletions or alterations to the Council's Register of Interests.

19.06.04 **Noted:**
4.1 A written report from SCC Ward Member Cllr Jane Storey
4.2 A written report from MSDC Ward Members Cllrs Geake & Mansel

19.06.05 **Noted:**
The following when questions or comment was invited from Councillors or the public on any District Council or County Council matter or on any matter on this agenda;
5.1 The Clerk agreed to seek from Cllr Mansel confirmation of the situation regarding the Manns Court bungalows which have lain unoccupied for several years following contamination from heating oil.
5.2 A member of the public spoke to urge rejection of Planning Application ref. DC/19/02605 at Haughley Park along lines which were set out in a document which was distributed to Councillors.

19.06.06 **Noted:**
The following correspondence to this meeting unrelated to an Agenda item;
6.1 From Crest Nicholson Eastern expressing thanks for patience and understanding during the recent lengthy closure of Wetherden Road and for the efficient liaison via Council regarding problems arising.
6.2 From MSDC Planning Enforcement confirming that the case regarding 10 Wetherden road is still ongoing.
6.3 From Suffolk Highways warning of drainage investigation work along Ashfield Road requiring a temporary road closure between Monday 17th & Wednesday 19th June.
6.4 From Elmswell History Group inviting the Chairman, as representative of Council, to the unveiling of a memorial to the airmen who served from Elmswell's RFC aerodrome from 1917 -1919.
6.5 From Suffolk Highways re possible parking restrictions.

- 19.06.07 **Noted:**
The Clerk's report as per Appendix A;
- 19.06.08 **Noted:**
That when any Complaints Committee business for information, to be noted or for inclusion on a future agenda was invited none was forthcoming and that the date of the next Complaints Committee meeting was not known.
- 19.06.09 **Noted:**
Planning results as notified by Mid Suffolk District Council & Suffolk County Council.
- | | | |
|-----|-------------|--|
| 9.1 | DC/19/01488 | Erection of single storey front and rear extension ...
Canley House, Church Road
GRANTED EPC supported |
| 9.2 | DC/19/01671 | Erection of single storey rear extension...
Manorbier, Ashfield Road
GRANTED EPC supported |
| 9.3 | DC/19/01700 | Variation of Condition 2...
Orchard House and Woodstock, Ashfield Road
APPROVED EPC no comment |
| 9.4 | DC/19/01596 | Conversion of barn to form 1 dwelling
Old granary adjacent to Ten Ten, Kiln Lane
APPROVED EPC objected |
| 9.5 | DC/19/01876 | Erection of 2 detached single store dwellings...
Hedgerows, Grove Lane
APPROVED EPC objected |
- 19.06.10 **Noted:**
The following Planning Applications as referred by MSDC for comment:
- 10.1 **DC/18/04267 Application for approval of reserved matters – scale, appearance, landscaping and layout
LAND TO THE EAST OF BORLEY CRESCENT**
Councillors objected to this application for the following reasons:
- 1 The community consultations prior to the Outline Permission being granted found considerable favour in light of the overall pattern of house types which sought to accommodate the needs of a neglected demographic in the community by including 16 bungalows. Despite other reservations, the Parish Council and the community at large were supportive of this element of the proposal.
It remains extremely unsatisfactory that, despite pressure from the community and the parish council alike, there are just 6 bungalows included here.
Apart from the clearly identified need for bungalow accommodation in the community, it was always considered that the strain on the highways infrastructure, given an access which spurs off from an existing large housing estate, would be reduced by the pattern of occupancy that the prevalence of bungalows would present. Resiling on this clear promise to the host community is an unacceptable and arguably disingenuous tactic.
It would seem part of a policy of cramming the site way beyond the original concept on which the community was consulted in July 2016.
The mix of house- types should be re-visited to address this.
- 2 One of the inevitable results of the cramming of the site is the loss of amenity in terms of the Right of Way network which traverses it. Councillors agree with the Place Services consultant regarding FP 10 which is funnelled through a narrow bottleneck at the Northern end of the site and which entirely loses its current rural outlook. A diversion along the Southern and Eastern boundaries to join FP 9 East of the present junction is necessary to prevent this serious degradation by way of totally urbanising the current pleasingly open rural setting.

3 The overly-tight arrangement creates highways problems within the development which are well defined by the SCC Highways development management engineer in recommending Refusal. Councillors support these reservations which must be properly addressed before permission is considered.

10.2 **DC/19/02521 Erection of single storey detached cart lodge
SPINNAKERS, ASHFIELD ROAD** Now determined as Approved

10.3 **DC/19/02495 Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission –
appearance, layout and scale for 106 No. dwellings
LAND TO THE EAST OF ASHFIELD ROAD**

Councillors objected to this application for the following reasons:

1 The parking provision, as identified by SCC Highways, is unsafe in that it requires reversing across footways in all cases. There are particular problems at plots 4, 34, & 50 with regard to the proximity to junctions or bends and the requirement for tandem parking serving a 4 bedroomed dwelling needs to be designed out of the proposal.

2 The siting of the 3 storey flats at plots 101 – 106 would present an overbearing mass of building at this significant visual position on the access road and problems of overlooking into the gardens of plots 96, 97 & 100. This house type would be better placed at the North-West corner of the site, currently occupied by plots 39 – 45.

3. The LAP proposal suggests no provision to encourage play and this should properly be re-designated as a LEAP with equipment installed. The application should confirm that management of green spaces, including the play provision, should be passed to a Local Authority with an agreed commuted sum.

4. The site boundary is contiguous at the Southern extremity, with The Blackbourne community facility. An arrangement allowing proper access between the sites should be agreed in the interests of encouraging walking and cycling away from the road network.

10.4 **DC/19/02605 Outline Planning Permission with all matters reserved except
the access point for the demolition of existing industrial buildings and
construction of 134 dwellings, employment provision (Use Class B1),
community building, provision of public open space including playing fields,
village greens, green corridors, community orchard, landscaping and surface
water attenuation and associated works (amended scheme to refused
application DC/18/03592)**

FORMER POULTRY PROCESSING PLANT, HAUGHLEY PARK
Councillors objected to this application for the following reasons:

1 This proposal relies entirely upon the surrounding villages to furnish infrastructure needs by way of retail access, educational and medical provision. These resources are overstretched and further threatened by similar off-plan opportunistic developments already permitted, requiring, for example, a new primary school in Elmswell before an influx such as threatened here can be accommodated.

2 There has been no pre-app discussion with these adjacent communities despite the considerable imposition upon their stretched resources as is buried within this proposal. As such, the application, in NPPF terms, is premature and should be refused.

3 The site is in the countryside outside of any Settlement Boundary within which new development will properly take place. Exceptions which would support the local economy do not include the opportunistic development of an isolated large housing estate rather than the retention of the employment opportunities which the site offers if redeveloped as a business park or similar, as is happening in the adjacent Warren Farm development.

4 The supporting road network will not support the traffic generated by this proposal. Preferred access to A14 Westward will, clearly, be along the old A45 to Warren Lane at Elmswell and thence via Church Road to the roundabout. This requires the use of 2 junctions in Elmswell already identified in the Parish Council's recent independently commissioned professional traffic survey as close to capacity. The School Road / Church Road junction is already at capacity given the recent granting of permissions in the village for large ad hoc housing estates, just such as proposed here. The implications for Wetherden and Haughley New Street, already suffering the blight of the expansion of the Lawn Farm Quarry workings, are equally dire. Given the difficulties for vehicular traffic, the prospects for cycling and walking are considerably worse and render the application, again, unsustainable in Policy terms.

5 The educational needs of the proposed development cannot be met without strategies of school places allocation and home to school transport which are not addressed. The catchment area primary school in Haughley is site-constrained to the extent that expansion is not feasible. Children from this development would have to be farmed out to Elmswell or Woolpit where the primary schools are already under pressure from developments within their own catchments. A similar scenario is encountered when considering pre-school provision for the assessed outcome of 21 pre-school children arising from this development.

6 NPPF clearly requires that the Planning system should be genuinely Plan led. This proposal is not part of any plan and simply seeks to impose a large, isolated housing estate in the countryside on the basis that this is preferable to empty factory buildings. The emerging BMSDC Joint Local Plan is the vehicle which will provide the framework for sustainable rural development. It states that, '*The location of development is a critical determinant on its sustainability and has a significant effect on the extent to which it contributes socially, economically and environmentally.*' This chimes perfectly with the strictures of the NPPF. This proposal fails entirely to satisfy any one of the contributory factors listed. It should be referred to a Strategic Planning exercise where the true effects and implications on the hinterland on which it seeks to impose itself can be evaluated and mitigated appropriately.

7 In summary, this is a proposal for the creation of an ad hoc settlement far removed from essential support services and facilities and requiring access to those services and facilities by car. There is no public benefit which would ensue when it is clearly the case that very adequate new housing provision is being made in all of the settlements identified in the legitimate Plan-led process.

In reaching these conclusions, Councillors had reference to the following Policies within the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Core Strategy Focussed Review, The Saved 1998 Local Plan, the NPPF as revised:

- CS1 settlement hierarchy
- CS2 development in the countryside
- CS5 development should conserve the overall character of the area
- CS6 development should provide appropriate and accessible infrastructure
- CS11 protecting existing employment sites from inappropriate loss to other uses
- FC1.1 proposals must demonstrate the principles of sustainable development
- FC3 endorsing a good range of employment sites across the District
- E4 refuse proposals likely to prejudice continued industrial or commercial purposes
- H7 controlling proposals for new housing in the countryside
- T10 the capacity of the existing road network
- NPPF the Planning system should be Plan-led
- NPPF development should be shaped by engagement between plan-makers and communities
- NPPF strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for pattern and scale of development
- NPPF applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan

NPPF applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals

- 10.5 **DC/19/02656 Outline Planning Application (All matters reserved) Provision of land for the extension of Woolpit Primary Academy School. Erection of up to 40 dwellings, associated works and infrastructure.**

LAND SOUTH OF OLD STOWMARKET ROAD, WOOLPIT

The meeting noted that the Clerk had been in touch with Woolpit Parish Council which has previously been in favour of this application, backed up by a Site-Specific Allocation in their emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Clerk was delegated to echo this support once confirmation was received that it represents the WPC continuing view.

- 19.06.11 **Resolved:**
That the Clerk makes known the Council's comments on the above Planning applications to the Corporate Manager, Growth & Sustainable Planning, at Mid Suffolk District Council.
- 19.06.12 **Noted:**
That there was no other Planning business.
- 19.06.13 **Resolved:**
That, in line with the Internal Audit recommendation for a staffing review, the Assistant Parish Clerk's hours be increased forthwith to 25 hours per week.
- 19.06.14 **Noted:**
The vacancy for 2 Council appointees to the BWMA, as referred from the Annual Meeting, was discussed. It was agreed that Cllr Osborne be appointed and that the pending appointment be left to a subsequent meeting
- 19.06.15 **Noted:**
That, as referred to this meeting from the Annual Meeting, the membership of the Planning Committee and of the Complaints Committee be as follows:
Planning Committee:
Cllrs Barker, Burch, Edmonds, Hawes, Mansel, Osborne, Pallett, Roots, Schofield, Shaw.
Complaints Committee:
Cllrs Barker, Burch, Edmonds, Friend, Mansel, Osborne, Pallett, Shaw.
- 19.06.16 **Resolved:**
That the Trefoil Guild be thanked for their excellent stewardship of the Station Road recycling centre for the 3 months to 31st May and that a grant of £150.00 be made to the Guild's funds.
- 19.06.17 **Noted:**
That a Contract is close to signature with the Council's preferred contractor to undertake the refurbishment of the Wesley chapel and to build a new community hub attached. Meanwhile, all of the Wesley group meetings and activities have successfully transferred to the Blackbourne for the 8 month duration of the works.

- 19.06.18 **Noted:**
That the Railway Tavern and its immediate environs, recently put up for sale by Greene King, remain subject to an Asset of Community Value Registration with Mid Suffolk following application by Elmswell Parish Council, despite the Community Right to Bid Registration having been withdrawn by Mid Suffolk following a challenge from the vendor's solicitors. There is widespread support for an aspirational Council scheme aimed at developing the site, including the area recently granted Planning permission for 8 houses, to the general community benefit. The Meeting noted the overwhelming support at the recent Annual Parish Meeting where experts in the fields of social housing and Planning were available to answer questions in a public forum. The Council's Professional adviser is in touch with the selling agent towards establishing a basis for formal negotiation.
- 19.06.19 **Noted:**
Authorised payments made and income received as per Appendices B and C, and indicative financial overview as at 31.05.19.
- 19.06.20 **Resolved:**
That proposed payments, scheduled as Appendix D, be authorised.
- 19.06.21 **Noted:**
The Balance as per Appendix E and the Chairman's confirmation that the relevant bank statements and computer report verify the published figure.
- 19.06.22 **Noted:**
That when public comment or questions on matters relevant to Council business were invited none were forthcoming.
- 19.06.23 **Noted:**
That when any other Council business from Councillors or the Clerk for information, to be noted or for inclusion on a future agenda was invited, none was forthcoming.
- 19.06.24 **Noted:**
That the next meeting of Council was scheduled for Monday 15th July 2019 beginning at 7.30 p.m. at the Blackbourne.
- 19.06.25 **Noted:**
That the meeting closed at 9.23pm.