

**DRAFT STOKE BY NAYLAND PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY 3 OCTOBER 2017 AT 7.00 PM**

Present: Jeremy Bloomfield (JB), Chairman
Vivienne Klimowicz (VK)
Isabelle Reece (IR)

Apologies: Stevie Bezencenet (SB), Martin Nielsen (MN), Adam Sedgwick (AS)

In attendance: James Dark – Clerk (JD)

Public present: Sean Fry, Trish Orriss (7.05-7.55pm)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

See above

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

3 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2017 were approved and signed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4.1 Re-consultation on application DC/17/03117 – Hill Farm, Polstead (Konings)

The committee had no comments on the application beyond its original letter of objection.

Action: Clerk to respond to the re-consultation stating that the Parish Council's original response stands and the Parish Council has no further comments to make.

4.2 Application DC/17/04495 – Topcroft House extensions

The committee had no comments on the application

4.3 Application DC/17/04626 – Bedford House extensions

The committee had no comments on the application

4.4 Application DC DC/17/04202 – 2 The Blundens garden room

The committee reiterated concerns, expressed at previous meetings, that the structure had been built without planning permission, that work had continued despite the developer being told by the District Council's enforcement officer that permission would be required, and that the structure appears not to comply with regulations.

The chairman closed the meeting at 7.18pm to hear views on the matter from the members of the public present. The meeting reopened at 7.30pm.

The committee agreed to object to the application on the grounds that the structure is:

- To one side of the house
- Is in an AONB, over 10 square metres and over 20 metres from some of the walls of the building associated with the application.

These features contradict points 1 and 3 respectively in guidance on permitted development.

In addition the height of the building is not clear. If the height is over 2.5 metres it would contravene point 8 in the guidance because the structure is less than two metres from the boundary of a neighbouring property. If the eaves height is over 2.5 metres it would contravene point 7 in the guidance.

Furthermore, the committee noted that:

- The building appears designed for unidentified leisure use which could contravene planning requirements to maintain tranquillity in AONBs.
- The District Council received the application on August 25 but the Parish Council had only been notified on October 2.

Actions: Clerk to reply to consultation objecting on the grounds identified.

Clerk to write to the District Council requesting earlier notification of applications.

Comment [JD1]: The planning application information and documents were only validated on September 29 by Babergh.
Given this, is it necessary to ask them about why we were not notified before then? – is there any point in them notifying us before applications are validated? I'm not an expert but I'm not sure there is.

4.5 Difficulties in viewing planning applications online

Committee members reiterated concerns about difficulties experienced in viewing large documents greater than A4 in size online, following the District Council's decision to switch to electronic consultation. It was also noted that the format of the electronic documents means they can be hard to view when printed. A further difficulty is that, on occasions, documents have timed out when councillors have been viewing them. In addition councillors felt it unreasonable that they should be required to meet the costs of printing.

JB recalled that the District Council had suggested that one solution could be to view these documents on larger screens at its drop-in centres. It was agreed that this arrangement is inadequate given the travel involved. The committee had previously rejected the District Council's view that funding should be sought for a projector to view applications at meetings. Councillors need the materials to prepare adequately before committee meetings.

IR pointed out that the District Council had indicated at a liaison meeting, before the change to electronic consultation, that applicants could be required to meet the cost to the District Council of continuing to provide paper copies of large documents. It was agreed that this should be pursued.

Action: Clerk to write to District Council requesting that the DC consider supplying paper copies of large documents related to planning applications, and that the cost of supplying them be included in the application fee.

4.6 Planning applications neighbouring the parish

Leavenheath Parish Council had alerted members to an application for renovation works at Beachams Farm neighbouring Stoke by Nayland Parish. The committee noted that changes in access are proposed. It is assumed that access would be via the existing bridleway, which would be inadequate for construction traffic.

Actions: Clerk to respond to the application bringing the District Council's attention to concerns that there is no adequate access to the site for construction vehicles, and that using the existing bridleway would damage it.

Clerk to write to the District Council requesting that it notify the Parish Council of applications neighbouring the parish in line with DC policy.

Comment [JD2]: Ask Vivienne re all of it.

5 PLANNING DECISIONS

None received.

6 ARRANGEMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO BABERGH MIDSUFFOLK DC DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

Members noted SB's written report on the September 5 meeting of the Babergh Alliance of Parish and Town Councils.

The committee then discussed the District Council's proposals for development sites in the draft local plan. Members expressed concern that the District Council's preferred site would not have a pedestrian access route to the village centre, and noted that this is contrary to the DC's policy of minimising car use arising from new development.

It was agreed that a Working Party meeting should take place to discuss fully the proposals in the

draft local plan with a view to recommending a response to the next Parish Council meeting on November 7, three days before the November 10 deadline for responses.

Members considered it likely that development proposals could be formulated better under the guidance of a Neighbourhood Plan. The committee recommended that the possibility of producing a Neighbourhood Plan should be discussed at the next Parish Council meeting.

Actions: IR to arrange Working Party meeting to discuss fully the proposals in the draft local plan with a view to recommending a response to the Parish Council meeting on November 7. Clerk to include discussion on the potential for a Neighbourhood Plan on the November PC agenda.

7 PLANNING TOGETHER AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The committee noted that the clerk had clarified to the District Council that the Parish Council will not proceed with a Housing Needs Survey until funding is received.

8 PLANNING MATTERS ARISING

8.1 Update on 2 The Blundens

The matter was considered during discussion on the planning application.

8.2 Konings

The matter was considered during discussion on the planning application.

9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 7 November at 7pm

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 8.10pm.

.....
.....

Chairman

Date