

**STOKE BY NAYLAND PARISH COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY 5 SEPTEMBER 2017 AT 7.00 PM**

**Present:** Vivienne Klimowicz (VK)  
Martin Nielsen (MN)  
Isabelle Reece (IR)  
Adam Sedgwick (AS)

**Apologies:** Jeremy Bloomfield (JB), Stevie Bezencenet (SB)

**In attendance:** James Dark – Clerk (JD)

**Public present:** Shaun Fry, Olivia Print, Stuart Print

---

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

See above

**2 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING**

IR agreed to chair the meeting in JB's and SB's absence.

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**4 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2017 were approved and signed.

**5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**5.1 Application DC/17/04436- Old Vicarage Cottage tree work**

The committee had no comments on the application.

**6 PLANNING DECISIONS**

**6.1 Application B/17/01092 - Old Vicarage Cottage**

The committee noted approval of the application. AS reported that the applicant is appointing a new architect and has agreed to take into account points made by a neighbour, Douglas Pike, when proceeding with the work. These points correspond to issues raised in the committee's objection to the application.

**6.2 Application DC/17/02380 and DC/17/02378 – Walnut Tree Cottage**

The committee noted approval of the application.

**6.3 Application B/16/01734 - Old Bakehouse**

The committee noted approval of the application.

**6.4 Application DC 17/02733 – Thorington House**

The committee noted approval of the application.

**6.5 Application DC/17/02498 and DC/17/02499 – Scotland Hall Barn**

The committee noted approval of the application.

**7 ARRANGEMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO BABERGH MIDSUFFOLK DC DRAFT LOCAL PLAN**

The committee agreed to defer a decision until SB reports on the September 5 meeting of the Babergh Alliance of Parish and Town Councils. Her report will guide the committee on whether

it would be appropriate to work informally with neighbouring parish councils on responding to the local plan proposals. Matters arising at the BAPTC meeting, along with members' emerging views on the draft local plan, will be discussed at the PC's October planning committee. Points to note will be publicised to parishioners with a view to encouraging individuals to respond directly to the district council.

**Action:** IR to brief JB and SB on the planning committee's position and ask SB to consider the potential for informal discussions with neighbouring PCs in preparation for October's committee meeting.

**Action:** Clerk to place publicity about the district council's drop-in consultation sessions on parish noticeboards.

## **8 PLANNING TOGETHER AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

### **8.1 Format of planning application consultations**

The committee noted the clerk's report outlining Babergh MidSuffolk's District Council's reiteration that it can no longer provide consultees with paper copies of planning application documents, primarily due to cost. The DC advised that if parish council members find it difficult to view large plans online, PCs should pursue grant funding for projectors so they can show full size documents at meetings.

The committee agreed that Babergh MidSuffolk's recommended approach is not an adequate solution. Members need to make sure they have a thorough understanding of the applications in preparation for committee meetings. The committee's position is that the DC should provide hard copies of large documents to maximise the opportunity for consultees to make informed, accurate responses to applications.

IR reported that the DC had recently mentioned [at the Town & Parish Liaison Meeting 29th June] that it was considering an additional charge for planning applications to reflect the cost of sending large paper documents to consultees.

The committee agreed that SALC and BAPTC should be contacted with a view to these organisations taking the matter up with the district council.

**Action:** SALC representative (JB) and BAPTC representative (SB) to contact these organisations to relay the committee's concerns and raise the possibility of SALC and BAPTC lobbying the district council to revert to providing paper copies of large planning application documents.

## **9 PLANNING MATTERS ARISING**

### **9.1 Update on 2 The Blundens**

IR opened the meeting to the public. Shaun Fry reported that he had attempted to contact the relevant district council enforcement officer about his concerns over the unauthorised development at 2 The Blundens. He was told that the enforcement officer was on sick leave and therefore the DC is in no position to progress the case. His previous attempts to contact the officer suggest that his absence, and hence the DC's inability to pursue the matter, dates back to June. VK reported that further work is continuing on the structure.

The committee also noted that the enforcement officer's manager confirmed to the PC in June that the development requires planning permission but the owner of 2 The Blundens needed to be given further time to submit an application. He had assured the PC that action would be taken if no application was made.

The committee expressed concern over:

- The DC's ongoing lack of clarity on how long a developer should be given to apply for planning permission. As the DC opened an investigation into the situation five months ago, the committee considered that an excessive time appeared to have passed, particularly given the facts that there was no evidence the developer had any intention of applying, and that work on the development continued
- Working practices at Babergh MidSuffolk. The culture appears to be that it is acceptable for

work to stop if an officer is absent, with no arrangement for case work to be taken up by a colleague.

**Action:** Clerk to write to district councillor Melanie Barrett asking her:

- To clarify at what point the DC proposes to take enforcement action over the situation at 2 The Blundens if a planning application is not submitted, and any related regulatory, statutory or advisory timescales the DC works to
- To raise the issues of the DC’s working practices with senior management.

**9.2 Undergrounding cables – The Downs, School Street**

AS reported that the project presents a considerable opportunity to improve the public realm in Stoke by Nayland village through removal of overhead wires. To maximise the scale and potential benefits, financial contributions would be required from households and organisations (e.g. the church and the estate) on top of UKPN’s. Two households have already indicated a willingness to make a contribution but the committee recognised that some will not be in a position to do so. VK noted that experience from previous projects shows householders are more likely to consider contributions if they can be given an early, accurate indication of costs.

**Action:** AS to draw up a strategy for engaging with residents on the undergrounding project. Work will include understanding the benefits for householders and the potential contribution property owners could be asked to make with a view to publicly consulting residents when the application for work is submitted – expected to be early 2018. Committee members (potentially a working party) will email contributions to AS on how he could develop the strategy.

**9.3 Konings planning application**

The committee agreed to investigate effective ways to continue making the case against the development following submission of its formal objection, and how to co-ordinate action with neighbouring PCs.

IR opened the meeting to members of the public. Olivia and Stuart Print described how a Leavenheath action group is lobbying against the proposed development.

**Actions:** AS to contact Suffolk Preservation Society for advice on further steps the PC could take to make the case against the proposed development in the period before Babergh and MidSuffolk DC’s committee meeting to consider the application.

AS to attend the DC committee meeting where he will make the case against the application in the allotted three-minute slot for consultees. He will co-ordinate with neighbouring PCs with a view to agreeing that each one should make different points in their three-minute slots.

Clerk to update the Leavenheath action group on committee actions as appropriate.

**10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 3 October at 7pm

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 7.39 pm.

.....  
.....

Chairman

Date