

**STOKE BY NAYLAND PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 1 DECEMBER 2020 AT 7.30 PM (Skype meeting)**

**Present:** Martin Nielsen (MN) – Chairman  
Sean Fry (SF) – Vice-Chairman  
Stevie Bezencenet (SB)  
Adam Sedgwick (AS)  
Vivienne Klimowicz (VK)

**Apologies:** Isabelle Reece (IR)

**In attendance:** James Dark - Clerk (JD); one member of the public

---

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

See above

**2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ANY AGENDA ITEM**

SF said he would not vote on agenda item 5.2 as the planning application relates to a property close to his own.

**3 MINUTES**

**3.1 Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2020 were approved. (These would be signed at a date agreed by the Chairman and Clerk).

**3.2 Review of outstanding actions from previous meetings**

Actions not scheduled to be discussed elsewhere on the agenda were reviewed. The following ongoing issues were noted:

- MN will contact BDC to suggest suitable locations for tree planting in the parish;
- SCC and the golf club had not yet taken promised steps to clear blockages on footpath 22;
- BDC's enforcement team will consider investigating works at Beacham's Farm following a complaint from the parish council.

**4 PUBLIC FORUM**

See above.

**5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**5.1 Application DC/20/05189 - The Pyghtle**

It was agreed that no response would be submitted, but MN would have an informal discussion with the applicant on reducing the large amount of glazing proposed for the dormer which would be visible from Scotland Street.

**5.2 Application DC/20/04418 – 20 The Blundens**

It was noted that the proposed development required planning permission because of its position relative to the building line. It was considered that an alternative location may be more appropriate, depending on the reasons for the positioning proposed.

**Action:** It was agreed that SB should request a site visit to understand why the applicant had proposed this location and draft a response to the application depending on the findings.

**5.3 Application DC/20/04811 - 1 Butt Road**

A draft response, circulated before the meeting, objecting to the proposal was approved.

**Action:** Clerk to submit the approved response.

#### **5.4 Application DC/20/05325 - Maples**

Members considered that the rationale for the design of the proposal was not clear. It was noted that the determination date for the application provided sufficient time for a site visit to discuss the proposal with the applicant before deciding whether to respond at the January meeting.

**Action:** AS to request a site visit; Clerk to request an extension to the consultation period.

### **6 PLANNING DECISIONS**

None had been notified.

### **7 PLANNING CONTROL**

#### **7.1 Compliance matters**

The meeting noted correspondence from BDC's enforcement team stating that no action would be taken in relation to the positioning of a flue at 2 Goldenlonds following some mitigating actions by the owner. The team had also advised the owner against misuse of public land.

SB reported that the manager of The Angel had indicated that he was considering removing the garden wall of The Stables and further trees following the recent acquisition of this Grade II listed property. It was agreed that the manager should be asked for clarification of his plans and advised of planning constraints.

**Action:** SB to invite the manager to the next committee meeting and request that exterior clearance works are paused until then.

MN reported that the Clerk had asked Chapman Stickels to remove signs on Scotland Street that contravene the Parish Council's roadside advertising policy and make good damage caused to the street name sign.

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

#### **8.1 District Council's draft Joint Local Plan consultation**

Concerns were expressed over potential development of the Clipt Bush Corner site designated for housing in the draft Joint Local Plan. It was noted that this site was designated initially in the 2019 iteration of the JLP and had not appeared in previous drafts. It was agreed to object to the inclusion of this site on the grounds of;

- Issues identified in the Landscape Appraisal commissioned as part of the Neighbourhood Plan development process;
- Protected species on the site identified in the District Council's sustainability appraisal of the 2019 draft JLP.

The response would also make the points that:

- The District Council had recently announced that it intended to scrap the planning model on which the 2020 draft JLP is based;
- It would be desirable if the JLP does not compromise Neighbourhood Plan development, drawing on a forthcoming presentation on the linkages from the District Council.

**Action:** AS to draft a response.

#### **8.2 Quiet Lanes**

MN presented a report proposing a network of lanes for designation including some that cross the border into neighbouring parishes. These had been discussed with the parishes in question. MN explained that the list of lanes had been submitted to Quiet Lanes Suffolk before the meeting due to initial deadlines but could be altered. He thanked Janine Roffey for her assistance with the work and for preparing the report.

VK noted that Quiet Lane designation would not provide enforcement powers. MN advised that traffic regulations generally are moving in a direction of greater enforcement and Quiet Lane

designation could be helpful in that respect in the future. AS considered that Quiet Lane signage could be an effective nudge towards behaviour change and could potentially assist in future 20mph designations. During discussion, councillors considered that Scotland Street would be the top priority for designation but considered that some lanes not on the list submitted could be candidates. MN replied that there was flexibility to withdraw lanes submitted before signing an agreement to proceed; other lanes could be added at a later date; and further funding tranches may become available.

It was noted that at present funding support from Quiet Lanes Suffolk would be available to the parish council for designation of two lanes, but potentially land owners and the District Council could be approached for contributions. MN indicated that costs are uncertain at this stage but could involve an outlay of £900 per lane.

**Action:** It was agreed that MN should continue with preparations for Quiet Lane designation and that a budget for the project would be considered at the January parish council meeting when the 2021-22 budget is due to be approved.

### **8.3 Boxted Mill Bridge**

It was noted that Essex County Council's plans to strengthen the bridge for HGV usage could cause lorries to be diverted through the parish while the works take place.

**Action:** It was agreed that at the next parish council meeting James Finch would be asked to ensure that any diversions do not include roads that are unsuitable due to weight restrictions or otherwise.

## **9 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

### **9.1 Footpaths**

MN reported that:

- Road drainage spills are affecting the accessibility of the footpath leading from The Crown.
- The village Gateway sign near The Crown is tilting.

**Action:** MN to report these matters to SCC via the online reporting tool and request remedial action.

VK reported that the first section of Footpath 27 from the swing gate past the allotments had become very overgrown. It was noted that clearance would involve considerable work.

**Action:** Clerk to make allowance for this work in the budget presented for approval at the next parish council meeting.

### **9.2 Arboreal conservation**

MN reported that he is planning work to identify alternative sources of funding for tree planting and to raise awareness of arboreal conservation among landowners. Janine Roffey had indicated that she would assist and may attend future committee meetings as an observer/adviser.

## **10 CLERK AND CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence from SCC asking for notification of any request for changes to streetlighting times over Christmas and New Year was considered. It was agreed that there should be no change to the regular timings.

**Action:** Clerk to inform SCC of this decision.

## **11. DATE AND TIMING OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 5 January 2021 at 7.00pm – venue TBC.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.10pm.