

## STOKE BY NAYLAND PARISH COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016 AT 7.00 PM

<b>Present:</b>	Stevie Bezencenet (SB) Jeremy Bloomfield (JB) Martin Nielsen (MN) Isabelle Reece (IR) Adam Sedgwick - Chairman (AS)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Jane Cryer - Clerk (JC)
<b>Also present:</b>	Douglas Pike (item 4.1)
<b>Apologies:</b>	Vivienne Klimowicz (VK)

---

#### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

See above.

#### 2 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2016 were approved and signed.

#### 3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

#### 4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

##### 4.1 B/16/01617 - Old Vicarage Cottage, School Street

AS had visited the owner, Robert Dossor, to discuss the application, in line with the Committee's decision in October. He confirmed that Mr Dossor was aware of the existence of the Design Review Panel, and he had been in the building trade himself. In response to a question, AS said the applicants had given consideration to demolishing the property and starting again, but had ruled this out.

AS then invited Douglas Pike to speak. Mr Pike said his house, Cross Keys, was only about 40 metres away from the proposed development and the north elevation would be clearly seen from his property. However, Cross Keys was not mentioned in the Design & Access Statement, although other properties further away were; he felt that this made the application inaccurate 'by omission'. He said the proposed new development would be dominant to the existing cottage (which had been built originally as a gardener's cottage for the Old Rectory), especially as the height of the ridge would be 1.5m higher than any of the existing roof lines. He suggested that the ridge could be lower, to line up with the gable ends. He also felt that the materials the applicants proposed to use were not suitable for a property in a Conservation Area.

Mr Pike also made the point that visitors using the path past the south door of the church would be able to see the new development, which was only screened by one sycamore tree, which was old, had already lost one large branch, and could be lost at any time. (It was noted that the church pictured in the application was not, in fact, in Stoke by Nayland, but possibly a generic image downloaded from the internet). Mr Pike had written to Babergh outlining his objections; he asked the Parish Council for its support.

Councillors felt that the proposed development appeared to show little regard for the Conservation Area. The north elevation design was a clumsy mixture of old and new, and was especially

important because it was this that was visible from the church path. However, MN noted that the new footprint would be only slightly larger than that of the conservatory, which had been added approximately ten years ago. It was agreed that the PC should object to the application; AS emphasised the need for the PC's response to be relevant in planning terms:

- The materials used should be more in keeping with a Conservation Area, eg real slate rather than re-constituted slate, wooden window frames etc;
- The ridge of the rear addition should be lowered, in order that the new development should be subservient to the old, not dominant;
- The design of the north elevation should be reconsidered, given its effect on the setting of a Grade 1 listed building, namely the church.

AS and JC would liaise to draft the PC's response.

#### **4.2 Other applications**

No other applications had been received.

### **5 PLANNING DECISIONS**

#### **5.1 B/16/01297 - 3 Thorington Villas, Thorington Street**

It was noted that permission had been granted in respect of the above application.

#### **5.2 B/16/01396 & 7 - Fenwood Cottage, Church Street**

It was noted that permission had been granted, together with Listed Building Consent, in respect of the above application.

### **6 PLANNING TOGETHER AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Bill Davies from Stratford St Mary had been confirmed as the Parish Council representative on the AONB Partnership. AS said the training session had been agreed in principle.

### **7 ANY OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

#### **7.1 East Bergholt**

The High Court decision on the proposed initial development in East Bergholt was noted; however, it was possible that Babergh might wish to appeal. JB said there was likely to be a bid for a development in Capel St Mary.

#### **7.2 Great Horkesley**

AS said he would follow up with SVAG about the possibility of a covenant in favour of the National Trust.

#### **7.3 Circulation of planning applications**

It was agreed that it would be useful to have telephone numbers on the circulation sheet, and that councillors should check that the next person on the list was not away before passing the papers on.

### **8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 10 January 2017 at 7pm.

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 7.40pm.

.....

Chairman

.....

Date