

## **Swilland and Witnesham grouped Parish Council**

*Clerk to the Parish Council: Steve Barron*

Telephone: 07719 176917

Email: swill-witpc@outlook.com

Website: www.swillandandwitnesham.onesuffolk.net

### **MINUTES**

Planning Committee Meeting  
Monday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 7.30pm  
in the School Room at Witnesham Baptist Church

1. Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies: None
2. Councillors' declarations of interest. : Mr Hindle, Tuddenham Lane affects his property. Mr Hindle, Fynn Valley Golf Club member. All committee, site visit to Fynn Valley Golf Club on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2016.
3. Minutes of the meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016 confirmed as a true record.
4. SCDC decisions received since the meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016:

Application: **DC/16/0173/FUL** Rear and side extension, single storey  
**Tarnside, Mow Hill, Witnesham**

**Was supported**

**Permitted by SCDC**

Application: **DC/16/0554/FUL** Rear single storey extension **Marble Hall,**  
**Rose Hill, Witnesham**

**Was supported**

**Permitted by SCDC**

5. Application: DC/16/1114/FUL **Land on Tuddenham Lane adjacent to Tanglewood: Erection of nine dwellings including three affordable**

**bungalows with associated access road and parking. The application includes the change of use of a portion of farmland to form additional garden space for Tanglewood.**

Chairman explained proposal and background. He reminded the meeting of the previous application, submitted approximately one year previously, which had not been supported by the committee.

SCDC also stated that there were grounds for refusal:

- Plot outside physical limits boundary
- Insufficient access
- Irregular site design
- Landscape sloped and elevated

This previous application was withdrawn.

The current application was then outlined by the Chairman in detail to the meeting, with some questions from the committee. The Chairman then went through the map drawings of the site plan. It was felt by some committee members that apart from three affordable dwellings, an extension of the garden at Tanglewood as well as changes to the dwellings plans and layout, other differences between this application and the previous one were not obvious. Discussions continued within the committee and included the applicant's representative. Some inconsistencies e.g. red line, were identified and discussed. Concerns over road safety at the junction of Tuddenham Lane and Tanglewood were debated.

Discussion then covered access arrangements and hedge removal. This included the potential effect of enlargement of garden for Tanglewood on hedges on the boundary as the current field edge would be moved according to the plans. It was stated by a resident that the hedge would remain, but this fact was not in the plan being discussed.

The Chairman then invited those residents and members of the public to speak in turn if they so desired. Various comments followed as a result, including fears over increased surface water flooding on Tuddenham Lane which is already evident in severe downpours, concerns over bats and other wildlife and also past accidents and current risk including speeding motorists at the B1077 and

Tuddenham Lane junction. The view was again expressed, that this application did not differ from the previous one to any great extent and therefore previous issues still applied, e.g. Access/Highways, inappropriate design, hedge removal, flooding etc.

The Chairman summarised points raised by the meeting and asked the Committee to decide.

The application was not supported by any of the committee.

The site is not identified in the emerging Site Allocations document as necessary to meet the currently identified housing need for the Parish. The committee believe that sites in the village should continue to be progressed through the proper channels, rather than speculatively, ostensibly seeking to capitalise on SCDC's alleged lack of a five year housing land supply. Even if that is proven to the case, the presumption in favour of development cannot apply to this site as the development described in the application is not sustainable in that it fails to provide for safe access, evidence how flood risk will not be increased off site, or mitigate for the impacts on the local landscape character, which arise from the site's unfavourable topography, size and hedgerow removal.

**Decision:**

**Not Supported**

Application: DC/16/1037/FUL **Fynn Valley Golf Club: Erection of new clubhouse with associated facilities, conversion of existing buildings to form 10 dwellings plus the section of 4 new build dwellings.**

The Chairman gave an overview of the application which is classed as an “Enabling Development” involving approx £6 million investment, which may be more acceptable because of benefit to the community which would otherwise not normally be allowed if this was a standard development.

The cost for a new club house would be funded from conversion of the old club house into 10 dwellings and also from the 4 new dwellings.

The effects of the proposals, it was suggested, would:

- Be important to the Community
- Increase in the club membership
- Have an economic benefit on the community

The plan was then discussed in more detail including parking and moving the driving range. The sequencing of the development proposed would be:

1. Build new club house, 4 new dwellings and demolish existing green keepers store etc.
2. Convert old club house into dwellings
3. New driving Range
4. The access road could be upgraded, but not clear.

The applicant was questioned by the committee in regard to the new driving range, car parking capacity, tree loss and driveway changes when construction had begun.

The Chairman invited residents and members of the public to speak. The question of affordable housing was raised and the Chairman explained that there was no affordable requirement as this was an “Enabling Development”. There would likely be a CIL charge which would be discussed with SCDC.

The Chairman then invited the Committee to decide. Points raised by the Committee included:

- Large employer, adds to community economy and attracts people outside the village.
- Development impacts considered minimal.
- “Enabling Development” seems acceptable.
- Finances well balanced by the applicant. e .g. Things pay for things
- The whole thing is around upgrading the Golf Club.
- Site visit on 2<sup>nd</sup> April was good and helpful.
- Fencing and lights need some clarification.
- Sequencing of development is good.

- Concerns over driving range e.g. why move? what would the old buildings and driving range area be used for?
- It was suggested that consideration to any new kitchen facility would include ventilation and windows for the staff working within it.

**Decision:**

**Supported**

Chairman's comment:

***"The FYGC is important community asset for the Parish, providing an excellent leisure resource and a source of local employment and as such the Parish Council would be concerned if this was jeopardised. The PC does not ordinarily support new housing in the countryside, but considers that the proposals are a proportionate response to the need to enable refurbishment of the existing facilities to a modern day standard and thus ensure the ongoing viability of the FYGC.***

***As such we fully support the application."***

6. Further applications received: None.
7. Other business.

LAIS1388 proposed changes to the planning process was discussed briefly. Mr Lightfoot recommended that Committee study this document. Mr Lightfoot had concerns as to whether Parish Council consultation by SCDC would prevail in future as a result of LAIS1388.

**Anglia Cleaning Equipment Site, Ashbocking Road, Swilland:** Mr Everett had received further questions regarding when SCDC will respond to the enforcement case. Mr Wilks agreed to ask SCDC when he visits them on 6<sup>th</sup> April.

Meeting closed at 9:00 p.m.