

Swilland and Witnesham grouped Parish Council

Clerk to the Parish Council: Sarah Bailey, 38 Weyland Road, Witnesham, IP6 9ET

Telephone: 07719176917

Email: swill-witpc@outlook.com

Website: www.swillandandwitnesham.onesuffolk.net

MINUTES

Planning Committee Meeting
Monday 15th June 2015 at 7.15pm
in the School Room at Witnesham Baptist Church

In Attendance:

John Lightfoot, Chris Rush, Paul Laughlin, Terry Everitt, Michael Wilks and Kim Shaw. Jerry Hindle also attended having been proposed as a new member at the AGM.

Martin Last of Last and Tricker Agent for application DC/15/1991/FUL

1. To elect a new Chair and accept apologies for absence.

John Lightfoot opened the meeting and welcomed Mr Last and confirmed that he was standing down as Chairman but happy to remain on the Planning Committee. Mr Rush as PC chairman thanked Mr Lightfoot for the many years of dedicated service he had put into chairing the Planning Committee - there had been many difficult and time consuming applications during that time which John had expertly helped steer the Parish through and for which the Parish should be very grateful.

Michael Wilks was proposed by JL Seconded by CR and was duly elected as the new chairman and took the remainder of the meeting.

2. To receive Councillors' declarations of interest.

JH Declared an interest in Hillbrow Farm application as a very near neighbour.

3. To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 31st March 2015 as a true record.

Agreed

4. To note SCDC decisions received since the meeting of 31st March 2015.

Conifers – Permitted

Venns Farm Permitted

Hill House – Permitted

Hill Crest – Permitted

Tuddenham Lane – Withdrawn by applicant

White House Farm – This was an application for prior notification of change of use from an agricultural building to a single dwelling. SCDC had confirmed that prior approval was not required and thus this was considered Permitted

Development. MW had clarified with SCDC why the PC had been consulted and it was confirmed that this had been in error. MW explained that Hillbrow Farm was also an application for prior notification, thus again the PC should not have been consulted (see below).

The Button – Permission to let the dwelling for purposes other than those associated with the running of the Moon and Mushroom pub has been given, but the Button must remain within the same ownership.

5. Application: **DC/15/1991/FUL** Willow Cottage, Rose Hill, Witnesham.
MW – Reminded the committee of its recent views on applications outside the physical limits boundary (PLB), the opportunity we had had to redraw the PLB and the recently consulted upon sites proposed for the Local Plan. In short, the Committee had been consistent in its views that development outside the PLB should not be supported at this point. It was noted that development in this location would be therefore contrary to the Local Plan and previously expressed views of the Committee on similar issues.
JH – Raised concern that the SCDC web site had no Highways comments. Mr Last confirmed that Highways had not responded to him either. JH clarified that access was not of particular concern
JL – Felt that whether access was acceptable or not was really a matter for Suffolk County Council. Overall while there were positive aspects of the development it was really in the wrong place
JH – Supports in principle but concerns with elevational designs, preferring something similar to the existing dwellings.
CR – Not at all supportive and would want the Committee to hold firm on applications that are outside or not well related to PLB such as this one. CR commented that if permitted it could open flood gates for several similar applications throughout the Parish where gardens have been extended by adding farmland or where large gardens already exist and this precedent should be avoided
TE – Agreed that the Committee should stick with position adopted on similar applications.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION – Whilst the application site on its own appears workable, its location is simply not close or well related to PLB
Not Supported - Site is not within or well related to the PLB of the village being some distance away and is very much an isolated site and the Committee remains reluctant to change its view on such developments. In addition, there are concerns with the proposed style and elevational design which does not blend particularly well with the cottage style buildings in that area - the materials and appearance are not attractive and the scale seems inappropriate.

Application: **DC/15/1941/PN3** Hillbrow Farm, Tuddenham Lane, Witnesham

MW Confirmed that following correspondence with SCDC, while the Committee could offer comment it would not be used to determine whether or not prior approval was required. The Committee agreed therefore it would not respond to applications for prior notification going forward. Plans were

available for general information only and it was commented that it was a relatively large development for a single bed dwelling

6. To consider any further applications received prior to the meeting.

None

7. Other business

JH – Advised that an application for works at Witnesham Church was on the website but it was merely for a planting scheme which was unlikely to come to Parish Council

MW – EA1 Windfarm Application is in the process of being amended but with no significant changes to Witnesham area. Still on same route, laying cables for EA1 and ducts for EA3. Start date approx 2017-8

MW – EA3 Windfarm now out for Consultation - updated proposal is potentially to undertake works (i.e. the pulling of cables through the ducts) in two phases. Duration of works up to approx 44 months starting 2020 – 2025. Strugglers Lane had been removed as a potential access point. Consultation Meetings at Bramford Church Rooms 22nd June 12 – 7pm and Woodbridge Library 23rd 12 – 7pm

CIL – MW explained Community Infrastructure Levy had now been adopted by SCDC and would come into force from 13th July 2015. Levy in Witnesham for developers has been set at £150/ sq m of which 15% would be provided directly to the Parish Council for Infrastructure Improvements, which may be play space, village hall improvements etc. Remaining 85% to District and County Councils. If Neighbourhood Plan in place this would attract 25% to the Parish. Committee expressed concern that applications should always be considered on their planning merit irrespective of CIL monies that successful applications might generate. It was noted that we will need to engage with parishioners when spending our CIL receipts. It was agreed that this matter would be brought to the attention of the full Parish Council.

MW –To send out Invitations to the World of Planning event and a Sizewell C engagement flyer.

Meeting closed 8:30