

**Shimpling Parish Council**  
**Minutes of Meeting of the Council**  
**Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2018, 7.30pm in the Village Hall**

**Present:**

**Councillors:** Liz Brunwin (Chair), Colin Johnston, Dan Sharpstone, Gerry Shrimpton, Mike Atkins & Ken Rush

**Clerk:** Stuart Palmer (SP)

1. **Apologies for absence:**

Katie Haselhurst and Richard Kemp apologies received and accepted

2. **Declarations of Members Interest(s):**

a. **To receive disclosure of pecuniary and non-pecuniary interest(s) including gifts of hospitality in excess of £25:** Nothing raised

b. **To consider requests for dispensation for the agenda item(s) under discussion:** One councillor declared that they were a member of Suffolk Preservation Society who had written to the council in relation to planning matters. The council acknowledged this and felt it was unnecessary to take any action in relation to this meeting.

3. **Minutes of previous meetings:**

- **To confirm the minutes of Parish Council meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

The minutes were confirmed

4. **Correspondence** (taken out of order)

The Clerk reported that there had been a further exchange of correspondence with Mr Shayer about the planting of trees. The Chair reminded the meeting that it was agreed that Mr Shayer could replace two trees that had died on the public space outside his property. The council were informed that 3 trees had, in fact, already been planted. Mr Shayer was present and stated he had misunderstood the previous authority. The Chair proposed that the authority be extended to three trees and reiterated that this would be the last dealings of the council in relation to the trees, he was reminded that he is responsible for their upkeep and maintenance and not to plant any further trees.

This was resolved unanimously.

**Action – Clerk to write to Mr Shayer with revised authority.**

**Public Participation Session**

Around 15 members of public (MOP) were present. The following matters were raised:

In relation to the planning application to be discussed from the Croft, a MOP said that there was already traffic causing danger in relation to the two houses being built, a further 5 houses would be too much. They pointed out that noise was a nuisance and they could not double glaze as they are listed.

Another MOP stated the problem was wider than the ones the council were looking at tonight with plans for around 20 new buildings in the village

Another MOP pointed out that the replacement building for the development at the Old School was the same size as the one it was planned to be replacing.

The public participation session was closed.

5. **Planning:** The council discussed their response to the consultation by Babergh DC to the following planning applications they had received:

a) DC/18/03094 – Planning Permission Application – Cracketts, The Street, Shimpling. IP29 4HU

b) DC/18/03095 – Application for Listed Building Consent - Cracketts, The Street, Shimpling. IP29 4HU

These applications taken together as they concern the same work. The council had supported the application as an opportunity to renovate a property. However, concern was raised by the Heritage Team and new drawings had been submitted and re-consulted on. The council agreed that there was nothing to change their original decision of consent to the application and decided it was for the applicant to work with BDC and the Heritage team to resolve the issues raised.

**Action – Clerk to send a 2nd letter of consent**

c) DC/18/00267 – Planning Application – The Old School, Shimpling IP29 4HS

The clerk pointed out that the council had recently objected to a similar application. The applicant had resubmitted drawings and the PC were being re-consulted. The Clerk read a letter of objection from Suffolk Preservation Society to the meeting. In summary, they welcomed the applicant's attempt to reduce the massing of the proposed dwelling but stated that the newly created plot continues to look uncomfortably small and restricted. Their opinion remained that the application should continue to be resisted. (Full letter available on LPA website)

One councillor stated that in our original objection we had posed 4 questions:

- Is the space within the boundary of The Old School able to accommodate a further residential building?
- Is this new dwelling appropriate in size and design for a site with a listed building?
- Is there due consideration of the residential amenity of both the old and the newly proposed property?
- Is the overall effect of the new building to enhance or detract from the listed building and the wider environment?

He stated that in another application the council were to consider, the applicant had gone to considerable lengths to deal with the matters raised in a previous objection. He stated that this applicant had not done the same so there was not enough information to help a decision. Therefore, he felt, the 4 questions remain unanswered. The council felt it was incumbent on the applicant to take the same degree of care towards a listed building as they had seen in other applications. However, some on the council felt that the applicant had gone some way to alleviate concerns. The council felt that as the replacement building was residential and therefore had to plan for parking, this made the whole plan of the site 'too tight' as proposed. One councillor felt that with more professional and detailed drawings of what the development would look like from different aspects including any contrasts to the listed building may help an application.

For the above reasons, the council decided that there was not enough information to rescind its original objection to the application and the objections remains.

**. Action – Clerk to raise a letter of objection to the application.**

d) DC/18/0429 – Application for the erection of 5 dwelling houses – The Croft, Gents Lane, Shimpling IP29 4HR

The clerk stated that this was a new application but similar to ones that had previously been objected to. He read out a letter from Suffolk Preservation Society. In summary, they wished to object to the application. They stated the site was isolated in the countryside, does not relate well to the existing village of Shimpling and the suburban layout will be incongruous and visually intrusive within the agricultural, rolling and scenic landscapes. (Full letter can be accessed on LPA website)

One councillor stated that the boundary of the built up area from 2006 still applies. Some property that is outside the boundary were built before the boundary existed. In that, he pointed the map on p14 of the planning statement was inaccurate. He stated this was the seventh application for the site albeit this was the first time it was based on self builds. He stated the last objection was on the basis of restricted access, built in the countryside, detached from the village, encouraged more car journeys, not really any substantial public transport to service the development and on the design and scale of the development.

One councillor pointed out that Gents lane continued to be mixed use for walkers, horse and cycle riders and vehicles. However the vehicular access was very restricted. 5 new buildings at the end of the

narrowest part of the lane would have great impact. One councillor pointed out the 5 buildings could house around 20 people and put up the population of Shimpling almost overnight by around 5%. Another councillor stated that it was difficult to see how dustcarts and oil delivery could service the new development effectively without causing major disruption.

For the reasons stated in previous applications that were still relevant and those above, the council decided to object to this new application.

**Action – Clerk to raise a further letter of objection for the application.**

e) DC/18/04254 – Application for the erection of two dwelling houses on land to the south of the Street, Shimpling IP29 4HS.

One councillor stated that this is a further application since a previous application for 5 houses on the property have been rejected by the LPA. Again this application would affect the village green or verge and the village sign which was a designated area of visual and recreational amenity (AVRA). He stated that the applicant and their agent had attempted to refute some of the reasons for objection by the LPA in the previous application. However, this 'gap' in the Street affords long views over countryside that would be curtailed. The applicant is proposing access across the village green including moving the village sign. The applicant produced a Heritage Report which was designed to address issues related to the development and Shimpling House, which is a listed building. He pointed out that this application was for outline planning consent, mainly concentrating on the access and it could be changed later. The councillor referred back to minutes of the PC in 1994 where they considered a similar application. When there was a resolution by the pc to protect the land between Tolcarne and Shimpling from development as it was an important visual gap for the village. He stated there was little reference in the application to the AVRA or its status or importance. The councillor stated that there are significant issues with the proposed visibility splay for access to the site and it was his view that the claims within the application was inaccurate.

The council decided that in view of the previous objections that were still relevant and those listed above, it would object to this application.

**Action – Clerk to raise a further letter of objection for the application.**

f) 7APP/D3505/W/18/3196511 – Planning Appeal - The Bush, The Street, Shimpling IP29 4HU  
The clerk informed the council that there had been no update on this.

Clerks note. Appeal upheld and application granted on 10/10/18 since notified by the Planning Inspectorate.

g) DC/18/02251– Planning Decision – 6 Slough Hill, Shimpling IP29 4HN  
The council had received notification that the application had been approved.

The clerk stated that a further application had been received in relation to Malting Farm but there was not enough time to include on this agenda. It will be included on the 12<sup>th</sup> November meeting as an extension had been granted to the consultation deadline.

## 6. Finance:

(a) **Lark Valley Willow.** £219.60 approved for grass cutting

(b) **Central Source Ltd** - £48.00 approved from CIL reserves for replacement blind spot mirror

(c) **Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC)** – £69.60 approved for budget workshop fees for the Chair and Clerk

(d) **.L Rooke** – Payments of £90.00 and £81.00 authorised for materials to refurbish the circular bench and new tree to be planted respectively. No labour costs had been charged. The Chair expressed the thanks of the whole council for the generous contributions of Laurence Rooke, Ted Pine and Tony Heighs for renovating the bench and planting a new tree. It was rewarding to see the seat back in use.

(e) **Community Action Suffolk** - £60 authorised for annual web hosting fee for the PC website authorised

- (f) **F R Nevil** - £1997 for the painting and refurbishment of outside of village hall authorised from CIL funds.
- (g) **Insurance** – The clerk explained that the PC insurance was due. The PC has two policies, one for the Village Hall and another for the PC and other assets including the playground and telephone box etc. This is year 4 of a 5 year contact with Zurich through CAS. Due to advice on the asset register we had increased the value of the playground equipment and the cost of insurance had escalated. However, speaking to the Insurance manager she proposed a revised total figure of £50,000, based on some market research she did on replacements and setting a value of excess of £500 per claim, she quoted a renewal of £644.10. This was an increase on £604 paid last year. The council authorised the renewal costs.

**7. Urgent business to be brought to attention of council:**

Nothing raised

There being no further business the meeting concluded at 9.40pm.