

Shimpling Parish Council
Minutes of Meeting of the Council
Monday 17th August 2020, 7.30pm via ZOOM Video Conference

Present:

Councillors: Liz Brunwin (Chair), Colin Johnston, Katie Haselhurst Gerry Shrimpton, Mike Atkins and Nathalie Brown

Clerk: Stuart Palmer

1. **Apologies for absence:**

, Michael Holt and Ken Rush 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:**

All members made private interest disclosures in that they lived in the vicinity of two planning issues on the agenda.

b. **To consider requests for dispensation for the agenda item(s) under discussion:** All the private interests were put to the council and all members were granted dispensation to contribute to the relevant debate by unanimous vote of the councillors as it was pragmatic approach to councillors living in a small village and none of the private interests were very close neighbours.

3. **Minutes of previous meetings:**

• **To confirm the minutes of Parish Council meeting of 13th July and the AGM on 13th July**

The minutes were confirmed was the amendment to a typo in Chair's report

Public Participation Session

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

One member of the public said that although not on the agenda he had noted that only 4 members of the village used the bus into Bury on Wednesday and only 3 back.

The public participation session was closed.

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

a) **DC/20/03069 - Land Adjacent The Bush, The Street, Shimpling, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP29 4HU**

One councillor pointed out the following:

- In the outline application there was an exchange of emails between the agent and the case officer referring to a 2 storey 120sq m house. The Design and Access Statement for DC/20/03181 says the application is now for a 1.5 storey, 3 bedroom house with a cart lodge. This is a more substantial proposal but there is no reference to floor area. He felt that the dimensions of the buildings and the floor area should be stated in the conditions. His concern is that it should fit in with the cluster of buildings to which it is naturally aligned (the pub). It should also not compromise in size, design or materials the listed building opposite.
- BMSDC Economic Development made a strong case against development on this site at the outline planning stage but 'have no comment to make' on this current application.
- There seems to be no interest from Heritage in this application. Given that Cracketts (Grade II listed) is immediately opposite, we found this strange. Heritage has shown some interest in Cracketts recently, having opposed an extension at the rear (even though it is obscured from public view). Heritage concerns have also been important considerations when discussing planning at Land South of The Street, where the site in question is in similar proximity to a listed building.

- The case officer's report at outline stage discussed how a residential building might impact the viability of the public house. The reduced availability of land for parking was highlighted as was access to buildings at the rear of the pub. It would have been helpful if these had been addressed within this application. Since the initial application and successful appeal the Pub has been designated as an Asset of Community Value (ACV). Further reduction of parking would impact on the ACV and business.
- The Design and Access Statement is short on the specifics of landscaping. The councillor wanted the inclusion of a stipulation that the two trees at the front of the site next to The Street, are retained.

Members agreed to the points raised. Additionally one member raised concern that they do not have planning permission for the cart lodge and felt that the PC should object to this also on impact to the ACV. Another member raised the issue of pushing customers' parking onto the highway out of the existing parking area into an area where the speed limit reduces from 60MPH to 30MPH. This was seen as very dangerous.

Members resolved to object to these reserved matters on the grounds outlined above.

Action: Clerk to send a letter of objection to BDC

b) DC/20/03181 Discharge of Conditions Application for DC/18/04254– Land South of The Street, The Street, Shimpling. IP29 4HS

One councillor pointed out that

- The PC has already made a submission in respect of the Reserved Matters application (DC/20/01664) but were again disappointed to see that our comments and suggestions for improvement were not taken up.
- However, there are few points he wanted to pick up on from the Officer's Report:-
- In the BDC summary of our letter they failed to acknowledge (p4 summary point 6) the distinctive nature of the 'management plan' which we were suggesting. It was quite clear from our letter that we had no confidence in a developer sustaining a landscaping plan, nor did we think that Babergh would monitor such a plan, much less enforce any breaches. Our proposal was for a Section 106 planning obligation rather than a general planning condition (which is simply a hostage to fortune). He felt that Babergh should have given weight to this in their summary of our position and then narrated why this was a non-starter.
- He stated that the PC made some points about the proposed development referencing the Suffolk Design Guide for Residential Areas. BDC dismissed this Guide as being 'somewhat out of date' (p6, 3rd para from the bottom of the page). In the most recent iteration of the Joint Local Plan is the following comment:- *'In determining applications regard will be given to the Suffolk Design Guide for Residential Areas (p97. 15.54).*
- He pointed out that on p7 BDC discuss final ridge heights. He could find no reference to ridge heights in the applicant's documents (maybe it is stated and we missed it). Our request is that the ridge heights and dimensions of the proposed buildings are clearly stated and included within the approved documents. The PC did mention about the heights being declared in the letter.
- He stated that at the start of the letter, and a matter of concern to some of the other objectors was the contentious visibility splay. On p8 BDC quote a communication with Suffolk Highways where any pressure to prove the achievement of the visibility splay has been sidestepped by saying that 43m is sufficient! This is an interesting revelation, particularly in terms of timing, but the question must be asked:- **why wasn't this stated as the required visibility splay at the beginning?**
- Turning now to the **Discharge of Conditions Application DC/20/03181**. His overriding concern is to secure the integrity of the AVRA, both during the construction phase and afterwards. Looking at the **Condition Approval Layout Plan: -**

- The blue green line forming a rectangle is stated in the key as making a fence line for the site. He assumed that all building materials and equipment will stay within that area (unless used elsewhere during the working day) so that the AVRA is kept clear and open to the public. He stated that he would like this stated as well as shown on the drawing.
- The width of access from the road is stated as 4.8m. Can it be stated that there will be no widening of this?
- He assumed that the tree line along the ditch towards the west is retained?
- Considering the **Condition Approval Statement:** - He stated that a bin collection point in the middle of a protected area of public open space to be counter-intuitive.
- Concerns over the drainage and levels plans were presented in response to the Reserved Matters Application by other objectors (including those with a surveying/engineering background) but there was no discussion of these in the Officer's Report. Reference to some cross checking by an independent professional would go some way to establishing confidence.
- Condition 10 (d) This, as it is written, does not make sense. If it is suggesting that, contrary to the Layout Plan, the verge is to be fenced off, then he objects. It is important that the verge/AVRA is kept as an open area of public open space.
- There should be a requirement to keep the roadway free from mud and debris and a cleaning regime declared.

The PC resolved unanimously to write to BDC pointing out the concerns with the discharge of conditions and object to them.

5. Finance:

The PC noted the following payments made outside the meeting

5a) Outstanding invoice 999Networks service contract for Laptop	£120.00
5b) Outstanding invoice for Eastern Play Services for Inspection on Playground	£144.00

The Chair asked for quotes for any remedial work as a result of the inspection to be brought to the next meeting.

Action: Clerk to get quotes for the remedial work on the playground.

6. Correspondence

Nothing received

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

Nothing raised

Public Participation Session.

Nothing raised

There being no further business the meeting concluded at 8.30pm.