

**Shimpling Parish Council**  
**Minutes of Meeting of the Council**  
**Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> August 2019, 7.30pm in the Village Hall**

**Present:**

**Councillors:** Liz Brunwin (Chair), Colin Johnston, Gerry Shrimpton,

**District Council:** Stephen Plumb

**Clerk:** Stuart Palmer (SP)

1. **Apologies for absence:**

Katie Haselhurst, Dan Sharpstone, Mike Atkins and Ken Rush Michael Holt 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:**

Colin Johnston raised a private interest in that he lived in Gents Lane near the developments subject to application and appeal. Gerry Shrimpton raised the same private interest in that he lives in Gents Lane. Liz Brunwin raised a private interest in that she lives in The Street

**b. To consider requests for dispensation for the agenda item(s) under discussion:** All three private interests were put to the council and all three were granted dispensation to contribute to the relevant debate by unanimous vote of the council. This is the reality of a small village represented by councillors who live in the village.

3. **Minutes of previous meetings:**

• **To confirm the minutes of Parish Council (PC) meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> July 2019**

The minutes were confirmed

**Public Participation Session**

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

One member of the public asked for an update on bus services. The chair said it was not on the agenda but would be on the agenda for the next meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> September. One councillor gave a brief update on PC efforts to improve and maintain the bus service provision. The PC are awaiting a response from SCC having written with some demands and suggestions.

One member of the public said that her planning application was objected to after being guided in an illegal way to the council. She also said that her planning statement had gone in but had not been uploaded to the portal. She objected to some of the language used in the letter from the PC as she regarded it as inaccurate. The chair of the council stated that her complaint about the process that the PC followed had been dealt with by the Monitoring Officer at Babergh District council and the matter is closed. She also stated that the PC can only deal with documents that are available on the portal.

The public participation session was closed.

**Standing Orders**

The Chair proposed suspending standing order limiting councillor debate to 10 mins for the next item as it was particularly complex and needed more time to debate. This was passed unanimously.

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

**a) DC/18/04395– Planning Appeal APP/D3505/W/19/3229105– Malting Farm, The Street, Shimpling. IP29 4HS**

One councillor pointed out that this was an appeal by written submission with a deadline of 28<sup>th</sup> August. . This was an appeal against a refusal by BDC of an earlier application. The PC wrote a letter of objection of 14<sup>th</sup> November without the benefit of a planning statement. The PC wrote again on 30<sup>th</sup> November after the planning statement was provided. The objections raised in those letters still stand but it is necessary to add

further to them for the appeal to deal with others matters raised by the appellant. We also needed to include matters that had been raised by inspectors in two recent appeals.

The councillor pointed out four areas to be included:

- Areas of disagreement in the document 'Full Statement of Case' provided by the agent.

These included that the map of the BUAB used was incorrect. The correct map shows this development in the countryside. The services to the village stated was inaccurate, and the statement on land supply was wrong. BDC state that net completion of developments is 102% of target. In the most recent Inspector's report on the appeal for DC/18/00581 in Gents Lane, the Inspector judged the functional cluster idea to be just that, an idea; it did not reflect the day to day reality of people's lives.

The councillor concluded that the development was outside the BUAB (built up area boundary), was not integrated with other development. Views would be compromised for all. Vehicle access would have to change and spoil the area. BDC housing policy states the delivery of the right types of homes, of the right tenure in the right place meeting need.'

- The recent planning history in Gents Lane.

Two recent and similar developments have been refused permission. In both cases Gents Lane was recognised as a distinct entity. It was also noted that Gents Lane was not a sustainable area for development. One inspector noted on a site visit that they had serious concerns for road users and safety with development.

- Relevant evidence in the emerging Joint Local Plan (JLP).

It is assumed the new Joint Local Plan (JLP) will gain some weight with planners. It clearly shows the BUAB now includes the 2 new buildings but the rest of the lane is outside and therefore in the "countryside". As far back as 1994, the PC had wanted to protect the nature of Gents Lane and this had been recorded in minutes. The JLP recognises Shimpling as a Hamlet and basically a non-sustainable village. This has implications for planning. The plan gives examples of sustainable development such as infill development with reference to Hamlets.

- Babergh's current policies and material considerations.

CS1 supports sustainable development. CS2 states that building in the countryside will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances and justifiable need.

The councillor concluded by stating that the proposal does not constitute sustainable development. It fails when set against the relevant policies in 'Core Strategy and Policies'. The two most recent Appeal Decisions also confirm the unsustainable nature of Gents Lane as a location for development. The plot for consideration is off Gents Lane at the narrowest part. If it is approved, it would destroy the lane as a resource for all, give a green light to further ribbon development and call into question the purpose of existing planning policies.

The other councillors present agreed with the comments being made and having read all the relevant papers in advance unanimously agreed to further object to the appeal along the lines discussed.

**Action: Clerk to write to the planning inspectorate to object to the appeal.**

#### **b) DC/19/03607 Planning Application – Plot adjacent to Gents Lane, Shimpling Street, IP29 4HP**

One councillor pointed out that this was a new application sent to the PC for consultation with a deadline of 23<sup>rd</sup> August. There is pre-application advice in the documents from BDC. While the re-application advice

letter referred to 3 houses, presumably referring to an earlier application not carried through, the advice still holds weight when set against the current three dwelling application. BDC stated the development relied on cars, would not be sustainable and showed no local need. They also stated that vehicle access onto Gents Lane was unlikely to be acceptable. They further stated that it may not comply with CS1. None of these reasons for refusal have been overcome in this application.

He went on to say that the outline planning statement says that this would be a linear development of 'starter homes'. In order to be in this category they would need to sell for a maximum of £250K outside of London. At current market value the houses proposed in this application are far in excess of this amount. Therefore these proposed homes could not be considered starter homes. In the application form they are more accurately described as 'market' homes i.e. for sale on the open market.

The agent falsely claims that other developments along Gents Lane have been approved. The councillor stated that facilities nearby are inadequate to support sustainable development. The applicant proposes to widen the vehicular access which would spoil the area and substantially change the environment. The applicant states that charging points will be provided but there is no obligation for purchasers to use electric vehicles, which are expensive and not really suitable for rural areas.

The comments that inspectors made about the earlier discussed appeal are equally relevant to this application in Gents Lane.

The councillor summarised that this application should be objected to by the council. The other members present agreed and it was resolved to object unanimously.

**Action: Clerk to write a letter of objection to the planning authority by 23/08/19.**

**c) DC/19/03692 – Planning Application – Mount Farm Barns, Blooms Hall Lane, Shimpling, CO109BY**

One councillor stated that there are regulations that cover this type of development. It is virtually permitted development. The only exception to this is if someone is trying to develop in e.g. a flood zone. The documents include a survey of the barns that show that they are suitable. The development is remote with a private drive. The only reservation was for increased traffic in the area. Other members agreed with the assessment so it was unanimously resolved to support the application.

**Action: Clerk to send a letter of support to the Planning Authority.**

**5. Finance:**

The PC were asked to authorise the following outstanding payments:

5a) Outstanding invoice for Caloo Ltd to repair Playground Aerial Slide	£720.00
5b) Outstanding invoice for 999 Network Services for Silver Support to PC Laptop	£120.00
5c) Outstanding invoice from Babergh District Council for election costs	£104.78

All the items were authorised for payment.

**6. Correspondence**

Nil received

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

Nothing raised

**Public Participation Session.**

One member of the public asked how the PC determined local need. The Chair referred her to BDC for information. The same member of public stated that the village green development was allowed despite it being not sustainable. The Chair confirmed that the PC objected to the development and had meetings with the BDC Planning leadership over the decision.

There being no further business the meeting concluded at 8.31pm.

DRAFT