

REDGRAVE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING - MINUTES 7 February 2018  
Held in the Redgrave Activities Centre at 7.00 pm

Present: Angela Bigley, Mike Denmark, Richard Hilton, Matthew Millard, Ann Preston, Jason Walker, Parish Clerk, County Cllr Jessica Fleming, District Cllr Derek Osborne and 57 members of the public.

1. Chairman's Opening: Mike welcomed everyone.
2. Apologies: John Giddings, Bob Hayward and Neil Smith.
3. Declarations of interest: None.
4. Minutes of the meeting of 3 January 2018 were agreed as a true record.
5. None.
6. Public Forum: Susie Parker and Michael Rees represented the Llanover Estate in a discussion about proposals for Estate land next to the playing field and Activities Centre. The outline plans Ms Parker had discussed at the meeting in November had been developed further with conceptual layouts and drawings of the site. This included continuing the row of housing north of Churchway and a larger area south of Churchway. The larger area proposed a mixture of property types, starting with gatehouse style larger properties and more cottagey housing and green spaces down a central lane, with a larger structure at the end containing smaller units for all ages. The smaller units had potential to include an element of care for the elderly if needed. They reassured attendees that if the land was passed on to a developer, the Estate would make sure that there were limits/controls on what the land could be used for, the number of houses, the layout and type of housing. As these were ideas only and there was a great deal of flexibility overall, they requested feedback from the community. The plans would be put on the Redgrave website and the Llanover Estate would be sending out some information to every household.

Rob Marsh-Feiley from Hollins Architects attended on behalf of the owner of the land next to Charters Towers. Mr Marsh-Feiley explained the current planning situation that MSDC had created with no up-to-date Local Plan and no 5-year housing supply, as required by Central Government, which had resulted in the suspension of the usual planning rules. It had led to a great deal of pressure on villages, and as one resident put it, opportunistic development on sites outside the settlement boundary. Mr Marsh-Feiley explained that his intention was to design a low-density, open site with a continuation of the street-side development at the front and larger, more modern houses at the back. Some would be self-build. In the feedback residents gave, it was clear that the majority were highly concerned about the safety of the access and the additional pedestrian traffic on very narrow footway. It was noted that Suffolk Highways had recommended that the footway be widened but there was no scope to do so in front of existing houses. There were also strong feelings about the lack of prior consultation on the proposals, particularly as this was a full planning application and there would be no opportunity for discussing the details with the applicant. There were other concerns about the maintenance of public spaces, future build on the open space, etc.

District Cllrs Osborne and Fleming said that they would both represent the community's views on the planning applications when they went to the MSDC planning committee.

A member of the public thanked Cllr Fleming for backing the fight against the loss of free school transport in Suffolk.

7. Planning: Councillors reported on a meeting they had with John Pateman-Gee, the Head of Planning for the area, to discuss whether these large applications could somehow be considered all together. The answer was a firm no. Planning law dictated that each application must be considered individually and on its own merits. However, he gave councillors a lot of useful information on the policies that applied to the applications.

7.1 Applications:

7.1.1 Land Adjacent to Charters Towers, The Street. DC/17/05663. Planning Application - Erection of 30 No. residential units. The Parish Council noted the objections of residents. There were several significant concerns about the application. Redgrave was a linear settlement and the land adjacent to Charters Towers played an important part in defining the entrance to the village. The proposed development in the open field would remove an

important part of the setting of the conservation area and would be entirely at odds with the historic pattern of development in the conservation area. The new houses sought to reflect local styles of building and materials, but several were grouped in short terraces giving them a density not found in the area. The Parish Council considered that the development would result in harm to the significance of the conservation in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. The NPPF also stated that a 'clear and convincing' justification must be made for 'any' such harm. The Parish Council did not believe this had been made successfully.

The Transport Assessment was brief and contradictory and was of limited value in assessing whether the development created a 'safe and secure layout which minimised conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians' (NPPF). It was a busy road and there was no scope to widen the footway into the village due to the proximity of existing buildings. The access visibility splays were based on a 30mph speed when there was some evidence that vehicles regularly exceeded the limit. It was felt that an up to date speed survey was necessary and without one, full consideration of the access location could not be made.

It was felt that the position within the site and the orientation of the affordable housing was ill-considered. With their backs to the cul-de-sac and either in isolation at the far end of the site or at an angle to the street, the affordable properties did not share the same street scene as the other houses within the development or the existing houses along the main road, resulting in social isolation rather than integration. Furthermore, the relationship and the interaction between the development and the village would significantly reduce the amenity and privacy of nearby residents, particularly of the last three houses in the village before the field. On higher land, the proposed 2-storey houses backed onto their gardens, not just overlooking but imposing. The last house in the row, Pine Cottage, particularly suffered with direct overlooking from two angles and a concentration of parking behind its garden. The central green space would be relatively unusable by families as it was completely cut off from the surrounding houses by the access road.

The 1300m fenced-in buffer area to the south, with no indication in the application of how it would be maintained, was likely to become a no-man's land of overgrown vegetation and over-fence fly-tipping, contrary to policy stating that the relationship between buildings and open spaces in any layout should act to minimise opportunities for criminal activity.

There were further concerns about insufficient information within the application regarding the archaeological impact, the ecology report, drainage and the value of the agricultural land. In addition, it was noted that four of the houses were designated as self-build, making them exempt from affordable housing requirements and Community Infrastructure Levy, thus reducing what little benefit there would be to the community from the proposed development.

The Parish Council therefore objected to the application, for the reasons set out above, and expressed its concerns about the lack of community engagement which had led to an application which completely ignored local needs and concerns.

- 7.1.2 Land West of Hall Lane, Hall Lane. DC/18/00224. Planning Application. Erection of 17 dwellings with associated access and landscaping. The proposal was for 17 houses set around a cul-de-sac road entering the site from Hall Lane. Only one of the new houses would address the street as was the pattern of development in much of the conservation area, including historic building around this part of Redgrave Green. They would also be more formally and densely laid out than most building in this area. In addition, the design of the houses was more suitable for an urban environment with elements not commonly found in the area, e.g. parking underneath the houses. The PC considered this contrary to policy which specified that design and layout should respect the character of the proposal site and the relationship of the proposed development to its surroundings; and should complement the scale and form of traditional building in the area.

A further concern was the access to the site. The Parish Council agreed with SCC Highways that the current layout did not provide the necessary visibility splays this close to a blind corner. There was no evaluation within the application of the real speeds achieved as

vehicles entered the village and approached the site, and local surveys from the Redgrave Speedwatch group and the Vehicle Activated Sign reported a significant percentage of traffic in excess of 30mph on Hall Lane going both ways as well as roughly 1000 vehicle movements through the village each day.

The Ecology report was of limited scope and didn't allow full assessment of the impact in terms. There was particular concern locally about the loss of turtle dove, barn owl and grass snake habitats on site and it was considered that a more detailed ecological survey was required.

Redgrave Parish Council therefore objected to the granting of consent for the application for the reasons set out above. The PC did, however, commend the landowner's agent for the level of consultation carried out in the community.

7.1.3 Land at Pound Farm, Gallows Hill. DC/18/00119. Outline Planning Application (with some matters reserved) - Erection of 1 No dwelling and creation of access. There was no objection to the application.

7.2 Decisions: None.

#### 8. Ongoing Items:

8.1 Cross Keys Pub: The new management couple, Georgina and Naomi, had started on 22 January, and a lot of work had been done by volunteers to get the pub open again. The car park had been re-shingled, the upstairs accommodation had been redecorated, the downstairs was almost finished and the kitchen had received a thorough cleaning. The managers were sorting out menus, suppliers, etc and new flooring would be fitted in mid-February. A possible hold-up was the broadband connection to allow Wi-Fi and a separate, more secure line for the card reader. The delay made it more likely that the pub would open in March rather than February.

8.2 Neighbourhood Plan: It was noted that there would be a public meeting at 7.30pm on Wednesday, 21 February to discuss whether to produce a Plan for Redgrave.

8.3 Old School Playing Field: It was noted that a grant had been received from Locality for ecological and speed surveys.

#### 9. New Items:

9.1 Internal Audit Review: It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to appoint Cllr Preston to carry out the annual review.

9.2 Community Housing Fund and Community Land Trusts: The PC noted the availability of funding for community housing projects and agreed that it would be useful to consult with the community on setting up a Community Land Trust to pursue local projects.

9.3 Data Protection Regulations: The PC noted that new regulations would apply from 25 May 2018 and the steps the Council needed to take to be compliant. It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to appoint a third-party Data Protection Officer in the first year to support the Clerk as it was currently unclear whether the Clerk could act as DPO. It was agreed to accept a quote from the Local Council Public Advisory Service for £650 for a combined service to Redgrave (£150), Botesdale (£250) and Rickinghall (£250).

#### 10. Correspondence:

10.1 MSDC: Councillors noted the request from MSDC to update their Registers of Interest and would notify the Clerk if any changes needed to be made.

10.2 Suffolk Neighbourhood Watch Association: The PC noted the transfer of "ownership" of local NHW from the police to the SNWA. It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to give the SNWA a donation of £50 for initial set-up costs.

10.3 St Nicholas Hospice: Councillors considered the offer to hold a fundraising carolling event in the village but noted that RAHOF already fundraised in the village.

10.4 Age UK: It was agreed to consider this for the next year.

10.5 MSDC: The PC received the invitation to workshops on Community Infrastructure Levy and how it could be spent. The nearest event was at Elmswell Community Centre at 10am and 6pm on 19 February. The Clerk would attend the morning session.

11. Finance:

11.1 Account balance: £15,705.47

Income	£ 351.44	Transparency Fund
--------	----------	-------------------

11.2 Accounts for Payment:

L Jackson-Eve (Total £269.44)

£ 231.52	Salary Jan 2018
----------	-----------------

£ 37.92	Expenses Jan 2018
---------	-------------------

PW Electrical

£ 426.00	Electrics Report for Cross Keys PH
----------	------------------------------------

Redgrave Amenities Trust

£ 210.00	Hall Hire for 2017-18
----------	-----------------------

J Cresswell

£ 211.00	Christmas Tree
----------	----------------

RESOLVED, with all agreed, to approve payment of the accounts detailed above.

11.3 Grants for Payment (agreed on 3 January 2018, minute 11.3):

RBR PCC	£ 300.00	s214(6) LGA 1972
---------	----------	------------------

Suffolk Accident Rescue Service	£ 100.00	s137 LGA 1972
---------------------------------	----------	---------------

East Anglia Air Ambulance	£ 100.00	s137 LGA 1972
---------------------------	----------	---------------

Rural Coffee Caravan	£ 50.00	s137 LGA 1972
----------------------	---------	---------------

Neighbourhood Watch	£ 50.00	s137 LGA 1972
---------------------	---------	---------------

Citizens Advice Bureau	£ 50.00	s142 LGA 1972
------------------------	---------	---------------

Avenues East (Optua)	£ 50.00	s137 LGA 1972
----------------------	---------	---------------

Headway Suffolk	£ 50.00	s137 LGA 1972
-----------------	---------	---------------

Victim Support	£ 50.00	s137 LGA 1972
----------------	---------	---------------

RESOLVED, with all agreed, to approve payment of the accounts detailed above.

12. Matters carried forward from this meeting or to be brought to the attention of the council: None.

13. New matters for next meeting: None.

14. Next meeting: 7 March 2018 at 7.30pm.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 10.00pm.