

THURSTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the MEETING held on Wednesday 17 June 2020 at 6.30pm by VIDEOCONFERENCE of Thurston Parish Council.

Present (by video): Cllrs. Rainbow (Chair), Haley, Morris, Rainbow, Thurlbourn, Towers, Turner and West. Also in attendance (by video): Mrs V Waples, Parish Clerk.

1. **OPENING** – the Chairman opened the meeting advising all that the Video Protocol adopted by the Parish Council, would be enacted for this meeting. *A copy of the Protocol is available from the Clerk or can be downloaded from the website:*
<https://thurstonparishcouncil.uk/parish-council/policies-procedures-and-strategy/>
2. **APOLOGIES** –
 - a) Council received apologies for absence from Cllr. Dashper for work commitments.
 - b) Acceptance of the apologies submitted was agreed by all, aif.
3. **DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST FROM COUNCILLORS INCLUDING GIFTS OF HOSPITALITY EXCEEDING £25** –
 - a) To receive declarations of pecuniary, local non-pecuniary interest(s) and personal interests in items on the agenda and their nature including gifts of hospitality exceeding £25 – there were no declarations declared.
 - b) To receive declarations of lobbying for planning matters on the agenda – there were none declared.
 - c) To receive requests for dispensations – none had been received prior to the meeting.
4. **PUBLIC FORUM** - due to government advice relating to public meetings, it was confirmed that the Meeting ID and Password for this meeting had been made available via the website and the parish noticeboards for those who wished to join the meeting.
5. **PLANNING MATTERS** –
 - a) To consider and authorise the Clerk to respond to the following planning applications submitted to the parish council as a statutory consultee:
 - DC/20/01981 - Submission of details (reserved matters in part) following outline approval DC/19/05114 – appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 9 No. self-build dwellings. Phase 2 Plot 1 @ land to south of Barrell’s Road
 Proposal will impact negatively on Mofley and Bridge Cottage opposite – Mofley Cottage is a flint cottage and anything coming forth needs to be in-keeping and a similar size. Whilst a Chalet style was more in-keeping with scale; why was the setting of Mofley cottage not taken into account before at full application stage as this will impact on setting (see heritage report). Urban style properties – executive houses in the countryside without regard for the area around it and the countryside in which it is located. All comments as made for Plots 9 and 8 remain as given for this application. All agreed that the PC should recommend refusal on these grounds, aif.
 - DC/20/02236 - Submission of details (reserved matters in part) following outline approval DC/19/05114 – appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 9 No. self-build dwellings. Phase 5 Plot 4 @ land to south of Barrell’s Road
 Once again large houses on the plots - over-massing. Same comments as previously mentioned before still stand for this one. The PC should reiterate its view that it was very unhappy with the manner in which this application (i.e. DC/19/05114) and all the others have come about. Estate of houses without any regards that it was a village, urban design without taking into account the rural character. Characterless and out of keeping with the area in which it is located. Limited detail on hedgerow. Large three garages with office above – likelihood for future impact. Again, it was agreed that this should be refused on the grounds that it was not appropriate for its setting, with comments as previously raised, aif.

So approved at the meeting of 01.07.2020

- DC/20/02237 - Submission of details (reserved matters in part) following outline approval DC/19/05114 – appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 9 No. self-build dwellings. Phase 7 Plot 6 @ land to south of Barrell’s Road
Large houses and plots- over-massing; same comments as previously mentioned before. Dim view of the manner in which this application (i.e. DC/19/05114) and all the others have come about. Estate of houses without any regards that it was a village, urban design without taking into account the rural character. Characterless and out of keeping with the area in which it is located. Mirror image of 2236 – reinforces urban aspect.
 - DC/20/02211 - Submission of details (reserved matters in part) following outline approval DC/19/05114 – appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 9 No. self-build dwellings. Phase 1 Roadway and Footpath @ land to south of Barrell’s Road
Internal road too narrow, safety aspect against Policy T10. Potential of 27 vehicles – impact on residential amenities of all with traffic impact. 1st entrance is onto the corner of Barrells Road which will impact on Highway Safety for all users of the highway, close to existing junction. Impact on hedgerow but understand that this is needed to gain visibility splay. Plans for new native hedgerow not submitted. Ensure Construction Management Plan removes Barrells Road as the site access route. Agreed that for the concerns raised, it should be flagged up for refusal, aif.
 - DC/20/01994 – Householder Planning Application – Erection of a two-storey side extension and retention of front porch @ 33 Oakey Field Road
All agreed that it fits in with the scale of the existing building and precedent has been set for such an extension in the neighbouring area.
- b) Applications determined by the LPA:
- DC/20/01477 – Planning Permission for the conversion of garage to additional living accommodation (work room) @ The Garden House, Great Green
 - DC/20/01182 – Planning Permission for the conversion (and extension) of barns to residential use to form 2 No. dwellings and ancillary storage @ Grove Farm, Barrells Road
 - DC/20/01183 – Listed Building Consent for the conversion of barns to residential use to form 2 No. dwellings and ancillary storage @ Grove Farm, Barrells Road
 - DC/20/01688 – Planning Permission – erection of a two-storey rear extension @ 36 Genesta Drive
- c) To note matters arising from approved planning applications:
- Ixworth Road Cycleway/Footpath – to note the support by the Parish Council for a discussion over the alternative proposal to retain trees and provide enhanced street- scene forming part of the development proposals for the College Park site (Persimmon) – it was noted that this proposal had been passed onto all relevant departments involved with seeking a solution to this matter. All had agreed to review the contents. Initial comments from the LPA had stated that the report underestimated how the land was owned and the various parties involved in the options on the land.
 - Meeting of earlier today(17.06.20) called to discuss the above – update provided by District Cllr. Turner: this was the second meeting and was positive by all who had attended and who were keen to try and find a solution: Highways; Persimmon; Planning. However, Highways made it clear that they were not moving on the visibility splay and would not support a built-out and 20mph due to agricultural vehicles. Surveys are still to be carried out. LPA and SCC Highways to revisit the cycle path from the school through to the Persimmon site. August time houses should be ready for occupation and Persimmon can put in a temporary cycle access to the school and village. Land ownership still needs to be resolved between the landowner and the land needed by SCC Education Department. All in attendance seemed resolved to save the trees at the southern end but the one at the Persimmon entrance with permission to be removed is proving difficult although all are trying to find solutions to retain this tree. 20mph speed limit along this stretch is not supported by the Police.

So approved at the meeting of 01.07.2020

- Further meeting planned for July with all parties to explore this further. The meeting noted that the issue seems to be SCC Highways resolve not to move on highway safety grounds. There was a need to look at this in terms of what the NPPF said over mitigation of biodiversity and climate emergency. Leverage can surely be applied against some of the comments made by SCC Highways in terms of government comments and momentum for change for ensuring that all users of the highway can use so by sustainable means. All agreed that there was still a need to try and explore further ways to slow the traffic as opposed to just limiting the speed limits.

6. YOUTH MATTERS:

- a) to receive an update on the formation of a Youth Council – Cllr. Turner confirmed that he had been in touch with the person (organiser) who was organising the young people who had shown interest in forming a Youth Council. Discussions and agreement had been reached as to who would be willing to attend regular meetings of the Youth Council and provide feedback to the PC at its meetings. All appeared to be eager to get an idea as to how the PC works and how they will contribute.
- b) Youth Shelter – keen to get this established and set-up. The organiser has agreed to be the liaison between Cllr. Turner and the young people and they were in agreement that this would also involve the pinpointing of any anti-social behaviour. They had agreed that they would monitor and take ownership of the shelter and try and make it a more successful venture than last time. Two types of shelter on the Calloo website were the preferred type of shelter – The King and the Meet-up. It was agreed that siting needs to be agreed with the landowner although this had tentatively been agreed prior to lockdown. All agreed that there was a need to have formal agreement from the landowners and New Green Trust for the siting of a shelter. Cllrs. Haley, Turner and Thurlbourne agreed to liaise over this matter and report back at a later meeting.

7. FINANCIAL MATTERS:

- a) To review the monies held under the CIL Reserve and consider allocation against projects as identified in the Parish Infrastructure and Investment Plan (*Paper 8 – 03.06.20*) - also see background papers on CIL – Appendix A,B,C – the meeting agreed that this was a work in progress and that the projects identified to date should be costed to ensure that they were realistic and of benefit to the community. The Clerk was to review the projects and where appropriate seek advice on how to take some forward. Discussion followed over the Station Railway Building and how it might be retained and enhanced? It was agreed that NR would need to come on board but there were drawbacks on projects moving forward as there is insufficient parking and issues with the building that need to be investigated and resolved. It was agreed that initial conversations were to be explored and noted that NR had previously advertised for a station sponsor for the building.

8. ETHOS PLAY STRATEGY REPORT - Draft report from Ethos Environmental Planning for an Open Space and Play Strategy for Thurston – previously circulated

- a) to consider the draft report – all confirmed that they had read the report and that some of the recommendations should be incorporated and graded as feasible and obtainable. Emphasis on incorporating community growing areas was a positive point as well as the evidence to support provisions for youth as the report shows that it is lacking. Support for leverage in other planning areas was welcomed. The meeting agreed that some of the conclusions within the report could be used to support provisions to enhance areas and move forward and that this would help focus the provision of open space and recreational facilities across the whole village.
- b) to provide comments / items for inclusion / consideration – it was agreed that all should review the report for inaccuracies and submit them to the Clerk via email provided separately. A number of items will require updating and the report needed to also highlight issues regarding allotments in terms of looking to the future.

So approved at the meeting of 01.07.2020

Heath Road – they need a response to this – how will this area be dealt with? *Clerk to liaise with the owners of the land.*

Land at St Peter's Way – the old gravel pit – who does this belong to? *Clerk to liaise with MSDC/SCC.*

Why has the Primary School been identified as education – page 40 – but TCC is not identified as an educational facility?

It was agreed that Cllr. Fawcett would review the report and liaise with the Clerk on items for inclusion / amendment.

9. CLERK'S REPORT - to receive the Clerks report and in particular:

- a) to receive the reports of items actioned under delegated powers – Council was informed that the Clerk had reported a number of 30mph warning signs that were either missing or leaning; had liaised with a number of residents over encroaching hedgerow; liaised with the LPA on behalf of residents over Construction Management Schedules; bonfires and footpath issues.
- b) to receive items of correspondence for noting only – it was confirmed that all relevant emails had been passed onto the Councillors.

10. TO CONFIRM THE DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

- a) 18th June 2020 – Recreational Facilities Committee Meeting – via the Zoom platform – commencing at 6.30pm
- b) 1st July 2020 – full Council Meeting – via the Zoom platform – commencing at 7.00pm
- c) 22nd July 2020 – full Council Meeting – via the Zoom platform – commencing at 6.30pm

11. TO RESOLVE THAT UNDER THE PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISISON TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960, THE PUBLIC BE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING DUE TO THE CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF THE BUSINESS TO BE DISCUSSED – *it was resolved that the public be excluded from the meeting to consider negotiations over a possible land transaction as publicity of the options being offered is likely to prejudice the position of the council, aif*

- a) to receive and discuss information on negotiations over a possible land transaction involving the parish council – the meeting discussed the landowner's proposals as identified on a previously circulated map and identified a number of concerns with the way in which the land was to be offered and potential consequences of retained land.

It was agreed that prior to the Council making a decision on the proposals offered further questions needed to be posed to SCC and that once those were answered the Parish Council would consider this matter further.

12. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING – there being no other business the meeting was closed at 20.19pm.

So approved at the meeting of 01.07.2020

Appendix A - Glossary of Common Abbreviations used

Aif	All in favour
AGAR	Annual Governance and Accountability Return
APM	Annual Parish Meeting
ASB	Anti-social Behaviour
BACS	Bankers Automated Clearing Services
BUAB	Built Up Area Boundary
BMSDC	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils
CC	Credit Card
CCG	Clinical Commissioning Group
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
Chq.	Cheque
Cllr.	Councillor
CMP	Construction Management Programme
Cttee.	Committee
DC	District Council
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government
DD	Direct Debit
FOI	Freedom of Information
FR	Financial Regulations
GPoC	General Power of Competence
HMRC	Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
JR	Judicial Review
LAIS (from SALC)	Local Association's Information Services
LGBCE	Local Government Boundary Commission for England
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MSDC	Mid Suffolk District Council
NHS	National Health Service
NDP	Neighbourhood Development Plan
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NR	Network Rail
PC	Parish Council
PCSO	Police Community Support Officer
Pdf	Portable Document Format
PIISG	Parish Infrastructure Investment Steering Group
Rec.	Recreation
RFO	Responsible Financial Officer
SARS	Suffolk Accident Rescue Service
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SALC	Suffolk Association of Local Councils
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SID	Speed Indicator Device
SNT	SaferNeighbourhood Team
SO	Standing Order
SPS	Suffolk Preservation Society
TCC	Thurston Community College
TNPSG	Thurston Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
TRO	Traffic Regulation Order
VAS	Vehicle Activated Sign

So approved at the meeting of 01.07.2020