

THURSTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the MEETING held on Wednesday 20th May 2020 at 6.30pm by VIDEOCONFERENCE of Thurston Parish Council.

Present (by video): Cllrs. Dashper (Chair), Cllrs. Morris, Rainbow, Thurlbourn, Towers, Turner and West.
Also in attendance: 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 to receive apologies for absence – apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Fawcett and Haley due to personal circumstances.
 - b) Council to consent to accept the apologies submitted – Council agreed to accept the apologies submitted.
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 noted that the Parish Council was trialling the public forum, by ensuring that the Meeting ID and Password for this meeting were made available via the website and the parish noticeboards for those who wished to join the meeting. There were no members of the public present.
5. TO CONSIDER MATTERS RELATING TO NETWORK RAIL –
6. **TO CONSIDER MATTERS RELATING TO PLANNING FOR THURSTON** –
 - a) To consider the following planning applications: full details of the applications listed below are available to view online by visiting:
 - DC/20/01385 – Application to determine if Prior Approval is required for a proposed change of use of agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses (C3) and for building operations reasonably for conversion. Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q – conversion of 1 No Dwellings @ Moat Farm, Barrells Road – comments submitted covered:
 - rejection in system
 - what are the operational conversion clause
 - not sympathetic conversion
 - Internal layout a little different from the previous one.
 - Noted that the more modern barn next to it has planning permission already for two dwellings.
 - These are barns that need to be preserved and the best manner to retain them should be to convert them.
 - If these are being passed as dwellings – lots of people cycling along these areas – what about passing places.
 - Poor layout and poor access and poor egress and ingress – notes that it abuts part of yard that belongs to the farm.

So approved by the Council at the meeting of: 03.06.2020

- The PC's standing response talks about the cumulative impact and noting that there is obvious pressure in this part of the village with approved and ongoing applications, the PC needs to ensure that the safety of all highway users is considered. However all noted that a precedent for approval has already been made in this location.

All agreed that there was a need for this application go through a process for proper consideration to ensure that that which came forward was with a clearer idea as to how any impacts will be mitigated, aif.

- DC/20/01617 – Application for Outline Planning Permission with some matters reserved. Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (some matters reserved, access to be considered) – erection of 1 No. dwelling (following demolition of barn) –

Comments received are summarized below:

- barn located on southern side of Barrells Road – adjacent to existing areas for development.
- Extension to the area. Incidious and creeping nature of development.
- No consideration for the open countryside.
- Close to railway line – any impact?
- Lack of landscaping details - reference was made to the paper submitted by Cllr. Morris along with the photos showing the development at this point in the village. Use of appropriate photos agreed.
- Noted that the land allocated to the 9 plots appears to exceed the land that has planning permission.
- There needs to be a cumulative approach to this area but issue is that MSDC have set a precedent in allowing further development.

Council was in agreement that it would recommend refusal for the same reasons as previous application at this point in the village including the narrowness of lane, inability for lack of passing places; impact of safety of cyclists and pedestrians, aif.

- DC/20/01716 – Hybrid Application – erection of 171 No dwellings (inc. 60 affordable) together with associated access, infrastructure, landscaping and amenity space (applied for in full) and 9 no self-build plots (applied for in outline with all matters reserved, access to be considered) @ land on the North Side of Norton Road – comments were received and summarised as follows:

- if approved this will take the site to 263 dwellings in total – contrary to the adopted NDP = 200
- issue that the increase will have on safety aspects for emergency evacuation
- impact on the school given the increase of vehicles accessing the main highway – highway safety issues;
- loss of allotments;
- MSDC appear to be supporting this application – see Design and Access Statement; urban landscape
- need more wildlife friendly trees and planting;
- plans for Lady Green Woods;
- need to learn lessons from promises given by developer;
- need to ensure that the interest for green awareness and alternative transport to encourage all out of the cars;
- clean environment should come to the fore.

All agreed that the Council should recommend refusal as per the application for reserved matters with the additional impact and strengthening of the green agenda and impact on the infrastructure.

- DC/20/01803 – 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 9 Plot 8 @ land to south of Barrell's Road – not self-build.

- The Clerk was asked to challenge whether these were self-builds and whether these plots actually follow the definition as per NPPF "Self-build and custom-build housing: Housing built by an individual, a group of individuals, or persons working with or for them, to be occupied by that individual. Such housing can be either market or affordable housing. A legal definition, for the

So approved by the Council at the meeting of: 03.06.2020

purpose of applying the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended), is contained in section 1(A1) and (A2) of that Act.”

- Noted that they are large individual properties onto large plots.
- It was considered that they were possibly out of character – Popples is a pre 1840C farmhouse, thatched and much extended – not a chalet bungalow.
- Noted that there is a comment within the Officers Report for outline approval that design matters should be against the Thurston NDP
- Character and scale – materials are out of character and keeping with the area – flint cottages – houses being proposed are redbrick and black cladding.
- No landscaping details – notice that significant hedges have / are being removed.
- Garages are back to back and one has dormers and velux in the roof – require a condition that it remains ancilliary to the property – noted it is described as a studio/home office.
- Reference was made to the paper submitted by Cllr. Morris along with the photos showing the development at this point in the village.

It was agreed that the application should be refused for further consideration, aif.

- DC/20/01802 - 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 10 Plot 9 @ land to south of Barrell’s Road.

It was agreed that comments made under application DC/20/01803 stood for this application and that Council was in agreement that it also should be refused for further consideration, aif.

b) To consider the following planning applications: full details of the applications listed below are available to view online by visiting:

- SCC/0011/20MS - Proposal: Phased development for Thurston Community College. Phase 1: Construction of a 60-space car park, 10-place drop-off area, cycle parking and footpath link to community college. Phase 2: Construction of a floodlit Multi-Use Games Pitch (to include out-of-hours community use of pitch and car park) @ Land To The West Of Thurston Community College Ixworth Road, Thurston, IP31 3QE.

The following comments were made:

- space allocated to the College – conscious how close it is to the approved development and the parcels of land that might be forthcoming given that the primary school is to be located elsewhere
- consultees comments online should be reviewed and considered
- Have the issues relating to the Oak Trees been sorted? Is there capacity within the development for the path - surely it does not need to cut across the entrances. Needs further design in the planning stage to counter for this.
- Community use – is it not an All Weather Artificial Pitch – does this change the use? Confirmed that this is another name for an all weather MUGA.
- Artificial Pitch will need to be managed but other areas need to be accessible to ensure that they are for community use.
- Lighting and noise – evening use may well impact on residential amenities
- Ecological impact?
- Road width/traffic – issues as to how traffic will be widened to accommodate increase of traffic on the road for the Persimmon development and the proposed 60-space car park plus drop-offs for this proposal.
- Volume and nature of traffic are overall concerns - has SCC undertaken any traffic modelling?
- Community use will be controlled by either the school or a community group – will it be truly community accessible? What are the hours for college and what for the community
- access is an issue – two entrances in for safety grounds – need a redesign on the footpath
- Need to ensure that the PC is able to access this site for community use and that it unlocks the piece of land adjoining.
- Project beneficial to village and school – but design issue and safety issues need to be addressed.
- Need to have clarification that the area that the PC is interested in needs to be available 24 hours

So approved by the Council at the meeting of: 03.06.2020

All agreed that this would be a benefit to the Community College and the community and that it was minded to support for committee consideration as the following issues needed further detail:

- technical issues over route of footpath from College Park Development to the centre of the village (as per the S106 agreement)
- safety of access in terms of location and flow of vehicles
- ecological mitigation measures in terms of light pollution and noise
- wishes of the community are taken into account in the use of the space not required for education
- restrictive clauses can be amended to allow the area in the proposal to come forward.

c) To note planning applications determined by the local planning authority:

- DC/20/00639 – Planning permission to remove or vary conditions relating to approved DC/19/05126 dated 16.01.20 (erection of 1 no detached self-dwelling, garage-studio with attic accomodation and new vehicular access) – condition 2 approved plans and documents – to i) reduce the extent of timber cladding ii) change roofing material to slate iii) omit ground floor windows to west elevation of drawing room iv) omit high level glazing over glazed screen to master south elevation @ land west of Elgin Lodge, Barrells Road
- DC/20/00633 – planning permisison for erection of part two storey and part first floor extension over existng single storey side extension; erection of single storey rear extension; erection of single storey side extension including garage (following demolition of existing garage and store). Creation of parking and turning area @ Fairways, 60 Barton Road
- DC/20/00814 – Discharge of Conditons for DC/19/01602 – Condition 10 (elevational details to plots 63 and 76 @ land on the North Side of Norton Road
- DC/20/00637 – Discharge of Condtions for DC/19/05126 – Condition 5 (Refuse and Bin Collection), Condition 6 (Contamination) and Condition 10 (Materails) @ land West of Elgin Lodge, Barrells Road.
- DC/20/01183 – Listed Building Consent given – conversion of barns to residential use to form 2 No dwellings and ancillary storage @ Grove Farm, Barrells Road

d) To note responses to previous planning comments submitted as statutory consultees: *the Clerk provided an update on the following:*

- DC/20/01249 – the Clerk advised that the Area Planning Manager had responded to the Council’s submisison on this matter by stating that they would look at this in detail and consider possible solutions for the issues raised. At this time it is intended that this application will be a committee matter. It was noted that the Planning Officer seemed to be ignoring the Council’s requests to discuss this application further.

e) To note matters arising from approved planning applications: *Clerk to update where necessary*

- DC/19/05114 - Barrells Road – the meeting was advised that the Area Planning Manager had stated that as the previously approved application had been given permission to go ahead where the highways authority had no objection at all in respect of the development of this site there was little ground for the LPA to consider refusal. When challenged as to why they had not considered passing spaces as had been mentioned by SCC Highways, it was stated that in an appeal situation the LPA appear to be unreasonable to ask for passing places now when for only a slightly reduced development they had not requested such a condition. It was also stated that the need for passing places was not supported by evidence and all existing dwellings along that road are in the same position which would make this very hard to defend. It was also stated that the LPA had managed to partly deal with this issue by securing an internal footpath to the junction to serve the development. This was not secured for the previous application and so in their opinion represents a planning gain and would be safer than the previous scheme (despite the slightly smaller size) for the residents of the proposal and development of this site. In conclusion the Highways comment was given due weight, but the LPA states that they also gave due weight to the previous decision that was also a significant material consideration in this case.
- DC/20/00585 - Harveys – the meeting was advised that the LPA had given the applicant the opportunity to look at Policies 4, 6, 9, 11 and 12 of the NP and thus avoid costs of being unreasonable should it come to appeal.

So approved by the Council at the meeting of: 03.06.2020

- Meeting with LPA re discussion over the NDP – the Council were advised that Counsel had stated that whilst discussions could be had with the LPA over the interpretation of the wording in the Thurston NDP on a “without prejudice basis”, he had agreed with the Clerk’s assessment that as this was part of the grounds for the JR it was best to await that outcome prior to detailed discussions on how to interpret the Thurston NDP are had. Council agreed to accept this advice and the Clerk was asked to respond accordingly, aif.
- Footway/Cycleway and tree issues – land to the West of Ixworth Road – Council noted that this was an ongoing issue and that District Cllr. Turner had been discussing the matter with the Chief Planning Officer about the potential redesign of the footway cycleway in the area [a] outside the caretakers bungalow which you had thought about and [b]of the trees further north along Ixworth Road which front onto the land formerly to be reserved for primary school use.
- DC/17/02782 – The Firs – the Area Planning Manager’s comments on the delay of achieving a signed S106 agreement in accordance with the conditions imposed were noted by the Council. It was further noted that the condition imposed “That in the event of the Planning obligations referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured within 6 months of the committee resolution that the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse the application on appropriate grounds” was merely a standard resolution for committee for many application and helps prevent a need to return to committee should no progress / no agreement be achieved. In this case the LPA were not seeking to activate this option as there was positive agreement work between parties that had taken place to date which was nearing completion.

7. YOUTH MATTERS -

a) To receive an update on the establishment of a Youth Council – it was confirmed that seven young people were prepared to be on a youth council and that discussions pre Covid-19 had resulted in the following being agreed:

- Once set-up, the Council would meet regularly and discuss issues with a link Cllr.
- The Youth Shelter would be self-policing by the Youth Council
- Issues could be raised via the Cllr. for discussion at a PC meeting
- Attendance at PC meetings might be beneficial

Since Covid 19 lockdown, the above had been discussed remotely with contact being made via an adult but essence those that had come forward were keen to move forward with this project.

b) To discuss the provisioning of a youth shelter within the grounds of New Green - pre-Covid-19 it had been discussed that once the shelter was installed could there be an official opening? All who had been approached to assist wanted this it be viewed as a shared community asset. Preferred designs were the “Caloo” – The King or The Meetup. It was agreed that Cllr. Turner should report back that the PC was looking to get some sort of provision available for the Autumn term, aif. Noted that discussion over the shelter; funding and location would need to be had at a later meeting.

c) To discuss the adoption of a Safeguarding and Vulnerable Person Policy - it was agreed that given Council’s anticipated future engagement with young people it should seek to adopt such a policy. Cllr. Turner agreed to review the draft policy as drawn up by the Clerk and to be the designated lead person for safeguarding in the Parish Council. Once reviewed, it was agreed that this would be brought back to the Council for formal adoption at the June meeting.

8. CLERK’S REPORT - to receive the Clerks report and in particular:

a) to receive the reports of items actioned under delegated powers – Council advised the meeting that the day to day running of the council was continuing and that various issues relating to signage, potholes and possible planning infringements had been flagged up to relevant authorities.

9. TO CONFIRM THE DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

- 3rd June 2020 – full Council Meeting – via the Zoom platform – commencing at 7.00pm
- 17th June – Committee Meeting – 6.30pm

So approved by the Council at the meeting of: 03.06.2020

10. **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** – there was none to be transacted at the meeting.

11. **CLOSURE OF THE MEETING** – there being no other business the meeting was closed at 20.05pm.

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 by the Council at the meeting of: 03.06.2020