

THURSTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Thurston Planning Committee MEETING held on Wednesday 16 September 2020 at 7.45pm by VIDEOCONFERENCE of Thurston Parish Council.

Present (by video): Cllrs. Dashper (Chair), Cllrs. Haley, Morris, Rainbow and West. Also in attendance (by video): Mrs V Waples, Parish Clerk and one member of the public.

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) There were no applicable apologies for absence. It is noted after the meeting that Cllr. Thurlbourn has submitted his apologies for non-attendance due to work commitments.
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 for the agenda under discussion.
 - b) To receive declarations of lobbying for planning matters on the agenda – Cllr Dashper noted that the member of the public present had written to him in relation to Agenda Item 5a.
 - c) To receive requests for dispensations – none had been received prior to the meeting.
4. **PUBLIC FORUM:**
 - The member of the public drew the meeting’s attention to its own minutes of 22nd July 2020 and 19th August 2020 in which it was stated that the College appeared to be content to release land for community use and that the Parish Council agreed to support the application on the grounds that it supported the community aspiration for an area for community use coming forward within the area not required by SCC / College. The meeting’s attention was drawn to points as raised in the submitted written representation:
 - As proposed the plans cut off access to the remaining land to the West of the proposed pitch leaving only a footpath and cycle track access. This will severely limit how the land to the West could be used and precludes any parking and access for cars.
 - If the Council is considering the remaining land to the North of the proposed football pitch for wheeled sports the area is limited. It would also mean that any wheeled facility would be nearer to the housing. All objections to previous locations have been based on location being too near to houses.
 - Does the Council consider that it would be more appropriate if the pitch were located to the North of the available site avoiding the problem of a landlocked area that cannot be accessed and keeping the wheeled facility away from housing. It would also make more sense if access from Ixworth road and parking were shared.

The committee were urged to only support the application as long as the Parish Council’s requirements for access to other parcels of land in particular were met.
 - In recognition of the CIL funded community pot could SCC be requested to exercise its option in purchasing the whole of the land and consider gifting some of it to the PC?
5. **Planning Applications to be considered:**
 - a) SCC/0011/20MS, Land to the North of Thurston Community College, Ixworth Road -- 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 west of Ixworth Road (immediately north of Community College site) - Council to consider

So approved at the meeting of 30th September 2020

further this application based on responses to questions submitted and the site plan as submitted (T10) and to agree whether to submit a further response – it was noted that the site access and access to the potential community area differed from those that had been discussed in meetings with SCC and MSDC. The indicative route for a path to the north of the application site to gain access to the community site to the west is not part of the application submitted and was shown for indicative purposes only. All agreed that the PC should be hesitant in supporting this as there was a concern that it could end up with no access to the land to the west of the application site. It was confirmed that the PC had raised concerns and made comments in the Spring on this application and that having asked additional questions, which had now been answered via the Planning Officer, the application was being brought back to the Council as the responses given to questions raised over community access to land to the west; use/control of that land by the PC in terms of maintenance and installation had not been clarified and had raised further issues.

It was agreed that up until now, the PC had been supportive of concept of the application as a community facility despite several iterations of the concept in terms of plans and layout. With the details submitted there were still a number of points that were not acceptable in terms of the impact on the community. The PC challenges the facts raised in terms of access and the timing as to when SCC will discharge the option for the remaining pieces of land. The response from SCC on the discharge of land, leaves both of the plots of land in the gift of someone else. Access to the shaping of the car park has changed over time but previously there had always been a public access and a commuted access to the “community” land adjacent. Changes in this access arrangement would have an impact on the community aspect of the land being offered to the parish council. It was agreed by all that the Committee was minded to object until certain issues are resolved and accommodated – public footpath and a clearer definition as to how this is a community benefit especially as there is no vehicle access through to the land to the west as such the design is of no benefit to the PC . Furthermore the objection is based on the removal of the access to both of the remaining parcels of land and the fact that SCC has shown a lack of willingness to negotiate the community use of other parcels of land. The PC was also mindful of the objections that have come from local residents.

The member of the public further questioned why there was no consideration for cumulative open space given the size of development in the village and why such a lack of support from SCC? The Chair made all aware that SCC were initially supportive of the community need for open space but as the discussions have followed, that support seems to have changed and the application was submitted with little further consultation with the Parish Council.

6. Planning Applications to be considered:

- a) DC/20/03733 – householder application – erection of first floor extension over existing garage @ 23 Robin Close – the committee agreed that it had no objections to this application and agreed to support, aif.
- b) DC/20/03563 – householder application – erection of single storey side extension to form cartlodge/workshop @ Maple House, Church Road - the committee agreed that it had no objections to this application and agreed to support but there were concerns that this might become a separate dwelling. Support was to be conditional on this remaining ancillary to the host dwelling, aif.
- c) DC/20/02953 – householder application – erection of a first-floor extension over garage, single storey front extension and two storey side extension @ The Firs, Church Road – the committee noted that this was a large extension and that there was an issue with the non-retention of part of the flint wall. Overall given the size of the proposal there will be an imposing impact which will have a detrimental impact on the appearance and character of the area in which it is located and agreed to recommend the proposal for refusal, aif.

Signed Chairman

Date: 30.09.2020

d) DC/19/05531 - Appeal APP/W3520/W/18/3254850 – appeal for outline planning application (all matters reserved) – erection of 1 no detached dwelling (self-build) @ land north of Poplar Farm Lane - Council to consider if it wishes to make comments or modify/withdraw previous representation – a letter from the applicants was read out to the requesting support for the proposal. Following consideration, the committee agreed that its original comments stood and that it had no further representations to make, aif.

7. Planning Applications determined: to receive details of the planning application considered by the Local Planning Authority (Mid Suffolk District Council):

a) DC/20/03129 – consent to carry out works to trees protected by a tree preservation order (MS65/G1) @ 5 Oakwood Drive.

8. Planning Appeals determined: to receive details of the planning appeals considered by the Planning Inspectorate:

a) APP/W3520/w/20/3249891 – land east of Woodlands, Barrells Road – to note the appeal is dismissed – Council noted the reasons including the conflict with the Thurston NDP.

9. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has issued three consultations on reform of the planning system – NALC has provided briefings as outlined below for Council to consider in its response to the consultations. Documents are available to view online under planning agendas and associated papers at: Council to consider formulating a response to:

a) Changes to the current planning system (NALC deadline for responses 17 September) – it was noted that the current planning changes would have an impact on the deliverability of affordable housing as it appeared to be designed to make it easier for smaller developers which will impact on the numbers of affordable homes coming forward. It was also agreed that low cost housing over affordable housing was not a positive moving forward. The concern was that this could become a Developers Charter. In particular response to the questions posed by NALC No. 23 – answer was no as the Committee did not wish to see the removal of restrictions on permitted development. The Committee agreed to support the stance being taken by NALC and Acre

b) Planning for the future - the planning white paper (NALC deadline for responses 15 October) – it was agreed that this would be placed on the Agenda for 7th October 2020 and the following would be circulated to all for perusal prior to the meeting: Birketts webinar on the White Paper “Planning for the Future”; Locality – Summary of potential implications from the planning reforms; Paper from the Co-Chairs of the Thurston NDP on impact for made NDP.

c) Transparency and competition: a call for evidence on data on land control (NALC deadline for responses 16 October) – Council was in agreement that it had no evidence to submit, aif.

10. Other Planning Matters coming forth:

a) Email from Stradbroke Parish Council on briefing note being written for the Community Land Trust in Stradbroke by Bailey Venning Associates who were proposing to write a paper opposing the proposals to changes in the planning guidelines and in particular the part that will affect Affordable Housing.

The Committee agreed that it would support the paper acknowledging that this would have more impact and that the parish council should pursue the opportunity to be a joint signatory to the letter. It was also agreed that if the Parish Council could be one of the signatories allowed to make representations by adding further accounts of their own circumstances and the harm arising from the change in policy, the cost of £375 + VAT (maximum) was deemed to be acceptable. The committee agreed that it would recommend approval of this financial response to the Parish Council for formal approval. It was agreed that the Clerk would respond indicating that the Parish Council were supportive of being a representative and that she would meet with the Co-Chairs of the Thurston NDP to discuss Thurston’s own circumstances, aif.

Signed Chairman

Date: 30.09.2020

11. TO CONFIRM THE DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

- a) 23rd September 2020 – Committees meeting – via Zoom – commencing at 7.00pm
- b) 7th October 2020 – full Council Meeting – via Zoom - commencing at 7.00pm

12. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING – there being no other business the meeting was closed at 21.07.

Signed Chairman

Date: 30.09.2020

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

Signed

Chairman

Date: 30.09.2020