

BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

The Minute of a Council meeting held on Tuesday 19th November 2019 at 7.30pm in the Committee Room of the Village Hall.

Present: Councillors Baker, Fletcher, M Mitson-Woods (in the Chair), R Mitson-Woods and Williams. Additionally, Catherine Bacon, Clerk and fifteen members of the public.

9/1920/1 Welcome from the Chairman

The chairman welcomed Councillors and members of the public to the meeting.

9/1920/2 It was resolved that Apologies for absence received from Councillors Buckingham (work), Summers (personal) were approved and accepted.

9/1920/3 It was resolved that the Chairman should sign the Minute of the Meeting held on 12th November 2019 as a true and accurate record and.

9/1920/4 A Declaration of non-pecuniary Interest was made in Planning Application DC/19/4401/FUL by Councillor R Mitson-Woods due to the applicant being a friend.

9/1920/5 Public Forum

Prior to opening the meeting to the floor, the Chair thanked those present for attending and reminded them that the Council has to make planning recommendations based on material matters and Councillors may only comment on what is in the actual Application not what may happen in the future.

Comments received: -

- There was no full copy of the Minute of the meeting held on 9th July 2019 on the Brandeston website – it was at this meeting that the previous Planning Application (DC/19/2465/FUL) for this site was discussed. The Chair and the Clerk apologised and stated that the full Minute had been submitted to the website but an error had occurred. Additionally the Application to be discussed at this meeting was not circulated via the village email. The Clerk apologised for this oversight.
- Mark Hounsell wished to be named for his comments but the Chairman said it was not Council policy to record names.

Comments from the floor on Planning Application DC/19/4401/FUL

- The Chairman was asked why she had not declared an interest. She responded that she did not feel it was necessary and certainly was not pecuniary. She was happy to declare if people were more content that she did.
- A traffic census had been undertaken in Mill Lane and the results submitted as part of the application. Cllr Fletcher explained that a record of reduced traffic meant a reduction in amount of hedge requiring to be removed. The hedge width is the same but the visibility splays are different. The Highways Agency had been contacted for an explanation. The response was that occasionally speed is monitored.
- The census was undertaken by a private company employed by the agent acting for the Applicant. The traffic results were thought to be irrelevant and considered to be invalid due to the fact that the sensors were laid in a location where minimal traffic passed in comparison to the section of Mill Lane much closer to The Street.

Mitson-Woods

07:01:20

- Large agricultural vehicles using Mill Lane to gain access via the proposed gateway would impact on Mill Lane. Further impact will be on the road surface and on verges, trees and hedges. This raised the question as to why access was required via Mill Lane as there was alternative access. The Chair commented that the previous access from the adjacent field is now not available as the two fields are now in different ownership.
- An ulterior motive of a housing development was alleged and it was questioned why an architect would be required for a Planning Application for the creation of a gateway.
- Several houses with poor visibility exit onto Mill Lane, potential increase in traffic could make this worse.
- The location of the Planning Application is outside the Village Boundary.
- The elderly owner of the land may be manipulated and not be aware that her Executor has made the Application. Councillor R Mitson-Woods refuted this.

The Chair thanked all those who had contributed and confirmed that the concerns raised would be in the Minute and would be submitted to East Suffolk Council along with the Council's recommendation. The response to East Suffolk Council would be circulated with the Minute.

9/1920/6 Planning Matter

DC/19/4401/FUL Creation of Field Access, OS 228 Land East of Mill Lane, Brandeston

The Chair asked each councillor for a view on what recommendation should be returned. Cllrs Baker and Williams recommended that consent be refused following the concerns raised in the Public Forum. Additionally Cllr Williams noted that the only changes in this application from the original (DC/19/2465/FUL) is the result of the traffic census, which does not add sufficient extra weight to the application. Cllr Fletcher recommended refusal on the same basis as last time in that the access is inappropriate due to; loss of hedging which is contrary to planning policy, bound surface, loss of biodiversity and visual impact on the conservation area. With a majority in agreement to recommend refusal of consent for the application there was no further discussion. **It was resolved that the Council recommended that DC/19/4401/FUL Creation of Field Access, OS 228 Land East of Mill Lane, Brandeston be refused.**

9/1920/7 Date of Next Meeting 14th January 2020, 7.30pm, Brandeston Village Hall

Councillors to submit items to the Clerk by Thursday 2nd January 2019

Mr

07:01:2