

BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

The Minute of the meeting held on Monday 14th June 2021 at 7.30pm, in Brandeston Village Hall.

Present: Councillors Baker, Fletcher, Locke, Mitson-Woods (in the Chair), Summers and Williams.
Also present Suffolk County Councillor Bryce, East Suffolk Councillor Freeman, Clerk Catherine Bacon and three members of the public.

2/21-22/1 The chairman welcomed Councillors and the members of the public to the meeting. The chair reminded attendees of the covid restrictions in place including using the signed entrance and exit and social distancing. The Chair introduced and welcomed Suffolk County Councillor Elaine Bryce as our new representative.

2/21-22/2 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Aitchinson (work). It was resolved that this was accepted.

2/21-22/3 There were no Declarations of Interest

2/21-22/4 It was resolved that the Chairman should sign the Minute of the Meeting held on 5th May 2021 as a true and accurate record.

2/21-22/5 County Cllr Bryce thanks the Parish Council for their welcome. She continues to work as an assistant to Dr Dan Poulter, MP, though is reducing her hours to focus County Council work. Praising Council leader Mathew Hick's opening up speech, she noted that she was also keen on tackling climate change too. County Cllr Bryce informed the meeting that Paul West, who had previously been standing in as County Cllr for Brandeston, as been appointed Cabinet Member for Ipswich, Operational Highways and Flooding. County Cllr Bryce has received many communications regarding highways in her first month in office and so will be working closely with Paul West on this. The Chair opened the floor for questions to County Cllr Bryce; there were none.

The Clerk apologised having omitted the Public Forum from the agenda. The Chair took the opportunity to open the floor to the public to raise any issues. No matters were raised.

2/21-22/6 The Chair congratulated Lydia Freeman on her appointment as East Suffolk Councillor. District Councillor Freeman has been focusing on the issue of verges since taking office. There has been an incident of a verge being poisoned locally. There has been an incident of a verge being poisoned locally. Verges have been cut at locations when it had previously been agreed to be left. District Cllr Freeman is working with County Cllr Bryce, Cabinet member Paul West and also the ecology department at Suffolk County Council to resolve the issues. Cllr Mitson-Wood stated that the same issue had occurred in Brandeston; verges that had been agreed not to be cut until mid-July were cut at the beginning of June; a meeting with the farm manager is to take place to discuss the matter.

Cllr Summers asked District Councillor Freeman if she would be heading up the Queen's Canopy remit. The DC was not aware of the launch, and it was agreed the information would be recirculated in order for it to be discussed at future parish council meetings.

2/21-22/7 Finance – RFO

The RFO reported that the balance of the PC account is £8383.23 and the 100+ account is £697.31

- a) **It was resolved that transfer of VAT reclaim (£500) from PC account (51541412) to 100+ account (02474506) (Ideal Catering invoice 9128) of was authorised.**
- b) **It was resolved that retrospective payment of the renewal of Microsoft office subscription for PC laptop (£59.99) was authorised.**

- c) **It was resolved that purchase of two FIDO dog bins (approx. £195+ £39VAT each) to be installed by the Chapel footpath and village triangle footpath was authorised.**
- d) The RFO stated that the Internal Audit Report was favourable regarding the financial record keeping of the parish council. Some technical points were highlighted regarding documentation available on the website. The RFO will go through the highlighted areas with Cllr Williams. These can then be signed off at a future meeting as 'actioned'.

2/21-22/8 Planning

- a) **DC/21/2533/LBC Listed Building Consent - New terrace and steps to replace and enlarge existing paved areas, installing guttering and rain chains to Garden Room and associated drainage works. New Oil Tank in garden screened by willow fencing., The Priory Earl Soham Road Brandeston Suffolk IP13 7AU**

Cllr Fletcher noted that he could not see any reference to the fact that the oil tank being located close to a watercourse. He questioned whether the planners would look at this. -He also felt that as a PC we are not qualified to comment on the listed buildings applications as we are not experts in the use of historic materials and their application. We can only comment on any impact we think it may have. As such we can only a response of 'no objections'

It was resolved that the Parish Council raise no objections.

- b) **DC/21/2532/FUL New terrace and steps to replace and enlarge existing paved areas, installing guttering and rain chains to Garden Room and associated drainage works. New Oil Tank in garden screened by willow fencing., The Priory Earl Soham Road Brandeston IP13 7AU**

Cllr Fletcher and Cllr Summers both noted that there was nothing contentious regarding this application. Cllr Summers stated that the old terrace was small for the size of accommodation and so understood the application to update it.

It was resolved that the Parish Council recommend consent it given.

- c) **DC/3535/QTEI3AQX07400 Proposed dwelling, with use of existing vehicular access. Conversion of part retained former agricultural building currently approved to be used ancillary to existing dwelling, Red House Barn The Street Brandeston Woodbridge Suffolk IP13 7AB**

The applicant of the planning application put forward comments regarding the application. He felt that, though stated otherwise at the PC meeting of 5th May, the Parish Council had made his planning applications a personal issue by continuing to raise objections to his applications. Cllr Summers responded that the PC responded to planning applications on material matters and there was nothing personal in refusing his previous planning applications. The Chair stated that the PC look at the applications and not the people submitting them; this was agreed by all councillors.

The applicant stated that the original application (years ago) was for the conversion of the main barn. Prior to its conversion the barn frame/building was destroyed by fire, a subsequent application was submitted for a new oak frame and barn. Since this time, the applicant has gone back and forth to the planners with various applications. He noted that his wife had been a resident of Brandeston for a few years, approximately in 1996 when the new BVH was being constructed. At this time, he noted there were discussions about residents converting their properties to residences of their wishes.

The Chair asked a neighbour of the applicant, in attendance, if she wished to comment. She declined at this time.

A previous Brandeston Parish Cllr and current resident wished to highlight the history of the planning on this site considering it relevant and to set it in context. He stated that after the original oak frame had been destroyed, during PC discussions the parish councillors objected

to the subsequent application for a new oak frame residential barn, the original application having been for the conversion of an oak frame barn (which was no longer there). The previous Brandeston Parish Cllr and current resident stated that he encouraged his fellow parish councillors to support the application and that the points raised/the conditions of the previous applications should be taken into consideration. And that without his support and encouragement the application for a new oak frame and barn would have been refused, most likely resulting in the applicant losing his opportunity for residential development on the site. He continued on to stress that the barn can be seen across the valley from Crettingham and its setting is very important, the Red House Barn and associated ancillary annexe should be retained as a single planning unit in order to protect the setting of the Red House, setting within the landscape and the gateway to the Village and the Conservation Area.

The addition of another dwelling (outside of the village settlement) would detract from the Red House and the setting of the barn, the original application being granted on condition that these additional barns of no historic note/build quality should be demolished prior to the occupancy of the main barn. The applicant responded by saying that he thinks the planners would have supported the demolishing of the barn and an application for two new modern buildings. He stated that he just wanted the opportunity to live there.

A neighbour to the application stated that the original application stated that the site was to be used for horses including a paddock.

(Note for readers; there is a long and detailed history of planning applications on this site, it is complicated and preferable to read all the documents in date order, to put it all in context and to access the correct information.)

Cllr Summers proposed that the PC object to the application and provided a number of material reasons for this proposed objection:

- No Landscape Assessment submitted with application.
- Impacts upon the setting of the Red House and Red House Barn.
- Extension of development outside of the village settlement.
- Not an in-fill plot and no Planning Policy /Guidelines to support the building of a new dwelling in open countryside.
- Design & Access statement does not identify any Planning Policy/Guidelines to support this application.
- The existing structure does not warrant preservation for its own sake.
- Development of the existing structure is 'Not Permitted Development'.
- The Red House Barn and associated ancillary annexe should be retained as a single planning unit in order to protect the setting of the Red House, setting within the landscape and the gateway to the Village and the Conservation Area.
- Reference to the Conservation response 4th December 2020 – Robert Scrimgeour ESC.
(Composed at the time regarding the proposed access road to the same site – subsequently refused.)
'The barn dwelling falls within the Brandeston Conservation Area, although the ancillary site falls outside but is immediately abutting. The site of the proposed access road lies within the immediate setting of this part of the Conservation Area to its west – see extract below from our adopted appraisal (2012) (north upwards):

Please note that the Red House Barn is identified in the appraisal as an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is also noteworthy that the boundary clearly extends to include this site, as it forms part of the historic village. Indeed, the Conservation Area.'



The applicant responded by referencing the contribution of the work done there and noted that the PC stated that the driveway would detract. Cllr Summers responded that they were responding to this application and not the previous one.

A resident asked the applicant what the response to the pre-application was. The applicant's response indicated that there was no pre-application made for this particular application.

Cllr Fletcher noted that the quality of the building work would be good. However, he noted it is a brown not green field site and so subsequently felt torn. The current application relates to an area outside the village envelope and abuts the conservation area. He is concerned that by granting consent it would open up applications from others. Cllr Fletcher said he would object on this basis.

Cllr Summers agreed that the quality of the building work is good.

Cllr Locke felt guided by Cllr Fletcher's response.

Cllrs William and Baker agreed with the comments previously raised, with Cllr Williams adding that preservation was important to the village.

It was resolved that DC/3535/QTEI3AQX07400 Proposed dwelling, with use of existing vehicular access. Conversion of part retained former agricultural building currently approved to be used ancillary to existing dwelling, Red House Barn The Street Brandeston Woodbridge Suffolk IP13 7AB should be refused.

2/21-22/8 Cllr Locke reported that all leaflets had been distributed regarding the Quiet Lanes and is now waiting for the next phase to begin.

Cllr Mitson-Woods reported that the plant sale jointly held by the BVH and PCC committees and PC raised £1400. She also reported that she will continue to discuss the verge cutting with the local farm manager.

Cllr Baker reported there was a Village Fete meeting on the 15th June via zoom. He also reiterated the success of the plant sale.

Cllr Fletcher reported that he had downloaded the data from the SID in preparation for the APM. He has yet to analyse the data but reported that the highest speed recorded was 80mph.

2/21-22/9 The plant sale held jointly by the BVH and PCC committees and PC raised £1400 which was deemed a great success considering it was a cold day.

2/21-22/10 a), b) and d) The Chair proposed that the clerk seek fresh quotes (having received none from those previously approached) for the professional repair of the bus shelter, village pump and village noticeboard. **It was resolved that the Clerk obtain quotes and report back to PC.**

- c) The clerk had enquired at Timpson's about the pricing of plaques for the village sign. Pricing ranged from £20-£56 depending upon the size of the plaque and this included the engraving. **Cllr Mitson-Woods agreed to ask Susannah Roberts for wording for the plaque for the sign.** The Chair stated that the gates to the village hall were created by Hector Moore upon Brandeston winning village of the year in XXXX and proposed a plaque be erected on the gates to record this. She noted there was a space on the gate to put this plaque but one was never implemented. **The PC agreed this was a good idea and the wording would be written to agreed for the plaque.**

2/21-22/11 Date of next PC Meeting, Monday July 12th 2021 at 7,30pm.

The Chair noted that in light of the Prime Minister's announcement at 6pm today, the APM would have to be delayed. With the Covid restrictions in place on 21st June, the risk assessment carried out for the attendance in the village hall would be too restrictive regarding attendance numbers.

Mh Mh Wh

12:57:21