

EASTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held at Easton and Letheringham Village Hall at 7:30pm
on Monday 24th February 2014.

<p>Present: Cllr Owen (Chair) Cllr Boon Cllr Coney Cllr Gibbon Cllr Hollins Cllr Kerr Cllr Smith</p>	<p>In Attendance: Mrs. E Brown (Clerk) 25 members of the public on the Register of Electors for the Parish of Easton 5 further members of the public 3 representatives from Hopkins Homes/ Hopkins & Moore 1 member of the press</p>	<p>Apologies SCDC Cllr Snell Easton Community Primary School Headteacher Mrs Cheryl Singleton 3 members of the public on the Register of Electors for the Parish of Easton</p>
---	---	---

<p>EPC023/14 Chairman's Welcome Cllr Owen welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p>	
<p>EPC024/14 To Receive Apologies Apologies were received from SCDC Cllr Snell, Easton Community Primary School Head Teacher Mrs Cheryl Singleton and 3 members of the public on the Register of Electors for the Parish of Easton, (2 of those members of the public would like their "total opposition to Hopkins Plans" noted.)</p>	
<p>EPC025/14 Declarations of Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Kerr declared a pecuniary interest in Agenda item 5.1 planning application DC/14/0137/VOC – Easton Grange. 	
<p>EPC026/14 Consideration of Dispensations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the meeting Cllr Hollins had applied for a dispensation regarding agenda item 7.1 planning application DC/13/3766/FUL 17 dwellings on land adjacent to Eaton Primary School. A partial dispensation was granted by the clerk after receiving advice from SALC and discussion with Cllr Owen. • Cllrs Boon, Gibbon and Smith already hold full dispensations regarding the development plans of Hopkins and Moore on land adjacent to the school. 	
<p><i>Meeting adjourned for the Public Forum.</i></p>	
<p>EPC027/14 Public Forum for comments on Easton Grange and Agents House <u>Easton Grange:</u> The applicant spoke regarding varying condition 9 of planning permission C/10/3150 at Easton Grange to allow it to be open until 2am on 30 days per annum. There is no change to the license being requested and alcohol will continue to stop being served at midnight. This variation is to make the venue more attractive to non wedding bookings. 3 members of the electorate objected to the proposed variation (1 at the meeting, 2 by letter read to Council) reasons given were the lateness of the closing time, high number of days per annum, noise disturbance to neighbouring villages and risk of road accidents within the village. <u>Agent's House:</u> No comments made.</p>	
<p><i>Meeting opened. Cllr Kerr left the meeting.</i></p>	
<p>EPC028/14 Planning Application DC/14/0137/VOC – Easton Grange. Council were read the body of Kettleburgh Parish Council's letter to SCDC which objects to any alteration to condition 9 of planning permission C/10/3150. They were further informed that Kettleburgh Parish Council supported the application as a wedding venue, that the requested alteration would cause a variation to the venue's clientèle (as a 2am ending time would be for non-wedding events) and that they would not support such an application. Discussion followed and it was noted that currently there have been no complaints received by SCDC Environmental Protection Department regarding this venue. Decision – Council to request a 1 year trial of 15 days per year with a 1 am vacation of premises time, on Friday or Saturday evenings only and</p>	

alcohol to continue to stop being served from midnight. Proposer Cllr Owen, Seconder Cllr Smith. Clerk to inform SCDC.	Clerk
<i>Cllr Kerr returned to the meeting.</i>	
EPC029/14 Planning Application DC/14/0142/LBC – Agent's House Council have received no representations regarding this application. Decision – Council unanimously decided to support this application. Proposed Cllr Smith, Seconder Cllr Coney. Clerk to inform SCDC.	Clerk
EPC030/14 Plan App DC/13/3766/FUL – Land Adjacent to the School (Part 1) The Clerk summarised correspondence received by the Council with respect to this planning application and earlier plans for the site by Hopkins and Moore. (<i>Summary attached</i>).	
<i>Meeting adjourned for the Public Forum.</i>	
EPC031/14 Public Forum for comments on Land Adjacent to the Primary School Summary of comments by 4 members of the public on the register of Electors for the Parish of Easton. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCDC have received 28 letters of objection and 3 in support of the application. • SCDC Policies listed as opposing the development include: DM1, DM4, DM21, SP27, AP4, AP13, and NPPF Section 11. • The proposed site is not all on land identified in the SCDC 2010 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) document. • The site is currently quality agricultural land and the historical nature of the area should be protected. The wildlife survey of the site was felt to be ineffective. • The development was described as inappropriate, unsustainable and isolated as being outside the village boundary, too large (SCDC consider it a major development for a local service centre), prominent within the landscape and its character as out of keeping with the rest of the village (single storey housing would be more appropriate) • The development would increase the flooding risk in the area and the proposed drainage scheme has not been proven with one consultee unhappy with the information provided by Hopkins and Moore. • Light pollution in the area may increase. • The poor quality of consultation with the community providing misleading information about the development and the community's support for it. • The new car park would not remove all parking from The Street as it is too small and the speed of traffic would increase. The school could try to obtain grants to improve the parking situation. • Low level of benefit to the community. The School car park benefit is debatable (no accidents at school time in at least the last 7 years, too small for expected number of parents). All monetary payments by Hopkins and Moore are government stipulated and only play space money is allocated to be spent by the Parish Council to benefit the community. • The new road junction is located in a dangerous place (bend, near a blind hill, speed of traffic) and could see 200+ movements per day (school and resident traffic) as well as act as a bottle neck at busy times. • The development would completely surround the school and prevent expansion of the school land in the future. Summary of comments by Hopkins and Moore representative. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hopkins and Moore would answer questions sent to them by email. • As Easton is a local service centre it will see some (housing) development and the proposed development is appropriate in “size” and “location” (SP27). • Affordable housing in Easton is needed according to the SCDC Housing Officer • The new car park has a demonstrable safety benefit and provides a 'drop off' zone. The current parking arrangements and staff car park exit are not ideal. The current safety measures are only a traffic mirror. • A speed operated sign of the village would be provided. • The wildlife survey showed no 'special' wildlife on the site and was carried out at an 	

appropriate time.

- The maintenance of the anti-flooding measure is in place.
- The siting, height, mass and form (DM21) are appropriate with bungalows at the top of the site and double storey dwellings lower down.
- Drawings of how the development would look into relation with other properties in the area (especially Verandah/Lowbarn Cottages) are available .
- The wider benefits of the scheme for the community were commended.

Meeting opened.

EPC032/14 Plan App DC/13/3766/FUL – Land Adjacent to the School (Part 2)

Cllr Hollins was asked to make his representation to the council. In summary this covered:

- the management, maintenance and ownership of the car park.
- Cars continuing to park on The Street and now also on the side of the new road.

Cllr Hollins left the meeting.

EPC033/14 Plan App DC/13/3766/FUL – Land Adjacent to the School (Part 3)

Clerk commenced reading a letter she had been handed shortly before the meeting by a member of the electorate. The letter was unsigned. Part way through the letter Cllrs discussed whether it was appropriate to continue. After confirmation from the bearer of the letter that it was from a resident the clerk continued. In summary the letter objected to the development.

Cllr Owen provided information regarding some of the acronyms that were likely to be used by Council in their discussion; explained how SCDC view applications on SHLAA land and read Para14 of the NPPF.

Council discussed the application under 6 material consideration headings.

1. Design, Appearance and Layout. In summary council discussed the following:

- The large size of site and house number.
- The acceptable level of housing density.
- The lack of footway to centre of the village
- Houses being unlike existing village housing stock.
- English Heritage and Suffolk Preservation Society letters to SCDC provide design, appearance and layout reasons to recommend refusal of the application.

2. Impact on Visual and Residential Amenity. In summary council discussed the following:

- Alteration of the view of village when entering from Wickham Market direction or Hacheston Lane to the modern houses upon a very open/visible, primary site. That the majority of houses not on SHLAA land will be visible.
- That Easton will no longer slowly emerge into view from the surrounding countryside.
- English Heritage and Suffolk Preservation Society letters to SCDC provide impact on visual and residential amenity reasons to recommend refusal of the application.
- The confusion over the presence or not of street lighting within the development.
- DM4 - Housing clusters in the countryside. The harm that this cluster of dwellings would have on the surrounding landscape.
- AP13 - Special landscape areas. The site being a special landscape area.
- SP29 – The Countryside. Development outside the physical limits of a settlement being limited to what is necessary therefore this development must have additional reasons to be agreed.

3. Impact on Trees, Listed Buildings, Conservation Area In summary council discussed the following:

- The centre of the village being conserved and development occur on the edge, to the benefit of the centre. The isolation of this development from the village with no footway nor scheduled bus service which may increase car movements.
- DM23 – Residential Amenity. The overlooking of Lowbarn Cottages (Grade II listed).
- Light pollution which may be caused by the development.

4. Highways Safety and traffic In summary council discussed the following:

- The dangers of the new junction especially its visibility (near bend, blind hill, fairly narrow, busy road). Significant increase in users of the junction (residential and school related)
- The lack of footway to the village and removal of footway that was on the original proposal

provided by Hopkins and Moore.

- The isolation of the residents from the village in the new development.
 - The small size and unknown layout of the car park compared to known need, it is therefore unlikely to resolve all the parking issues on The Street.
 - The lack of use of existing village car park by parents.
5. Any Other Comments - The new Car Park In summary council discussed the following:
- The possibility that a car park for the school may not occur again.
 - The benefits the new car park would bring (lessening but not removal of parent parking on The Street for residents, a long term issue, improved safety for children, removal of coach parking from School Lane.)
 - Parking on the developments road would lessen parking on The Street.
 - The 'cost' that the parish would pay for the benefit of the car park (number of new houses, use of none SHLAA land, envisaged increased traffic speed on The Street due to reduced hazards, envisaged traffic congestion at the new junction.)
 - Other ways of improving the parking issue outside the school (more use by parents of the village car park, smaller, less visible development on SHLAA land with a school car park)
6. Planning Policies (not already covered). In summary council discussed the following:
- Flood Risk. The East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board (ESIDB) have commented to SCDC regarding the proposed surface water drainage strategy and soakaway locations put forward by Hopkins and Moore. Proper maintenance of any drainage strategy should be a condition of the planning application.

Decision - By a majority of 5-1 Council decided to recommend refusal of the planning application. Clerk to inform SCDC. Reasons given for this included:

- Visual impact of the new housing within the landscape.
- The representations made by members of the electorate.
- The development is not in accord with various planning policies.
- The encapsulation of the school by housing.
- Carbon footprint of the new residents as they would work outside the villages
- Easton should accommodate some new housing
- A car park for the school is required
- Easton has had other developments which in time mellow into the environment
- There is a need for affordable housing in the area.

Council also considered whether a smaller development (on the SHLAA land only) might be acceptable recognising that it may not provide a new school car park but that Easton does need to have some new development which is integrated into the village by footway and does not have too great an impact on the landscape.

Decision - Clerk to inform SCDC that a smaller development on the SHLAA site would be looked at more favourably by Council especially if there was parking provision for the school.

Decision – Clerk to request that conditions be placed on planning application DC/14/3766/FUL if it is granted by SCDC to cover the following areas which are of concern to Council:

- Footway access from the new development to the centre of the village.
- A maintenance agreement for the surface water drainage soakaways.
- Changes to the layout of the site so that the School is not encapsulated by the new development.
- A robust system of management for the car park.
- Assurances that the field would not be further developed in the future.

Clerk

Meeting closed at 9:15pm

Chairman:

Date: