

## CHATTISHAM & HINTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Additional Parish Council Meeting held in the Meeting Room of the Community Hall  
On Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> August 2021 at 7.30pm

### PRESENT:

Ian Bryce (Vice Chair)	Debbie Archer
Peter Eaton	Diane Chase
Stephanie Coupland	Chris Leney
Ben Cox	Jim Hammond
John Whyman	Jamie Bostock

### APOLOGIES:

Les Cole - Chairman & Tamsin Pearce (Parish Clerk)

### IN ATTENDANCE:

3 members of the public were present

**The Chairman announced that the meeting was being recorded and welcomed everyone. He reminded the members of the public they may only speak in the Public Section of the meeting.**

### CHPC240/20 – DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The Declarations of Interest register was signed by Chris Leney & Jamie Bostock reflecting their respective interests in planning application items DC/21/04267 & DC/21/04360. Both Councillors abstained from voting and taking any direct discussion on these matters and only spoke when questioned by the Vice Chair or members.

### CHPC241/20 – PLANNING

DC/21/04267 | Full Planning Application – Construction of new field access (existing field access to be stopped up by new residential development to the south-west) | Land To The East Of Duke Street, Hintlesham, Suffolk.

The Vice Chair read from a briefing document prepared by Les Cole - Chairman setting out the recent history of the site, the original planning application and permission granted (DC/17/03892) & subsequent applications (DC/18/05613 & DC/21/0371). Members were reminded of the original application from documents contained within the briefing note. The Vice Chair asked for comments and observations.

After a short discussion, members unanimously agreed they had no objection to the application.

DC/21/04326 | Full Planning Application (Amended Scheme) – Erection of agricultural building (retention of) (amended scheme to that approved under this planning reference) – Charity Farm, The Street, Chattisham, Suffolk IP8 3QG

The Vice Chair referred members to the briefing document received from Les Cole - Chairman and went on to remind members of the more recent planning history of the site and the complaints raised by property owners that are in close proximity of the site. The Vice Chair then closed the meeting and asked members of the public present to speak.

Members of the public, who live in close proximity to the site restated previous objections relating to the overall non-compliance with planning/site to give context to their extreme concern that the current amended scheme was simply to hide yet another 'commercial use' behind the thin veil of 'agricultural occupancy'. It was stated that the building is already in use at weekends and evenings with heavy levels of motor vehicle fumes and wholly intolerable noise nuisance. The Vice Chair then closed the Public Session of the meeting.

Peter Eaton opened the discussion referring to the council's position on the original planning application and the correspondence issued by C&HPC to Babergh District Council planning department along with the strong concerns raised with District Councillor Busby. The subsequent permission granted was considered by C&HPC, to have been based upon an ill-informed decision precipitated by a complete lack of professional diligence undertaken by BDC planning department. The 'agricultural credentials' substantiating the application were as incredulous then as they are now.

Peter Eaton was wholly supported by members present who reiterated strong concerns over the continued use, within the Planning, Design & Access Statement, to misleading terms such as 'site is a mixture of industrial and agricultural, with several business's operating on site alongside sheep being farmed'. There is no evidence, whatsoever, that 'sheep are being farmed' on this site. A further factual inaccuracy is the statement 'The building is located on the North-West of the site, adjacent to the west boundary, however there are no houses within 350m'. Fact - there are 6 individually and fully occupied residential units within 350 metres and one residential unit within 50 metres of the site. Councillors are, and remain, entirely dissatisfied with the overall growth of development at this site and confirmed this current 'retention of' application to be completely unacceptable. After considering the documents available and discussing the potential impact this will continue to have upon the nearby Chattisham residents and the clearly misleading information given in the application, members were asked to make a proposition. Diane Chase proposed the following which was seconded by Stephanie Coupland & received unanimous support from councillors present:

The Chattisham & Hintlesham Parish Council object to the planning application DC/21/04326 for the following reasons:

1. In consideration of the factual inaccuracies both at the time of the original application (referred to BDC Planning Department, Councillor David Busby and, latterly, BDC Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Clive Arthey) and currently which was and remains a 'material fact' in the current application. Moreover, there is no evidence, whatsoever, that this site has or has had, in the past 10 years, any form of agricultural business activity and suggestions and, or statements made by the applicants agents, Planning Direct, are wholly false and misleading.
2. The application site and this building (retention of) is currently in breach of environmental noise and pollution emission standards as set out under the UK Air Quality Strategy and, inter alia, the Environment Act 1995 which binds BDC to consideration and enforcement of their duty under the act to protect residents.
3. In consideration of the current use of the application site and ongoing breaches in previously granted permissions being the subject of investigation by BDC Enforcement team, C&HPC object to this building and its retention on site on the basis of the negative cumulative environmental impact on the reasonable enjoyment of the lives of nearby residents.

In conclusion of this application consideration by members. The Council requested that their objections and ongoing disquiet be conveyed directly to both Councillor David Busby and Cabinet Member for Planning, Councillor Clive Arthey with our strongest possible request for direct intervention from both Councillors. The acting clerk/note-taker agreed to make this request to both Les Cole – Chairman and the parish Clerk.

DC/21/04360 | HYBRID APPLICATION - Full Application for Greenkeepers building (following demolition of existing) and Outline application for Residential Development of 5No dwellings. | Hintlesham Golf Club George Street Hintlesham Suffolk IP8 3JG

The Vice Chair again referred members to the briefing document received from Les Cole - Chairman and the document file to hand on both the full application for the Greenkeepers building and the outline application for 5 dwellings. The Vice Chairman had previously, welcomed the owner of Hintlesham Hall Golf club to the Public Session and went on to remind members, with an interest in this application, to speak only if requested by himself or members present. At that point the Vice Chairman opened the meeting to a further Public Session to allow the HHGC owner to speak to his application proposal.

The Vice Chairman asked members to consider the Greenkeepers part (Full Application) first. After a discussion which centred upon the effective replacement of an existing and, now, outdated structure and after requesting additional information from both Jamie Bostock and the HHGC owner concerning 'land ownership', members unanimously agreed they had no objection to the application.

The Vice Chairman then asked members to consider the 5 New Dwellings part (Outline Application) Stephanie Coupland opened the discussion and spoke favourably of the proposed application referring to the 'hidden nature' of the site and the modesty of the proposed dwellings. Debbie Archer confirmed her favourable outlook on similar grounds of positioning and modesty of dwellings.

Peter Eaton set out the technical basis of application consideration with regard to the NPPF and BDC Local Plan inter alia residential development outside the built up area, impact upon a Grade 1 listed building and the implications for setting further residential growth beyond the accepted village boundaries. This view was endorsed by Diane Chase. Ian Bryce spoke in favour of the development siting similar views to those expressed by Stephanie Coupland & Debbie Archer.

John Whyman expressed, in his opinion, that the nature of the development whilst being supportive of the business motives set out by the club owner would likely be contrary to current NPPF & BDC Local Plans as being development outside the built up area and along the lines of those views expressed by Peter Eaton.

Jim Hammond indicated he considered that the application site is unlikely to qualify as a 'brown field' location and must therefore be viewed as 'open countryside'.

After an extensive discussion amongst members, the Vice Chairman asked for a proposal. Peter Eaton proposed that for the Parish Council to be consistent in its considerations of planning applications and in view of the application site being in outside the acceptance parameters for NPPF & BDC Local Plan, Councillors must object to the proposed application regrettably.

The Vice Chair asked for a show of hands with 4 members in favour of rejection, 2 members in against rejection with a further 4 abstentions. The Council was, therefore, objecting to the proposed application by a majority vote.

**CHPC242/20 – ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA**

Jim Hammond requested the Council urgently consider the ongoing planning permission breaches relating to the use and occupation of land off Duke Street & occupied by the horse livery business.

**CHPC243/20 – DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm

Meeting closed at 9.20pm