

## CHATTISHAM & HINTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Additional Parish Council Meeting held in the Meeting Room of the Community Hall  
On Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2021 at 7.30pm

### PRESENT:

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

### APOLOGIES:

Les Cole, Chris Leney, Peter Eaton & Tamsin Pearce (Parish Clerk)

### IN ATTENDANCE:

2 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.**

### CHPC256/20– DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no Declarations of Interest added to register.

### CHPC257/20 – COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Vice Chair closed the meeting and invited members of the public to speak to any items on the meeting agenda.

A member of the public read from a prepared statement (Copy available upon request) to members concerning the planning application reference DC/21/04752 in California Lane. The member of the public indicated to Councillors that this statement represented the views of a significant majority of residents living in California Lane. The statement confirmed the outright objection to the to the planning application DC/21/04752 for the following key points:

1. The application site is isolated and in the 'countryside'
2. The development proposal is out of character and incongruous
3. There is only limited and inadequate access and its development will have a damaging impact on the existing highway safety in California Lane
4. The Development contravenes existing national & local planning policies
5. BDC has already passed the Housing Delivery Test for 2020 at 118%
6. The Planning application statement is factually inaccurate in numerous areas & misleading.

The Vice Chair thanked the members of the Public for their contribution to the meeting and closed the public session.

### CHPC258/20 – PLANNING

DC/21/04752 | Planning Application – Conversion of stable to form 1 no. dwelling house | Land on The South West Side Of California Lane, Hintlesham, Suffolk. IP8 3QJ

The Vice Chair summarised the application details and confirmed the locus to members with his knowledge of the application area and historic use of the site. Councillor Stephanie Coupland also added historic context to the site and its past use.

Councillor Jamie Bostock opened the discussion indicating his concern that the proposed development failed to satisfy many of the expected national and local planning policies.

Councillors Diane Chase and Stephanie Coupland added their own concerns that the proposed

development breached the planning guidelines in numerous areas, primarily, that its setting was clearly outside the 'community development envelope' (In open countryside) and added that access to and from California Lane is already difficult – any additional development would only exacerbate this problem. Councillors Debbie Archer, Jim Hammond & Jim Murphy concurred on these points. The Vice Chair asked for a proposal – Councillors Coupland and Hammond proposed & seconded that the Council object to the application. This was unanimously supported by council members.

The Chattisham & Hintlesham Parish Council object to the planning application DC/21/04752 for the following reasons:

1. In consideration of the factual inaccuracies and misleading statements made in the Application proposal prepared by Acorus dated 20<sup>th</sup> August 2021 and submitted to BDC Planning Department.
2. The application does not fulfill existing NPPF and local planning guidelines (in 'Open Countryside', demonstrates no 'sustainability' credential & is 'remote' from the core community of Hintlesham & Chattisham). We feel there are no extenuating circumstances, in terms of 'exceptional design' or other compelling reasons that should allow these guidelines to be set aside nor, indeed, is there a case for 'presumption in favour of Development' principle.
3. Access into and out of the proposed development site would negatively impact on an already less than optimal road infrastructure which will exacerbate existing road safety issues for California Lane residents.

DC/21/04711 | Planning Application – Change of use from agricultural land to solar farm and construction and operation of a solar photovoltaic (PV) development with capacity of up to 49.9MW with associated grid connection cable route, infrastructure and planting (accompanied by an EIA Statement). Land North Of Tye Lane, Bramford, Ipswich, Suffolk.

The Vice Chair referred members to the application details and contextualised this application with the other existing and ongoing applications within the overall areas of Flowton, Burstall and Bramford. He also referenced the ongoing planning update prepared by BDC planning department on the above mentioned PV developments. There were no members of the public present to speak either in favour or against this proposal.

Councillor Debbie Archer opened the discussion referring to nature of the application relating specifically to the clear loss of agricultural land, the impact of the development on local residents, but was broadly concerned that there is an overwhelming requirement for 'no fossil fuel' power generation and there is an inevitability it has to be constructed somewhere. Councillor Jamie Bostock commented that there is a compelling reason, relating to 'connectivity' and why all the applications, including this proposal, are sited in this specific location. Other points relating to 'significant overdevelopment' loss of grade 1 & 2 agricultural land', inadequately contextualised multiple PV developments' and finding alternative 'brown field and ex-industrial sites' were made by other councillors present. The Vice Chair brought the discussion to a conclusion and asked members for a proposal. Members proposed that the application was fundamentally unacceptable and voted to object to the application. All members voted to object with one abstention for the following reasons:

The Chattisham & Hintlesham Parish Council object to the planning application DC/21/04711 for the following reasons:

1. In consideration of the multiple ongoing planning applications, of significance, in this area of our overall communities there is insufficient consideration being afforded by UK Gov to

the adverse impact on local residents, their Environs and cumulative impact on wildlife and bio diversity. There is an overriding and compelling case for the Secretary of State to 'call in' the multiple PV applications and allow for consideration as a 'whole project'

2. The Council object to the loss of grade 1 & 2 productive agricultural land and disagree with the principle of trading 'food for energy'
3. The Council appreciate the compelling need for non-fossil fuel generated energy, but feel there are better and more less impactful locations where such developments and be achieved with significantly less impact on the local communities and are less damaging to land use.

#### **CHPC259/20 – PARISH COUNCIL INSURANCE RENEWAL**

The Parish Council had been advised that their existing insurance providers, Royal & Sun Alliance have exited the market and an alternative provider needed to be sought. The Parish Council Clerk has undertaken an exercise to seek alternative carriers that would be suitable and appropriate for the Parish Council. Working in conjunction with Suffolk Association of Local Councils (SALC) the Parish Clerk has identified 2 potential carriers, Zurich Mutual and Covea via Norris & Fisher Insurance Brokers Ltd. Both providers have dedicated 'Local Council' schemes and are geared and appropriate for Parish Councils. Under normal circumstances there would have been the opportunity to seek additional alternatives unfortunately, due to severe time constraints imposed by the late announcement of RSA's exit from the market, this wasn't possible.

Members had asked Councillor Whyman to prepare a critique on both the existing Parish Council risk portfolio and also consider the alternatives against both the existing RSA provision and that offered by the two new potential carriers. Due, again, to time constraints, Councillor Whyman was only able to compare and contrast the risk protection provision offered by Zurich Mutual and Covea (Norris & Fisher)

Councillor Whyman reported to members, following a time limited research into each provider with emphasis on quality risk cover, support process availability and provision of best value for the Parish Council he recommended the council instructs Zurich Mutual to act as Parish Council insurers for the forthcoming 3 years from 30<sup>th</sup> September 2021.

The Vice Chair asked members to consider Councillor Whyman's presentation and seek views/comments. Councillor Archer and Coupland proposed & seconded acceptance of the proposal that the Parish Council instruct Zurich Mutual become the new insurers with effect from 30<sup>th</sup> September and, additionally, a full appraisal of the Councils assets and liabilities be undertaken in the near future once the new insurers are 'on risk'. The proposition was unanimously accepted by councillors present.

#### **CHPC260/20 – DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021 at 7.30pm

Meeting closed at 8.20pm