

**MEETING OF RENDLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL
HELD VIA ZOOM
ON MONDAY 1 FEBRUARY 2021 AT 7.30PM**

MINUTES

In accordance with Standing Order No: 38 any matter relating to an employee shall not be considered until the Council or Committee has decided whether or not the public shall be excluded (See SO No: 67). Due to the nature of the business to be transacted the meeting, or parts of it, may be closed to the press and public.

Under Standing Order No. 1. c) Meetings will last no longer than 2 hours and 1. d) If the business of the meeting has not been concluded after 2 hours a resolution will be taken to continue to conclude or defer the business in hand. In any event the meeting will last no longer than 2 hours 30 minutes.

<https://zoom.us/j/97866651388?pwd=SVRkcIRLZ2hWMUZGTIISazZkUFBLZz09>

PUBLIC FORUM – 15 minutes

Members: Mike Stevenson (Chairman); Martyn Redfern (Vice Chairman);
Douglas Burness; James Carter; Mike Parry;
Victoria Proctor; Peter Wyartt; Ally Gibbs;
Dave Moore;

Present: Mike Stevenson (Chairman); Martyn Redfern (Vice Chairman);
Douglas Burness; James Carter; Mike Parry;
Victoria Proctor; Peter Wyartt; Dave Moore;

In Attendance: Mrs Heelis – Parish Clerk
12 Members of the public
Steven Bainbridge – Applicant
Peter Warburton – Applicant

PUBLIC FORUM – 15 minutes

Mike Stevenson welcomed everyone to the meeting and informed those present that the meeting is being recorded.

Resident – objected to the application.

- Rendlesham the number of houses with an increase in vehicles.
- Design and layout does not meet the requirements. There was a marked contrast between Tidy Road and the proposal and plot 7 had no relation to the rest of the development.
- Highways – roads were not suitable and not to adoptable standard.
- Concern that the issue of flooding is yet to be resolved. SCC have stated that the drainage is not policy compliant.
- Social housing – concern that these will not be made available to the general public.
- Concern regarding the length of the construction period time.
- No provision of allotments or public spaces being transferred to RPC.



Resident – Infrastructure concern.

- Proposal for 75 new families without adequate infrastructure ie shop, doctors, school.
- Increase in traffic and pressure on the Melton crossroads.
- Increase in the risk of crime and safety to children.

The public session was closed.

1. ACCEPTANCE OF APOLOGIES.

To receive and accept apologies for absence. Alli Gibbs – leave of absence as resolved 4 January 2021.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND REQUEST FOR DISPENSATION.

To receive and record members' declaration of interest on any other matter on the agenda.

Martyn Redfern as current resident of Tidy Road. Dispensation from the Clerk was given.

3. MINUTES

To approve the minutes of 4 January 2021 – **Agreed**. Mike Stevenson proposed the minutes were accepted. James Carter seconded.

4. DC/20/5278/FUL | A phased development of 75 dwellings, car parking, public open space, hard and soft landscaping, and associated infrastructure and access.

Land To The North And West Of Garden Square And Gardenia Close, Rendlesham, Suffolk

Mike Stevenson noted that this was deemed as a major application and therefore it is required that the decision had to be made by full Council following a recommendation by the Planning Committee.

Martyn Redfern presented the application and the recommendation for the Council to Object to the application.

- 75 homes instead of 50 as outlined in the Local Plan – cumulative impact on the village.
- Impact on the Melton crossroads, currently at capacity.
- Objection had been made by Melton PC.
- Affordable housing – there was no strategy on how this would be managed by the company set up by CCD.
- Request for a viability assessment of the scheme.
- Drainage proposal has been rejected by SCC. If a scheme is not agreed the application should be rejected. A flood assessment update should be requested.
- The application makes no provision for allotments. Policy requirement of RNPP3 and the Allotment Strategy.
- Request the adoption of all roads by SCC.
- The applicant confirmed that the roads are up to the standard and just need topping. This contravenes SCC comments.
- Areas of land proposed to be used by the general public. The land should be transferred to the Parish Council to manage for the village in perpetuity.
- Disability Access – comments made regarding accessibility should be taken on board.



- The traffic survey is based on residents of TM. The survey should be assessed on a wider basis.
- Parking for 170 vehicles – impact on the Melton crossroads.
- Air Source Heat Pumps should be installed to meet incoming legislation.
- The applicant claims that 33% of homeowners will be owning electric cars – it was felt that this claim cannot be within the remit of the applicant. It was noted that there were no charging points on development.
- All construction traffic needs to be parked on site. A construction management plan is needed.
- There is a need to ensure that CIL contributions are sufficient to mitigate the impact of the development.
- It is important that there is no detrimental to wildlife.
- Build time – 6 years is the build time expectation from ESC. The proposed time for this development is 8-9 years. The vehicle disruption will inevitably have a detrimental environment impact in addition to the negative quality of life for residents living nearby.

Martyn Redfern proposed that the Parish Council object to the application.

Mike Stevenson invited Steven Bainbridge, on behalf of the applicant, to speak.

Steven Bainbridge reiterated the comments made by the applicant at the Planning Committee meeting.

The applicant's points were noted.

Peter Warburton, on behalf of the applicant, explained that he appreciated the statement that Martyn Redfern had read out. He confirmed that CCD can work with the objections that the Parish Council have made, explaining that there was flexibility and he wanted the development to add to the community, including through social housing and CIL.

He explained that he was not feeling antagonistic and loved the village. This was an allocated site for development and the applicant would welcome an opportunity to work with the Parish Council to find a satisfactory compromise.

A vote was taken on the proposal which resulted in 8 Objections – unanimous.

Whilst the Parish Council were objecting to the application it was noted that they were not excluding on looking at ways in which they could work with the applicant.

P Warburton confirmed that he would welcome working with the PC.

Mike Stevenson confirmed that the objection will need to be submitted as is, given the deadline for responses was tomorrow.

5. PARISH MATTERS FOR THE NEXT MEETING.

To raise any matters for inclusion on the next full Council agenda.

a) Committee vacancies.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

1 March 2021

The meeting closed at 20:10

SIGNED DATED



29/5/21