

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF RENDLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL
HELD AT THE COMMUNITY CENTRE ROOM1
ON MONDAY 13th MAY 2019 at 7.30PM**

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.

Members: Mike Stevenson; Douglas Burness; James Carter;
Wendy McKee; Martyn Redfern; Casey Rose;
Peter Wyartt;

Present: Mike Stevenson; James Carter; Wendy McKee;
Martyn Redfern; Casey Rose; Peter Wyartt;

In Attendance: Mrs Heelis – Parish Clerk
8 members of the public

PUBLIC FORUM – 15 minutes

The applicant's agent introduced himself as Steven Bainbridge.

Brief update:

- Highways – responded with planning conditions – sufficient parking and vehicle access
- EA – information re flood provided by the applicant
- Other statutory consultees have responded.
- Material considerations – principle of development, 75 homes – 23 dwelling per hectare,
- 011 Planning Practice Guidance – CIL 50-75 dwelling, NP 25% how local infrastructure can be funded.
- Other NP policies covered in the planning statement
- 50 dwellings plus 25 windfall are acceptable in planning terms.
- Design – some concern re back to back planning – ref NP
- Willow Way, Forest Gardens are other examples of back to back housing
- CIL - £700k towards the wider infrastructure

Comments:

Concern re open space – would people feel welcome

SB – can comment but the open space will be public open space. Owned by the developer and maintained by the developer.

Reliance on Tidy Road for most of the access.

SB – Tidy Road is one of 2 accesses.

SB – confirmed Garden Square will provide the construction access.

2019 - 15



SB – the proposal is phased and Tidy road may be opened later. Suffolk CC requires an agreement to carry out works on the highway. It may be possible to leave the opening of Tidy Road to a later phase.

SB – confirmed that the estate would not be private.

Noted the roads are not proposed to be adopted.

2/3 of dwellings available on the open market – the rest are affordable housing.

SB – the houses will be sold as any other development.

A member of the public – read out a statement from another member of the public who was unable to make the meeting.

Another member of the public noted that Bromeswell and Ufford have both stated that the application does not comply with the RNP. Concerns were also raised regarding the potential of a single storey building in place of the feature space. He expressed concerns that this could be 3-5 years of development.

Designated land for development – what would the resident like to see on the site.

Resident – factual errors in the last speech.

The Chairman concluded that the application will be discussed by the Parish Council as received.

- Police Report (circulated) Noted.
- County Councillor Report - Cllr Nicoll noted that the Council have an understanding of the amount of maintenance required post development. The other matter is the adoption of roads. Roads have to be of a good standard so they can be considered for adoption.

He reported that Cllr Herring was attending an East Suffolk Council meeting. Cllr Nicoll has agreed to fund 100% of the additional defibrillator for Jubilee Park.

Re membership of SALC – SALC is a worthwhile organisation, a very useful conduit between different tiers of government. An important portal for parish & town councils. He would commend remaining a member.

Mary Evans is Cabinet member for highways. He suggested inviting her to a meeting of the Council.

He will continue to deal with Sizewell. He no longer supports the project which will have a considerable detrimental effect on East Suffolk. Many issues haven't been addressed, traffic being one of the major issues. More information is needed to make an informed decision. As it stands the proposal has failed and the case has not been adequately made, yet. Efforts have been made to EDF to provide evidence of mitigation of the problems. The case has not been made to site Sizewell C in Suffolk.

- Any other local group attending – None.
1. **ACCEPTANCE OF APOLOGIES.**
To receive and accept apologies for absence.
Douglas Burness; Cllr Herring.
 2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND REQUEST FOR DISPENSATION.**
 - a) To receive and record members' declaration of interest on any other matter on the agenda.



Martyn Redfern declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5.

3. MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18th April 2019 – **Agreed.**

4. POST ELECTION PAPERWORK

a) Elections expense returns - All Candidates must submit expenses forms, even if they have not spent anything (a 'nil' return). The deadline for these to be returned is Thursday 30 May 2019. The return is a statement of the amount a Candidate has spent (if anything) to show that they have not exceeded the legal limit; it is not to claim money back. Failure to make a return is illegal and subject to a fine.
Noted.

b) Register of Interests – The Suffolk Coastal Register of Interests online system is no longer functional. An East Suffolk Council project team is working to get the replacement system in place. East Suffolk Council to advise how Councillors should record their interests. Noted.

5. TO CONSIDER THE FORMAL RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION C/19/1499/FUL, A PHASED DEVELOPMENT OF 75 DWELLINGS, CAR PARKING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND ACCESS

The Clerk circulated a planning brief she had prepared to help in Council's consideration of the application.

- 1) Para 10.13 – more weighting in large detached housing in the current application.
No care for the elderly in the proposals.
Not a healthy mix, large & small but very little in the middle.
Lack of homes for first time buyers – although shared equity could be considered as first time buyers
Some of the assessments restrict to a particular type of lifestyle

The application does not meet the RNP

- 2) At the last application there was indication that the affordable housing would be run through a housing association. There is no mention of this in the current application.

The application does not meet the RNP

- 3) There is considered to be plenty of space and the density is low.

The application meets the RNP

- 4) There is considered to be sufficient off road parking.
The application meets the RNP

- 5) The height of the buildings cause concern, exceeding the height of other 3 storey houses in the village.

No comment.

- 6) The application meets the RNP

- 7) The application meets the RNP

2019 - 17



- 8) The application meets the RNP
- 9) The application does not make tangible commitment to providing infrastructure for the village.

It was suggested that the Parish Council seek views from East Suffolk Council on how to ensure the infrastructure is provided.

It was noted that the Local Plan stated that developments in Rendlesham should make provision for a licensed premises. It was noted that, whilst the location of the site was not conducive for a licensed premises, a tangible contribution towards a facility could be made.

- 10) Is the current offer of an orchard sufficient to meet RNPP3? Would this be in perpetuity if run by the developer.

The application does not meet the RNP at the moment but this could be improved and provision made.

10.07 – social cohesion – the houses as they are designed are fairly isolated.

10.24 - Design principles – renewable energy, water reduction, electric car points – not addressed

Other Considerations:

- 1) Noted that the applicant is moving further away from the adoption of the roads. Mention of the developer maintaining the roads. Casey Rose reported that there is a desire to have the roads to be adopted but streetlighting is not desirable. There may be a trial of soda streetlighting.

It is understood that the applicants do not intend to have the roads adopted.

It is noted that Garden Square roads are not adopted. It is preferred to have the road adopted before development.

- 2) There are concerns regarding the length of actual time the development may take to build ie longer than 3 years. The legacy of a failed development is pertinent to the application. Based on the development of Garden Square and Gardenia Close the development time may be longer. It was noted that the original development was advertised through estate agents.
- 3) There was lack of clarity on how the affordable housing on this development will be made available and to whom. **Agreed** to continue pursue the local connection.
- 4) There would be more integration by using the Tidy road entrance. No construction traffic would go down Tidy Road. To uphold the previous comments.
- 5) **Agreed** as before.
- 6) **Agreed** to reiterate the comments submitted before. Of great concern to some residents in their correspondence. Also water authority has made comments



- 7) Concerns re 75 dwellings and the capacity of the infrastructure. Concern that 75 will set a precedent for the other site allocation.

It was resolved to continue for a further 30 minutes.

- 8) Impact is inevitable. It is understood that this matter has been addressed separately with the relevant consultees.

Concern of 75 homes and how the application did not promote sustainable growth.

Mike Stevenson proposed to object to the application on the grounds on the various points discussed and the unresolved matters. Casey Rose seconded. **Agreed** unanimously.

9. RENDLESHAM REVEALED

This item will be closed to the press and public

The public left.

The meeting was reopened.

6. NEW COUNCILLOR TRAINING

To confirm availability for Councillor Training.

7. REPORTS: Clerk – all deferred.

- a) Parish Action Report
- b) Community Centre Management Committee
- c) SNT

8. CORRESPONDENCE LIST

Clerk to action.

10. PARISH MATTERS FOR THE NEXT MEETING.

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

- a) Co-option of councillors

11. PARISH MATTERS FOR THE NEWSLETTER.

- a) Each Councillor to submit a brief introduction and photo for the newsletter.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 1st July.

James Carter gave his apologies.

13. DATES OF 2019 MEETINGS: Schedule of proposed dates circulated.

Meeting closed 22:14

SIGNED

