

**Brandeston Parish Council  
Meeting Minutes  
Venue – Brandeston Village Hall  
Date – 09 October 2012**

**Present:**

**Parish Council:** David Risk (Chairman), Kathy Churchill, Will Elson, Paddy Fielder, Helen Saxton, Phil Summers, Sue Thurlow

Nick Hayward (Minutes)

**Parishioners:** John Garratt, Chris Hutson, Paul Kirton, Richard Mitson-Woods, John Western – present for Item 1 only

**Apologies:** Mark Hounsell

**Item 1 – Open Discussion**

Parishioners presented their views on the two applications at Office Farm Mutton Lane, C12/1979 (Reserved matters on approved 6 properties) and C12/1939 (New application for 4 properties).

**C12/1979:** Enlarges the outline permission given in 2011, but had not previously been seen by parishioners or the PC, which will review it formally in the November meeting. The application changes integral garages to separate ones so allowing larger houses, and the appearance is significantly different from that approved in outline.

CH proposed that the village should engage a consultant to provide a professional viewpoint to balance the skills of the applicant.

NH explained that the outline approval application in 2011 sought to discredit the Parish Plan of 2008 and made invalid claims about the integrity of the Plan conclusions, those who had compiled it and therefore the village that had approved it; should this be tolerated?

**C12/1939:** RMW stated that the application was materially incorrect in a number of counts:

- Flooding; ditches are incorrectly defined and do not show the flow from Rose Farm Barn, under the road, through the RMW pond and along the ditch to the East of the application site. If not maintained flooding will result upstream
- Bio-diversity; the application was flawed as it could not identify any wildlife where a previous survey by Suffolk Wildlife trust had found newts, hedgehogs, barn owls, sparrow hawks, etc. SWT to be asked to revisit.

**ACTION RMW**

## Brandeston Parish Council

---

- Ponds; incorrectly recorded

RMW noted that his application for a Summerhouse had been refused because of the impact on the view from the valley, but this issue was apparently was not relevant to the application for 6 houses.

PS explained that District Councils are under heavy pressure to maintain a 5-year supply of housing land and are forced to review and analyse for suitability any proposals that landowners propose for potential building sites. The Mutton Lane site was consented for Employment use but the present applications are for residential use. Would residents prefer light industrial usage or residential; if the former, it might preclude access to the third site in Office Farm.

PS proposed that if the applications were to be opposed it would be important to provide SCDC with appropriate reasons, such as:

- Press for retention of Employment use (for which the site is already approved)
- Oppose grouping of buildings in C12/1939 as this differs from the linear development already approved and continued along Mutton Lane
- Brandeston is a small community and the application is stretching its ability to absorb the growth; this was recognised when the previous application (C10/2699) for 9 properties was refused, so a precedence exists

The residents supported opposition to C12/1939 although opinion was split over whether light industrial or residential was preferable; 3:2 in favour of industrial.

Application C12/1939 did not include a Blue Line Site Plan (3139-02A) without which the application is not valid. This indicates land ownership. Clerk to be requested to obtain.

**ACTION MH**

### ***Mutton Lane residents departed.***

In summary the PC noted that the application reduced employment opportunities, that the 6 properties in C12/1979 were too large for the site and that the 4 properties in C12/1939 should be reduced to 2, following the linear pattern already established.

### **PC review of C12/1979 – Reserved Matters on 6 properties**

- Agree linear development as this replicates the Mutton Lane form
- Size/scale of proposed houses too large, creating appearance of uninterrupted building line as they are too closely spaced
- Height is too imposing as viewed from the valley

## **Brandeston Parish Council**

---

- Concern over future of 3<sup>rd</sup> plot on Office Farm site, since it appears to be land-locked by C12/1979 and C12/1939; is this in the ownership of Landex, and is it to remain in agricultural use?
- Plot 1 is too close to Red Gables (Hutson) boundary.
- South elevation is too high and 1<sup>st</sup> floor window and overlooks Hutson - to be opaque

### **PC review of C12/1939 – 4 properties**

There is strong feeling in the village, and especially Mutton Lane, about the sustainability of large developments in Brandeston. The application C10/2699 for 9 properties was rejected as unsuitable. Now, with 6 already approved, and with the loss of employment opportunities, the additional 4 properties proposed become unsustainable.

The site to the South is linear in form and this application runs counter to it; if employment use is not to be ensured then linear development should be imposed.

### **Item 2 – Apologies**

Mark Hounsell.

### **Item 3 – C12/1761 & C12/1762 – Extension to Priory Barn**

The Priory is a beautiful building and is Grade 2\* listed, including its curtilage. The PC has no objections to extending the Priory Barn in principle, but has concerns over the impact of the application on The Priory since it would change the balance between the dominant Priory and subservient Barn.

Therefore the PC opposes the application because it:

- Detracts from the setting of The Priory
- Creates extensive changes to the balance between the dominant Priory and subservient Barn
- Detracts from the shape and form of the Barn

### **Item 4 – C12/1862 – Extension to 55 The Street**

Approved.

### **Item 5 – C12/1939 – 4 single storey dwellings in Mutton Lane**

See above, Item 1.

Nick Hayward  
10/10/2012