

BRANDESTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held at the Village Hall on Tuesday, 19 October 2010

Present

Councillors D Risk (Chairman) (DR), H Saxton (HR), W Elson (WE), P Summers (PS), K Churchill (KC) and S Thurlow (ST)

Parish Clerk and RFO A M Hounsell (AMH)

11 Parishioners

1-1011/4 - Chairman's Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chairman welcomed Councillors and Parishioners and advised of receipt of apologies for absence from Cllr J Fielder and Dist. Cllr Snell. The Chairman advised that Cty. Cllr Bellfield was away and therefore unable to respond to his invitation to the meeting.

2-1011/4 - To Receive Councillors' Declaration of Interest in Agenda Items

ST declared interest in agenda item 4 (ii)

3-1011/4 – Planning Application C10/2526 (8 Pond Piece – retention of fencing)

The Chairman opened the meeting for discussion with parishioners as indicated in the notes attached at the end of these minutes.

The chairman then reconvened the meeting and councillors commented as follows :-

The council agreed unanimously that the proposal represented overbearing and completely inappropriate development at this location.

The original approval conditions for the eight houses at Pond Piece were reviewed and it was noted that this proposal breached conditions 06 (implementation and retention of a planting scheme), 10 (visibility splays) and 15 (withdrawal of permitted development rights). The council agreed that it was clearly evident that the original developer of the eight houses at Pond Piece and the SCDC Planning Department had devoted considerable time and effort to ensure that the original development was completed with full regard to the rural nature of the site.

Furthermore, the council noted a number of inaccuracies in this (C10/2526) application :-

1. The application form asks the question (item 6) "Is a new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from the public highway?" The answer given is "no". This is incorrect because the new access gate does front the highway. With a "yes" answer, it is required that details be shown on plans/drawings and the reference of the plan given. This requirement has not been met.
2. The application states that "It has been necessary to remove rotten fencing situated to the side of 8 Pond Piece which is adjacent to the driveway into the estate." This is not correct – there was no fencing along this (west) boundary.
3. The application states that the fencing will be set at around 1.93m. The fencing as erected is actually 2.0m high
4. The application states that the fence is sited some 1.6m behind the front line of the property. The fence is actually situated right on the boundary to the shared roadway and is likely to impede maintenance of this roadway should this be necessary
5. The application is said to be for " removal of bare hedging" This is incorrect. Examination of the photographs and any examination at the site clearly shows that the hedging to the west boundary cannot be described as "bare"
6. The west fence is very clearly visible from Low Street contrary to the statement in the application that "the hedge almost completely conceals the fence from the Low Road aspect" Indeed, the photographs attached to the application clearly show just how visible the fence actually is.
7. With respect to the north boundary, the fencing as erected goes far beyond "replacement". There is now a considerably greater length and height.
8. In keeping with the rural nature and style of this group of houses, there are no driveway gates at any of the other seven houses at Pond Piece

The clerk was instructed to advise SCDC, Planning Dept. of the council's very strong objection to this proposal in the heart of the Brandeston Conservation Area and to cite the above details and the strong public objection.

4-1011/4 - Financial Matters

The Council agreed payments as follows :-

- (i) £20 to SCDC for the Brandeston 100+ Club licence for 2011
- (ii) £4.50 to Brandeston VH&RG for room hire for this council meeting.

5-1011/4 - Correspondence

There was no discussion under this heading.

6-1011/4 - Any other business as may be raised and accepted as appropriate by the Chairman under Standing Order 16

The Chairman agreed discussion of planning application C10/2597 (The Old Vicarage – extension to garden room). The council agreed no objections to the proposal and to support the application

Date of the next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 30 November 2010 at 8.00 pm

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

NOTES OF OPEN DISCUSSION

Comments included:-

1. A parishioner stated that the entry into Pond Piece with an attractive hedge line had been one of the first things that appealed to them. To see this destroyed is unsightly and has devalued the other properties.
2. The small gate at the side of the highway interferes with visibility and this will become worse as the hedging grows
3. The claim in the application that the hedging was bare was disingenuous or even completely untrue. It was strongly stated that the removed hedging was not bare or dead – especially since it should be noted that the removed plants had been replanted elsewhere.
4. It was suggested that electrical cabling to the houses at Pond Piece lies under the edge of the entrance road i. e. exactly where the fence (with concreted posts) had been erected. This is in contravention of the deeds and covenants on the property. PS advised that this was not a matter for the parish council but strongly suggested that the other residents of Pond Piece should send a solicitor's letter to the selling agent for the property to advise them of this breach.
5. All parishioners present expressed their opposition to the application.