

RICKINGHALL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held Thursday, 4 November 2021
Rickingham Village Hall

Present: Cllr Gillian Crossley-Holland (Vice-Chair) Cllr Andrew Gordon
Cllr Stephen Pattenden Cllr Brian Rhodes
Cllr Geoff Short (Chair) Cllr Sally Smith

Parish Clerk – Leeann Jackson-Eve
3 members of the public

7.30pm The Chair welcomed those present and opened the meeting.

1. **Apologies for absence:** None.
2. **Casual Vacancies:** There were no applications for seats on the Council.
3. **To confirm the minutes of the Meeting held on 7 October 2021:** The minutes, circulated prior to the meeting, were agreed as a true record.
4. **Magazine Input:** Cllr Short.
5. **Members Declarations of Interest and Dispensations:** None.
6. **Public Forum:** A member of the public, living in Garden House Lane, voiced concerns over several aspects of the new development at Land Adj Greenacres, Garden House Lane, including the impact of construction traffic on residents.
7. **Planning:**
 - 7.1 **Planning Applications:**
 - 7.1.1 **Land Adj Greenacres, Garden House Lane.** Ref. DC/21/05923. Application for approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission 3858/16, Erection of up to 42 No dwellings, supporting infrastructure and new vehicular access (highway and pedestrian) submission of details for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for Erection of 41No dwellings (including 14 affordable and 5No self-build). It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to object to the application. The PC felt this was a positive start to the process. However, there were several issues which the developer had failed to address, making it difficult to assess the application, particularly with regard to the Botesdale and Rickingham Neighbourhood Plan (B&R NP). This could potentially have been rectified by discussion between the developer and the PC prior to submitting the application. Unfortunately, the PC had not been approached.

Policy B&R 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan allocated the site for development and was referred to on p11 of the application Design Statement. However, the application did not appear to refer to the requirements of this Policy except with regard to direct links to the adjoining public rights of way network in 7.13 of the application Design Statement. This Policy also required children's play provision and "new and substantive tree and hedgerow screen using native species on the southeast and north-east boundaries of the site". There was no mention of play provision and the landscape proposals for that boundary treatment were rather less than substantive. Policy B&R 9 required developments to provide a higher proportion of three bedroomed dwellings. The Reserved Matters application provides 5 x 4 bedrooms, 23 x 3 bedrooms, 7 x 2 bedrooms, 6 x 1 bedrooms, and the PC felt this was a very good mix.

Policy B&R 10 required developments to meet the minimum internal floor space standards, a requirement also set out in Policy LP26 of the emerging Joint Local Plan. Although it appeared that the development met these requirements, this was not specified within the application. In addition, there was no reference to the requirement for covered storage of all wheelie bins and cycles and this appeared to not be provided.

Policy B&R 15 set out a number of criteria against which a proposal would be considered. There was no specific evidence that any of these criteria had been assessed and it was dismissed with one sentence in 7.31 of the application Design

Statement. The Policy also required planning applications to "as appropriate to the proposal, demonstrate how they satisfy the requirements of the Development Design Checklist in Appendix 4" of the Plan, which was taken from the Botesdale and Rickinghall Design Codes document prepared in support of the Neighbourhood Plan, and there was no specific evidence of this. At a minimum, they should address each point and how it was met by the application. The PC particularly would have liked more information on sustainable construction and materials, and energy efficiency measures (Reducing Carbon Emissions) which would be implemented, rather than stating what would be "considered for the site" "where feasible".

The PC's comments on the outline planning permission 3858/16 expressed concern about the public right of way running between the site and the Ryders Way development as follows: "The close proximity of the trees bordering the new site to the public footpath would result in a narrow, damp, lightless tunnel affecting the quality and the security of the public right of way. It would be an improvement to have an open buffer zone between the footpath and any development on site." Paragraph 69 of the NPPF said that Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve places which promote safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high-quality public space, which encouraged the active and continual use of public areas. There were continuing concerns about the effect the enclosure would have on the footpath, particularly with regard to the access point junctions where it was likely that the footpath would become a muddy track. It would be appropriate and desirable to make improvements to the public right of way to encourage continued use, as well as personal safety. The PC questioned whether a 2m hedge was the appropriate buffer here given that it was unlikely to be maintained by the adjacent landowners and would almost certainly grow to encroach onto the footpath. The PC preferred a widening of the footpath with a better surface and a more open buffer zone. This would accord with the recommendations from the Design Out Crime Officer in response to 3858/16 that the footpath should be preferably "at least 3m across to allow people to pass one another without infringing on personal space with low growing and regularly maintained vegetation on either side".

Finally, there were concerns about construction traffic management and potential parking/turning of vehicles on Garden House Lane. The PC agreed to request that the Construction Management Plan should restrict construction related parking to the site and make provision for large vehicles to manoeuvre on site as there was no room to do so on Garden House Lane.

- 7.1.2 **Hall House Cottage, The Street. Ref. DC/21/05466.** Application for Listed Building Consent - Replacement of windows by double glazed windows of same size in same location. It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to object to the application on the basis that there was no information on the original windows and insufficient information on the replacement windows. There was no reference to the material used for the windows and if they were double-glazed, they were unlikely to be like-for-like. It was considered that UPVC windows would not be acceptable, and the replacement windows should be of a similar quality and design to those at the front of the house.
- 7.2 **Notice of Intent to prune/remove tree(s) in the Conservation Area:**
- 7.2.1 **Hamblyn House, The Street.** Ref. DC/21/05730. Application for works to a tree in a Conservation Area - Re-pollard back to previous points 1No Lime tree as it is getting too big for area. It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to have no objection.
- 7.3 **Notification of Planning Decisions by Mid Suffolk DC:**
- 7.3.1 **4 North View, The Street.** Ref. DC/21/04488. Householder Application - Erection of garage outbuilding with home office (following demolition of existing shed). Installation of rooflights in main house lean-to roof. Planning Permission GRANTED.
- 7.3.2 **2 St Georges Drive.** Ref. DC/21/05039. Application for works to trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (MS168/A1) - Crown lift T1 Beech to 5m (To allow space) Fell T2 Beech (Growing next to T1 and starting to take over on one side of canopy) Crown lift T3, T4, T5 and T6 Beech to 5m to remove lower laterals (Close to property). Consent GRANTED.
- 7.3.3 **Ridge House, The Street.** Ref. DC/21/05013. Application for works to trees in a Conservation Area - Reduce 1no Beech(T1) 1No Ash (T2) and 1No Birch (T3) by up

to 30% to balance and shape, and fell 1 No Poplar tree (due to Honey Fungus) in rear garden. NO OBJECTION.

7.3.4 **Frederick House, Water Lane.** Ref. DC/21/05119. Notification for works to trees in a Conservation Area - Section fell to 1 no Elm ground level (Tree has died) Coppice 1 no Ash (To retain size within area next to house) Coppice 1 no Sycamore (To retain size within area next to house). NO OBJECTION.

7.3.5 **The Pightle, Water Lane.** Ref. DC/21/04822. Householder Planning Application - Replacement of existing bargeboards, fascias, soffits, cladding, guttering, downpipes, access door and workshop window with UPVC products. Planning Permission GRANTED.

7.3.6 **5 St Georges Drive.** Ref. DC/21/05080. Householder Application - Erection of single storey rear extension, and erection of a detached garage. Planning Permission GRANTED.

7.4 **Notification of other Planning Matters:** None.

8. **Progress Reports:**

8.1 **Chairman:** None.

8.2 **Clerk:** None.

9. **Correspondence:**

9.1 **MSDC:** The PC noted the update on the Active Travel Consultation which gave a summary of the information gathered. MSDC was aiming to produce a draft prioritised list of schemes for the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan by the end of November 2021.

9.2 **MSDC:** The PC noted the parish council consultation as part of the Lorry Route Review. It was noted that Redgrave would be submitting its concerns about the B1113, and it was agreed to support that campaign.

9.3 **Police and Crime Commissioner:** The PC noted the consultation on the new Police and Crime Plan and had no comment to make.

9.4 **Parochial Church Council:** The PC noted the request for funds for churchyard maintenance.

10. **General Items:**

10.1 **Street Lighting Replacement Programme:** Last month's report from SCC had detailed a total of £16,535 of work to 19 units and the PC had agreed to carry out Activities 1 & 2 of priority replacements. This would be covered by £11,500 available in earmarked funds and the budget. A further £1,000 had been identified meaning the PC could also afford to carry out Activity 3 priority replacements. The PC RESOLVED, with all agreed, to order the work to replace 14 units (Activities 1-3) from SCC, totalling £12,280, and add funds for the remaining non-priority work in the 2022-23 budget.

10.2 **Parish Assets:** It was RESOLVED, with all agreed, to accept a quote for £287.75 for work to refurbish the main notice board near Warrens Lane. There would be an additional cost of around £300 for removal and reinstallation of the board and this was agreed. The cost would be shared by Botesdale PC.

10.3 **Meeting Dates 2022:** These were agreed as follows - 11 Jan (Tuesday); 3 Feb; 3 Mar; 7 Apr; 5 May; 8 Jun (Wednesday); 7 Jul; 4 Aug (Planning only); 1 Sep; 6 Oct; 3 Nov; 1 Dec. It was agreed to trial a new start time of 7pm from December 2021.

10.4 **Skate Park:** It was noted that installation would take place in March 2022.

10.5 **County Broadband:** It was noted that BT had publicised their intention to bring Fibre to the Premises to Botesdale exchange by 2025.

11. **Finance:**

11.1	Account Balance:	£79,650.24	
	Income:	£ 6,194.15	MSDC CIL Payment Oct 21

11.2 **Accounts for Payment:**

Admin Payments	£ 923.57	Not itemised due to GDPR
Street Sweeping etc.	£ 180.68	St Clean/VAS Sept 21
Botesdale Parish Council	£ 50.00	War Memorial Insurance
Bryant Bros	£ 180.00	Bench Refurbishment x 3
RBR PCC	£ 2,000.00	St Mary's Inferior Church Maint

RESOLVED, with all agreed, to approve payment of the accounts above.

11.3 **Draft Budget 2022-23:** The draft budget would be considered further at the next meeting.

12. **Highways Issues:** None.

13. **Welcome Pack:** 1 to Cllr Smith.

14. **Councillors' Reports:**

- Local Charities – A meeting had been held on 19 October and three requests of £100 each were agreed.
- Parish Assets – It was noted that the bus shelter gutter needed cleaning out.
- Public Right of Way – It was noted that the extension of the boardwalk near the Events Co. was becoming increasingly desirable due to the state of the footpath surface.
- Village Hall – The Management Committee had requested that the PC appoint a representative.

15. **Matters to be brought to attention of the Council:** None.

16. **Next Meeting:** 2 December 2021 – This would start at 7pm.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8:59pm.