

# GREAT BRICETT PARISH COUNCIL

*Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held on  
Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017 in Great Bricett Village Hall at 7.00pm*

Present: Cllr S Burnett, Cllr D Payne, Cllr R Craddock, Cllr G Cooper, Cllr N Ford,  
In attendance: Vivienne Pratt (Clerk), 18 members of the public  
Apologies: Cllr R Morley, Cty Cllr Whybrow

	<b>Opening</b> – The Chair opened the meeting at 7.00pm and welcomed all present.	
<b>GBPC405/1017</b>	<b>Receive apologies for absence</b> – Cllr Morley (holiday) and Cty Cllr Whybrow (holiday).	
<b>GBPC406/1017</b>	<b>Receive Declarations of Interests and requests for dispensations regarding items on the agenda</b> - Pecuniary and non-pecuniary and requests for dispensation – The Clerk advised that Cllr Georgina Cooper had pre-advised an interest in the planning application to be considered at this meeting as the application is being made by her father. The Clerk advised that Cllr Cooper could participate in the meeting but could not take part in any vote or decision making.	
<b>GBPC407/1017</b>	<p><b>Public Participation Session</b> – The Clerk advised that any decision regarding planning applications is made by Mid Suffolk District Council and that the Parish Council are contacted as a consultee to provide local area knowledge of the site and its surroundings. She explained that the purpose of the meeting is to give the public the opportunity to express any comments to the Parish Council and for the Parish Council to decide what to write in an advisory letter to MSDC. She advised that, in order to give an opportunity for all present to raise their comments, each member of the public would be invited to speak for a maximum of three minutes each and, wherever possible, should try to avoid any issue raised by anyone else to avoid focussing on the same items. The Clerk explained that once this participation session is concluded, the public would be welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting but could no longer participate. She introduced Rich Cook, XXX for XXX, who had been involved in the application process on behalf of the applicant and was happy to answer any questions. It was agreed that Cllrs would have the opportunity to discuss the application, raise any questions with Mr Cook and that, as long as there was enough time left to comply with the Council’s Standing Orders, the public session would be re-opened in order that any members of the public could raise any additional questions with Mr Cook.</p> <p>The public comments (in brief) were as follows –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of road traffic accidents within the applications Transport statement was questioned as it states there were no accidents from 2012 – 2016 and is known to be incorrect</li> <li>• A bottle neck already occurs on the single lane bridge close to the entrance into the village off the B1078</li> <li>• The figures quoted as travel movements within the applications Transport statement were questioned as unrealistic</li> <li>• The ability to walk to school was questioned due to the lack of pavements and footpaths</li> <li>• The reduction of funding for school bus services means that cars would be required for school runs</li> <li>• Speeding within the village is already a big problem</li> <li>• It is believed that each of the proposed properties would require at least two cars per household</li> <li>• The lack of local shops would mean that there would be an increase in delivery vehicles</li> <li>• The existing road is barely wide enough for two cars to pass in places</li> <li>• The dykes/drainage are already at capacity and the existing field where the treatment plant disperses already regularly has a large pool of water</li> <li>• The hedging/security fencing to separate the development from Wixfield Park was questioned to ensure that children cannot pass through</li> <li>• The size of the Base already generates considerable traffic at peak times</li> <li>• The commercial buildings were felt to be in good condition and still useable</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of Superfast broadband and other new homes developments in the area would affect the saleability of these new homes</li> <li>• That Great Bricett has been give Countryside status and should not have any development</li> <li>• That a further bus stop would have no benefit as the bus service is virtually non-existent</li> <li>• That there is only street lighting on one side of the village (the Base side rather than the location of the proposed development)</li> <li>• That an additional 51 homes would represent an increase of approx. 170-180 people – an increase of approx. 70%</li> <li>• That the current cycle route is unsafe due to the narrow road and lack of passing spaces</li> <li>• That the school capacity might not cope with this number of new properties</li> <li>• That the Doctors surgeries capacity might not cope with this number of new properties</li> <li>• That the play area facilities in the village are not public and cannot be assumed can be used as they are owned by the Base.</li> <li>• That the scheme should include its own play area facilities for children rather than just open space</li> <li>• That traffic calming precautions in the village are already required</li> </ul> <p>When it was established that everyone present had presented their comments, the public were advised that their participation session was now closed and they could take no further part in the meeting unless invited to do so by the Chair.</p>	
<p><b>GBPC408/1017</b></p>	<p><b>Planning Applications –</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For discussion and decision – <u>Planning Consultation no. DC/17/03568 – Outline Planning Application for a Residential development of up to 51 dwellings at Great Bricett Business Park, The Street, Great Bricett, Suffolk IP7 7DZ</u></li> <li>b. Awaiting decision from MSDC – <i>None</i></li> <li>c. Decisions made by MSDC – <i>None</i></li> </ol> <p>At this point, each Cllr was asked to discuss this application –</p> <p>DP comments (in brief) -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The footpath needs to be extended to serve a larger portion of the village</li> <li>• The meadow on the site is currently very unattractive</li> <li>• That new homes in this location would bring a 'counter balance' to the village which currently has homes at each end but is lacking in the central part</li> <li>• That new homes are important to ensure young people can purchase properties close to their families</li> </ul> <p>NF comments (in brief) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That new homes should be welcomed</li> <li>• That the number of houses does not reflect the facilities available in the village</li> </ul> <p>RC comments (in brief) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioned the number of affordable houses and the mix of houses</li> <li>• That there is no significant bus service</li> <li>• That the footpaths do not service the entire village</li> <li>• That the amount of traffic generated by the new scheme has been vastly underestimated</li> <li>• That new homes should be welcomed as it may encourage other services into the village such as Superfast Broadband, a better bus service etc.</li> <li>• That additional homes would benefit the village</li> </ul> <p>SB comments (in brief) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That new homes are needed but the size of the development and number of houses is too high</li> <li>• That additional housing would be good for the area but an increase of 70% is too much</li> </ul>	

- That a development of 25 houses might be considered more favourably
- The footpath does not allow walking from one side of the village to the other

Cllr Cooper was invited to speak but did not wish to do so.

At this point, Rich Cook was invited to discuss the points raised so far by the Cllrs and public. It was explained that this is a pre-planning consultation to establish an 'in principle' decision as to whether a scheme might work here and that many aspects of the proposed scheme presented at the meeting will evolve and will undoubtedly change. Mr Cook explained that he had worked with the applicant and Mid Suffolk DC to establish the best scheme for the site. He advised the following –

- The site will be vacant soon and a future use is required
- The site has been looked at in conjunction with MSDC's Planning policy
- There is a requirement to build 250,000 new homes nationally
- The local plan for MSDC requires 430 new home to be built per year and it does not have the 'land bank' to provide this
- MSDC is ideally looking to build on Brown field sites, which part of this is
- Building on only part of the site has been considered but it does not make sense
- The number of homes being proposed is less than it could be as it is recognised nationally as 30 new homes per hectare so could be 90 on a site of this size (just under three hectares or 7.5 acres)
- It has been considered that a lower density scheme for this site would be more appropriate
- The design work is in keeping with the area and is for a high quality scheme
- The scheme does not include a play area as MSDC prefer a more open space or informal plan
- That this is not a finished plan and not the only way a scheme could look as it will be refined at a later date
- It is felt that this scheme will work alongside existing properties
- That a scheme similar to this could generate approx. £10,000 for the village via CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) as well as a potential section 106 payment to address specific issues
- That there is an Affordable Housing aspect to the scheme

Each Cllr was now given the opportunity to raise any questions to Mr Cook –

DP asked about the New Homes Bonus which Mr Cook advised would benefit District Council and County Council and not the PC but that the PC could potentially benefit from 15% of this bonus.

NF reiterated that he felt that the size of the scheme is too large regardless of national averages.

RC stated that the residents of Wixfield Park adjacent to the site would question the location of the sewerage treatment plant and suggested that the Environment Agency should be consulted with regard to the suitability of the clean water ditch dispersal and general location of the treatment plant.

SB asked the ratio for the Affordable housing which was advised as 35% or a third of the scheme. She asked whether a full drainage scheme had been drawn up and was advised that it would be done at a later stage.

DP asked how many people are currently employed and was advised there are 7 employees on the Business Park.

The Clerk asked whether SCC Highways have been consulted as traffic, accidents and speeding issues have been raised at every Parish Council meeting this year including a letter being sent to the Police Commissioner as well as the Base Commander in the previous month. Mr Cook advised that an independent Transport assessment had been carried out.

	<p>The Chair now re-opened the Public Participation session to give members of the public the opportunity to raise any additional questions or comments –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Great Bricett play area facilities discussed within the application cannot be guaranteed as available for use by the public as they belong to and are maintained by the MOD and is cannot be assumed that it will always be available for use</li> <li>• That the sewerage facility in the scheme needs further investigation</li> <li>• That the site is next to a park home site designed for older residents and that this scheme is for family homes and consideration is required for adequate fencing and hedging</li> </ul> <p>Any further questions were invited and, when it was established that there were none, the Chair closed the second public participation session.</p> <p><b>Decision</b> – At this point, the Clerk asked each Cllr to advise the basis for the letter to be written to MSDC.</p> <p>DP – Wished to support the scheme as there is a need for more homes and that the money made available as a result of the building could fund additional footpaths.</p> <p>NF – Did not support the scheme as he felt it was too big and is unsustainable with the current shops and services.</p> <p>RC – Did not support the scheme on the basis as NF</p> <p>SB – Did not support the scheme as it is too large although a smaller scheme might be considered more favourably. She also felt that that the roads cannot accommodate this many additional cars.</p> <p>GC – Did not participate</p> <p>It was agreed that the Clerk would prepare a draft letter to object to the scheme to be circulated to all Cllrs which would need to be considered and responded to very quickly to meet the deadline set by MSDC that had already been extended to allow the Council time to respond.</p>	<i>Clerk</i>
<b>GBPC409/1017</b>	<b>To consider the exclusion of the public and press in the public interest for consideration of the following items</b> - None	
<b>GBPC410/1017</b>	<b>Matters to be brought to the attention of the Council</b> - None	
	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b> – The date and time of the next meeting is the <b>Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2017</b> at 7.00pm in Great Bricett Village Hall	
	<i>Meeting closed at 8.20pm</i>	

Chairman .....

Date .....