



Waldringfield Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Rebecca Todd
5 St George's Terrace, Church Road,
Felixstowe, Suffolk IP11 9ND
Email: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
Telephone: 01394 271551
Website: www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parish-council

1848 Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held on Tuesday 23rd March 2021

In attendance (via video conferencing): Councillors Kay, Elliot, Gold, Lyon, Reid, Archer, Quick, Doyle and Beaumont; 2 members of the public

Clerk: Rebecca Todd

1. To **RECEIVE** apologies for absence – ESC Cllr Allen.
2. To **RECEIVE** declarations of interest – none.
To **RECEIVE** delegated Declaration of Interest Dispensation decisions or **APPROVE** non-delegated DPI dispensations requested by a councillor – none.
Parish Issues – An opportunity for parishioners to bring matters to the attention of the Parish Council and for parishioners to seek guidance from the Council.
No matters were raised.
3. To **APPROVE** the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on **9th March 2021**. Cllr Kay proposed acceptance, which was seconded by Cllr Gold and approved by all councillors who had been in attendance.
4. **MATTERS for REPORT** from minutes of previous meetings and to **REVIEW ACTION POINTS** from the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on **9th March 2021**. Councillors unanimously agreed to defer discussion until the next scheduled Parish Council meeting. Since the meeting on 9th March, the Clerk had forwarded a survey document to the Planning Group from a member of the ESC Planning Team, who is completing a dissertation and has requested WPC to take part in a survey for their research. Cllr Elliot proposed that WPC collaborates. The Clerk will circulate the document to all councillors for their consideration.
5. To **CONSIDER** Planning Applications for **COMMENTS:**
DC/21/0907/FUL Barrack Row, Fishpond Road, Waldringfield IP12 4QX – Demolition of existing conservatory; erections of two-storey side extension and single-storey extension towards river; altered first-floor gable window; and amendments to the internal layout of the existing dwelling. Comments by 29th March. Case Officer Jamie Behling.
Cllr Kay invited a member of the public present to speak, as owner of the property. This resident said they hoped that WPC would find they had been sympathetic to the property. Cllr Elliot spoke through the report of the Planning Group. She identified the location of the property, the last of a small cluster of houses with no immediate neighbours (the application will have little impact on amenities for neighbouring properties). The Planning Group understood why the extension has been proposed, to take advantage of the views of the river. They also considered the proposal to be in proportion with a cohesive appearance due to uniform cladding. The property is well screened at ground level. The Planning Group did highlight concerns about fenestration. There will be more glazing in the existing house and the extension will have a number of windows. Cllr Elliot highlighted that the property is within the Deben Special Protection Area and the AONB, and in an area of 'dark skies'. Cllr Elliot suggested there will be inevitable light spillage from the property, which would have a detrimental impact. She highlighted there are specific ESC policies relating to the SPA (ie Light Pollution, Landscape Impact). Cllr Elliot suggested excessive light could have an impact on biodiversity.
Cllr Doyle questioned what possible mitigation measures are available (ie special glass or blinds). Cllr Elliot said such mitigation would not be possible to enforce. Cllr Kay said it is not for WPC to propose solutions.
The owner spoke, stating that the existing building will only have an additional double doors; they accepted there will be more windows in the proposed extension. The person said the inhabitants are private people who would not wish to be visible. Cllr Gold suggested the application could include more clarification. Cllr Elliot suggested a lighting plan for the exterior lighting. The owner said the lights would not be on all night but rather would be triggered security lighting. Cllr Elliot suggested this could be captured in a statement to be added to the application.

1849

Cllr Quick expressed support for the design of the house, as did Cllr Doyle. Cllr Elliot said the Planning Group had made no negative comments on the design. The owner said they had chosen not to completely demolish the property.

Cllr Kay proposed that the application be recommended for approval, however, Cllr Elliot proposed that no objection be made but for WPC's response to address concerns about lighting. Cllr Reid highlighted the property's proximity to the Reverend Waller's nature reserve, and pointed out the sensitivities of this area (ie birds and other wildlife); he suggested this be included in WPC's response.

Councillors showed general support for the proposed design. Cllr Kay proposed that no objection be made but for WPC's response to highlight concerns about lighting, which was seconded by Cllr Quick and agreed by all. Cllr Elliot will draft a response. Cllr Reid suggested the Planning Group's comments about possible impact on landscape character should not be included in the response, which was agreed.

DC/21/1238/FUL Cross Farm, Woodbridge Road, Waldringfield IP12 4PL – Double and single storey extension and internal alterations to dwelling. Previously approved under application DC/17/2277/FUL. Comments by 8th April. Case Officer Eleanor Attwood.

Cllr Elliot clarified the most recent applications relating to this property – 2014 new extensions and balconies, 2017 application for work not commenced before the 3-year deadline. Cllr Kay displayed a photo of the property taken in 2017, showing the previously approved work in progress.

Cllr Elliot highlighted the location of Cross Farm, set far back from Woodbridge Road. Another photo taken in 2017 was displayed, illustrating the view of the property from the river; this was used as a comparison to the 2021 proposal. The Planning Group thought, visually, the 2021 design was an improvement on the successful 2017 application (now expired). Cllr Elliot drew attention to the balcony which is no longer proposed for the top storey. Cllr Elliot said, while finding the design of the extension to be generally pleasing, the Planning Group had expressed concerns about the 'Orangery' – specifically relating to light pollution. As the largest room, it is likely the Orangery will be the main family living area, rather than an orangery in the traditional sense (ie for growing plants). The application includes a very large roof lantern for the orangery.

Cllr Reid highlighted the property's proximity to an area which is very important for wildlife, particularly river birds, and pointed out this area on the banks of the River Deben is one of few areas which don't have passing foot traffic. Cllr Reid suggested this area needs particular protection for wildlife; the breached river wall has allowed wildlife to flourish here. Cllr Kay highlighted the prominent situation of the property, close to the river, and Cllr Gold also highlighted the importance of the marshland here. Cllr Elliot said the application includes a descriptor of 'marshland'. Cllr Elliot expressed concern about potential detrimental impact on the environment, and highlighted ESC's 'dark skies' policy.

There was some discussion about whether the applicant could find a remedy to limit light spillage, however, Cllr Elliot pointed out that it is beyond WPC's remit to suggest any redesign and mitigation measures such as blinds cannot be stipulated conditions. Councillors were generally supportive of the design but expressed concerns about the amount of fenestration (specifically in the roof lantern); Cllr Elliot suggested WPC could only support the application if this was modified. Cllr Reid suggested WPC's response stresses the importance of the area for wildlife and highlighted that the proposed Coast Path route is proposed as such (inland) to avoid this sensitive location, which is actively colonised by birds. Cllr Elliot supported this view, pointing out that Natural England's Coast Path report specifies protection measures.

There was discussion about WPC's stance. Cllr Reid suggested WPC supports the general design but objects to the application on the grounds of light pollution. Cllr Kay proposed that WPC objects due to concerns about light pollution, which was seconded by Cllr Beaumont and agreed by all.

To **MAKE ARRANGEMENTS** to deal with applications received after publication of this agenda. None.

To **NOTE** any application decisions received – see separate list.

To **RECEIVE** any other planning information. No discussion.

6. To **CONSIDER** hosting the Annual Parish Meeting via Zoom, before remote meeting regulations expire on 6th May. (The APM must be held before 1st June.) The Clerk clarified the current circumstances; it is likely that legislation allowing remote meetings will expire at midnight on 6th May, therefore meaning that face-to-face meetings will have to be held. SALC has said that an

Waldringfield Parish Council

1850

extension to the period when the Annual Parish Meeting may be held is unlikely. The APM must be held between 1st March and 1st June.

Cllr Reid said he had attended a Zoom presentation by 10 speakers and he thought the format worked well. Cllr Elliot had attended the latest remote SALC Forum with many delegates present; this also worked well, largely as all attendees were muted with an option to raise a hand or type a question/comment. Cllr Elliot suggested, if the APM is to be held over Zoom, a limit of 5 minutes is given to speakers, a view supported by Cllr Kay, who also suggested a possible reduction in the number of presentations. Cllr Reid suggested an overall time limit of 1 hour, which was supported by other councillors. Cllr Reid also proposed that there should be little scope for discussion, but rather it being an information-sharing exercise. Cllr Lyon suggested that ESC Cllrs Kerry and Allen be invited, and Cllr Elliot suggested this invitation should be extended to SCC Cllr O'Brien, as there are no concerns about purdah due to Cllr O'Brien not standing again for election. All councillors agreed that the Annual Parish Meeting should be held by Zoom before 7th May; a date will be agreed at the next regular WPC meeting, on 13th April. The Clerk suggested that the regular May meeting could be brought forward before legislation expires allowing remote meetings; Cllr Reid pointed out that a SALC training session has been arranged for 4th May.

- 7. **PARISH MATTERS** for the next meeting. Signage for the beach bins. Cllr Lyon advised that one of the blue bins currently in situ was found to be contaminated with other, non-recycling rubbish. She suggested that WPC could look at adding more grey bins. Councillors thanked Tony Lyon for his voluntary litter-collecting on the beach.

The Chair closed the meeting at 20.40pm.

REVIEW OF ACTION POINTS FROM THE MEETING

ESC Planning Team Dissertation Survey – the Clerk to circulate the document to all councillors for their consideration.

DC/21/0907/FUL Barrack Row – Cllr Elliot to draft a response for the Clerk to send to ESC Planning.

DC/21/1238/FUL Cross Farm – Cllr Elliot to draft a response for the Clerk to send to ESC Planning.

Annual Parish Meeting – a date to be agreed for a Zoom meeting to be held before 7th May (7 clear days' notice will be required).

Parish Matters – to include discussion about rubbish bins and relevant signage.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

ITEM 5

To **NOTE** any application decisions received

DC/20/2710/FUL Rosemary Cottage, Sandy Lane, Waldringfield IP12 4QY – The removal of a section of southern boundary rear garden hedging and its placement with fencing of a similar height. This section of hedging is diseased and dying. The section is up to 30ft long with a trimmed height of 10/11ft. Planning consent C12/2396, dated 27 June 2012, contained obligations concerning our rear southern boundary to do with maintaining its integrity. We assume, to protect our neighbours’ privacy from being overlooked from the proposed balcony. In particular, it states: ‘Any trees or hedgerows removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years...shall be replaced....’ As this five year window has expired, our interpretation of the guidance is we could remove the diseased section and replace with new hedging or normal garden fencing, or, as the southern boundary is not our legal responsibility but our neighbours, do nothing. However, we feel this would be unsatisfactory as it would not provide our neighbour with adequate protection from being overlooked. A new hedge would take a substantial number of years to reach a suitable height and may, in any case, fail for the same reasons as the current hedge. We therefore propose to replace the hedge with fencing of an appropriate height. This fencing to comprise of concrete posts with timber panels. It would be up to 30ft in length and 11ft in height and would provide the neighbour with the same level of privacy as historically enjoyed. Application refused.