

Chattisham & Hintlesham Parish Council

Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the above Parish Council held on Thursday 9th August, 2012 at 7.30 in the Meeting Room at the Community Hall, Hintlesham.

PRESENT:

Councillors: I. Bryce, C. Leney, P. Eaton , D. Chase, F. Self, M. Taylor, R. Taylor, B. Cox, T. Wright.

District Councillor: Nick Ridley

Members of the Public: Mr. John Mower and Mrs. E. Damant.

- 1. Apologies** had been received from Mrs. J. Warner, Mr. Peter Jones and Samantha Barber. (Parish Clerk).
- 2. Declaration of Interest:** Mr. I. Bryce declared an interest in relation to the Pylons Issue and Mrs.F Self declared an interest in relation to the Planning Application for 'Vine Cottage', as the Declaration of Interest Book was not at the meeting the Councillors will sign at our Meeting on the 13th September, 2012.
- 3. Response to Babergh Core Strategy Amendment:** The Councillors had a very intense discussion regarding the Core Strategy as a whole.
Questions were put to Nick Ridley about
 1. Sustainability and what was BDC understanding of this?, Mr. Ridley pointed out that it was on Page 109 of the Amendment regarding this wording.
 2. Low Carbon in relation to people's opinions on this,
 3. Amendment No. 30, Development in relation to the Travellers/Gipsy Sites. One Councillor asked what was BDC definition of Plots/Sites. Mid Suffolk have to find 15 x 5 Pitches which at the present time they have achieved.
 4. Why did Sproughton have to wait another 5 years before the Industrial Clause can be lifted? It has been an on going problem for the past 17years, why should they have to wait another 5years ?

Following this discussion it was agreed that Mrs. Self would put a document together and forward (via email)to all Councillors to comment on. Following their responses she would collate a document for us to send to BDC.

Mod. No.	Modification	Comment
	Old sugar beet factory site at Sproughton.	" 5 years" 1 year should be enough. The site has been derelict for 17years already.
25	Renewable/Low Carbon Development	People's quality of life should be protected. Low carbon development should not be permitted at the expense of the health and welfare of other

		people or communities. Noise pollution should not be allowed.
30	Traveller provision	Infrastructure restrictions mean mixed use development in villages/rural areas is inappropriate

4. Pylon Update:

Councillor Guy McGregor. Cabinet Member for Roads and Transport at Suffolk County Council (SCC) had sent to all Parish Councils an email pointing out that on the 10th July 2012, SCC resolved that any new electricity transmission line between, Bramford and Twinstead should be entirely underground and that this should be achieved by presenting a specific case for each and every section of the line. He was asking for all Parish Councils' support in this and asked for us to all to complete a form which he had attached to his email. After much discussion it was agreed to send in the following response from our Parish Council. It had been written by Peter Eaton and on the Vote for sending in this response 6 Councillors voted for, 2 against and 1 abstained.

Chattisham & Hintlesham Parish Council.
c/o Mrs. Samantha Barber,
Parish Clerk, 37 Bentley Lane, Belstead, Ipswich, IP8 3LX.

10th August, 2012.

Following our Parish Council Meeting, it was proposed to send the following in reply to Mr. Guy McGregor email dated 23rd. July, 2012.

Since the consultation process for the proposed Bramford to Twinstead line began in Summer 2009, National Grid has had a deliberate and cynical policy of divide and rule within the Hintlesham, Chattisham and Burstall area.

By offering mitigation to one half of the community by taking down the smaller pylons of the existing 132kv line, National Grid are asking those residents to condemn their friends, neighbours and even close family members to horrendous further blight by having to suffer a new line of giant pylons that will run parallel with the existing 440kv pylon line.

National Grid are well aware that a house is the most expensive purchase most people will ever make. Not only is it their home, where they will bring up their family, in many cases it will need to provide for health and social care in later years and will also be a large contributor to pension funds.

Therefore it comes as no surprise that people will try to protect this valuable asset at all cost. There is no doubt that National Grid reneging on their long promised consultation on 2A/2B has only exacerbated the situation. The inevitable result is the fracture of our communities.

The fact that National Grid have tried to exploit this circumstance has always been morally

repugnant, but we now find that it is also against the letter and the spirit of planning law.

National Policy Statement EN-1

4.2.2 To consider the potential effects, including benefits, of a proposal for a project,

the IPC will find it helpful if the applicant sets out information on the likely significant social and economic effects of the development, and show any likely significant negative effects would be avoided or This information mitigated.

could include matters such as employment, equality, community cohesion and well-being.

It is obvious that National Grid's so called mitigation is the antithesis of community cohesion and well-being. The solution is simple and is provided by SCC's Michael Wilks in his excellent Addendum;

An underground solution would have long term benefits for this area in that regard.

5. Planning:

Application No. B/12/00773/FUL

Location: Vine Cottage, Duke Street, Hintlesham, Ipswich, IP8 3PL

Proposal: Erection of two-story detached dwelling with integral single garage and construction of new Vehicular access to serve Vine Cottage.

The Councillors looked at this application and took into consideration the Entrance to new and old property in relation to the road, also the Chairman felt that it was not in alignment with the other properties and felt that on previous applications for the properties next door they had to be moved forward to be within the Village Envelope. . The Chairman was to look at the Local Plan, which she did and it did show that the new property was outside the Village Envelope. Therefore the Council **Objected** to this application on the grounds that it was outside of the Village Envelope.

6. Wind Turbine Meeting 15th August, 2012. Belstead Village Hall. 7.30pm.

Request for representative from Parish Council to attend.

The Chairman had been to a Meeting at Burstall Village Hall and at this Meeting the Chairman of Belstead Parish Council spoke in great length about the problems his Parish was having with potential Wind Turbines in their area.

They were asking for support of neighbouring parishes to attend the above meeting.

Following a brief discussion on this matter, the Parish Council agreed that Margaret and Robert Taylor would attend plus the Chairman Mrs. Stephanie Coupland.

The Meeting closed at approx: 8.50pm

Open to Members of the Public: Mr. Mower was also concerned about the new entrance on the top of the hill by Vine Cottage and the ever increasing traffic and parking along Duke street.