

**Minutes of Playford Parish Council Meeting held at Playford Village Hall
at 7.00pm on Tuesday 1st June 2021**

Present: Mrs Joan Metcalfe – Chairman
Mr Ted Herrington – Councillor
Mr Keith Carson – Councillor
Mr Martin Hill – Councillor
Mr Ben Evans – Councillor
Mr Colin Hedgley - District Councillor

In attendance: Mrs Marian Hedgley – Clerk

Also present:

Mr Jasper Dormer
Mrs Michelle Dormer
Mrs Sue Kennedy
Mrs Trish Laws
Mr Simon Hanson
Mrs Tracy Hanson
Mrs Ursula Richards
Mr Glen Thimblethorpe

Apologies for Absence:

Mr Steve Hicks
Mr Adrian Melrose

Declarations of Members' Interests in any items on this Agenda - none

1. Planning Application: ref: DC/21/2186/FUL

Applicant: Mr & Mrs William Stennett

Address: Lux Farm, Playford, IP5 1DA

Proposed: New cart lodge, swimming pool & ancillary spaces and holistic landscape proposal providing enhanced bio-diversity.

Chairman Joan Metcalfe opened the meeting at 7pm. The applicants were unable to attend and the plans which had been considered by all councillors prior to the meeting were discussed in more detail and shown on the overhead screen.

No objections were raised to any of the proposals.

JM proposed that the PC should support the application and this was unanimously agreed by those present. The Clerk will convey this to the Planning Team at East Suffolk Council via their website.

Signed

2. **Planning Application DC/21/2171/FUL**

Applicant: Mr J Dormer

Address: The Piggeries, Butts Road, Playford, IP6 1DP.

Proposed: Erection of a detached dwelling (in lieu of the existing permission to convert & extend the existing building).

The plans which had been viewed by all councillors prior to the meeting were displayed on the overhead screen.

JM welcomed the applicant and his wife to the meeting and asked why they had changed from the original plans agreed in Sept 2020. Applicant replied saying the new building would be unique, more modern and the improved position would use the site better. A new build would be more efficient, greener, better for the environment, and would reduce carbon emissions. They are also proposing to build a wildlife pond on the site with public access and to put aside additional land to be developed as being environmentally friendly for wildlife.

A local resident was concerned that the overall building would be bigger than the original piggeries building but was assured by the applicant that this was not the case. BE asked for the size of the total footprint of the 3 buildings and how it compared to the new building but this was not established. He also said he would like to see a more positive statement about installing a heat source pump.

KC liked the design and thought it would be an asset to the village.

JM said that ESC had refused the addition of a porch on the original piggeries revamp as it would increase the size of the original footprint and not comply with the terms of Part Q that the permission was originally allowed under – therefore it was not likely that they would pass these new plans as it totally went against their previous criteria.

TH stated the plans contravened Local Plan Policy SCLP 5.3 regarding Building in the Countryside and therefore should not be permitted – he also wanted to know if there would be a tree survey. Applicant replied they intended to put in more trees and hedges. TH was concerned that the existing piggeries building would not be demolished as it is very close to the neighbours’ boundary and they would possibly have to endure noise if this was used as a work shop or garage.

CH asked why the change from the original plans - the only reason development was allowed on the site in the first place was because of the Part Q clause saying that just the footprint of the existing buildings could be used and that only one storey was to be permitted. Applicant replied saying that they have already been given permission to live there by virtue of the fact that the piggeries development was permitted by the previous application and so this right has now been established and can be modified.

KC (Neighbourhood Plan Chairman) said that the NP would need to be looked at carefully to see if the application complied. The Local Plan would be more difficult to negotiate as the District Council will quote Part Q objections. If Part Q was ignored, then Building in the Countryside restrictions would apply.

Signed

TH enquired whether pre-application advice had been sought and was told that plans for a 2-storey house had been turned down at a pre-app consultation but current plans had not been put through this procedure.

A neighbour asked that if plans for this application were permitted, would it open the gate for additional houses on the site? This was thought not to be as the only reason the original plans were agreed was due to the Part Q clause. Another neighbour said she would rather it was only one house sooner than the two originally planned but she would like an undertaking that no more trees were felled. Also it would be beneficial if screening were put in place along the driveway so that headlights could not be seen by any of the neighbours at night – this has already been put forward and agreed with another neighbour.

Siting of solar panels, grey water disposal and fitting of heat source pumps were discussed but these are not subjects covered by planning permission.

JM asked for a vote on who would support the application and it was passed 4:1 in favour but with reservations expressed about the implications of “Building in the Countryside” and concerns about the former piggeries building being converted to a garage/workshop. The Clerk will convey this to the Planning Team at East Suffolk Council via their website.

The applicant then thanked the parish council for their support and understanding of this project and extended a welcome to anyone from the parish who would like to visit the site and ask any further questions.

3. **AOB - none**

The meeting ended at 8.05pm

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 14th July 2021 at 7pm

Signed