

**Minutes of Playford Parish Council Meeting held at the Village Hall
at 6.00pm on Wednesday, 26th March 2014**

Present: Mrs Joan Metcalfe - Chairman
Mr Stephen Hicks – Vice-Chairman
Mrs Veronica Bunbury - Councillor
Mr Bob Coppillie - Councillor
Mr Tim Llewellyn - Councillor

In attendance:
Ms Marian Rosling - Clerk

Also present: Mrs Sue Kennedy
Mr Eric Metcalfe
Mr Jeremy Gray
Mr Ted Herrington
Mrs Sally Herrington
Mr Bill Johnson

Apologies for Absence.
Mr Steven Hudson – District Councillor

- 1. Welcome & Introduction**
Joan Metcalfe opened the meeting and welcomed the various members of the public.
- 2. Declarations of Members' Interests in any items on this Agenda.**
No members of the council declared any interests.
- 3. Planning Application: ref: DC/14/0783/FUL**

Proposed: Erection of dwelling and garage (Revised scheme to approved C04/1935 & refused DC/13/3353/FUL).

Address: Part of garden SW of Sevenoaks, Butts Road, Playford, Ipswich IP6 9DP.

The plans were displayed before the meeting and viewed by councillors and members of the public. The floor area of the new plans is bigger than the previously refused plans but the garage has been taken out of the equation. The new house is substantially different from the original plans passed in 2004 and is approx 70% bigger. The front extension is low so not quite so much would be seen from the road, but it will be more obvious from the rear. It was suggested that the new house should not be more than 50% bigger than the original plans if it were to comply with permitted development rights, but the total is 70% bigger if the garage is included.

Signed

Ted Herrington pointed out that the answers to Question's 4 - 10 were missing from the application document.

Bill Johnson commented that a new window on the side of the building which faces Copyhold was higher than the previous version and that this would overlook the next door premises.

Jeremy Gray felt that there were large gaps in the information supplied – e.g. no measurements were given between the hedge at the front and the front of the building. It was also impossible to adequately compare these plans with the originals as we only had a small summary of the original plans with no measurements supplied. It appears that no-one from SCDC planning dept. has checked the measurements on-site.

Steve Hicks felt the scale of the proposed building is still out of scale with the site.

Tim Llewellyn thought that the new proposals were an improvement on the previous plans – but these were refused on the grounds of being contrary to SCDC Local Plan Core Strategy & Development Policies DPD Policy DM21 (Design Aesthetics) & DM23 (Residential Amenity) and this would still apply to the new plans.

Serious concerns were voiced over the installation of a BioDisc as there is no watercourse to discharge it into. The alternative might be a soakaway but this would need to be 5m from the building and there is no room. There is no mention of 'Grey Water' disposal anywhere in the plans.

Tim Llewellyn mentioned a clause that existing hedges surrounding the site could not be touched for 5 years – this may be problematical as some are Leylandii which are notorious for blocking drains and upsetting foundations.

Joan Metcalfe proposed to refuse acceptance of the plans on the following grounds:

- a) The building is still too large for the site. Regulations say that permitted development should be no more than 50% of the original floor area and the new plans will represent a 70% increase. *
- b) Due consideration has not been given to the sub-surface irrigation system. The proposed installation of a BioDisc is not satisfactory and we consider that it should be a condition that Building Regulations will be in place before building work commences.
- c) Answers to Questions 4 – 10 are missing from the application document.
- d) Inaccuracies exist between front elevation and ground floor plans and insufficient measurements were supplied regarding distance between front hedge and commencement of front of building.

** Further research since the meeting has shown that it is the area of curtilage which is taken in to consideration when the 50% rule for extensions is applied not the floor area of the building. However, this would not change the recommendations of the Council.*

Signed

The above was seconded by Tim Llewellyn.

Tim Llewellyn will attend the SCDC planning meeting on Thursday 3rd April to expound the above views.

4. AOB

At the previous meeting, District Councillor Steve Hudson had said there was grant money up to £2000.00 available to be spent in the parish. It was suggested that the village notice board was in need of refurbishment and it was decided that the clerk should contact Jeremy Hearle for a quote in respect of this.

Date of next meeting:

Wednesday 7th May 2014 at 7.30pm (AGM), immediately after APM at 7pm

The meeting ended at 6.50pm

Signed