

**MINUTES OF KERSEY PARISH COUNCIL EXTRAORDINARY MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 28 SEPTEMBER 2017
IN KERSEY VILLAGE HALL AT 6 PM**

PRESENT

John Hume – Chair, Veronica Partridge, Yvonne Martin, Andrew Rogers, Giles Hollingworth (for part of the meeting), 4 members of the public (1 left early) and the Clerk – Sarah Partridge

128/17 APOLOGIES – were received and accepted from Iqbal Alam and Kevin Pratt.

129/17 ACCEPT MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - None

130/17 CONSIDER ANY DISPENSATION REQUESTS FOR PECUNIARY INTERESTS RECEIVED FROM COUNCILLORS – None received

131/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2017 were signed and dated as being correct.

132/17 TO DISCUSS AND AGREE A RESPONSE TO THE BABERGH AND MID SUFFOLK JOINT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

The Chair commented that the proposed new Joint Local Plan was a very important document because it will affect everyone in both Districts and sets out planning policy for the next 20 years. Responses to this consultation will be helping to shape our future. The Plan is set out in three parts:

**Strategic
Delivery
Place**

The policies set out in the plan will influence four priority areas that will have a positive impact on the future shape of the district:

**Housing
Economy
Environment
Healthy Communities and Infrastructure**

This is a large document with lots of questions. Councillors discussed the best way to respond to this consultation. One point put forward was to consider what the Parish Council wished for Kersey. After some discussion, it was agreed the best way to respond was to work through the consultation document questions. The full consultation document is available on the Babergh website.

Strategic

Vision

Qu1 The vision was discussed, it was agreed that this was rather uninspiring, something like 'A great place to live and work' would be better.

Qu2 The Parish Council did not agree entirely with the identified objectives. There was concern that the vision does not prioritise infrastructure ahead of housing.

Qu3 There is no mention of our heritage assets in the vision objectives. There should be a separate objective to protect and enhance our heritage assets. Tourism is an important economic driver for the Districts therefore, our heritage assets should be a priority. There is no mention of education in the vision. Education should be a key element of the Plan.

Qu4 The priority across both Districts should be to have sufficient people to implement the Plan, strategies and policies.

Qu5 Protection of heritage assets is one of the most important priorities for Kersey.

Duty of Cooperate

Qu5 & 6 No comments.

Delivery

Housing - Housing Requirement

Qu7 The Parish Council considers that there is not enough detail to be able to comment on option HR1. There needs to be more transparent calculations and forecasts.

Qu8 The Parish Council considers that HD2 was the best option because no contingency is required. Previously Babergh has overestimated the housing need. The forecasts for housing need should be kept under regular review.

Qu9 To assist in delivery of housing there should be dis-incentives to delay construction once planning permission has been granted. Measures could be introduced for large scale developments of more than 4 houses to reduce the expiry time for planning permission down from 3 years to 1 year or to levy council tax if development is not completed within one year from planning permission being granted. More regular matching of actual need against the forecasts would be helpful.

Qu10 No comment.

Review of the Settlement Hierarchy

The Parish Council discussed the data used to decide the hierarchy of Kersey as a hinterland village. It was suggested that there may be a possibility to get Kersey downgraded from a hinterland village to the status of hamlet and countryside. After some discussion, it was agreed that Kersey was clearly a village and it was unknown what future implications there may be for trying to downgrade the status of Kersey other than to prevent development. It was agreed the data used was out of date and inaccurate. It had included facilities and services such as a convenience store, post office and regular bus service which are no longer available in Kersey, but it had failed to include the playground, hairdressers, or proximity to Hadleigh as a larger employment site or as a town settlement with services. The classification of villages is based on a points system according to the services and facilities available. A hinterland village should have 9 to 17 points. After recalculating using up to date information Kersey would be in the midrange with 14 points confirming its status as a hinterland village.

Qu11 The Parish Council agrees with the proposed criteria approach to rank settlements in the hierarchy. It should be noted that some of the data used for Kersey is inaccurate.

Qu12 The Parish Council agrees with the proposed joint settlement hierarchy based on SET2.

Giles Hollingworth left the meeting.

Spatial Distribution

The Parish Council discussed the spatial distribution of housing development and how this would affect all the different settlement hierarchies, including Kersey as a hinterland village. Based on the data available approx. 350 houses are required annually in Babergh. If Hinterland villages were allocated 10% of District growth this would equate to 35 houses per annum or if 5% allocation then 17 houses per annum distributed across the 29 hinterland villages. This would mean around one house in each hinterland village per year, which although not considered ideal would be manageable.

Qu13 The Parish Council discussed the various options set out in the consultation document for how to meet the identified development needs up to 2036. It was agreed that the idea of a new settlement focused option BHD4 was not acceptable as a new settlement would not have good enough infrastructure or links to employment. BHD3 transport corridor focused option was a good idea as the development would be near to good transport links, infrastructure and jobs. The other good option was BHD1 as this would put less pressure on hinterland villages and development would be focused near to employment and the county town of Ipswich which should be a centre of excellence and focus for the whole county. The Parish Council favours BHD3.

Qu14 No comment

Qu15 BHD4 was not considered a good idea. Jobs and infrastructure need to be in place before homes are developed.

Housing Types and Affordable Housing

Qu16 Yes, the Joint Local Plan should include a requirement for new dwellings to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards.

One member of the public left the meeting.

Qu17 The Parish Council is broadly supportive of the proposed approach towards self-build and custom build dwellings.

Qu18 The Parish Council is broadly supportive of the concept of starter homes.

Qu19 There should be a provision, rather than a priority, for a variety of types and size of homes. The Parish Council would support a combination of options HM2 and HM3 which would take account of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the wider long-term needs of the population.

Qu20 In small towns and Ipswich Fringe, where this type of development would be appropriate, small blocks of flats could be considered. This would accommodate more people in a smaller space.

Qu21 There should be a role for District Councils to ensure that landlords keep rental housing in appropriate liveable standards. This needs better regulation with minimum standards, which are enforced. More higher quality private rental homes would promote renting a home as a sensible option for people.

Qu22 No comment.

Qu23 The question was not clear enough to be able to give an answer.

Qu24 Yes, there should be a preference for housing to accommodate key workers who contribute to the local community.

Qu25 When considering rural exception sites care needs to be taken to protect heritage assets. There is no doubt that there is a demand for housing for younger people who can't afford expensive houses in rural villages. After consideration the Parish Council would support RE2 if it was amended to include a clear statement about the scale of market housing included on rural exception sites. The scale should be proportionate to the site and village where the affordable housing is being delivered. Amended RE2 should read – Market housing supported on rural exception sites. Include a rural exception site policy which would support an element of market housing where this is necessary to bring the site forward and where the scale is proportionate to the site and village where the affordable housing is being delivered. The Council did not suggest a maximum percentage of market housing as it should be proportionate to the site and village where the affordable housing is to be delivered.

Rural growth and Development

Qu26 The Parish Council would support rural growth option RG1 – a policy criteria based approach.

Qu27 No other approaches to distributing development in rural areas should be considered.

Qu28 The Parish Council does not support HG2 because it is concerned that this approach might lead to large scale development of hamlets. The Parish Council supports the existing criteria based approach where each application is considered individually.

Accommodation Needs of Gypsies and Travellers

Qu29 to 32 No comments.

Economic Needs

Qu33 Babergh should continue to identify employment areas, but retain flexibility for the use should the demand change.

Qu34 No comment.

Qu35 Brownfield sites could be reallocated to other uses if it is not required for employment.

Qu36 No comment.

Qu37 No comment.

Qu38 Babergh should not allocate more land than needed to meet the forecast needs because the data is usually an overestimate of the needs, therefore, ECON1 is the appropriate option.

Qu39 No comment.

Qu40 No comment.

Qu41 The Districts should give support to new business formation by ensuring there is greater skills training available in the Districts and having an introductory business rates charge for genuine new businesses. The types of job and technology to support business by the end of this Plan will be completely different from now so skills training is vital.

Town Centres and Retail

Qu42 to 49 No comments.

Qu50 Yes, the District Councils should protect A1-A5 uses in core villages, hinterland villages and local centres within towns.

Biodiversity

Qu51 The Parish Council consider that BIO2 is the best option to protect and enhance designations, habitats and species.

Climate Change

Qu52 The Districts should choose option RE2 and develop a local renewable energy policy.

Qu53 Yes, the Districts should include water efficiency measures in new building projects.

Qu54 The Districts should be encouraging carbon neutral development, better insulation of buildings and alternative sources of heating such as ground source or air source heating.

Landscape, Heritage and Design

Qu55 The Joint Local Plan should use a combined approach to protect landscapes using both option L1 and option L2.

Qu56 This question could not be answered because there is no definition of a landscape project area.

Qu57 The Parish Council supports HA1. Protection of Heritage Assets should be integral to any planning proposals.

Qu58 The question is not well enough worded to be able to answer.

Qu59 Yes, the Joint Local Plan should take a more flexible approach towards climate change objectives where this would assist in protecting a heritage asset.

Q60 to 62 No comments.

Infrastructure

Qu63 Option INF2 is the best and more proactive approach to manage the infrastructure provision rather than the current reactive approach. Infrastructure needs to come before development.

Qu64 The key infrastructure issues in our local community are fast broadband speeds, poor mobile telephone connectivity, lack of public transport and the need to underground utilities such as telephone and electricity cables to protect heritage assets.

Qu65 Future infrastructure priorities should be better road planning across the Districts.

Qu66 No comment.

Qu67 No comment.

Qu68 Yes, provision of education should be a separate policy, education is vital to supporting a growing and healthy economy.

Healthy Communities

Qu69 The strategy of the Plan should be to increase the opportunities for growth and wealth rather than focusing on deprivation.

Qu70 More education and skills training will help to address deprivation.

Qu71 Open space, sports and community facilities should be required and protected.

Qu72 More areas of local green space should be identified and protected.

Qu73 Cycle paths, footpaths and playgrounds should be included in the definition of community facilities.

Place

Functional Clusters

Qu74 The Parish Council agrees that the approach to identifying functional clusters is appropriate for both Districts.

Settlement Boundaries

Qu75 Yes, the proposed settlement boundaries are considered to be appropriate.

Qu76 No comment.

Qu77 Yes, the threshold of 10 well related dwellings is appropriate for identifying settlement boundaries.

Potential Land for Development

Qu78 and 79 No comment.

The Parish Council was very pleased to have been able to consider and agree responses to all the consultation questions at this meeting. There was a feeling that the heritage aspect was not given enough priority in this Joint Local Plan. Given the prevalence of heritage assets across both Districts and their importance to the local economy, greater weight should be given to protecting and enhancing heritage assets. It was agreed a covering letter should be sent along with the answers to the consultation questions.

133/17 ANY OTHER BUSINESS - None

134/17 PARISH TIME - None

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.32pm.

There are no sheets appended to these minutes.