

Hartest Parish Council

Minutes of the meeting held in The School on Thursday 5 January 2006 at 7.00pm

Present: Cllrs James Long (Chairman), Mary Gough (Vice-Chairman), Rachel Irvine, David Loxton, Robin Oaten, Jo Pask.

Apologies for absence: Cllr John Schofield (previously arranged holiday).

Attending: Mr David Morbey (Clerk to the Council), 3 members of the public.

The Chairman opened the meeting by wishing everyone a happy new year.

06/1 Declarations of interest none

06/2 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2005

The minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

proposed: Cllr Pask, seconded: Cllr Loxton **Approved**

06/3 Public Forum due to the nature of the meeting which required feedback from members of the Parish Plan Group, the comments from them were taken on an as and when required basis throughout the meeting.

06/4 Parish Plan – consideration of 2nd draft of the Parish Plan

It was agreed that this item would be taken before agenda item 5 – Planning.

There was general approval for the 2nd draft of the Parish Plan. Councillors were pleased with the revised content and written style and happy to comment on the document without the additional charts and photographs which would be included in the final document. Some areas of concern were raised (in no particular priority order):

- a. "Religion" It was felt that the title did not reflect the content which was mainly secular and dealt with the church as a building rather than a spiritual place of worship. It was also felt that the importance of the church as an historic monument should be included in the description of Hartest.
- b. "The School" It was suggested that it was not a right to make greater use of the school, and that this could be re-phrased to suggest that closer links might be forged. It was felt that the term facilities (Draft page 16) should not be used, but that this section could be re-written to make it more expansive. This point about facility should also apply under "Religion".
- c. "Introduction" The last point of "Purpose of the Parish Plan" appears to be meaningless.
- d. The general point was made that the devising of the questionnaire would have carried more academic and impartial weight if correlations were drawn between the Hartest questions and government or even european statistics / projections / policies by reference made to published documents.
- e. "Review of property values" It was felt that the present wording suggested a full formal review had been undertaken on behalf of the group whereas the survey had in fact been rather more ad hoc albeit by a professional valuer. It was suggested that the review be described as an informal review and to remove the reference to the review being carried out on behalf of the Parish Plan.
- f. There was no reference to the Parish Council as a contributor to the Plan, nor was it included in the thanks page.
- g. "Allotments" There was discussion over the term "significant numbers" when in fact the numbers were only 23. It was felt that this term should be re-considered.
- h. Omissions. It was noted that there were some important omissions from the draft: the Cemetery, part time working from home, the elderly. It was accepted that because the data had not been requested in the questionnaire, it was difficult to include any comment, summary or recommendations, but that there may be scope to at least note these omissions within the document.
- i. "Village Trust" In response to a question, the concept of a village trust was outlined by members of the Parish Plan Group present. Council was concerned that the formation of a trust seemed to be a definite proposal and suggested re-wording the section so that the formation of a village trust might be suggested as a way to carry some recommendations forward.
- j. Possible conflict between recommendations and Babergh DC policy. Members of the Parish Plan Group present said that it was not necessarily their aim to provide recommendations which accorded with Babergh Policy but rather to provide recommendations which were right for the village.
- k. "Footpaths" The correct position is that footpaths are under the control of SCC Rights of Way Department, and not jointly administered with HPC.
- l. Some spelling errors were noted and these will be passed on to Mr Carpenter by Cllr Pask **Action Cllr Pask**

At the request of The Chairman, The Clerk suggested to Council that each recommendation should be considered separately because these would be the most important features of the Plan. He also suggested that some could be made more specific. The Chairman asked Council to consider these suggestions and while there was limited support for reviewing each recommendation, Council felt that this was not necessary and that because of the pressure of work which might arise from more detailed recommendations, they were best left unchanged. The

Clerk also expressed disappointment that the Youth Survey section was so short and had not produced its own recommendations. Members of the Parish Plan Group said there had been only a limited response to the questionnaire and that it was therefore difficult to draw meaningful results from it.

It was agreed that the comments made at this meeting would be sent in the form of a draft minute for review by the Parish Plan Group and that this and the Chairman's Introduction would be given to the Group before, at or immediately after the next meeting on 16th January. In the week after this, one copy of the final draft would be sent to the Clerk, so that Council members would have a final chance to quickly check the document before it goes to print.

06/5 Planning

a. Babergh decisions:

B/04/2147 further amended. Part garden of Ballingdon Yard Cottage, Hartest Hill, IP294ET Erection of single-storey detached dwelling. Alterations to existing vehicular access (existing outbuildings to be demolished), as amended by agent's letter dated 23 June 2005 and drawing numbers 003, 004 rev 01 and 007 rev 01 all received by the Local Planning Authority on 24 June 2005 and subsequently amended by drawing no's 1604/003C-01 and 005/C-02 received on 13th October 2005. Granted

B/05/1882 The Old Chapel, The Green, IP294DH. Removal of 1 No, Yew tree and 1 No. Conifer tree. No tree preservation order required

B/05/1372 Barns at Townsend farm, Melford Road, IP294JN Conversion of agricultural buildings to 2 (No.) dwellings. Granted

Council was concerned that applications which had been opposed had been granted permission and it was agreed that the Babergh documents would be circulated to Councillors for consideration of possible action. It was also suggested that Babergh site meetings could be requested in the future.

b. to consider planning applications

B/05/1938 Tan Office Farm, Cross Green, IP294ED Application for Listed Building Consent - Insertion of 2 no. windows and 1 no. door in north elevation; insertion of dormer window in west roof slope elevation; insertion of 1 no. window in south elevation, internal and external alterations.

The application was unanimously supported. The sensitivity to the historical importance of the building and the great attention to detailing is commended. Action Clerk

c. to consider any other applications received:

one application received, but agreed to take this at the 16th January meeting. A site meeting would be arranged before this. Action Clerk

06/6 Date of next meeting – Monday 16 January 2006 at 7.00pm in The Institute

The meeting closed at 8.35pm.