

RAYDON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 17 DECEMBER 2020 VIA ZOOM

Present:	Faith Backhouse (FB) Stephen Coe (SC) Jane Cryer - Clerk (JC) Keith Lovering (KL) Jim Lowe (JL) Sue Newton - Chairman (SN) Amanda Pyall - Vice Chairman (AP) Trevor Sayer (TS) Jayne Tann (JT)
In attendance:	Gordon Jones - Suffolk CC (GJ) John Ward - Babergh DC (JW) Chris Waters - Director, BVGC Katy Sparks - Planning Consultant, BVGC Parishioners
Apologies:	Sigi Steer (SS)

20.12.1P APOLOGIES

Apologies were accepted from SS.

20.12.2P DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None (KL noted that his property was mentioned in the application).

20.12.3P PUBLIC FORUM

Planning application DC/20/05024 - Brett Vale Golf Club

Chris Waters, owner and director of Brett Vale Golf Club, explained that he had purchased the course in 2007 having been a member since 1999, and now lived on site. He had invested heavily in the business, which he said had not made a profit initially; he had recently spent a further sum on the new lodges. A recent application for houses to be built on the site had been turned down. Mr Waters emphasised the need to compete with Stoke by Nayland and other courses in the area and said his aim was to make it the best course in East Anglia. He also said he could be facing bankruptcy if this planning application was not approved. In response to a question from SN about how the proposed development would benefit Raydon, he said it would enhance the area and benefit residents; schools and the community would be able to use it as a venue, and villagers would be able to continue to walk around it. Mr Waters went on to say the proposal was not to create a landfill site. Lorries would be bringing soil from local developments, not London; a parishioner commented that if the development was to rely on local waste only, it could take longer than two years to obtain sufficient supply. There was also concern expressed that the material would not be 'just soil'; the planning applications stated 'construction and demolition waste', which could include gravel, ceramics, bricks, concrete, sand and clays etc. Mr Waters' planning consultant, Katy Sparks, agreed that they could not control the composition of the waste. However, she confirmed that all material had to be tested three times in order to meet Environment Agency criteria. In response to a question about job creation, Mr Waters said he was aiming for at least six additional employees; however, his application stated two or three. The main objections to the proposal were:

- Damage to roads and verges
- Air pollution;
- Noise pollution;
- Loss of trees - in response to a question from JT, Mr Waters referred to felling of birch trees between 25-30 years old (however, the expected life of birch trees is understood to be 50-60 years). It was noted that there were also some oak trees to be felled, although

not near the end of their lives. Mr Waters said they would be replaced but was unable to confirm the age of the replacements;

- Health issues - a local doctor was concerned as there was no safe level of particulate pollution, which would be detrimental to anyone with lung disease or cardiovascular problems;
- Increased traffic and road safety - it was not possible for a lorry to turn from the B1070 into Noaks Road without going onto the verge. SN noted that traffic going through the village would be turning into Noaks Road just before where pedestrians and mobility scooters etc were crossing the road; she said the crossing on the B1070 prior to Noaks Road would need to be improved. The Four Sisters junction was known to be dangerous, particularly for lorries leaving and rejoining the road. A large number of lorries would be visiting the site on a daily basis for at least two years, using quiet, narrow, rural lanes used by cyclists (Noaks Road was on Regional Cycle Route 48), walkers and horse riders. This would have an impact on the Quiet Lanes Suffolk initiative, which the PC was involved with;
- Light pollution;
- Although not actually within the AONB, the site was within the setting. It appeared that an Environmental Impact Assessment had not been carried out, which was required under the Town & Country Planning Act. Residents were concerned about the potential loss of tranquillity and lack of information about the irrigation pond. There was concern about the impact on wildlife and whether any seasonal considerations had been taken into account;
- A resident expressed concern about the possible negative impact of the proposed development on her dressage / livery business; it was likely owners would remove their horses if the development went ahead.

GJ said his main concerns were highways and environmental issues, including gravel extraction; Katy Sparks said the only excavation would be material to be re-used on site. GJ said it was clear that the application was more about mineral and waste issues and should have been submitted to Suffolk CC rather than Babergh. He understood that the applicant had not accepted that, despite it being the view of both planning authorities. JW commented that it would have been helpful if the applicant had taken pre-application advice; KL queried why the Parish Council had not received prior notice of the application.

20.12.4P PLANNING APPLICATION DC/20/05024

Following the Public Forum, Parish Council members discussed the application. KL said the proposal for improvements to the golf course facilities would be welcomed where they made the recreational offer more attractive and viable. However, the proposal to import massive amounts of landfill in order to facilitate the improvements was an attempt to create a disassociated revenue stream and, as such, was incongruous with the environment as:

- It would lead to the destruction of natural and established habitat for fauna and flora;
- There was no commitment within the proposal to benefit or enhance the environment;
- There would be excessive pollution through noise, dust and gases during the 2-3 year period of construction. No pollution mitigation proposal had been produced.

Conclusions

- If the Club was not viable now, it was likely to remain so; therefore a full business case should be produced;
- A traffic management plan should be produced;
- A further extension to the deadline for comments should be requested;
- SCC and BDC should be formally asked to resolve which authority is responsible and a site visit requested;
- The final decision should be made by committee, not delegated to an individual;
- If the application was approved, there should be a decision on who would pay to repair the roads and verges;
- Babergh should be asked to clarify the position with regard to S106.
