



# MELTON PARISH COUNCIL



**Chairman: Councillor GK Butterwick**

**MPC(09)EPM01**

**Minutes** of an extraordinary parish meeting on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2009 in St Andrew's Church Station Road Melton IP12 1PX commencing at 19:45 and of the continued meeting on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2009 at St Andrews Church Station Road Melton IP12 1PX commencing at 19:45

## **Meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2009:**

### **Present:**

Cllr Mr GK Butterwick [Chairman – Melton Parish Council]  
115 Members of the Public [many more attended but failed to sign the register]  
9 Melton Parish Councillors

### **In Attendance:**

Cllr Mr A Smith [Deputy Leader - Suffolk Coastal District Council]  
Mr R Chamberlain [Principal Planner (Major Projects) – Suffolk Coastal District Council]  
Mr R Ward [Director – Suffolk Preservation Society]  
Mrs DM Sheldon [Suffolk Preservation Society]  
Cllr Mrs CE Aitchison [County Councillor]  
Cllr Mr MN Bond [District Councillor]  
Cllr Mr J Bidwell [District Councillor]  
Mr Richard Smith [East Anglian Daily Times]  
Mr MJ Green [Clerk to Melton Parish Council]  
Mrs H Palmer [Assistant Clerk to Melton Parish Council]

### **Apologies:**

Cllr Miss DE Dann [Melton Parish Council]  
Cllr Mrs JE Eckersley [Melton Parish Council]  
Mr PJ Ridley [Head of Planning Services – Suffolk Coastal District Council]

## **Continued Meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2009**

### **Present;**

Cllr Mr GK Butterwick [Chairman – Melton Parish Council]  
31 Members of the Public [several more attended but failed to sign the register]  
6 Melton Parish Councillors

### **In Attendance:**

Cllr Mrs CE Aitchison [County Councillor]  
Mr MJ Green [Clerk to Melton Parish Council]  
Mrs H Palmer [Assistant Clerk to Melton Parish Council]

### **Apologies:**

Cllr Mr MN Bond [District Councillor]  
Cllr Miss DE Dann [Melton Parish Council]  
Cllr Mrs JE Eckersley [Melton Parish Council]  
Cllr Mrs EJJ Hilson [Melton Parish Council]  
Mr G Ackers [Resident]

## **09.01 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Cllr Geof Butterwick – Chairman Melton Parish Council – welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the panel of speakers [Cllr Smith, Mr Chamberlain & Mr Ward] for giving their valuable time. He explained that the format for the first part of the meeting would be presentations by each of the speakers on the Girdlestone Site Development followed by questions and answers. The second part of the meeting would be looking into

the aspirations of local people for the future development of the village to allow the parish council to respond effectively to the district council's consultation process the on Local Development Framework.

**09.02 MINUTES OF ANNUAL PARISH MEETING HELD ON 24<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2008**

**This item was taken out of sequence at the continued extraordinary meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2009.**

**It was RESOLVED** that minutes MPC(08)M-APM of the annual parish meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2008 previously circulated be received noted and signed as a correct record by the chairman.

**Proposed by:** Cllr Butterwick

**Seconded by:** Cllr Brockett

**09.03 POSITION STATEMENT - MELTON PARISH COUNCIL**

A paper setting out the position of Melton Parish Council in relation to the Design Brief for the former Girdlestone Pumps Site had been previously made available to speakers and members of the public.

The Chairman highlighted the following key points:

- The importance of the site within Melton's community and the Parish Council's keenness to see development of this site in a way that is appropriate and sensitive to the surrounding area. The previous application submitted for the site was not appropriate and was withdrawn in June 2008.
- The parish council therefore believe an appropriate way forward is for SCDC to develop a Design Brief working with the local community to cover the above points mentioned. This could then help both the planners and developers when considering future applications in relation to the preferences of local people.
- Any development of the former Girdlestone Pumps site needs to take account of the following issues; types of use, density of use, impact on the local environment and people, impact on local transport network, and building and design standards.
- The Parish Council is aware of the interest shown in both the Girdlestone and adjoining CEL sites and in addition the approved plan for a railway station car park and believes the Design Brief should cover all 3 sites.

The Chairman was encouraged by the involvement of all parties present at this meeting and hoped that subsequent discussions would lead to an inclusive form of planning taking into account local people.

**09.04 POSITION STATEMENT - SUFFOLK COASTAL DISTRICT COUNCIL**

A paper setting out the position of Suffolk Coastal District Council in relation to the Design Brief for the former Girdlestone Pumps Site had been previously made available to speakers and members of the public.

Cllr Andy Smith and Mr Bob Chamberlain highlighted the following key points:

- SCDC advised that the original planning application received to develop the Girdlestone site was withdrawn and was believed to be inappropriate with regards to its design and scale, traffic flow issues, landscaping and impact on the village. SCDC has not taken a formal view on any future application and will consider future applications based on the appropriate planning legislation.
- SCDC acknowledged Melton Parish Council's request for a design brief.
- SCDC discussed the general planning situation at the current time. The Council is only able to consider planning applications, or adopt planning policies, in line with legislation and associated regulation in force at any given time. Until the Local Development Framework is complete the preceding Local Plan system remains in use in part.
- SCDC advised that whilst legally possible to prepare a Design Brief for the site under Policy AP242 this was not recommended best practice in that future design briefs should now be prepared under the emerging LDF. In any event a formal process would take some time to complete during which it was anticipated that a further planning application would be made.
- SCDC reiterated it had received and understood the views of the local community with respect to this site, but also emphasised that they have to work within the current planning system.
- SCDC advised they did expect a re-submission of the Developers application in a modified form.

#### **09.05 POSITION STATEMENT – SUFFOLK PRESERVATION SOCIETY**

Mr Richard Ward outlined the position of Suffolk Preservation Society in relation to the Design Brief for the former Girdlestone Pumps Site.

The following is a summary of the key points:

- The planning system is dynamic and moves forward and there is flexibility within the Local Plan when circumstances dictate.
- The Sustainable Communities Act and government planning guidance suggest local people know what's best for their area and there needs to be a way forward in this case that incorporates what local people would like to see.
- The LDF is an opportunity for villagers to comment on what they want for their village and to influence planning documents.
- There was a need for further dialogue and to move forward from the design brief in this way.

#### **09.06 QUESTIONS & ANSWERS - GIRDLESTONE**

The following is a summary of the key questions asked by members of the public together with the relevant answers from the speakers.

**09.06.01 Parishioner Question** - Parishioner first gave a statement of position on behalf of the Girdlestone Action Group. Can you tell us what you can do to help us and what do we have to do to help you?

- **Panel Response** - The panel reiterated that, from meeting representatives from the Council and Girdlestone Action group, they are aware of the issues and concerns the community has. They advised it will always be difficult to bring together the 2 visions of developer and community. The first plan put forward for the site was unacceptable.
- The panel advised it was very difficult to respond to the Parishioner's question at the current time. Any consideration for the Girdlestone site would work within the current planning legislation and regulation. Further details of the current planning system have been previously circulated in SCDC position statement document.

**09.06.02 Parishioner Question** - As Girdlestone site is zoned for industrial use, is it part of the LDF framework?

- **Panel Response** - The Panel advised that the Girdlestone site could continue with its existing use of manufacturing, however, any proposed different use would have to go through the planning process. It is unlikely in the LDF that we will have a specific policy relating to the Girdlestone site, more likely SCDC will have a framework which we will have to interpret for development of this site. The panel reiterated that SCDC would try and avoid a potential conflict situation with the community and be open to suggestions.

**09.06.03 Parishioner Question** - Was the developer invited to tonight's meeting?

- **Panel Response** - This meeting is a public meeting and therefore is open to any member of the public who wishes to attend. The Chairman commented that a specific invitation was not issued to the Developer. The developer is aware of the views of the community, but the parish council had heard nothing from them since April 2008.

**09.06.04 Parishioner Question** - Is the LDF a constraint or a process we can embrace? Are there different commercial uses that may apply to this site, for instance has live/work units been considered?

- **Panel Response** - The LDF in part is a constraint but does contain processes to suggest ideas, however we do have to stay within its processes. We do want Melton to come up with a response to the LDF and we will do our best to accommodate it.
- There is nothing to rule out live/work units for the one third of the site which is not considered on a flood plane. It can be difficult to get mortgages for this type of unit which makes the market very small and there have been few previous examples of this

type of use. In theory it's not ruled out, but it would be difficult to accommodate on this site.

**09.06.05 Parishioner Question** - At a meeting I attended with Bob Chamberlain, he stated he did not have a clear understanding of what the village wanted. Given the circumstances why is a design brief not appropriate?

- **Panel Response** - The panel commented that SCDC did not have a consensual view as to what the community wanted, but did understand the community's varied views. They also stated that a consensual view probably would not exist.
- With regards to a design brief the panel referred back to SCDC statement of position.

**09.06.06 Parishioner Question** - I would like to understand how likely it is that a similar size application would be accepted for the site. Is there any likelihood that the Developer only need make minor amendments to the initial application for this and for it then to be approved?

- **Panel Response** - It is not appropriate to give any indication on how we may judge an application which has not yet been received. The Panel agreed the original application was inappropriate against a number of criteria. Any future application would be assessed within the planning process.

**09.06.07 Parishioner Question** - Do you have any indication if and when a future application may be received?

- **Panel Response** - SCDC advised they did expect a re-submission of the Developers application in a modified form.

#### **CIlr GK BUTTERWICK - CHAIRMAN MELTON PARISH COUNCIL CONCLUDED THE Q&A SESSION.**

The Chairman welcomed the suggestion from the speakers that a meeting be arranged with the planning authorities, local community representatives and representatives of the developers and owners to share the various views expressed during the meeting and to try to find a way forward that would meet need of all. Mr Bob Chamberlain agreed to make the appropriate arrangement.

**DUE TO THE LATENESS OF THE HOUR THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 21:30 TO BE CONTINUED ON 4<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2009 COMMENCING AT 19:45 AT THE SAME VENUE.**

#### **09.07 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Details of the consultation had been available on the parish council website through the following links: [www.melton-suffolk-pc.gov.uk/PDF-currentevents/MPC\(08\)P240.pdf](http://www.melton-suffolk-pc.gov.uk/PDF-currentevents/MPC(08)P240.pdf) and on the district council website at [www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/review/default.htm](http://www.suffolkcoastal.gov.uk/yourdistrict/planning/review/default.htm).

A display had been erected in the church giving details of the various proposals in the consultation document.

The Chairman gave a brief background to the LDF consultation process after which the meeting split into break-out groups to consider the following questions:

**09.07.01 Do you think that the Playing Field and Leeks Hill [Burkes Wood] should be within the Town Limit?**

Group 1: No – should be rural/no development. Also include (in the exclusion) Melton Mead & Melton Hall (see Q3).

Group 2: No. Separate this area off from both town and village boundaries and protect it as a corridor of countryside.

Group 3: No.

Group 4: The town limit should not include the Playing Field and Leeks Hill (Burkes Wood) instead these should be classified as countryside/rural and protected from development.

**09.07.02 Do you have any other suggestions for changing the Town Limit (red line on map)?**

Group 1: No.

Group 2: No.

Group 3: Yes – exclude parks & east side of Leeks Hill houses & gardens. Best if it followed Woodbridge / Melton parish boundary.

Group 4: No other suggestions for town boundary.

**09.07.03 Do you have any suggestions for changing the Physical Limit Boundary for Melton Village Limit (green line on map)?**

Group 1: Possibly take out Melton Mead & Melton Hall corner (see Q1).

Group 2: Majority of group thought we should NOT change the village boundary at all EXCEPT to possibly include plot 634b.

Group 3: No.

Group 4: No suggestions for Melton Village boundary.

**09.07.04 Should there be the Physical Limit Boundary for Melton Park (brown line on map)? If so, should it include Site 501a and/or Site 501b?**

Group 1: All – some thought that this would be a good area for development, but not the woods.

Group 2: Missed this question

Group 3: No.

Group 4: Melton Park should have a physical limit boundary if this would constrain development on the site, not if it would result in enabling further development of the site. There was a strong feeling in the group that the heritage of the site should be protected and that it is part of Melton and should remain part of Melton - it is part of the identity of the community.

**09.07.05 Should Melton Village be classed as a 'Key Service Centre' or a 'Local Service Centre'? NB See Settlement Hierarchy and Table 1.**

Group 1: 'Local Service Centre'.

Group 2: 'Local Service Centre'.

Group 3: 'Local Service Centre' (see briefing notes).

Group 4: Melton Village should be classified as a Local Service Centre; not a Key Service Centre.

**09.07.06 Should Melton Park be classed as a 'Local Service Centre' or an 'Other Village'? NB See settlement hierarchy and table 1.**

Group 1: 'Other Village' - doesn't meet criteria for a 'Local Service Centre'.

Group 2: 'Other Village'.

Group 3: 'Other Village'.

Group 4: Melton Park should be classified as a Local Village.

**09.07.07 Do you have any other comments?**

Group 1: Like the open aspect on the north of Woods Lane.

Group 2: Pay attention to the special areas of Melton that should be protected as they maintain its unique character, streetscape etc. KEEP the close rural areas which allow people to get to the countryside / footpaths without having to use a car. The Girdlestons / CEL (possible 634b area) should be developed so that this side of Melton becomes a new centre for the village and takes the weight of traffic away from The Street. Better pedestrian / cycle access down Woods Lane between the school and the estate is very important. Put some parking restrictions around the Village Shop as this makes the entry into Saddlemakers Lane very dangerous. Speed restrictions on Saddlemakers Lane.

Group 3: Concerns re consultation process.

Would like opportunity to comment on LDF Sustainability Assessment.

Group 4: There was no desire for an enlargement of the village boundaries; instead it was felt that development should consolidate the current settlement. Particular regard should be made to the character of the village and in particular the preservation of trees and other items in the physical landscape. The development of the village should have regards to the future use of it by local people and in particular elderly people. There are sites that it is acceptable to local people to see developed including the Girdlestons site and Carters, but they should be developed (as above) with respect to future use of local people.

