

Minutes of Tunstall Parish Council Meeting**Held on 9th February 2015 ~ 6.00pm****Present**

Cllr. Stephen Saunders (Chair)

Cllr. Andy Durham

Cllr. Kevin Ross

Cllr. John Hazelton (from 6.21pm)

Cllr. Oliver Morgan (from 6.42pm)

Judi Hallett (Clerk)

8 Members of the public: Mr David Lowne, Mrs Margy Saunders, Mrs Diane Teager, Mr Mike Teager, Mr Peter Teager, Mrs Sarah Corbett, Mr Steven Bainbridge and Mr Philip Clarke.

Due to the nature of the meeting, Cllr. Saunders invited members of the public to speak as and when they wished.

1. To receive Apologies for absence:

Apologies had been received from Cllr. Taylor and Cllr. Clubb, with Cllr. Morgan indicating that he would be late.

2. To receive any Declarations of Interest and any applications for dispensation on Agenda Items:

There were no declarations of interest.

There were no applications for dispensation

3. To discuss the Site Allocations and Area Specific document as part of the SCDC Local Plan and to agree a response from the Parish Council:**a. To receive an overview on the document:**

Cllr. Saunders gave an overview of the purpose of the meeting and read part of an explanation letter from SCDC

b. To discuss the current balance of housing in Tunstall:

Mrs Corbett indicated that she felt there was the correct balance of housing in the village and that more was not needed. Cllr. Durham suggested that there were a number of houses that were presently 'unsold' in the village and that more were not required.

Cllr. Ross advised that a 'close eye' should be kept on 'development' by the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and RSPB as there were stories circulating that they may be looking at a visitors centre in the Tunstall area.

The Clerk gave an overview of the current process for applying for social housing and that there were a number of houses rented by Flagship currently in the village. It was suggested that the lack of public transport and facilities in the village made it unsuitable for people who did not drive.

Chairman's initials:

c. To discuss the number of proposed dwellings Tunstall should provide up to 2027:

Cllr. Saunders indicated that the suggested housing requirement as identified by SCDC had been set to zero. Mr Bainbridge indicated that the Parish Council should read this as a ‘minimum’ figure not a required allocation.

Mr Lowne suggested that once site 499 was developed (33 houses behind Street Farm) the Section 106 payment could be used to sort out the drainage issue in the village. Councillors agreed that they would have to take a more active role in insisting drainage was considered when any application was put forward.

d. To discuss the suitability of the three sites deemed ‘suitable’ by SCDC for potential development:

- i. **597** (Land adjacent to The Red House) – Mr Lowne suggested that if housing were allowed to be developed on this site it might be a chance to improve the drainage in that area; Cllr. Saunders read the comments that had been submitted to SCDC in October; it was suggested that development on this site could benefit the road structure in that area and improve access to Snape Road
- ii. **730** (Land at Three Corners, Woodbridge Road) – Mrs Teager indicated that the land in question was her land and that no permission had been given by herself or her family to develop the land; it was questioned if the area was in the correct place on the map as it seemed to cut across two properties, neither of which had given permission; Mr Bainbridge suggested an examination of the 2011 SHLAA may assist us and the Clerk agreed to investigate and report findings to the District Council.
- iii. **786** (Land at Plunkett’s Barn) – Cllr. Saunders suggested that access to this site would be an issue and that the roads were very narrow; Mr Clarke asked if any accidents had been reported, it was felt there had not; Cllr. Hazelton suggested a development in this area would put added pressure on the 4-way junction at the centre of the village; Mr Lowne indicated that any permission granted to this site would need to show an adequate drainage system that may assist with the current drainage issues in the area.

Cllr. Morgan indicated that he would be attending a meeting on this subject on Wednesday evening, where potential development was to be discussed. He could report that Tunstall was not specifically mentioned in the agenda and that this *may* indicate that we had ‘met our requirement’.

e. To receive comments from members of the public:

Members of the public had been encouraged to take part during each stage of the agenda

f. To discuss the cumulative effect of development of surrounding areas (such as Rendlesham):

It was felt that Rendlesham traffic did not affect Tunstall too much as it usually travelled towards Woodbridge.

The Clerk agreed to draft a response to SCDC and circulate to all Councillors before it was sent.

Each member of the public left the meeting, with the exception of Mrs Saunders and Mrs Corbett

4. To discuss the election process:

The Clerk explained that although SALC had given advice that individual candidates should take their nomination papers in to the District Council for verification, the District Council had indicated that it would be helpful to them if one person took them in from each parish.

After discussion it was agreed that the Clerk would nominate a specific date and time when the nomination papers were to be at the Chairman's house (4 Tunstall Green) and would notify all existing Councillors of this.

5. To receive Agenda items for next meeting and Date of Next Meeting

There were no additional items to add to the March agenda

The date of the next meeting was set for 11th March 2015.

The meeting concluded at 6.54pm

Signed:

Date:

Chairman

Judi Hallett
Clerk to Tunstall Parish Council

Chairman's initials: