

Shottisham Parish Council
Minutes of a meeting held on Tuesday 10th February 2015 @ WI Hall,
Shottisham

Present - Chr M Hazelwood, Cllrs. Jayne Backhouse, Peter Nichols, Ivan Clark, Paul Venediger, Cathy Newman, Kevin Dunnett, DC Cllr C Block

Attendees- Diana Bickerton, S Loader Clerk

AG1-10/02/2015 Apologies for absence

None recorded

AG2-10/02/2015 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Venediger, Cllr Dunnett, and Cllr Newman in respect to agenda item 8

AG3-13/01/2015 Public to raise questions regards items on the agenda

No comments

AG4-10/02/2015 Approve and Signed Minutes for 13th January 2015

Duly signed as a true record

AG5-10/02/2015 Matters Arising

Chr Hazelwood reports that CC Cllr Reid has provided an update on broadband connection date, connection date expected to be between June and September, fibre optics installed, waiting for connection from Eyke.

Cllr Venediger reports that CC A Reid had been emailed a copy of a letter sent to local farms expressing concerns over vehicle types. Copy emails have also been sent in respect to speeding

AG6-10/02/2015 Update on estimates for Rabbit fencing Cllr Clark

3 quotes

- Country Care £4893, Rectory Only £1800
- TSR £3935, Rectory Only £1100
- Kiwi £3665, Rectory Only £1200

Cllr Newman felt that the rabbit problem needs addressing every year, doesn't feel fences will be enough, council needs to address this issue of rabbit holes for the safety of the public. Doesn't want the council to look like it hasn't tried to solve the problem

Cllr Dunnett also asked if the fences will be effective and asked if a guarantee could be given.

Outcome: Cllr Clark reports that vegetation will also need to be ^{controlled} maintained along the new fencing, no guarantees can be given regards how effective the fence can be.

No decision could be made, further advice from Pest control to help determine final decision, to go on the agenda for the next meeting.

Chr Hazelwood and clerk to liase and complete funding request form from DC Cllr Block

Cllr Venediger to look into lottery grants

AG7-10/02/2015 Parish Survey Update

Chr Hazelwood reports:

- 82 letters sent out, 59 responses
- Survey revealed that affordable homes is not showing as a demand as it was previously
- Sorrel horse had been chosen by 6 residents wanting houses, 2 for Heath Drive, 2 had no specification
- Elderly residents would like to downsize
- Bawdsey Manor Estate may consider suggestions of smaller homes

Cllr Newman expressed that it wasn't up to the parish council to recommend an area for development. This is up to the land owner. Doesn't want increased development and refers to designated sites and non-designated, no security given, wants more security against unwanted development, there is also empty homes in the village. Questions if any development is required. Feels the goal posts keep changing and wants to be cautious about selecting numbers.

Cllr P Nicholls reports that his 2 bed homes have also been up for let for some time.

DC Cllr C Block reports that there is confusion over allocation of housing numbers only 600 required over the district. Will be questioning the protection given to the parish on designated and non-designated sites, will clarify this at district meeting. The sorrel could also be bound by its terms of sale in regards to development on the site.

Cllr K Dunnett reminds council it had agreed to some development and is unhappy with the indecisions. Leaves the meeting at 9.15pm

Outcome: Clerk to email Parish survey to Hilary Hanslip, SCDC Planning. Survey to be submitted only, majority vote recorded. 5 For, 1 abstained.

Clerk, reports that submitting survey with no comment could leave the District Council to make their own interpretation

AG8-10/02/2015 To discuss a response to the site allocations and area specific policies document from Suffolk Coastal District Council

- Council made reference to existing and the suggested physical limits boundary and notes very slight variances.
- Sorrel horse and heath drive areas are not within the physical limits boundary, possible exception sites
- Chr Hazelwood reports that shrinking the village envelope will reduce infill
- Cllr Newman would not like to see development going outside the village envelope, prefers villages to be clearly identifiable.
- DC Cllr Block asks to refer to coastal management plan, Shottisham could be effected by flooding

Outcome: Full council vote for Suggested Physical limits boundary and supports the implementation of Deben estuary plan. Clerk to email Hilary Hanslip, SCDC

AG9-10/02/2015 To discuss a response to the leisure strategy consultation from SCDC

Outcome: Full council support the leisure strategy with no recommendations.
Council suggested maps of walking routes of Shottisham

AG10-10/02/2015 Clerks Report

Notice of elections to be advertised 23rd March 2015

Completed nomination papers to be returned by hand to Council Offices, Melton by the 9th April 2015, this is legal deadline. To stand you need to live or work in the parish and have done so for the last 12 months, be 18 years and over, must not be disqualified by means of bankruptcy or have a conviction of more than 3 months during the last 5 years, or have been found guilty of corrupt or illegal practice by an election court. Clerk to circulate to councillors

AG11-10/02/2015 Parish Matters to be considered at the next meeting

- Cllr Clark to update on pest control costs

AG12-10/02/2015 Date and time of next meeting

10th March 2015 @ 7.30pm

Meeting closed 9.30pm

X

M. Hazlewood

Mr Mike Hazlewood
Chairman

10th March 2015

Action point update

- Seek volunteers to maintain one suffolk website. **Action: Clerk to contact J Excell for login**
- Filling in of rabbit holes on the playing field. **Ongoing**
- Clerk to contact Eibe regards swing
- Septic tank, ongoing. Cllr Clark has kindly donated padlocks.
- Cllr Clark to contact rabbit pest control for estimates of annual costs
- Clerk and Chr Funding request form
- Cllr Venediger, lottery grants in respect to rabbit fence

DRAFT

Shottisham Parish Council Housing Survey Analysis January 2015

Statistics

88 surveys distributed
6 empty houses

82 potential responses.
59 responses received (1 spoiled)

71% response rate, representing 135 individuals

Demographics

Age Range	Representation
0 - 15	16
16 - 24	10
25 - 34	6
35 - 49	21
50 - 64	45
65 - 74	21
75 - 84	11
85 +	5

Housing Need A1(for self)

ID	Type	Beds	When?	R/B	P/A	Age	EHD	SH	Either	Neither
8	-	2	2020	R	A	65-74		√		
11	-	-	-	-	-	35-49				
15	H	2	-	B	P	50's		√		
17	B	2/3	2018	B	P	75-84		√		
28	-	-	-	B	P	50-64				
31	H	2	2025	B	P	50's	√			
33	H/B	3	2020	R	A	20's		√		
38	H/B	3	-	B	A	35-49		√		
46	B/H	2	-	B	P	50-64			√	
49	H	3/4	2016	B	P	50-64	√			
51	H	2	2016/7	B	P/A	50's			√	
54	All	3/4	-	R/B	P	30's		√		

Housing Need A2 (other family members)

ID	Type	Beds	When?	R/B	P/A	EHD	SH	Either	Neither
17	H	4	2016	B	P		√		
19	H	4	ASAP	B	P				√
28				B	P				
37	H	4	2018	B	P			√	
50					1	√			

Key to Tables

Type H = House, B = Bungalow, F = Flat

R / B = Rent / Buy P/A = Private Purchase / Affordable

Location EHD = East of Heath Drive, SH = Sorrel Horse Field

Preferred Location B1

Location	Adults responding
EHD	29
SH	27
Either	25
Neither	23

Alternative Locations B2

ID	Alternative location / Comments
16	See below
17	Low field beside the Mill, opp. Cliff House. Would require drainage.
25	Between Trust Hall & Poors Common, mainly because of traffic and narrowness of The Street, and visibility @ The Knoll uphill to Heath Drive.
28	West of Trust hall - No extra traffic through village - not affecting current residents.
32	My concerns are that if up to 6 houses are built at Heath Drive then what would happen after 2025. Wouldn't more houses be built adjacent to these, and so on. Would not want any more second homes in the village.
34	1. What land belongs to the church? 2. Where the allotments are. 3. To the right (towards Alderton) of the Trust hall 4. Land of the Trust Hall 5. Sutton !!
44	The Street is narrow - more traffic would create risk to pedestrians. It might be better to build near / next to the Trust Hall to avoid traffic increase in the Street
45	Along Alderton Road so as not to increase traffic in village and keep pedestrians safer.
49	East of Heath Drive - possibly if design is right

ID	Alternative location / Comments
50	Opposite Cliff House. Land needs draining. Never used to be wet.
52	No- assuming the site opposite Cliff house is on the flood plain
56	1. Field west of New Houses (across from Wheel wrights) 2. Area / field between Heath Drive and the field adjacent to Villa Hill. 3. Part of the land, as indicated, of St. Margarets House. All are already accessible & better uses of unused land in the village. All should be 'affordable' & 2-3 bedroom only as well as 'Eco Housing' If there is more housing it should be dependent upon regular bus service.
59	Adjacent to Trust Hall / Alderton Road.

Transcript of ID16 Comments

Both of the suggested sites have severe flaws:

1. The land east of Heath Drive is outside the existing village and access by foot to the village is down a very narrow lane or unlit footpaths.
2. In recent informal discussions with Highways, the Board of the Sorrel Horse was told that vehicular access onto the field opposite the pub would not be feasible as there is no way to achieve a 70 metre sight line both ways up and down Hollesley Road.

I would suggest that the land west of Heath Drive is considered as a possible site. At present it is occupied by a sewage treatment plant and a recreational area.

The Board and shareholders of the Sorrel Horse could be amenable to ceding a proportion of their land to the development as a recreational area, in return for access to the field via Heath Drive. It would also enable the pub to create some overflow parking.

The advantages of building on this side of Heath Drive would be:

1. The houses would be more incorporated in the village.
2. Access to the Sorrel Horse field would be improved, making onstreet parking in busy times less of an issue, particularly in the summer.