



# EYE TOWN COUNCIL

## MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF EYE TOWN COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber, Eye Town Hall, on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> January 2022 @ 7:30 pm

**Present:** Cllr. Walker (Mayor), Cllr. Berry (Vice-Chair), Cllr. Smith, Cllr. Mann, Cllr. Brandon, Cllr. O'Mard, Cllr. Henderson, Cllr. Hill, Cllr. Byles and Cllr. Hudson.

**Also:** 2 members of the public, Dist. & Cty. Cllr. Gould and the Town Clerk.

### 1.0 Opening of the meeting

Cllr. Walker opened the meeting, welcoming all present.

### 2.0 Apologies and Approval of Absences

Cllr. Evitt, Cllr. Turner, Cllr. Talbot and Cllr. Winter all gave apologies.

### 3.0 Members Declarations of Interests and Consideration of Requests for Dispensations

None received/declared.

### 4.0 Public Participation - Meeting to be opened.

**4.1** County Councillor Report – Cllr. Peter Gould – Report circulated

**4.2** District Councillor Report – Cllr Peter Gould – Report circulated

- A meeting was held with Cllr. Brandon and other representatives regarding the HGV TRO for Eye. Design work was in progress.
- Cross Street building update - On target for work to begin in March 2022  
Cllr. Berry welcomed this progress and stated that it was important that a public consultation exercise be undertaken prior to starting and that the Queens Head be consulted.
- Paddock House – Cllr. Gould and Cllr. Henderson had been in communication with MSDC to ensure the garden area remained protected. Next stage would be for the hoarding to go up. The method statement for the demolition works was to be prepared and submitted the following week.
- Mid Suffolk District Council - Lease for public toilets draft would be sent to Cllr. Smith and the Clerk. To include resolving the floor survey.
- Shipping Containers – Notice issued in December 2021, response deadline 8<sup>th</sup> January. No update as of yet.

**4.3** Members of the Public – to receive questions and matters of concern from those present

There were none.

Meeting to be closed for public participation.

#### Exclusion of Press and Public

(LGA 1972, Part 1, Schedule 12A, Section 100A(4). To consider whether under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the business to be transacted involves the

2601

Signed: Mayor

Eye Town Clerk

Dated

likely disclosure of exempt information as prescribed in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and indicated against each item marked\*\*\*

Formal Council statutory business as follows: -

### 5.0 Co-option of a Councillor

Council to consider the co-option of Bruce Salter.

It was agreed unanimously to accept Bruce Salter as a co-opted Councillor. The Acceptance of Office was signed.

### 6.0 To receive and comment on planning applications and appeals as follows (and consideration of late applications) See appendix 1

Cllr. Berry stated that in view of the late cancellation of the December Planning Committee meeting no formal resolution could be offered for some of the applications below which had already been decided or the dates for the submission of consultee comments passed but the relevant Case Officer had been advised of the Planning Committee's views in each case.

<b>6.1</b>	DC/21/06183	Construction of covered vehicle wash bay building and rainwater harvesting tank	C And K Meats Ltd Potash Lane Eye IP23 7HE MSDC already made decision.
<b>6.2</b>	DC/21/05942	Erection of 7no dwellings following demolition of car repair workshop & redundant outbuildings	Land North Of Wellington Road Eye Suffolk Resolution tabled to oppose this application for reasons listed in Appendix 1 Cllr. Hudson Proposed and Cllr. Mann seconded. All in favour.
<b>6.3</b>	DC/21/06639	Application for a Non Material Amendment following grant of planning permission DC/21/03916 - Reduction of approved 3 bay garage to double garage.	2 Lowgate Street Eye Suffolk IP23 7AS MSDC already made decision.
<b>6.4</b>	DC/21/06626	Application for Consent to Display an Advertisement. 1 x non illuminated fascia sign to front elevation.	Co Op Store, Church Street, Eye, Suffolk IP23 7BD MSDC already made decision.
<b>6.5</b>	DC/22/00069	Erection of single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing conservatory)	The Gables, Yaxley Road, Eye, Suffolk IP23 7DP Resolution tabled to support for reasons listed in Appendix 1 Cllr. Berry proposed and Cllr. Mann seconded. All in favour.

With particular reference to Application DC/21/05942 Cllr. Henderson pointed out that the water course cited on the site layout drawing was NOT a drain but a beck and part of a working water course. This would be added to the Planning Committee's comments to the Case Officer.

**7.0 To receive and note Mid Suffolk DC planning decisions or appeals received since the last meeting. See above and minutes.**

All noted

**8.0 Other Planning Matters**

8.1 Consulted on the Hoxne Neighbourhood Plan. No comments to make but Eye Town Council wished Hoxne Parish Council well with it.

8.2 Application DC/21/06824 Erection of 6 Poultry House Stradbroom – It was felt that Eye Town Council should send an objection to this application even though they were not a consultee. Drafting of this to be delegated to Cllrs Brandon and Berry. Cllr. Hudson proposed and Cllr. Brandon seconded, 3 abstentions.

8.3 Road name proposed for properties off of Dove Lane – Suggested Beech Close

**Action: Clerk to respond back to Mid Suffolk District Council**

**9.0 To receive feedback and recommendations from the Environment Committee meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2022.**

- Cemetery entrance widening to be carried. Quotes and possible permissions to be sought
- Fund raising for path at Town Moor and Oak Crescent Park.
- Allotment holder verbally abused by another user.
- Flier for community meeting at Oak Crescent park 10.30am Saturday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2022

**10.0 To receive feedback and recommendations of the Finance & Governance Committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022.**

- Main items for going through and draft budget to be presented at F&G meeting in February
- Precept – it was proposed by Cllr. Henderson and seconded by Cllr. Smith to keep the precept at its current level. All in favour.

**Action: Clerk to send off precept request form for 2022/23.**

**11.0 To receive feedback from the Events Working Party held on the 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022.**

- Queens Platinum Jubilee: Beacon lighting and BBQ to be held on the Thursday and a street party for the Sunday. Friday and Saturday suggestions to be received.

**12.0 To receive feedback from the Town Hall Committee meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> December 2021 (after December's full council meeting) was cancelled.**

There were a couple of complaints regarding the heating that the hall was too hot, Cllr. O'Mard checked the thermostat, it had been turned off. The thermostat had now been reset.

Stage door runners had been fixed also; thanks given to Cllr. O'Mard.

**13.0 Policy documents for review**

Council to consider the recommendation from the Finance and Governance Committee regarding the following policies:

- a) Cemetery Regulations - deferred
- b) Risk Assessment – Committee activities - deferred
- c) Storage of valuables - deferred

**14.0 Draft budget for 2022/23**

Discussed previously.

**15.0 Precept for 2022/23**

Discussed previously.

**16.0 To note the attached items of correspondence – None**

CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COUNCIL – TO BE NOTED AND CONSIDERED	
<i>Details of Correspondence</i>	<i>Actions Taken/Required</i>

**17.0 Date of next meeting:** Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2022.

**18.0 Meeting closed at 20.30**

## Appendix 1

### Agenda item 6.1-6.5 Planning application decisions from January's Planning Committee meeting

#### 7.0 Planning Applications

7.1	DC/21/06183	Vehicle wash bay, CK	These applications had been on the agenda for the December planning committee which had to be cancelled at short notice. They were dealt with by email within the planning committee and onwards to the MSDC as 'no comments'. Determinations had been made and these were noted
7.3	DC/21/06639	Meats	
7.4	DC/21/06626	2, Lowgate St Co-op signage	

#### 7.2 DC/21/05942 – erection of 7 dwellings, land north of Wellington Rd

Councillors discussed the above and felt that whilst the project was designed with the Eye NP in mind the positive aspects of the design were overshadowed by the danger posed by the narrow exit and the likely traffic congestion in Church St.

Recommendation to full council:

That the council objects to this application with the following comments and reasons:

Eye Town Council acknowledges that the development is within the Settlement Area as defined in the ENP and meets the dwelling mix in Policy Eye 3. The design quality broadly meets the requirements of Policy Eye 16 and this is clearly referenced in the Design Statement. In summary this mix of property fits the identified need for housing in Eye. There is concern about the number of parking spaces allocated to the flats at only one per household.

However when coupled with Application DC/21/04401 there would be 21 homes exiting via two adjacent highway accesses as currently constructed with inadequate protection for pedestrians and cyclists. ETC offers this as an overriding reason for opposing the development as submitted as was the case for Application DC/21/04401.

The comment made by ETC on application DC/21/04401 regarding the consideration of traffic growth and the need for a traffic review in the wider area of Wellington St and Church St is also relevant to this application. Also Paddock House will add a further 16 dwellings. This will potentially total 37 dwellings all having to exit via Wellington Rd towards Church St junction which is already heavily congested. No traffic could more west along Wellington Rd given the access restriction in place before the Dove Lane junction. In determining this application a review of traffic management should be undertaken in Wellington Rd itself and Church St. This should also include an early review of on-street parking provision especially in Church St.

There is also significant local concern about flood risk to the rear of the site and ETC requests that any application review should be accompanied by an independent assessment of the flood risk calculations.

Proposed by Cllr. Walker and seconded by Cllr. Brandon. All in favour.

**7.5 DC/22/00069 – The Gables Yaxley**

Resolution to council:

Eye Town Council supported this application and considered that it enhanced the elevations of the building.

Proposed by Cllr. Smith and seconded by Cllr. Walker. All in favour.