CHILTON PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting held on Monday 6th June 2016 at Gt Waldingfield Village Hall at 7.30pm

Present: Councillors Keith Shapley (Chairman), Adrian Beckham, Richard Edgeley and Eileen Gore.

Attending: Margaret Maybury (Babergh District Councillor) and D Crimmin (Clerk).

16/068 Apologies for Absence
Apologies received from Cllrs Hart of Chilton and Reeve.

16/069 Declaration of Interests and Requests for Dispensation
No interests were declared and no request for dispensation received.

16/070 Minutes of Meeting held on 9th May 2016
The minutes of the meeting were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

16/071 Public Forum
No issues raised.

16/072 Planning
a. The councillors reviewed Planning Application B/16/00567 Adjoining Parish - Land west of Sudbury Garden Centre, Sudbury Road, Newton - Erection of detached agricultural building and surfacing and resolved that they objected to the application on the following grounds:
   i. The council questions what operation is planned for the site. Nowhere in the application has the applicant outlined what he proposes to do with the livestock on the smallholding. Any proposal should demonstrate the viability and sustainability of the proposed operation in order to justify the requirement of a building of this size and scale.
   ii. CPC is not in accord with the applicants claim that there were animals and a building on site before the site was purchased last year. Babergh’s Enforcement team should be able to verify the precise design of any building that was present on the site.
   iii. The application is described as an agricultural building and surfacing. The design of the proposed building does not look like an agricultural building to house livestock ie goats and chickens. It has no ventilation which is usually created with slatted boards with gaps in between. Ventilation is required so goats do not become ill. This design seems unsuitable for that and more suited to garaging vehicles.
   iv. The proposed building is very large and high in relation to the size of the site. The council consider the building to be over dominant and disproportionate. Most of site is taken up by building and the drive to it and as result, little area is left for grazing the livestock.
   v. The whole design looks more residential / garaging in style. There is a very large space for garaging 2 vehicles yet on this very small area of land the council would not expect such vehicles to be needed for a smallholding. More space is allocated for vehicles in the design than livestock.
   vi. The purposed building’s layout is not suitable to keep 40 goats. A goat requires at least 1.5m² for housing therefore 40 goats require 60m². The area shown on the drawing is approximately 20m². Where are the chickens going?
   vii. The application has no design for the storage of waste water or manure produced by the livestock. Where is the dirty water from the toilet and the Kargester going to be discharged? The goats and chickens will produce droppings and there will also be soiled bedding eg straw or wood chip so there will be further waste generation yet no information about foul sewage is provided other than to answer “unknown” which is not acceptable. Trade effluent or waste is also answered “no” by the applicant so there are no plans for waste disposal.
viii. Will this development cause flooding on adjoining agricultural land that is owned by Suffolk County Council and tenanted by two farmers?

ix. How is water and electricity to be supplied to the site? Goats require a fresh supply of water and when there isn’t enough natural light you need to have controlled artificial light that creates contrasting dark periods for housed livestock.

x. What proposal is there for a stockman to look after the flock on a daily basis? With the applicant living in Dagenham, will this mean someone living on site?

xi. The application states no new vehicle access from road. Has the entrance created by the applicant been accepted by SCC highways for this proposed use of the site?

xii. Section 25 of the form states that none of the land is an agricultural holding. This certification is therefore inconsistent with the planning application unless smallholdings are not “agricultural”.

b. The councillors reviewed Planning Application B/16/00422 Adjoining Parish - The Red House, Lavenham Road, The Heath, Great Waldingfield - Application for Listed Building Consent - Erection of weather-boarding to gable end of house and resolved that they had no comment on the application.

c. No further planning application had been received since the agenda was posted.

16/073 Councillor Vacancy
No applications have been received in relation to the councillor vacancy.

16/074 Questions to Chair
No questions were raised.

16/075 Next Meeting
The next scheduled meeting will be held at Gt Waldingfield Village Hall on Monday 4th July 2016 starting at 7.30pm.

The meeting closed at 8.17pm.