

Chair's Report Full PC Meeting 151220

For Information:

1. Planning Saga Post Mill

A Joint Local Plan meeting was held by MSDC with the Mid Suffolk NDP Working Group. Andrea Long, former NDP Consultant, sits on the working group. She offered to put a question regarding the planning meeting 25th November (Post Mill Application). In the end other Parish representatives jumped in and asked about the status of NDP's in the light of the Fressingfield NDP being ignored. There is obviously much concern locally now and MSDC definitely on back foot. Counsel's response is likely to be in January.

2. Complaints follow up meeting with MSDC 8th December

PC reps DW, NS and AP.

MSDC: Philip Isbell head of Planning, John Maudsley IT performance quality officer, Simon Bailey Heritage and planning compliance, Samantha Lake Manager customer services complaints, Eliana Ciufu admin, Cllr Lavinia Hadingham observer.

The minutes will be out in 10 days.

Purpose: To understand the processes and procedures for raising concerns and complaints and to get assurance that these will be followed in a professional and timely manner.

PI did apologise for not responding to queries, concerns, questions and complaints in a timely manner.

Agenda:

- Communication between the District Council and PC/Parishioners
- District Council Feedback Process and Policy
- Section 106 Conditions
- Change of Conditions notification process
- Response Request Process

We hi-lighted examples and had a robust conversation about the issues. There is still some wriggling particularly around the compensatory woodland, and also the notion of PC's not being able to complain as a body. More to follow here.

There were some explanations about MSDC service viability and quality of response. Enforcement has recently come under Planning.

However, steps forward include answering concerns in a timely manner and acknowledging receipt of concerns. - This has begun but needs to be sustained.

Review of their complaints policy to make easier for residents to follow.

Review of website and access to named staff

Encouragement for Clerk to talk to people and not just rely on email.

Review of automatically allowing PCs to delay response to applications when meetings do not coincide.

Next meeting 8th January when PI expects to explain Counsel Response to the Post Mill Saga/ and or next steps.

3. Visit to New Chapel Site

I was invited by Stuart Balmer, Baptist Pastor, to have a look at the interior of the new chapel and its impact on the local community in Oatfields in particular.

I found the interior of the building to be interesting and potentially to be beneficial to the community. However, the marketing of this will be down to the Baptist Church.

I suggested that it would be a good idea to invite other PCs and residents along to see the work in progress both to allay fears about adverse impact and also to promote its potential.

4. Drainage

There have been 13 plus overflows in Cratfield/Low Road in the last 2 yrs months. The last reported was 4th December. At same time water egress was reported in the gutters at Jubilee Corner. It has also been noted that the Beck rose rapidly and equally reduced rapidly possibly as a consequence of saturated fields.

The principal Planning Officer Vincent Pearce , for the Post Mill Site has raised a series of questions with Anglian Water regarding the drainage from the site.

1. Is telemetry used at all at the Post Mill Lane pump station?
2. If it is [and maybe it is not] what is the purpose of that system?
3. To what extent is outflow from the pump station controlled [if at all]
4. What was the original design capacity of the Post Mill Lane pump station? Does it have any extra capacity itself to accommodate foul flow from 18 dwellings?
5. How often to the pumps routinely operate within the pump station on a daily cycle [if that is how they operate]
6. How and when do back up pumps operate
7. How does the alarm system [if there is one] at the pump station operate in terms of breakdowns or overcapacity?
8. When did AW take on responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the Post Mill Lane pump station?
9. How often has/have the pump/s failed since AW took over responsibility and what has been the operational impact
10. How many complaints have been received from residents in Fressingfield about odour nuisance from the pump station since AW took on responsibility?
11. Has AW discussed foul drainage alternatives with the applicant and/or their agent/s. Here I include private treatment works and/or increasing capacity at the pump station with or without added telemetric control over release rates? What was the nature of these discussions and the outcomes please?
12. Are you able to analyse pump station data to determine whether there is a correlation between pump operation, volume release and flooding incidents within the village when the inspection covers in Cratfield Road 'pop' and discharge material into the road and Beck.
13. Another issue that was raised at the Committee meeting which was not necessarily a material planning consideration but is likely to come up again
If the question of additional charges to Fressingfield residents which may or may not be connected to properties that may or may not have unauthorised surface water connections. Are you able to explain the nature of these charges, who is being asked to pay them and why and if so what those receipts are used for?

These questions are important. It has taken MSDC a long time to get around to this but are there now. They have also asked for a rep from AW to present to the Planning Committee again when Post Mill is heard again.

It is time that the Drainage group met again. I propose a meeting early in January.

Happy Christmas and Bonne 2021..... it's got to be bettersurely?

DW