



Waveney Local Office
London Road, Halesworth

Monday 20th September, 2021 at 6.30pm

Held in the Day Centre

Minute Book ref No 66

**EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE DAY CENTRE, HALESWORTH
And remote viewing provided via Zoom**

Present: Councillors;

Peter Dutton, Anne Fleming, James Hewett, Rachel Kellett, Rosemary Lewis (Chair), Karen Prime, Jill Reece, Maureen Took, David Wollweber (Vice-Chair), Jackie Wagner.

In Attendance: Nick Rees (Town Clerk), 0 members of the public, 9 attendees on zoom

Minutes

1. **Apologies:** Cllrs; Annette Dunning, Joyce Moseley
2. **Declarations of interest: Non pecuniary;** HCSL trustees; Cllr Dutton. Cllr Prime, Cllr Lewis & Cllr Wagner
3. **Public Session:** No members of the public were present in the Day Centre
 - a) **Campus: To consider the revised application deferred from the meeting held on the 8th February, 2021** DC/21/0007/FUL | Change of use to sports facilities comprising new grass football pitch adjacent to Harrisons Lane and construction of a new artificial football pitch with associated parking, access, lighting, acoustic fencing and drainage adjacent to the Apollo Youth Centre and adjacent field to the south. | North Suffolk Skills Academy Harrisons Lane Halesworth Suffolk IP19 8PY
Cllr Dutton was particularly concerned with SCC's Flood & Water Management's comments that they were maintaining a holding objection as there was insufficient test results to ensure that a large infiltration basin is viable in this location. Cllr Lewis and Took had attended the presentation at the Rifle Hall and were told that Campus had met all of SCC's requirements but this was not evidenced on the Planning Portal. The current documentation from SCC showed that there were 12 points of information still outstanding. Cllr Dutton highlighted that the data supplied by Campus had been generic, involving a desk top survey and this did not account for local conditions.
Cllr Dutton was also concerned about the acoustic fencing in the sense that this was very restrictive for future residents, a 3m high fence with netting on top, positioned close to windows and a recommendation that the windows are not opened was not acceptable. Cllr Wollweber expressed concerns that the whole development involving Campus and CMC proposals were not what residents were expecting. Furthermore the Apollo Centre, which could very reasonably be argued was a site of cultural value to so many residents, was being demolished and not replaced. Cllr Wagner was also concerned about the relationship between a care home and residential units mixed in with a full-sized Rugby pitch and the inevitable and understandable difficulties and tension that may arise with noise, inappropriate language etc. Once again the matter of whether investing in a 3G pitch with its associated ecological concerns was appropriate or necessary in these current times. The Council also discussed the original survey conducted almost ten years ago and how it did not appear to reflect this proposal and the associated CMC proposal being considered at the meeting. The Council was also mindful that on social media these proposals did not appear to be well received in the main. Public opinion was nevertheless difficult to judge and quantify. Cllr Wollweber asked whether it was now time to revisit the Campus Project and ask the residents again.

It was first RESOLVED that the Council would be prepared to commission a new referendum in order to establish the residents views, it would set up a Working Group to consider this matter further and the appointed members were Cllr Kellett, Cllr Reece and Cllr Wollweber. The Clerk advised that there were not insignificant costs associated with this decision and that its effectiveness would be dependent on whether the planning process could be halted to allow time for a referendum, in the meantime he would check the process, timing and legalities. The Group would need to liaise with all the necessary authorities and the applicants.

It was also RESOLVED that the Council recommended refusal of the application DC/21/007/FUL on the followings grounds:-

1. The proposal was not in keeping with the local area
2. The loss of the Apollo Centre, a building of cultural value
3. The surface water and flooding risks which had not been resolved
4. The environmental health issues and concerns associated with plastic pitches

The Clerk would also write to East Suffolk Council to advise them that the Council had not simply refused the application on the reasons stated above but was sufficiently concerned to request a referendum to seek the views of the residents again, assuming it was possible to do so in the timescales and to seek their advice and support and to emphasise the urgency and importance of this decision.

- b) **Castlemeadow Care: To consider the amended plans:** DC/21/0027/FUL | Hybrid Planning Application for Retirement Community development to include (i) Full Planning Application for 54 bed care home (Use Class C2, Block C), associated landscaping, parking, acoustic fencing, access from Norwich Road and waste storage and (ii) Outline Application with all matters reserved for 100 Extra Care apartments and communal facilities (Use Class C2, Blocks A and B) and administration, training and staff accommodation building (Block D) | Halesworth Campus (Former Halesworth Middle School Site) Norwich Road Halesworth Suffolk IP19 8PY (eastssuffolk.gov.uk) The Council reconsidered the revised application. After some debate it was clear that the revised application did not address most of the concerns of the Town Council (noted in the minutes 56.3 8th February, 2021) to any significant degree and it was RESOLVED that the Council recommended refusal of the application DC/21/0027/FUL on the followings grounds
1. The application would set a precedent for similar applications. Halesworth was at risk of becoming a retirement town.
 2. The current infrastructure was not in place to serve this proposal especially as regards the provision of medical and care infrastructure which is inadequate for the current population
 3. The site was not an urban location but a thinly populated approach road to a small market town and the design was inappropriate for the area
 4. The Scale and Density was overbearing
 5. The proposed gas heating is against the Government's commitment for a low carbon economy
 6. It was at odds with the Government's move towards home care
 7. A significant loss of an important open space
 8. It does not serve local needs as can be demonstrated by the availability of similar 1 bed units in the town and the vacant beds in the existing care homes
9. **Correspondence:** None
10. **Items for the Website/Noticeboard/Newsletters/Library:** Post the decisions on the website and Facebook.

The meeting was closed at 7.46pm