**Draft Minutes of the Meeting**

**Of the Whepstead Parish Council on**

**Wednesday November 13th 2019 at 7.15pm**

Attendees Councillors N Aitkens - NA

 L Smith – LS

 T Smith – TS

 G Merrett – GM

 G Corcoran – GC

 A Walsh – AW

 Members of the public A Maddever - AM

Clerk D Rix – DR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 179/1180/2181/3182/4 | **Apologies for Absence**None**Declarations of Interest**None**Public Forum**AM said he was keen to hear the discussion regarding proposed development sites in Whepstead under the new Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). His agent had asked him six months ago whether he had land available for development. AM let the PC know which sites highlighted on the SHELAA map were his.**Proposed Development Sites in Whepstead**Cllr TS said that Cllr Evans’ email had explained the situation well. This said that sites had been submitted by local landowners/developers and had not been chosen by the council. The consultation taking place now (deadline Nov 26th) was simply to ask parishes/ the people who submitted the sites whether the information submitted was accurate.The submissions would then be reviewed and consulted on early next year in what would be called The West Suffolk Issues and Options Local Plan.Whepstead was considered an infill village. So only infill development comprising single dwellings or small groups of five homes or less within the designated housing settlement boundary would be permitted. All of the submitted sites fell outside the settlement boundary. Cllr NA questioned whether the settlement boundary (Old School Road and some of Rede Road) was relevant today. He said that other than the social housing at William Flack Place there had been no developments of up to five houses in the village.Cllr TS proposed that two sites WS189 and WS211 (already the subject of a planning application) at the start of Chedburgh Road could be developed, but that those areas marked red (Deferred Housing) should not be considered.Cllr GM disagreed. He said that Old School Road was too narrow, had no footpaths and could not stand more traffic. There was no easy access to amenities. It was also outside the settlement boundary and so could not be considered infill. Cllr GM proposed WS507 (a site running from B1066 down Rectory Road) to be more suitable. It was nearer to the centre of the village and had a footpath. Cllr NA said he would support the site if it was a similar size to WS189.The size of houses built was discussed. The PC would prefer more modest houses. Cllr AW felt that more modest houses were more likely to be built at WS507 than at WS189. She supported Cllr GM’s proposal. Cllr TS withdrew his proposal. All agreed that WS507 was within walking distance of the chapel, church, community centre and play area. An ideal development size would be something between the glebe lands development in Rectory Grove and the William Flack Place development.Councillors commented that they could not see how site WSE14 (highlighted green) which was proposed for ‘office use’ could be relevant for economic development. Other sites highlighted were dismissed.The meeting closed at 8.15pmSigned………………………………..Dated……………… |