

## CHARSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting Held on Friday, 6<sup>th</sup> January 2023

**Present:** Councillors Moor (Vice Chair), Haird, Sharp, Laird, McArthur, Murray and Pam Hembra (Parish Clerk)

**Members of the Public: 19**

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
	Councillors Pedgrift and Murray	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
	None	
	<b>Planning:</b>	
	<p><b>Planning Application DC/22/4714/FUL</b> – The Three Horseshoes, Charsfield - Pub refurbishment and extensions, improved access and car park and outside facilities together with the construction of 4 no two bedroom cottages and car parking.</p> <p>Councillor Moor gave a brief overview of the Planning Application and this meeting was convened to formulate the Parish Council’s comments.</p> <p>Councillor Moor asked if anyone did not want the pub to open again and only one person was doubtful. The main goal therefore was to maximise prospects of the pub opening and ensuring its longevity.</p> <p>Was this the most appropriate scheme? The pub remains in the ownership of Edward Bolton with David Houchell remaining his agent.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>1. Who should determine the Application? Should this be a delegated decision?</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Who should determine the application – planning officers or the Planning Committee?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">There are three triggers which require a planning application to be taken directly to Planning Committee (i.e. by-passing the Referral Panel):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">2.1 The Planning Application is, in the opinion of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management or the Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee, of significant public interest; would have a significant impact on the environment; or should otherwise be referred to members, due to its significance in some other respect.</p>	

- 2.2 Significant public interest proved by those attending meetings and membership of FROTH. Thirty-five members of the village were present at a public meeting convened by FROTH on 3<sup>rd</sup> January.
- 2.3 Significance in other respect proved by the fact the pub is an asset of Community value..

**Asset of Community Value**

Policy SCLP8.1 states that proposals to change the use, or redevelop for a different use, a facility registered as an asset of community value will not be permitted. This sets a high bar and the reasons whereby the redevelopment of the car park and subsequent loss of the garden would be permitted, have not been met.

**2. Attempt to ensure that robust evidence as to the ‘need’ for the proposal is provided.**

This application has been badged as an ‘enabling application’ in the covering letter. The need for this enabling has not been justified or proven in the application. There are validation requirements for a planning application to ensure all appropriate matters have been addressed.

**3. Is the application valid?**

An application may be refused on the basis of ‘lack of information’. No marketing assessment (necessary as ACV). No references to national and regional policies.

**4. A Viability Report has been submitted**

Has this been prepared by an appropriately qualified individual? The viability report does not include vital information that would be necessary

**Comments from the public:**

- What evidence is there the works are needed?
- The Application is not accurate or robust
- If this application is approved is any value created by residential develop directed towards improvement of pub?
- Will the pub be more welcoming or more viable?
- Needs to be clear what will happen to pub eg landlord etc to see whether viable.
- Is car parking in relation to covers?
- Could the rent be levied?
- There is clear policy an ACV cannot be redeveloped.
- If pub not viable it must be put it on the market at price agreed by an independent valuer.
- CIL monies would be available from this development
- An accoustic wall is a close boarded fence around the houses and whole site
- The public would mostly use a restaurant

	<p><b>Parish Council discussion:</b></p> <p>CPC did not feel this application would maximise the prospect of the pub re-opening and ensure its longevity and would therefore object to the proposal.</p> <p>It was agreed CPC would ask for the matter to go to Committee (ie no delegated decision and by-passing the referral panel) as it is of significant public interest and an asset of Community Value. The PC would also ask Tony Fryatt to support this decision.</p> <p>CPC would ask for the planning application to be refused as it does not meet the validation criteria.</p> <p>CPC would not recommend approval for the planning application as it has been submitted.</p> <p>CPC would ask the Local Authority to require a third party independent review of the viability information.</p> <p>CPC would ask East Suffolk Council to ensure by obligation, not condition, that any residential properties must <b>NOT</b> be occupied before the works to the Public House are completed as per the planning application, and <b>NOT</b> to be occupied before the business is fully operational.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Date of Next Meetings</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">24<sup>th</sup> January 2023 21<sup>st</sup> March 2023</p>	