

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS COMMITTEE OF
MARTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON 08 AUGUST 2018**

Present: Mr C Blundell (Committee), Mr L Brome (Committee), Mr S Denton (Chairman), Mr J Forbes (Committee), Mr J Kelso, Mr E Thompson (Committee),

There were approximately 70 members of the public.

In attendance: Mrs S Robertson (Clerk)

1. Apologies: Miss J Bear, Mr M Irwin, Mr W Welch.

2. Interests

2.1 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI): None declared.

2.2 Local non-Pecuniary Interest (LNPI): Mr Kelso re planning application DC/18/2845/AD should any discussion arise.

3. Actions from last Meeting

Actions ongoing or on the agenda.

4. PUBLIC FORUM: *To allow members of the public to address business on the agenda; to note any issues raised by the public. Extension to the public forum given in light of agenda items 5.1 and 6.1.* Members of the public were attending with regard to item 5.1. The Chair explained the Council's role, i.e. it is a statutory consultee, not the planning authority. He invited comments. A number of residents living in the Falcon Residential Park and Hilton Road spoke. They largely shared the same concerns regarding proposals to build a Travis Perkins builders' merchant. The issues included: safe access and egress for existing residents, parking, increased traffic – impact on road infrastructure, noise pollution, lighting, loss of trees, disturbance to wildlife, loss of amenity, right of access to Falcon Residential Park, highways obstructions, poor visibility, health & safety, lack of screening, air pollution. The DPC Chairman responded to a number of questions.

District Cllr Blundell read out an extract from the most recent National Planning Policy Framework highlighting that planning policies should be promoting healthy, inclusive and safe places. He explained that he is a member of the SCDC Planning Committee. He commented that SCC Highways are not happy with the current proposals and both SCC and SCDC must take on board the many concerns and retain the amenity of the area. He expected that it would be a few months before the planning application is heard and he will insist on a site visit.

5. Planning applications outside the scope of the delegated authority to the Clerk

5.1 DC/18/2821/FUL – Land at Anson Road, Martlesham Heath Business Park – Hybrid planning application for development of a General Employment Area comprising: 1.Full: Erection of 1no. building for use as a builders' merchant (sui generis) for the display, sales and storage of building, timber and plumbing supplies, plant and tool hire, including outside display and storage along with storage racking; access and servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping and associated works. 2. Outline: Employment development (Classes B1(c), B2 and B8) with all matters reserved. (See CR1 & CP filed in the office together with the minutes)

The Committee members agreed that they supported the concerns raised by the residents and these had been already largely highlighted in the report circulated before the meeting. It was agreed that the additional issues of health & safety and drainage should be included in the Council's response, as well as reference to the Nation Planning Policy Framework 2018, item 91 on page 27.

The committee asked the Falcon Park Residents' Association if they could establish ownership of the access road to the Park, which appears unadopted, through writing to the owner of Tingdene. The **Clerk** to follow this up with Tingdene too.

DECISION D2018/8a:

The Parish Council strongly objects to this planning application.

The development site is fairly large in a conspicuous corner position fronting Felixstowe, Anson and Hilton Roads. It is adjacent to woodland and part of the Falcon Residential Park site to the east, Hilton Road housing area to the south, and a County Wildlife site to the north. Whilst the site is allocated as a General Employment Area in the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan, Policy MAR18, this appears to be an ill-judged one size fits all application which does not take into account its unusual position between the existing Business and Retail areas and the countryside, and its proximity to two residential areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) section 81 'Promoting healthy and safe communities' says:

"91. Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places...." It goes on to describe how this can be achieved. The Falcon Residential Park and Hilton Road area is already a healthy, inclusive and safe place such as the NPPF is promoting, and this will be undermined if this application is approved.

It is regretted that Travis Perkins did not contact the Parish Council prior to submitting the application. In pre-planning application discussions with the previous owners (Chancerygate) the Council made it clear that their proposals for warehousing were inconsistent with the location's character; our preferred option would be for an office based scheme similar to Brightwell Barns. The applicant is missing an opportunity to produce a well-designed development.

The strong reasons for objection, based on the application documentation submitted with the plans, are as follows:

- The application fails to address substantial parts of the SCDC pre-application advice (ref: DC/PREAPP/18/1247), including adequate parking (MAR16), connectivity (MAR14), the impact on the Public Right of Way (footpath 40) and the County Wildlife Site (CWS) (Local Plan policies SP14 & DM27). It is noted that some mitigation for the loss of part of a CWS is proposed and this must be secured through a S106 agreement, but this does not make the application acceptable.
- The absence of an acceptable Transport Assessment. The Transport Statement contains insufficient information on the impact on surrounding areas and is reliant on mitigation to come forward from two applications: DC/17/1283/FU - Land off Anson Road – Drive thru unit and DC/17/1435/Out – Land south and east of Adastral Park – Outline planning application for up to 2000 dwellings. The road infrastructure is already struggling to cope with the increased traffic due to the success of the Retail & Business Park. Car parks are often near to capacity which means more lorries and cars are parking at the road side, reducing visibility such as at the junction of Hilton Road with Anson Road.
- The proposed access will be detrimental to the residents in the Falcon Park and Hilton Road as it will significantly increase the use of Hilton Road particularly by large vehicles. Hilton Road is a pedestrian and mobility scooter route, and will be promoted as part of a pedestrian route from Brightwell Lakes to the retail area. There will be significantly increased conflict between pedestrians and vehicles particularly across the site access.
- Health and safety concerns – risk of queuing lorries at the site entrance, parking in inconsiderate areas if there are no restrictions which could restrict access to and egress from Falcon Park causing delays to emergency services. Due to the age of the majority of Falcon Park residents we are advised that there is regular need for ambulances.
- The absence of a Comprehensive Landscape Design therefore no evidence of how the requirements of Local Plan policies DM27 'Biodiversity & Geodiversity' & DM23 'Residential Amenity' will be met. The layout and intensive use of the whole site appears to preclude any form of acceptable landscaping. The pre-application advice made clear the importance of landscaping which is a common feature throughout the business and retail areas.

- The “builders yard” appearance when viewed from the retail area - the use of Paladin fencing is regretted as it does nothing to conceal the builder’s yard (contrary to policy DM21 ‘Aesthetics’).
- The lack of details of the external racking – i.e. what racking heights will be where on the site. The proposed site plan shows possible racking immediately next to the fencing alongside the path on the Felixstowe Road. This is regretted due to its visual impact, which is again contrary to policy DM21.
- The failure to tailor the design to retain at least some trees within the development site & consider the wildlife corridor (contrary to policies SP14 & DM27); the application is out of keeping in this sensitive area.
- The overdevelopment which would arise if phase 2 were permitted - this would further increase the adverse effect on the character of the approach to Falcon Residential Park. Hilton Road is currently bordered by trees and vegetation which makes a reasonably attractive approach to Falcon Park. The development of phase 2 of this application would result in the loss of most of the trees on the north side of this approach to Falcon Park. In addition the proposed unit on the eastern side of the access road would be almost adjacent to the actual main entrance to Falcon Park. These outline proposals are therefore contrary to policy DM23.
- The threat to veteran trees, which are to be afforded the highest priority in a new government directive, especially an Austrian Pine and a line of silver birches, 2 of which are veteran trees. These might have to be cleared if the outline planning permission for additional units is granted or in order to make the visibility splay at the entrance to the site acceptable.
- Lack of detail as to how the lighting scheme will operate. What measures will be taken to avoid glare for residents and road users, and to avoid light spillage into the woodland areas including the County Wildlife Site. What lighting will be left on outside trading hours? There should be compliance with policy DM26 ‘Lighting’.
- The noise assessment does not appear to take into consideration that the homes on Falcon Park are static mobile homes, and that their soundproofing will not be as good as normal residential buildings. In addition the hours of operation for Travis Perkins will start at 7am which is potentially antisocial for the mostly retired residents on Falcon Park.
- There is an existing problem with surface water drainage and sewage at the Falcon Park – reassurance needed to demonstrate that this development will not exacerbate the problems.

The Council notes and supports the objections, to date, of some 88 residents living in the Falcon Residential Park and Hilton Road.

If this application goes to committee a site visit is strongly recommended.

If approved, conditions should take account of (this list may not be exhaustive):

- screening
- connectivity which includes safe crossing points with dropped kerbs & a footway
- road safety & access
- adequate parking (vehicles should be prevented from parking on the verges on the approach to and beyond the access to the proposed development)
- retention of trees
- protection for the Public Right of Way
- light, noise and air pollution
- mitigation for the loss of the County Wildlife Site

However as it stands, the application does not address all these issues in an acceptable manner and should therefore be refused.

Unanimously agreed.

8.25pm Mr Blundell left the meeting. All members of the public also left the meeting.

5.2 **DC/18/2774/ARM – Land south and east of Adastral Park, Martlesham Heath** – Application for Reserved Matters Approval of: **Site Entrance and Boulevard** comprising the detail of the following elements:

- The new junction with the A12
- The entrance to the site, including the new entrance feature/acoustic bund along the A12 boundary
- The new boulevard from the site entrance to the junction with the Eastern Spine Road
- The new Western Spine Road and new Junction with the Ipswich Road, incorporating measures required by condition 43 of DC/17/1435/OUT
- The Landscaping to the entrance and zone along the boulevard/spine road
- The new Drainage to the boulevard and spine road, including pumping station off the Ipswich Road, in the Valley Corridor
- The new incoming utility supplies along the route of the boulevard and spine road

In respect of Outline Planning Permission DC/17/1435/OUT (See CR2)

A paper with proposed comments following the meeting of the Brightwell Lakes Working Group on 03.08.18 had been circulated prior to the meeting and is filed together with these minutes in the office. The Committee agreed the following response:

DECISION D2018/8b:

General Comments

We felt we had a reasonable working relationship with the previous consultants used by CEG. Are there plans to extend this to the new firms involved?

Is it necessary to depart from the approved application's illustrative designs if these were deemed acceptable and feasible at the application stage? Is this foretaste of further departures from the application designs as the development progresses? The Council is concerned that the vision to produce a high quality, well-designed development is not lost. Ongoing early discussions on reserved matters applications would be appreciated.

The Parish Council neither objects to nor supports these applications but offers its comments on certain aspects of the applications, noting that some details are too technical for members to understand. We have made no clear distinction between the two applications as there is a certain amount of overlap and repetition of reports and plans between them.

The Parish Council's comments are as follows:

The Site Entrance and Boulevard

Landscape Design Report D2632 DOC001-C

Page 8 shows a very different entrance design to the application. It is difficult to imagine without a quality CGI as previously made available. The Council has concerns that it is too urban, dominant and grey. Is it possible to see a sample of a wall using the construction technique proposed? The Council reserves judgement until it receives further information.

The fencing shown on Page 10 implies that timber will be used other than near the entrance. This differs from the consistent design approach along the whole length as previously shown. What is the reason for this? Timber fencing will degrade over time and look poor against the solidity of the entrance. The standard quality of fencing as used, for example, at a site near Stowmarket on the A12, would not sit at all well with the entrance design in the longer term.

We hope the large signs will not be internally illuminated.

What will the planting scheme be on both sides of the bunding, in the area not shown on Page 8? Will specimen trees be planted on both sides? We would like more information on the landscaping outside the wall by the A12. We would expect to see the land well maintained, like alongside the Woodbridge by-pass.

Is it going to be possible to retain any of the existing bund? It's taken about 5 years to get to its current state of maturity.

If the bund is to be replaced by a newly constructed bund, can the work be done in winter please? It will be noisy and dusty for existing residents if carried out in summer months.

Page 18 – Trees chosen should be suitable for the site and sensitive to wind.

Elevations Site entrance

This implies a less steep bunding under the timber fence and shows mainly grass. The existing grass within about a metre of the A12 carriageway gets very tired and dirty in winter and looks unattractive. We would welcome alternative landscaping proposal ideas.

Noise assessment for bunding

This is much more digestible than the original noise studies. It seems to be an effective set of proposals for the new housing. However the glimpsed noise contours on the west side of the A12 reveal the potential extent of the problem for existing residents. The proposed reduction of the speed limit is welcomed. However we would like reassurance as to whether the constructions on the east side will increase the amount of reflected noise at the receptors on the west side.

We continue to press for a quiet surface when this section of the A12 is resurfaced on the grounds that it is better to reduce noise at source where possible.

Environmental Action Plan

Trees and climate change: There is a fashion for only using native species of trees, but there is a greater need for more diversity, especially in trees, in case our climate becomes warmer, colder, wetter, drier or more extreme.

Fencing: Please avoid impenetrable fencing on the boundary or around grass areas. Wildlife needs to be encouraged, not fenced off. Do physical barriers need routes through or under for small mammals?

We are pleased to see a North/South and a narrow west bound green wildlife corridor.

Overhead cables: It would be good to avoid any overhead wires wherever possible for aesthetic reasons. We assume there will be none.

Hard surfaces: Wherever possible please encourage the use of permeable surfaces to allow grass to grow through which is better for drainage and oxygen and CO2 control.

The presence of Japanese Knotweed is noted. What measures are being taken to avoid the dispersal of stem sections etc. when the Knotweed is being removed?

Butterflies: One of our councillors has been carrying out annual butterfly surveys along footpath 51 - please see **Appendix 1**.

In view of his observations we request that any works carried out on Footpath 51 are sensitively done, and wherever possible are carried out in a way which will increase its attractiveness to butterflies. Ideally this path and its vegetation should be kept in its present state as far as practical.

Lighting plans: we are pleased to see that proposals will take account of bats, otters etc. The narrow band kelvin of LED lighting seems to influence bats as the whiter colours now being used by SCC (4000k?) seem not to attract so many flying insects which the bats used to feed on.

See <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/09/160901093006.htm>. This effect has been observed in Lancaster Drive.

Street lighting on the A12 should be consistent with a 40mph speed limit and should avoid glare to the new and existing developments.

Heathland management - Page 9: The parish has residents with plenty of experience in this, in particular through the management of the Western Corridor/SSSI on Martlesham Heath.

Heather cultivations: regrettably seeds from Martlesham Common are not available as they are needed for the Council's efforts to re-establish more heather on the Common. We can help with finding other possible sources.

Tree protection strategy

We will be interested in the next stage of this work when individual trees are being identified for retention.

Cycle/Pedestrian Movements

The Parish Council is very concerned that connectivity in and around Brightwell Lakes is well managed so that there are safe and easy routes for all.

Western Access off Ipswich road

We have concerns re the conflict between the pedestrian/cycle route and traffic at the junction. In the mornings traffic queuing to leave will block the east-west pedestrian/cycle route, and in the evening cars turning in to the development will be a hazard particularly to cycles/pedestrians going east. No amount of white lines, yellow boxes or signs will ameliorate this. Maintenance of this current right of way in the new development was a major feature of the proposals.

The only realistic long-term solution would be to create a cycle/pedestrian underpass as in Grange Farm under Ropes Way.

Boulevard

Facilities for a 3m shared pedestrian/cycle way are only shown on one side of the road. This will cause unnecessary conflict as cyclists use this in both directions, or with pedestrians on the 2m footway or with cars.

We suggest these routes should be 3m on both sides of the boulevard.

Cycles using the road to leave the development will have to cut across the carriageways to continue north.

This should be via a crossing some distance before the junction is reached, as is done in Dutch cities.

We have similar concerns about bike/car relationships at other entrances, especially the northern quadrant exit.

Boulevard junction with A12

The unequal provision as above will lead to uncertainty about which routes cyclists will/should take when going north, or when crossing the A12, which is more likely to cause accidents. Although few will cross the A12 in the near future it is very likely this will become much busier if developments along Foxhall Road take place.

Scheme of traffic light management, marking and signage should be agreed to facilitate safe cycle/pedestrian movement in this area.

Phasing Plan

The latest version looks different from that previously submitted with the full application.

It would be useful to have a top level timeline plan where the number of dwellings occupied is mapped against the provisions of main infrastructure elements e.g.

- access roads
- footpaths

- Primary and secondary district centres
 - education facilities
 - sports and other leisure facilities
 - completion of main facilities at Primary Local Centre.
 - SANG and other green corridors
- etc.

We are led to believe that the concrete plant will be operational for a long time in order to service the site's needs locally. This is close to part of the SANG - what will the impact be on the completion of the SANG?

Appendix 1

Butterfly observations by Cllr Staines on Footpath no. 51 Report written in July 2018

Footpath 51 is the path that leads down in a N/S direction to the Waldringfield Road from Spratts Plantation near the Falcon Residential Trailer Park. The path in question is a wide unmade semi-road sometimes used by farm machinery and it passes the large lake next to the gravel pit. The path terminates after crossing the Swale at the entrance to the Waldringfield Road, across which there is Foxburrow Wood.

Monitoring butterfly there began for me in 2001. A mass of data has been collected since then with each year recording butterfly species' behaviour and presence on that path. 29 different species of butterfly visit Martlesham, but that means neither that one is going to see all of them in every season, nor that they are all to be found along the hedgerows bordering path 51. Distilling my records for this response I can safely say I have seen the following species at some point over the last eighteen years: Large White, Small White, Green-veined White, Brimstone, Orange-tip, Small Tortoiseshell, Painted Lady, Red Admiral, Peacock, Comma, Speckled Wood, even a Wall Brown (rapidly declining, possibly endangered now, a rare event to see one), Grayling (in August), Ringlet, plenty of Gatekeepers (though a bit thin on the ground this year), Meadow Brown (likewise), Small Copper, Common Blue (amongst the grasses at the north end), Holly Blue, Brown Argus, Small Skipper, Essex Skipper, Large Skipper, even a pair of Clouded Yellow once, Green Hairstreak, and in the connecting path to 51 from the top of Betts Avenue, Purple Hairstreak (elusive certainly, but I know exactly when and where to look). That constitutes a total of 26 out of a possible 29 species. In other words, 89.6% of the butterflies we are fortunate in having here at Martlesham can be observed along the hedgerows of Path 51. It is rather a lot.

Agreed.

5.3 DC/18/2775/ARM - Land south and east of Adastral Park, Martlesham Heath - Application for Reserved Matters Approval of: **Green Infrastructure** comprising the detail of the following elements:

- Main Green Infrastructure – SANG
- SANG Valley Corridor
- SANG Links to Southern Boundary
- Allotments and Community Orchards to area 5b

In respect of Outline Planning Permission DC/17/1435/OUT (See CR2)

DECISION D2018/8c: To issue the same comments agreed by DECISION D2018/8b on planning application DC/18/2774/ARM to planning application DC/18/2775/ARM as there is a certain amount of overlap and repetition of reports and plans between them. **Agreed.**

6. Consultations/Infrastructure Projects

6.1 Local Plan Review: Consultation 20.07.18 – 14.09.18; Meeting with SCDC officers on 25.07.18 DP/22 & DP/26, notes of meeting on 25.07.18 circulated at the meeting and filed in the office together with the minutes
DP/22 was noted.

Action: All DPC members to look at the document and give comments to the Clerk in time for the PC meeting on 05.09.18.

7. Neighbourhood Planning (NP)

7.1 NP made on 17 July 2018 by SCDC – final made version published DP/29

Noted that SCDC will provide 20 copies of the made NP for distribution to the PC & for display.

7.2 Ongoing work on aspects of the NP and NP Plus after the referendum

Noted that Mr Irwin & the Clerk will liaise with Community Action Suffolk re a Village Audit.

7.3 Adastral Park Travel Plan DP/23

Noted that the Travel Plan is likely to tackle some issues raised through NP Plus. It is possible that BT will have some influence with SCC Highways.

Clerk to find out how the PC can take part in the development of the Travel Plan and draw BT's attention to our NP. Clerk to express disappointment that BT declined an offer to meet at the NP consultation stage, because their site sits outside the NP designated area.

8. Highway Matters

8.1 Highways Register (HR): Create a pedestrian route along the access track used by the Environment Agency CR4

It was noted that the project cannot currently be progressed further.

Clerk to amend the Highways Register.

Mr Forbes reported that a unit at Sandy Lane is being converted without consent – he was encouraged to send a photo to SCDC planning enforcement.

8.2 HR Priority 3: Speed Limits – Sandy Lane & Martlesham Hill (Top Street)

No verbal update. **Clerk** to request a progress report from Cllrs O'Brien and Page.

8.3 HR Priority 4: Martlesham Park & Ride roundabout

June DPC minute noted – topic to stay on the agenda although cannot currently be progressed.

8.4 Top Street roundabout highways improvements DP/28 *Should the improvements be permanent? Accept invitation to meet construction team?*

There were differing opinions.

DECISION D2018/8d: To support the retention of the Top Street roundabout highways improvements, so that they are adopted by SCC once the EA One works are completed. **Carried.**

Clerk to seek views of local residents via a local contact, if possible.

Clerk to respond to ScottishPower Renewables and ask when the restoration of the land is likely to be completed.

It was agreed that the DPC should focus on making Martlesham Hill safer through requesting that visibility is improved through vegetation clearance and making the temporary 30mph speed limit permanent. Visit by the construction team not required.

9.03pm Mr Brome left the meeting.

9. Issues pertinent to the committee

9.1 Frequency of DPC meetings CR5 *Any recommendation to the full PC re number of DPC meetings?*

No recommendation but keep under review.

9.2 Opportunity to discuss areas of common interest with Kesgrave Town Council DP/27 *Appoint councillors to meet with Kesgrave TC to discuss common issues?*

DECISIONH D2018/8e: Messrs Denton & Irwin to meet informally with members of the Kesgrave TC planning committee to discuss areas of common interest & the potential for a structure for partnership working. **Agreed.**

9.3 Michael Howard Homes Development off Black Tiles Lane Any verbal update?

Naomi Goold, SCDC Case Officer, has advised that SCDC has received no application to discharge conditions and she can provide no more information regarding the start of the development – noted.

9.4 DPC Terms of Reference: Clerk did not receive any input by 31.07.18 Defer to future meeting?
Noted that the Terms of Reference should include the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan.

Defer to next meeting.

9.5 Increased protection for veteran trees DP/24 – noted.

9.6 East Anglia ONE Onshore Cable Route – Construction activity DP/25 – noted.

10. Pre-Planning Application Consultations

10.1 Potential sale of the Martlesham Police Headquarters site for residential development CR6, DP/19 & 20 – noted.

Clerk to check the planning application for the Police Investigation Centre with regard to mitigation measures.

Clerk to request feedback from the public meeting re the sale of the Police HQ.

10.2 Grainger plc referred to MPC by SCDC re development of its land

Noted that we have not received any approach to date.

DECISION D2018/8f: To suspend Standing Order 3w to complete all business on the agenda. **Agreed.**

11. Brightwell Lakes (formerly called Adastral Park) Development

11.1 Any update on Community Liaison Group?

The Clerk circulated an e-mail from Ben Woolnough regarding the change of the name to Community Forum and with draft terms of reference. We are invited to put forward two representatives – noted that this can be ratified by the full Council. Mr Denton was happy to put himself forward and suggested that Mr Irwin might also be interested.

Clerk to suggest to Mr Woolnough that a NHS representative should also be a member of the Forum.

12. Suffolk Coastal DC decisions E-mailed in advance of the meeting and noted.

13. Planning Comments issued to SCDC between meetings

CP – circulated at the meeting and filed in the office together with the minutes. Noted.

14. SCDC Scheme of Delegation

14.1 Table of Clerk's referrals CP – circulated at the meeting and filed in the office together with the minutes. Noted.

15. Referrals to SCDC Planning Committee meetings

15.1 8 Birch Grove – application refused Noted.

16. Appeals

16.1 Bell Lane appeal refused DP/21 – noted.

The Clerk reported that DC/17/3143/FUL – Part Garden of 11 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath and DC/17/4684/OUT – Land adjacent to The Chestnuts, Hall Road, Kesgrave have both gone to appeal. There is an opportunity to make further comments to the Planning Inspector by 06 September 2018.

Clerk to highlight in the case of Birch Grove that the Martlesham NP has been made. **Clerk** to ask Liz Beighton, Senior Planning Officer, if there is anything that the PC can do to support SCDC's case against 11 Birch Grove.

No further comments with regard to The Chestnuts.

17. Martlesham Newsletters

17.1 Any issues for the September 2018 editions

Refer to the Travis Perkins planning application and the lively & robust DPC meeting held with a large turnout by Falcon Park & Hilton Road residents.

18. Any items for the next agenda

None identified.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.45pm.

M. J. Irwin

Chairman, 05 September 2018