

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS COMMITTEE OF  
MARTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2018**

**Present:** Miss J I L Bear (Committee), Mr C Blundell (Committee), Mr L Brome (Chairman), Mr J Forbes (Committee), Mr M Irwin (ex officio), Mr E Thompson (Committee),

There were no members of the public.

**In attendance:** Mrs D Linsley (Deputy Clerk).

**1. Apologies:** Mr S Denton, Mr J Kelso, Mr W Welch, Mr H Woldsmith.

**2. Interests**

2.1 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI): None declared.

2.2 Local non-Pecuniary Interest (LNPI): None declared.

**3. Actions from last Meeting**

Actions completed or on the agenda.

**4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** *To allow members of the public to address business on the agenda; to note any issues raised by the public*

There were no members of the public.

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

5.1 DC/17/4684/OUT – Land adjacent to The Chestnuts, Hall Road, Kesgrave – Dwellings on land adjacent to The Chestnuts, Hall Road, Kesgrave (extension for comments to 15.02.18 received) (see CR1)

*Response from Kesgrave TC and SCC Highways - objection from Kesgrave Town Council and an objection from SCC Highways as no application has been made to create a new access as shown on the plans. Response to be submitted on 15.02.18.*

**DECISION D2018/2a:** The Parish Council has consistently objected to additional housing in this area because it is development in a Special Landscape Area in the Countryside, i.e. outside the physical limits of the parish. It does not meet the requirements of SP29 "The Countryside" of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan. The new SCDC policy SSP38 in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Development Plan Document protects Special Landscape Areas.

There appears to be no reference to the Local Plan or the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan which carries some weight as it is nearing completion of the Examination Stage. Local Plan Policy SP15 - Landscape & Townscape applies to this site, as does MNP Policy MAR1 which shows the physical limits boundaries for Martlesham.

The Chestnuts site & land adjacent has a long history of refused applications and appeals. Inspectors have concluded that development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Special Landscape Area, which outweighs any benefit. Concern was also raised about the loss of and pressure to remove trees within protected woodland, part of which is covered by a TPO.

The Parish Council objects to this planning application. **Agreed.**

5.2 DC/18/0180/FUL – Waldringfield Golf Club and Chapel Works Site, Newbourne Road, Waldringfield – Demolition of existing buildings on the Chapel Works Industrial area and the redevelopment of the site for 16 residential dwellings; the development of the golf course practice area for 33 age-restricted dwellings and 24 holiday chalets; together with landscaping, car parking, supporting infrastructure and the continued use of the existing points of vehicular access into the application site from Newbourne Road. (see CR2) (extension for comments to 19.02.18 received)

Waldringfield Parish Council's preliminary report, previously circulated, is filed in the office together with the minutes.

**DECISION D2018/2b:** Martlesham Parish Council objects to this planning application on the following grounds:

- The site is outside the physical limits of Waldringfield and therefore in the 'countryside'. The development does not meet the requirements of Local Plan policy SP29 – the Countryside and paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- The proposed development would be in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This development cannot be assessed in isolation from the approved Adastral Park housing allocation of 2,000 dwellings and it is vital that cumulative effects are taken into account.
- The development would bring additional cars to the area with regular vehicular movements on and off site in order to access shopping & leisure facilities elsewhere, and for some residents to get to their place of work. It would have a detrimental impact on the local highway network.
- There is a lack of connectivity to the surrounding areas and therefore the application is contrary to paragraphs 32 and 35 of the NPPF.
- Additional housing and holiday makers will also bring an increase in walkers & dog walking. The Deben SPA (Ramsar) site is within 1km which will be a strong draw for residents and visitors alike. The provision of on-site dog walking facilities and improved areas of landscaping would be welcomed but the fact remains that the development will inevitably bring increased visitor numbers to local sites of interest and an increase in disturbance to birds and wildlife. Due to the lack of connectivity residents are also very likely to use the car to get to destinations in Waldringfield or neighbouring villages for walking.
- It would contribute to coalescence, reducing the open spaces between the new development at Adastral Park and Waldringfield.
- This planning application does not contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development nor does it accord with the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan taken as a whole. There is no identifiable need for such housing in this location. With reference to paragraph 7 of the NPPF, there may be some economic benefit from the development but it cannot be shown to be 'land of the right type', 'in the right place' and at 'the right time' to support growth and innovation. The development would not fulfil a social role reflecting the community's needs, or an environmental role – it would be to the detriment of the natural environment. **Agreed.**

5.3 DC/17/5259/OUT – Chandlers Lodge, Ipswich Road, Martlesham – Outline Application – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of proposed 4no. houses and 1no. bungalow (see CR3)

**DECISION D2018/2c:** Martlesham Parish Council objects to this planning application on the following grounds:

- The 5 properties on the outline plan appear cramped and represent overdevelopment. The application is therefore contrary to Local Plan policy DM7 – Infilling and Backland Development within Physical Limits Boundaries, in particular it does not meet requirement (a) *"It would not result in a cramped form of development out of character with the area or street scene"*; the other categories (b) to (e) are also pertinent in this case.
- There appear to be no proposed garages. There would be little room for parking or manoeuvring what could be up to 10 cars (2 for each property) and therefore no indication of where visitors might park, which is likely to be in Seckford Hall Road. The application is therefore contrary to policies DM19 – Parking Standards & DM22 – Design: Function *"Planning permission will be granted for new development if the following criteria are met: (a) The design and layout of the development provides and maintains safe and convenient access for people with disabilities; (b) New development generally makes adequate provision for public transport, cars, cycling, garages, parking areas, access ways, footways etc in a manner whereby such provision does not dominate or prejudice the overall quality of design and appearance; (c) Provision is made to enable access, turning and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles and the collection of waste."*
- The proposed development is out of keeping with the surroundings. It is therefore against policy DM21 – Design: Aesthetics, in particular (a) *"proposals should relate well to the scale*

and character of their surroundings particularly in terms of their siting, height, massing and form."

- The proposed garden of the bungalow will be overlooked by the townhouses. The application is considered contrary to policy DM23 – Residential Amenity "Development will be acceptable where it would not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjoining or future occupiers of the development."
- Increased vehicular movements at this location will decrease road safety at the already difficult junctions of Seckford Hall Road/Old Barrack Road/Ipswich Road/California.

Please note that page 6 of the applicant's Planning Supporting Statement refers to policies considered relevant to the determination of the proposal but they do not exist within the SCDC Local Plan. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) relevant policies are also listed. The applicant refers to a need for further residential development in the area due to a lack of 5-year housing land supply and the need for further housing to meet government ambitions, as well as the development helping to support and maintain local services and communities. The Parish Council understands that SCDC can now demonstrate that it has a 5-year housing land supply. The adverse effects of this development would significantly outweigh any perceived economic, social or environmental advantages. **Agreed.**

## **6. Adastral Park (AP) Development**

6.1 AP Development of 2,000 dwellings unanimously approved by SCDC Planning Committee on 15.01.18 Noted.

## **7. Consultations/Infrastructure Projects**

7.1 Consultation on Air Quality in Suffolk Coastal DP/4 + Mr Denton's comments circulated via email and filed in the office together with the minutes.

The **Clerk** to submit a response based on a report by Mr Denton to be compiled. The Committee supported Mr Denton's initial comments, circulated via email (filed in the office together with the minutes), arising from his reading of SCDC's air quality report.

The response to include a request that monitoring of air quality is continued during the development of Adastral Park as data collected could help monitor the effects of this large development.

7.2 Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Working Group meeting – opportunity to attend DP/5

**DECISION D2018/2d:** To ratify that **Mr Denton** is to represent the PC at the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Working Group meeting on Friday 23 February. **Agreed.**

7.3 Suffolk Highways: Community Self Help DP/6 & questionnaire

The Committee addressed each question in turn.

**RECOMMENDATION D2018/2a:** To complete the Suffolk Highways: Community Self Help survey monkey questionnaire as recommended by the Development Plans Committee and attached to these minutes (filed in the office together with the minutes). **Agreed.**

## **8. Pre-Planning Application Consultations**

8.1 Anything further on proposed development on Anson Road

Nothing new to report to date (Clerk provided Liz Beighton, SCDC Officer, with the 5 year mitigation plan for Martlesham Common LNR)

8.2 Proposed Development of Land off Bell Lane for 1,300 homes DP/2 Noted.

**9. Suffolk Coastal DC decisions** E-mailed weekly Noted.

**10. Planning Comments issued to SCDC between meetings** CP - at the meeting Noted.

## **11. SCDC Scheme of Delegation**

11.1 Table of Clerk's referrals CP Noted.

## **12. Referrals to SCDC Planning Committee meetings**

### **12.1 Land off Anson Road Drive Thru Unit & ALDI application**

*Nothing new to report to date*

Cllr Blundell reported that the ALDI application might be determined in March.

## **13. Appeals**

13.1 DC/16/4654/OUT Home Meadows Nursery: Public Inquiry on 10.01.18 – Mr Brome represented the PC – awaiting decision Noted.

## **14. Neighbourhood Planning (NP)**

14.1 Examiner's Report with recommendations for modifications received – due to be published on SCDC website Verbal update Note

*Meeting being held on 15.02.18 with SCDC & Navigus to agree modifications*

It was reported that the meeting will finalise the response to the examiner's recommendations. Drafts have already been prepared. Topics include ensuring greater protection for undeveloped areas in the parish, both within and between built up areas and safeguarding the aviation heritage. A realistic target for the referendum, which will be managed by "East Suffolk", is April or May.

## **15. Highway Matters**

15.1 Proposals for two pedestrian crossings at Anson Road & Felixstowe Road DP/1 Noted.

15.2 Speed Limits – Sandy Lane & Martlesham Hill (Top Street) There was no progress to report. Noted.

15.3 Cycle mirror at Broomfields: advice from SCC Safety & Speed Management Engineer DP/3  
*If the mirror can be placed on private land with permission of the landowner, does the DPC wish to carry out this project if it is within budget?*

MHHL's response that they were no longer keen to allow the mirror on their land given the advice provided by SCC (see DP/3) that they could be found liable if any accident occurred was disappointing.

As there are no funds available to straighten the path the Committee felt that the only option available to them was to end the project. **Agreed.**

Concern was raised about the potential for accidents to occur in this area in the future. The responsibility for the safety of those using this path was with SCC Highways.

15.4 Highways Register (latest version circulated by e-mail as requested) CP – Highways Register filed in the office together with the minutes.

The following comments were made on the Highways Register:

### **Priority 1**

#### **Improve Eagle Way crossing at Manor Road.**

This priority was mentioned in the 'walk through' with the PC, SCDC, SCC Highways, CEG, Cllr O'Brien and 2 local residents on 07.12.17 and is included (point 10) in the resulting summary map compiled by Ben Woolnough titled 'Martlesham pedestrian movement – improvement opportunities'.

A point further away from the A12 and roundabout was identified as being a safer place to position a crossing.

DPC to continue to press for a solution. **Agreed.**

### **Priority 2.**

#### **Footbridge over A12.**

Use of the bridge will increase with the development of Adastral Park.

**DECISION D2018/2e:** To lobby for a new footbridge over the A12 to improve arrangements for combined pedestrian and cycle use and to accommodate increased use resulting from the Adastral Park development of 2,000 homes. **Carried.**

To consider the demise of the NP team and the role of the APWG at the next DPC meeting in April.

**Agreed.**

**Priority 3**

**Footway up Lamb Barn Hill**

Remove from the register as the project has been completed. **Agreed.**

**Priority 4**

**Sandy Lane – improvements for pedestrians & cyclists**

Mr Denton and Cllr Page are continuing to work on making the speed limit along the length of Sandy Lane 30mph. Ongoing.

Visibility for those leaving the industrial units is obstructed by hedges. The **Clerk** to write to the landowner and request that they are trimmed. **Agreed.**

**Priority 5**

**Awkward right turn into Main Road coming north up A12.**

Near misses continue to occur on the roundabout. The situation appears to have worsened since the completion of Mill Heath. Ongoing.

The **Clerk** to obtain accident figures from SCC Highways. **Agreed.**

**Priority 6**

**Improvements to link between Top Street & Ipswich Road**

This section is dangerous for cyclists and visibility is very restricted. Cyclists often have to dismount and walk.

Cllr Blundell thought that there might be an opportunity for improvements to be made after the windfarm cabling has been laid during the restoration phase of the works.

The **Clerk** to contact SCC Highways to request that the vegetation on both sides of Martlesham Hill/northern end of Top Street is trimmed back. **Agreed.**

**Priority 7**

**Eagle Way crossing at Valiant Road (Birchwood School)**

Remove from the register. See item 15.3 Cycle mirror at Broomfields: advice from SCC Safety & Speed Management Engineer above. **Agreed.**

**Priority to be set**

**Create a pedestrian route along the access track used by the Environment Agency.**

The project is a good idea. Mr Burrows, who suggested the new route, to be asked if he would be willing to explore the project further. **Agreed.**

**Priority to be set**

**To improve the junction where Felixstowe Road, Gloster Road & Anson Road meet ensuring road safety and reduced congestion (added in June 2013)**

This was referred to during the 'walk through' with SCDC, CEG and others on 07.12.17 (See Priority 1)

To note that improvements might encourage more use of the Felixstowe Road and Gloster Road as a rat run. **Agreed.**

The Highways Register to be updated and filed in the office together with the minutes. **Agreed.**

**16. Other issues pertinent to the committee**

16.1 Meeting with District Councillors & SCDC officer re Mill Heath development CR4 Noted.

The **Clerk** to contact Mr Newton for an update. **Agreed.**

6.2 Michael Howard Homes Development off Black Tiles Lane CR5 Consider

The need for someone to look into the issue of access to the Jubilee Play Space and the provision of play facilities on the proposed development was discussed.

**Mr Blundell** volunteered to look into the matter as he had recently met with local residents who were concerned about the development.

16.3 Development of Woodbridge Town Football Club site by Hopkins Homes

*Requested as agenda item at Dec DPC meeting.*

Cllr Blundell informed the Committee that there had been no further developments. Information from Hopkins Homes was needed. The football club were having difficulty making plans for the future and the maintenance of the pitches was being affected.

16.4 SCDC's Civil Parking Enforcement

*Requested as agenda item at Dec DPC meeting.*

Cllr Blundell informed the Committee that all the Suffolk district councils were working together and were in agreement. As the Government is occupied with Brexit the power/responsibility for civil parking enforcement is unlikely to be granted in the near future.

16.5 Martlesham Park and Ride: SCC confirmed no current plans for change Noted. *(Reported at February PC meeting)*

16.6 NP-Plus (agreed as a standing item on agendas)

*Hard copies issued previously, Mr Brome to identify the relevant issues in the NP-Plus – ongoing*

**The Chairman** to reassess how NP-Plus issues are tackled.

**Mr Irwin** to recirculate the NP-Plus paper. **Agreed.** **Mr Irwin** to pass on any specific NP-Plus issues to Cllr Blundell to consider for the Core Strategy. **Agreed.**

**Mr Forbes** to email Cllr Blundell about strengthening policy SP14 which helps to protect wildlife and wildlife corridors but does not prevent fences and barriers to wildlife being erected across ordinary gardens. Mr Forbes informed the Committee of the tall metal fence erected around the Brethren Church development recently which prevents the movement of mammals. Mr Forbes hopes that hedges, not fences can be encouraged. **Agreed.**

**17. Martlesham Newsletters**

17.1 Any issues for the April 2018 editions

There were no suggestions.

**18. Any items for the next agenda**

To consider the winding up of the NP team and possible changes to the APWG.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.30pm.

*M. J. Irwin*

---

Chairman, 07 March 2018