

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS COMMITTEE OF  
MARTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON 13 JUNE 2018**

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

There were 16 members of the public.

The Chairman thanked Mr Brome for his work as the Chairman of the DPC for the previous 8 years.

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

**1. Apologies:** Miss J Bear, Mr Kelso, Mr W Welch, Mr H Woldsmith.

**2. Interests**

2.1 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI): None declared.

2.2 Local non-Pecuniary Interest (LNPI): Mr Irwin, item 15.8 National Cycling Route No.1 Felixstowe Road - Mr Irwin is a member of Sustrans.

Mr Denton, item 5.1 DC/18/2068/FUL – 8 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath – Proposed detached two-storey dwelling (revised scheme) - Mr Denton has friends and a former business colleague that live in Birch Grove.

**3. Actions from last Meeting**

Actions completed 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 public forum proposed in light of agenda items 5.1 and 6.1)*  
The Chairman explained the meeting procedure to the members of the public.

It was agreed that **Mr Brome** chair the public forum and subsequent committee discussions to address item 5.1 DC/18/2068/FUL – 8 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath – Proposed detached two-storey dwelling (revised scheme) due to Mr Denton's declared local non-pecuniary interest, see item 2.2 above. **Agreed.**

Mr Brome gave a brief résumé of the planning history of the site and invited the applicant to speak. The applicant stressed that the covenant on the property was a legal issue between Grainger Plc and homeowners on Martlesham Heath and was not a planning issue. His view was that Birch Grove does not have to be restricted to 12 houses and that more homes could be allowed by the planning authority. The applicant queried his neighbours' concerns that their views would be adversely affected by the proposed build and mentioned that he is open to discussions on screening the development by planting a hedge and landscaping. He felt that the impact of a few more cars in Birch Grove would not be significant. He added that several changes had been made since the original vision of Mr Parker for the village. The applicant cited examples on Martlesham Heath and in Old Martlesham where infilling had been granted on plots much smaller than his and had resulted in overcrowded plots which had greatly diminished the aesthetic quality of some of the original homes. Mr Brome stressed that the Parish Council had objected to the applications mentioned by the applicant and reminded the meeting that the planning authority, who had granted permission for these homes, is the District Council. The PC had been consistent in its approach to these planning applications.

A resident, who supported the many objections lodged with the District Council, did not think the proposed building met Local Plan policies. The development was cramped and out of character. The proposed house was close to the host house and its design was too long and narrow. There would be a reduction in the residential amenity and a loss of light to the garden at No.10. The development was against policies MAR3 and MAR4 of the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan (NP).

The Chairman closed the Public Forum for the Committee to consider item 5.1

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

5.1 DC/18/2068/FUL – 8 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath – Proposed detached two-storey dwelling (revised scheme) (extension for comments to 14.06.18 received) (see CR1)

Mr Irwin could not see anything that differentiated this application from the recently refused application for 11 Birch Grove. Comments made by the PC on the initial application which had been withdrawn had not been addressed.

Mr Forbes had not objected to the previous application for the site but recognised that since that time circumstances had changed. The NP had been accepted by 94% of those who voted and therefore needed to be taken into account. Policy MAR 4 of the NP did allow for small properties, however, the house proposed was too large for the plot.

The consensus was that the Committee should support the relevant policies clearly stated in the NP. Mr Brome emphasised that the PC was clear in its aims to maintain the character of Martlesham where it can.

The application was more problematic than the previous application for the site.

The Chairman permitted the applicant to respond.

The applicant disputed the distance quoted by others regarding the space between buildings. Advise that he had been given by a Planning Officer had latterly been changed. He stressed that there would be no issue of overlooking into neighbouring properties. He remarked that District Council planners had suggested a large building for the plot.

**DECISION D2018/6a:** The Parish Council **objects** to this planning application. It notes that some of the reasons for the planning authority's refusal of planning application DC/18/11134/FUL for 11 Birch Grove apply equally to this site. The refusal notice acknowledged that "*Birch Grove is characterised by large detached dwellings set within substantial plots, and this character derives from the vision and masterplanning of Martlesham Heath*".

The Council's objections are made on the following grounds:

1. The planning application is against SCDC Local Plan policies DM7 & DM23 and does not meet all the criteria that are required for the sub-division of plots.

a) DM7 – Infilling and Backland Development within Physical Limits Boundaries – it would be out of character with the area and street scene. It would significantly reduce residential amenity with loss of privacy for the neighbouring property at no.10. It would erode the particular character of the surroundings. Provision for a reasonable size curtilage has not been made with regard to the size of the buildings and their setting. In Birch Grove this new dwelling would be uncharacteristically close to the existing dwelling and to the boundary with no. 10. It also extends rearwards towards the boundary with Eagle Way which is uncharacteristic of the hamlet's overall design and would adversely affect the street scene from Eagle Way.

b) DM23 – Residential Amenity – the Council considers that there would be unacceptable loss of amenity to the neighbouring property due to overlooking and loss of sunlight. Particular attention needs to be paid to the difference in height levels between no. 8 & no. 10 Birch Grove. The proposed property is only about 5.5 feet from the boundary, and would sit about 8 feet higher than no. 10, therefore the gable end overlooking no.10's patio will be at a relative height of approx. 35 feet above the patio. Overall the structure will be approx. 65 feet long close to the southern boundary of no.10.

Please see the three images at the foot of this document - 2 aerial shots showing the proposal in the context of the existing layout, and the street scene showing elevation difference between no. 8 (applicant) and no. 10 (neighbour).

2. It is against the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 53 states: "Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area".

Condition 5 of the original 1981 planning permission for Hamlet K (now Birch Grove) C7763/182 clearly states "not more than 12 dwellings to be erected on the site". This condition was imposed in the interests of amenity and the Parish Council is unaware of any time limit on this condition.

Martlesham Heath was an award winning village due to its design and therefore conditions were imposed so that it could retain its character & this has been maintained successfully over many years. If backland development is allowed, it will undermine the original design of the Birch Grove hamlet which was one of large properties on large plots. It could set a precedent of infilling which would eventually erode the character of the village which the District Council has sought to retain as a rare example of a successful 'new' village. The 2002 Local Plan said of Martlesham Heath: *'Basically, the overall physical and design principle which emanates from the original social concept is one of a series of hamlets separated from each other by wide areas of open space. The District Council has sought, and will continue to uphold the principles of this concept, and, accordingly, once these hamlets have been fully developed there will be no potential for further development other than ancillary to recreation of an outdoor nature. To do otherwise would be regarded as adversely affecting the village and its open setting.'*

3. It does not accord with the following Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan policies, which have built on the District Council's policies to maintain an exemplar village:

Policy MAR3: Development within Martlesham Heath

- A. Within the physical limits boundary of Martlesham Heath, but outside the areas to be protected from development (Policy MAR2), proposed development should be in keeping with the character of the individual hamlet in which the site is located or is adjacent to.
- B. In particular, development should be at broadly the same density as the existing density of the hamlet. It must also take into account the requirement for an appropriate level of parking (Policy MAR15).

Policy MAR4: Residential Design and Amenity

Proposals for residential development will be expected to demonstrate good quality design. In particular, development proposals will be expected to (NB. Only relevant clauses are shown below):

1. respond to and integrate with local surroundings and the local landscape context as well as the existing built environment;
3. retain the established building line and be in keeping with the existing arrangements of front gardens, walls, railings and hedges;
4. relate to the established plot widths within streets, particularly where this has established a rhythm to the architecture in a street;
6. ensure that new buildings, including balconies, do not adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by virtue of overshadowing or impinging on privacy;

The Parish Council adds the following comments:

- The existing dwelling at no.8 is not built centrally on the plot as the plot was used as a landfill site; this is not acknowledged within the planning application. There would need to be more extensive research into land contamination.
- The applicant considers this to be a much needed family home. The Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan has not identified a need for such large houses within the parish nor is it needed to meet SCDC's 5-year housing land supply.
- If SCDC is minded to approve this application, the Parish Council strongly urges the Planning Committee to make a site visit before reaching a decision because of the complexity of the land gradients.

**Carried.**

Mr Denton resumed the chair.

**4. PUBLIC FORUM** continued to address item 6.1 Potential sale of the Martlesham Police Headquarters site for residential development: invitation to briefing by Suffolk PCC on 12.06.18/exhibition on 18.06.18

The Chairman reported that representatives from Martlesham PC and Kesgrave TC had attended a briefing with Police Crime Commissioner, Tim Passmore, on the potential sale of the Martlesham

Police Headquarters. He explained the main issues of the briefing which he had listed on the meeting room white board.

As well as an income from the sale of the site savings would be made by not having to meet current running costs for the building. A proportion of any profits from the sale would have to be given to Grainger Plc, previously Bradford Property Trust.

Neither the NP nor the Local Plan has allocated housing on the site. The Revised Local Plan, to be consulted on in the near future, also does not allocate the site for housing.

The Chairman encouraged people to attend the public meeting on 18.06.18 and make their views explicit when asked to fill in a questionnaire.

Issues include access off the A1214, the effect of increased traffic on the A1214 and proximity to the Police Investigation Centre (PIC) which is about 15 years into a 25 year PFI contract which would be expensive to be released from. Other issues raised included the density of housing (250 homes for the site) which would be higher than local developments i.e. Mill Heath (approximately 180) and housing on Woods Lane, Melton. Tall buildings, including apartments, would replace the HQ building. None of the needs of the parish, shown in the NP, are addressed by the proposal.

A member of the public queried whether work on preparing the site had already begun as several trees at the back of Squires Lane had been cleared. The Police had indicated at the meeting that they would retain trees etc. to provide screening.

It was confirmed that the PIC is separate to the plans for the HQ site, however, it was not known what would happen to the police houses on Portal Avenue. All buildings on site are to be 'flattened' and a 'clean sheet' created.

The woodland to the west is leased by Grainger Plc to Martlesham Heath Householders Ltd. Portal Woodland, to the north, is owned by Grainger Plc and managed by Portal Woodlands Conservation Group, a working group of the PC. Rare species have been recorded on Portal Woodlands. The Clerk reported that the Police would be undertaking their own surveys.

A member of the public stressed the need to provide a suitably sized area of open space. There had been a lot of discussion about the sensitive nature of the Deben estuary during the BT development process and the creation of the Local Plan. The cumulative, damaging effects of several developments on the Deben Estuary could affect the progress of Brightwell Lakes. The development of the Police HQ could not be seen in isolation.

The District Council had 'agreed' a respite for Martlesham from further development.

It was not known what would happen to the trees planted in commemoration of police officers.

There is no specific site plan available at the moment. The proposal had not been discussed with the District Council.

13 members of the public left the meeting.

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

6.1 Potential sale of the Martlesham Police Headquarters site for residential development: invitation to briefing by Suffolk PCC on 12.06.18/exhibition on 18.06.18 DP/15

**DECISION D2018/6b:** To request that the District Council put in place TPO's on the mature trees and wooded areas on the Police Headquarters site. **Agreed.**

The following actions were agreed:

The **Clerk** to ask for the feedback received at the exhibition to be held on 18.06.18.

The **Clerk** to ask the Police if work has begun on the proposed development.

To seek clarification of Grainger Plc's position.

To ask PWCG for their input.

The potential sale of the Martlesham Police Headquarters to be placed on the July PC agenda.

The **NP team** to take up Mr Passmore's invitation to meet when further information has come to light.

The PC to communicate its vision for the site, based on information from the NP, if the proposal is granted planning permission.

The **Clerk** to thank the PCC for briefing the PC and inform him that it **objects** to the proposal because:

- The proposal does not fit in with the NP, the Local Plan or the revised Local Plan.

- There are concerns about the A1214 access, the impact of more traffic on the A1214, the proximity of the development to the PIC and existing houses and the height of the dwellings that are proposed to replace the Police HQ building.
- The proposed density of housing of 250 homes for the site is higher than new housing developments in the area.
- None of the needs of the parish, set out in the NP, are addressed.

**Agreed.**

2 members of the public left the meeting.

**6.2 Anything further on proposed development on Anson Road, near Falcon Park**

There was nothing new to report to date.

In response to Mr Forbes request that the trees on the site be protected with a TPO Mr Brome reported that to his knowledge many of the trees in the centre of the site had been removed. **Mr Forbes** to visit the site again and liaise with the Clerk on whether there is a need for a TPO. **Agreed.**

**7. Brightwell Lakes (formerly called Adastral Park) Development**

7.1 Meeting with CEG on 24.04.18 CP filed in the office together with the minutes. Noted.

The Clerk went through her notes of the meeting briefly. Mr Irwin reminded the meeting that the PC was to be consulted on the development of the main boulevard and T Junction in May/June. The **Clerk** to ask for an update. **Agreed.**

**7.2 Brightwell Lakes Working Group**

*Note: Adastral Park WG renamed & re-appointed at May Annual PC meeting.*

**7.3 Possible themes for street names in Brightwell Lakes Delegated by full PC**

Eminent scientists were suggested as the theme for street names in Brightwell Lakes e.g. Ada Lovelace, Charles Babbage and Michael Faraday. This would reflect the impact of scientific work on the parish e.g. the work undertaken at the BT laboratories and in aviation research. **Agreed.**

**7.4 Any update?**

There was no update.

**8. Consultations/Infrastructure Projects**

8.1 Local Plan Review: Consultation due 20.07.18 – 14.09.18 Noted.

Mr Brome left the meeting at 9pm and returned at 9.03pm.

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

**10. Planning Comments issued to SCDC between meetings** CP – circulated at the meeting and filed in the office together with the minutes. Noted.

**11. SCDC Scheme of Delegation**

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

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

12.1 Land off Anson Road Drive Thru Unit CR2

This application will be considered by the District Council's Planning Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018. Issues relate to the landscape proposals and the pedestrian crossings. **Mr Brome** will attend if possible.

12.2 DC/18/1134/FUL – 11 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath: application refused Noted.

12.3 DC/17/5462/FUL - 9 Carlford Close - 2-storey side extension: application refused CR3 Noted.

### 13. Appeals

#### 13.1 Bell Lane appeal still pending

Cllr Blundell informed the Committee that the original planning application for 300 houses was going to Public Inquiry.

### 14. Neighbourhood Planning (NP)

#### 14.1 Referendum – congratulations & next stage DP/16 Noted.

The 'Yes' outcome at the referendum was a good result. A lot of hard work had been accomplished over 5 years.

**Councillors** to inform the Clerk if they prefer a hard copy or electronic copy of the NP.

#### 14.2 Ongoing work on aspects of the NP and NP Plus after the referendum

The Chairman explained that it would be very beneficial to develop areas of expertise. Other parish and town councils have Transport Committees. The Chairman to find out how these committees operate.

Mr Brome suggested bringing together retailers, business park owners and others to provide funding for projects and lobby the District Council. The role of the PC would be to bring together the group. It would take a lot of work and resources which the PC does not have.

Mr Irwin suggested using the services of Community Action Suffolk (CAS) to undertake a Village Audit based on issues listed in the NP Plus. Through that process volunteers could be identified to move forward on various projects. Mr Brome added that the PC could act as a catalyst to community projects.

Mr Irwin and the Clerk will be attending media training including using media in campaigning on 3<sup>rd</sup> July in order to help achieve the aims of the NP Plus.

Cllr Blundell, as a District Councillor, reported that the CPE was underway. When the power has fully been transferred the District Council will be able to ask for yellow lines, signs and road crossings, it will also set fees across the district. The District Council will also be responsible for on and off street parking. The enforcement role will be contracted out.

Cllr Blundell was in favour of an 'employers' forum'. He recommended that a cautious approach was taken when approaching businesses to join the group. He was happy to be part of the group. Mr Brome added that possible projects for the forum to consider could include traffic circulation, wheelchair accessibility and parking. The involvement of key players is needed to make such a group viable.

### 15. Highway Matters

#### 15.1 Highways Register (HR) circulated by e-mail Noted.

#### 15.2 HR(priority to be set): Create a pedestrian route along the access track used by the Environment Agency

Mr Burrows has agreed to progress the project and is seeking agreement from the landowner – Noted.

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

It was noted that Cllrs O'Brien & Page have agreed to work in partnership.

The Chairman was focussing on speed limits along Sandy Lane and did not support the inclusion of Martlesham Hill. He reported that he had contacted both County Councillors informing them that he would be happy to meet with them to progress the project.

The last member of the public left the meeting.

#### 15.4 HR Priority 4: Accident figures for the Martlesham Park & Ride roundabout

Collision data circulated by email on 29.05.18

It had been worth paying the money for the data.

Mr Brome understood the data to show that the accidents that occurred were down to human error.

Mr Irwin suggested that the data proved that those involved with collisions on the roundabout were not to blame. The fact that there were accidents meant that engineering solutions were needed to remove risks and make the roundabout safer to use.

The topic of the Martlesham Park & Ride roundabout to stay on the agenda although the matter cannot be progressed at the current time. **Agreed.**

15.5 Work to trees on highways land & new dropped kerb - Angela Close/Endeavour CR4  
Cllr Blundell reported that he had copies of the permissions given for the dropped kerb. He had contacted the Landscape Officer for SCDC who had no problem with the removal of the trees. Concern was raised that permission was given for a dropped kerb despite a planning application for the site being refused. The removal of the trees had been to the detriment to the street scene. It was difficult for the Committee to fully understand how these actions had been allowed.

At 9.30pm the following decision was made.

**DECISION D2018/6c:** To suspend Standing Order 3w to complete all business on the agenda.  
**Agreed.**

15.6 Parking at junction of Anson Road & Betts Avenue DP/11  
Emails from Roberto Ices Ltd were circulated at the meeting and are filed in the office together with the minutes.  
The District Council will have the powers to assist with issues of parking in the future (see item 14.2 above). Any future solutions should include the area by Greggs.  
The Clerk to send a reply.

15.7 Felixstowe Road bus route and Wickes development DP/12  
There was a brief discussion.  
**DECISION D2018/6d:** To note and ratify the Clerk's response to Mr and Mrs Leonard's letter about their concerns regarding the Felixstowe Road bus route and Wickes development as detailed in the Clerk's Report for June 2018, DP/12. **Agreed.**

15.8 National Cycling Route No.1 Felixstowe Road DP/18  
Mr Denton had been in contact with Jill Painter over the matter. He had suggested that she take traffic counts on the Felixstowe Road. Jill Painter is continuing to try and reduce rat running down the Felixstowe Road and encourage cyclists back on to our roads.

15.9 New Traffic Regulation Order DP/14 e-mailed on 24.04.18  
There were no comments.

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

16.1 Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 267 on 5 maple trees on land beside the eastern car park, Martlesham Heath Details e-mailed on 30.04.18 Noted.

The creation of TPO 267 on 5 maple trees on land beside the eastern car park, Martlesham Heath was a good result.

Cllr Blundell added that TPOs without a strong wildlife element to them cannot prevent planning applications being granted.

This is pertinent to the PWCG.

16.2 TPO 268 Chandlers Lodge DP/13 It was noted that the Clerk had welcomed the TPO.

16.3 Five year housing land supply – response from P Rowson DP/17 Noted.

16.4 Michael Howard Homes Development off Black Tiles Lane  
There was no update.

16.5 DPC Terms of Reference CR5 & CP

*Consider & give comments/ideas to the Clerk by Tues 31 July in time for the August agenda*

The Chairman to develop his ideas on the DPC ToR and produce a starter paper for discussion.

Cllr Blundell suggested that this could be a group discussion.

**17. Martlesham Newsletters**

17.1 Any issues for the August 2018 editions

Consultation on the revised Local Plan, proposed sale of the Police HQ.

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

DPC Terms of Reference.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.44pm.

*M. J. Irwin*

---

Chairman, 04 July 2018