

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS COMMITTEE OF  
MARTLESHAM PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON 11 APRIL 2018**

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

There were 14 members of the public.

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

**1. Apologies:** Mr C Blundell, Mr S Denton, 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 FORUM:** To allow members of the public to address business on the agenda; to note any issues raised by the public

DC/18/1134/FUL – 11 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath – Construction of a detached two-storey dwelling and detached garage – revised scheme

The Chairman informed the public that the PC had objected to the original planning application.

Local resident, Julian Page, informed the meeting that 165 objections had been submitted in response to the first application which had been unanimously rejected by SCDC's Planning Committee. He urged the PC to reject the current planning application which was judged to be worse than the previous application as it did not address any of the concerns raised by the first application and included a garage making the site more cramped. Mr Page listed the planning policies in the Local Plan and in the NP which the application was contrary to.

The proposed sealed patio doors could mean the loss of a fire escape. Concern was raised that the patio doors could be reinstated by the owners at a later date without the need for planning permission. The erection of a garage close to the boundary of the site will greatly reduce the amenity value of the adjacent path which would be transformed from a pleasant, treed lane to an enclosed walled alleyway.

Recently felled trees have exposed the site. Concern was raised that the building would not blend in and without the trees will be highly visible.

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

5.1 DC/18/1134/FUL – 11 Birch Grove, Martlesham Heath – Construction of a detached two-storey dwelling and detached garage – revised scheme (extension for comments to 13.04.18 received) (see CR1)

**DECISION D2018/4a:** The Parish Council objected to the previous scheme for this site, planning application DC/17/3143/FUL, which was unanimously refused planning permission by the SCDC Planning Committee following a site visit. The Parish Council considers that this revised scheme does not overcome its objections and is in some aspects worse than the previous application. It strongly recommends that the planning authority refuses this planning application.

The grounds for objection are:

1. It is against SCDC Local Plan policies DM7, DM23 & SP15 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** – in particular this is a cramped development out of character with the area and street

scene, made worse by the addition of a garage. It would significantly reduce residential amenity for both the existing and neighbouring dwellings. It would erode the particular character of the surroundings as the proposed style and finishes of the property are more likely to make it stand out in the street scene rather than blending in. 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.

- b) **DM23 – Residential Amenity** – the Council considers that there would be unacceptable loss of amenity to the neighbouring property due to overlooking as the new property would look directly into the garden of no.9 as well as into the donor dwelling. Loss of amenity to the donor dwelling no.11 will be increased by the proposed sealing of a pair of patio doors on the elevation facing the proposed dwelling. We note that the latter may be an issue for building regulations due to the loss of a fire escape.
- c) **SP15 – Landscape and Townscape** – the Council agrees with SCDC's decision on the previous application 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. Whilst it is acknowledged that there may be physically space to accommodate a dwelling on the site, the resulting impact from these proposals creates a development which appears cramped and out of character with the spacious character and appearance of Birch Grove".

The gaps, gardens and spaces in Birch Grove make an important contribution to the character of the road. There is a footpath to the woods between nos. 9 & 11 which has a pleasant outlook but, with these proposals, it will become an alleyway with a loss of amenity to all residents.

- 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 policies in the Martlesham Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Version, which have built on the District Council's policies to maintain an exemplar village:

**POLICY MAR3: DEVELOPMENT WITHIN MARTLESHAM HEATH**

- 1. *Within the physical limits boundary of Martlesham Heath, but outside the areas to be protected from development (Policy MAR2), proposed new development should be in keeping with the character of the individual hamlet in which the site is located or is adjacent to.*

2. *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 MAR 4: RESIDENTIAL DESIGN AND AMENITY**

*Proposals for residential development will be expected to demonstrate good quality design. In particular, development proposals will be expected to:*

1. *respond to and integrate with local surroundings and the local landscape context as well as the existing built environment;*
2. *respect the scale and character of existing and surrounding buildings;*
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 application notes that this development does not involve the removal of trees within the garden; this is because they have been gradually removed over the last year. This has already altered the setting of the house amidst woodland.
- There is a footpath to the woods adjacent to the drive of the proposed property therefore there should be regard to road safety with a potential doubling of traffic to and from the site.
- 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 (noting that members may have changed when/if this is considered by the committee) to make a further site visit before reaching a decision.

**Agreed.**

13 members of the public left the meeting.

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

6.1 AP Development update DP/10 Noted.

Miss Bear strongly objected to the marketing name for the site, 'Brightwell Lakes', chosen by CEG, as most of the development and the only lake present is in Martlesham.

Cllr Kelso reported that the proposed new District Council warding arrangements do not group Brightwell with Martlesham and therefore, the name might cause some confusion.

The **Clerk** to express the PC's concerns regarding the new name "Brightwell Lakes" for the Adastral Park development to CEG. **Agreed.**

Comments concerning the new name to be kept separate from any comments made regarding the s106 agreement for the site.

The Clerk reported that Victoria Walker of CEG and Ben Woolnough of SCDC had offered to meet with the PC.

6.2 The ongoing role of the Adastral Park Working Group

The Chairman's suggestion that items 6.2 and 14.2 'Ongoing work on aspects of the NP and NP Plus after the referendum' and aspects of the Highways Register under item 15. Highways Matters be discussed together later on in the meeting, was agreed. **Agreed.**

**7. Consultations/Infrastructure Projects**

7.1 Government Changes to Planning Policy CR2 Noted.

7.2 Consultation on the Draft Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) CR3

The Committee to respond to the consultation on the Draft Revised NPPF. **Agreed.**

Committee members to read through the documentation and identify what is relevant to Martlesham. A draft response to be formulated by Committee members via email. The draft response to be considered by the full Council at its May meeting. The deadline for a response is 10<sup>th</sup> May.

## 8. Pre-Planning Application Consultations

### 8.1 Anything further on proposed development on Anson Road

Nothing new to report to date.

## 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 ALDI application agreed on 26.03.18 by SCDC Planning Committee Noted.

Mr Irwin was thanked for providing a prompt and detailed response to the East Anglian Daily Times who requested the PC's comments on the agreed ALDI planning application.

12.2 Land off Anson Road Drive Thru Unit: request to review our response to the planning application DP/7 & SCC comments filed in the office together with the minutes.

The Chairman reluctantly suggested that the Committee withdraw its objections to the Drive Thru Unit in order to help facilitate the creation of pedestrian crossings which would improve the safety of residents using the retail area.

It was felt that the Drive Thru Unit would be popular with younger people in the parish.

Cllr Kelso maintained his objections. Mr Forbes commented that the removal of the trees from the Wickes development had ruined the outlook from Felixstowe Road and he highlighted the need for the area to be landscaped.

**DECISION D2018/4b:** To maintain the PC's previous **objections** to DC/17/1283/FUL Land off Anson Road Drive Thru Unit **unless** pedestrian crossings are provided and request that landscaping is carried out and the verge by the deliveries entrance is reinstated. **Carried.**

12.3 DC/17/5462/FUL - 9 Carlford Close - 2-storey side extension

**Mr Brome** to represent the PC at the SCDC Planning Committee meeting on 19.04.18. **Agreed.**

## 13. Appeals

13.1 DC/16/4654/OUT Home Meadows Nursery: Public Inquiry on 10.01.18 – appeal refused Noted.

The **Clerk** to ask SCDC how the lack of clarity over the 5 year housing supply is being resolved.

**Agreed.**

## 14. Neighbourhood Planning (NP)

14.1 Referendum likely to take place on 24 May 2018 (NP Referendum Version circulated by e-mail)

Mr Irwin reported that the Referendum would be publicised in the monthly newsletters. The insert in the Martlesham Monthly will be designed so that it can be used as a poster. Big banners will be erected near the schools and in The Square. Posters are to be given to shops and the surgery and will be displayed on the PC notice boards. Copies of the plan will be available at the Runway Café and Parish Room. Mr Irwin reported that the NP Team had decided not to include a summary of the NP in the insert. Hilary Slater, Head of Legal and Democratic Services for the District Council, will be given the insert to comment on.

It was stressed that care was needed by the Parish Council not to influence the electorate into voting for the NP as this is forbidden.

A press release will be issued and a competition for the 3 primary schools to design a poster for the referendum is planned.

The Chairman urged Committee members to encourage friends and neighbours to vote in the Referendum.

Committee members to contact Mr Irwin with any further ideas on promoting the Referendum they may have.

14.2 Ongoing work on aspects of the NP and NP Plus after the referendum CR4

*NP Plus hard copies issued previously & recirculated by e-mail*

*Is there a need for a new working group to be established?*

See item 6.2 The ongoing role of the Adastral Park Working Group above.

## 15. Highway Matters

15.1 Highways Register (HR) (updated at last meeting & 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 CR5 + CP - map filed in the office together with the minutes.

The Committee agreed that the creation of a pedestrian route along the access track used by the Environment Agency is a good idea. **Agreed.**

**Mr Burrows** to be asked to progress the project. **Agreed.**

The first step is to contact the landowner and SCC's Rights of Way team to determine whether the project can go ahead.

The project could be eligible for Locality funding. The current surface of the path is made up of hard gravel. A bridge is needed to cross the ditch between the Recreation Ground and the neighbouring land.

The priority of the project to be set once it is known that the project is feasible. **Agreed.**

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

There was no update. The **Clerk** to ask Cllr Page for an update. **Agreed.**

15.4 HR Priority 4: Accident figures for the Martlesham Park & Ride roundabout CR6

**DECISION D2018/4c:** To purchase collision data from SCC for the Martlesham Park & Ride roundabout at a cost of £70 +VAT. **Agreed.**

15.5 A12/A1214 Roundabout light failure on 29.03.18 DP/8 Noted.

15.6 Traffic & parking concerns DP/9

It was agreed to press for larger parking spaces in new housing developments when consulted on them. **Agreed.**

## 16. Other issues pertinent to the committee

16.1 Meeting with District Councillors & SCDC officer re Mill Heath development CR7 Noted.

16.2 Update on Falcon Park planning application DC/17/4527/FUL CR8

There was no update.

16.3 Michael Howard Homes Development off Black Tiles Lane

There was no update.

6.2 The ongoing role of the Adastral Park Working Group + 14.2 Ongoing work on aspects of the NP and NP Plus after the referendum + aspects of the Highways Register under item 15.1

The ongoing role of the Adastral Park Working Group

The need for there to be people to attend meetings regarding the Adastral Park development was expressed. The disbanding of the group and the role of DPC members was discussed.

**DECISION D2018:4d:** To disband the Adastral Park Working Group and its functions passed to the DPC to carry out. **Declined.**

The **Clerk** to contact the members of the Adastral Park Working Group informing them of DECISION D2018/4d. **Agreed.**

Ongoing work on aspects of the NP and NP Plus after the referendum + aspects of the Highways Register under item 15.1

The NP, if agreed, would be a legal document used by the DPC. Help from the authors of the NP might be needed in the future from time to time.

The Committee was reminded that the members of the NP Project Plan Team had fulfilled their role and would be stepping down from the working group.

Mr Kelso reported that highways issues were the responsibility of SCC and that the PC was a consultee on highways issues and had no funds or technical expertise for solving highways issues. The PC should continue to highlight issues to SCC and liaise with them to resolve highways matters. The Chairman commented that there was an expectation that in the future parish councils would be undertaking Highways projects. Funding might come from other sources eg s106. Mr Irwin suggested that a working group of the PC made up of councillors and interested members of the public could take NP Plus issues forward.

The identification of interested people who could lead on NP Plus projects to be considered after the Referendum. **Agreed.**

Miss Bear left the meeting.

**Mr Irwin** volunteered to research undertaking a Village Audit using the NP as a basis for the audit and facilitated by the District Council. **Agreed.**

It was important to have achievable goals and not raise peoples' expectations. Any future working groups could incorporate expertise from the local community.

#### **17. Martlesham Newsletters**

17.1 Any issues for the June 2018 editions

There were no suggestions.

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

Village Audit.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.06pm.

*M. J. Irwin*

---

Chairman, 02 May 2018