

Minutes of the Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2022 commencing at 7.30pm at the village hall.

Present: Mr D Lugo, Mrs H Hollier, Mrs J Ellinor, Ms P Procter, Mr J Bird, Mr R Blake and Mrs C Frost (Clerk). There were 15 members of the public present at the start of the meeting and more residents arrived during the meeting.

1. **Election of Chair for the purpose of this meeting** Mrs Ellinor proposed Ms Procter as Chair for the purpose of this meeting. This was seconded by Mr Lugo and unanimously approved.
2. **Chairman's Welcome and Apologies** Ms Procter welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave an overview of the Agenda and how the meeting would be conducted. Apologies had been received from Mr Hedgley (District Councillor), Mr Hicks (County Council representative), Mr Pipe (Parish Council Chair) and Mr Brightwell (Parish Council Vice-Chair).
3. **Public Forum** There were no additional Items raised to those on the Agenda.
4. **To receive declarations of interest.** Mrs Hollier declared a neighbour interest in Item 5.(a) and would recuse herself from the Item when it arose. Mr Blake declared a neighbour interest in Item 5.(c) and would not take part in the Parish Council consideration of this Item.
5. **Planning Matters, including:**

(a) DC/22/4810/TCA. The Granaries. 1no. Group of Sycamore, Horse Chestnut, Beech (T1 on plan) - Crown reduction by up to 2.5 metres. 1no. Group of Hawthorn (T2 on plan) – Fell. Ms Procter questioned if the Tree Warden should be involved in consideration of this matter. After a short discussion about this being a crown reduction, there were no comments to put forward.

(b) Response to Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan Additional Focused Consultation Following a short discussion, there were no comments to put forward.

(c) DC/22/3748/FUL. Residential Development for 25 new dwellings in Keightley Way. Mr Blake removed himself from the Parish Council to the public area of the meeting. Ms Procter explained that Mrs Ellinor would give a short historical background to the East Suffolk Council (ESC) Local Plan and how this proposed development had become allocated land on the Local Plan. The meeting would then be temporarily adjourned in order to receive public comments.

Mrs Ellinor explained that she had made various attempts to get a Neighbourhood Plan started for the village but with no village support apparent, this had not got started. In an endeavour to identify the important issues to residents there was a Village Review carried out in 2016 and which residents were invited to. It was carried out on behalf of the Parish Council by Community Action Suffolk. This meeting had shown that residents taking part were not averse to development, but that it should not be towards Ipswich and it had to be the right sort of housing and price. The need for extra public and private parking had also been highlighted. (NOTE – A copy of the Final Report of Tuddenham St Martin Village Review of 5<sup>th</sup> April 2016, is viewable on the Local Services/Information webpage of the Parish Council website [www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net](http://www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net) ) Mrs Ellinor went on to explain that in 2017 ESC launched their call for sites from landowners which could be suitable for new development. The Keightley Way site, which had historically had planning permission years ago, was one of the locations in Tuddenham put forward, and this was chosen as a preferred site by ESC following their Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.

In 2018, ESC produced the First Draft of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (SCLP), which included an allocation of 35 homes on the Keightley Way site and the Parish Council held a meeting for residents to discuss the allocation. There was a well-attended meeting and a summary of the response from the Parish Council to the SCLP First Draft was that ESC had ignored views put forward from Tuddenham St Martin residents when allocating this housing provision.

In January 2019, ESC produced the Final Draft of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (SCLP), which had reduced the number of allocated homes on the Keightley Way Site to 25. The Parish Council held another meeting, which was again well-attended, for residents to discuss the allocation. A summary of the response from the Parish Council following this meeting was to reiterate that the number of dwellings at Keightley Way was still too high, alternative sites were suggested to spread any new housing around the village in order to reduce impact around Keightley Way and have less impact on the village highways.

A Planning Inspector was then appointed for the Examination stage of the SCLP. Hearing Statements were submitted to the Planning Inspector and Hearing sessions were attended during the late summer of 2019 by Mrs Ellinor on behalf of the Parish Council. Other Parish Councillors and residents also attended the Hearing Sessions. Mrs Ellinor had fought hard to put forward the objections from the Parish Council, but the outcome was that the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan was adopted September 2020 with 25 dwellings allocated for the Keightley Way site under Policy SCLP12.66.

Copies of the Parish Council response/representation to the First Draft (Sept 2018) and Final Draft (Jan 2019) of the Local Plan, are viewable on the Local Services/Information webpage of the Parish Council website [www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net](http://www.tuddenhamstmartin.onesuffolk.net)

The meeting was then temporarily adjourned in order to receive public comments.

A statement was presented to the Parish Council and everyone present, which had 35 signatories from different parts of the village and was to demonstrate the high level of objections to this development. Please see Appendix 1 at the end of these Minutes for a copy of this statement.

Other comments from residents included:

- An existing property in Keightley Way which backs on to Plot 1, presumably has Ancient Lights, an easement under common law which means if the light into the rear windows has been unaffected for at least 20 years then a structure may not be built which affects that light. A two-storey house built so close to the rear boundary would appear to have some effect in this regard.

There was a widespread dissatisfaction at the timing of this application being over the Christmas period and the tight deadline for comments to be submitted. It was explained to everyone present that the Parish Council deadline for comments had been questioned with the Planning Dept. at ESC, and an extension had been granted. The Planning Dept. had then also been asked about the deadline for public comments. The response from the Planning Dept. was shown on the village hall screen, via the projector, as follows:

'There is always a variation in end consultation dates due to letters being sent out on different days to site notices being posted etc however it is always the latest one.'

Public comments received prior to a decision are taken into account in any case but it is best if comments can be received within the consultation period. Anything by 13th as agreed with yourselves will be in plenty of time.'

A resident read out a statement which would be put forward to ESC as part of the consultation on this application. A summary of the details were:

- A house sale has fallen through as a result of this development.
- Access to the development is only possible via The Hill or Westerfield Lane, both of which are unacceptable.
- Westerfield Lane has been identified as a Quiet Lane as it comprises of a single lane with passing places. This is totally unacceptable for any increased traffic.
- Emergency vehicles will be compromised because of the limited access.
- It's noted that Suffolk County Council Highways and Suffolk Fire Service have been consulted. Their responses however, have been desktop exercises related to the actual development. Surely, both must be invited to physically visit the site.
- As for local facilities, there is no local shop, store or post office.
- There's only a limited bus service through the High Street and there'll be an increased reliance on car traffic.

- There is no footpath from Keightley Way to the bus stop and the nature of the landscape means it would be virtually impossible to build a footway to enable safe pedestrian access from Keightley Way to the bus stop.
- Can the local schools provide enough places to accommodate this new demand. Should we really be considering adding to the already over-subscribed local education system?

There followed a short discussion about whether a footway from Keightley Way to access the bus service would be viable.

Comments from residents continued as:

- The impact the development would have on the Quiet Lane status of Westerfield Lane.
- Would there be a covenant on the Open Space in the development to protect it from further development?
- The roads around Keightley Way are never gritted and there's a huge danger at the Keightley Way junction.

Mrs Ellinor reported that Westerfield Lane is a Class C highway, which do not get gritted by the Highways Authority.

- How will the traffic be flowing through the village to access the site?
- Was born in Tuddenham. Grundisburgh is having 500 houses built and 80% will come through Tuddenham. There's already gridlock in the village and no-one respects Quiet Lane manners.
- Keightley Way is not a quiet road and it is bonkers for Westerfield Lane and the Hill to be used for access.
- Have witnessed HGVs already driving on the bank of the Hill causing damage and potential risks to pedestrians and cyclists. It is a dangerous junction The Parish Council should impress upon ESC that people should have a right to walk safely to the bus stop.
- Why build on a greenfield site when brownfield sites in the District area are still available?

A discussion followed about why villages were being developed and that the 35 dwellings originally allocated had been reduced to 25 due to the objections received.

- There's a lack of joined up thinking.
- The road issue is a nightmare.
- What if residents are now averse to development in the village?

One of the Parish Councillors explained that the land allocation at Keightley Way was part of the Local Plan but it would not stop the Parish Council representing the feelings put forward. There was frustration at the allocation of this land in the Local Plan as there were better sites in the village. There was further discussion about the difference of a Local Plan consultation and planning application consultations. There was also discussion about the limited role the Parish Council had as a consultee in the Planning process and that the planning decision would be made by the Planning Dept at ESC. Everyone present was urged to put their comments to ESC. There were a few more resident comments which included:

- Is the green space on the development private land? Who will maintain it?
- Will there be management charges to the new houses for the upkeep of the green spaces?

Ms Procter reconvened the meeting for the Parish Council to consider comments to submit to the Local Planning Authority at East Suffolk Council for their decision on the application.

Mr Blake left the meeting.

Parish Councillors considered the village comments put forward earlier. One Parish Councillor reported that a lot of time had been spent looking over the planning documents, including paying special attention to the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Report which had addressed the sewage issue highlighted in the representation made earlier at the meeting. Then comments from Parish Councillors were put forward which included:

- Keightley Way is jammed with parking.
- There should be provision of more public parking.
- Construction work should be addressed by a temporary access via Poplar Farm.
- ESC should be asked to review parking.
- There are access, road safety and parking issues.
- Has social housing been addressed?
- Has disability access been addressed?

At this stage of the meeting, it was unanimously approved to object to the application.

The objection statement was discussed and it was unanimously approved to include the following points:

- The Parish Council maintains its objection to the allocation of this site in the Local Plan. This development is contrary to SCLP5.2: Housing Development in Small Villages.
- The Housing Strategy should be referred to and the Parish Council would like to see Chris King (Design Champion and Specialist Services Manager at ESC) is approached for guidance on this development in the event of the development being agreed in principle by ESC.

- In the event of it being approved by ESC, there should be more parking provision. It ignores the parking shortages in Keightley Way and the Parish Council would like to see a re-evaluation of the parking provision. Mr Bird agreed to draft this part of the comments.
- Comparison should be drawn to the inadequate parking and access at The Paddocks.

There followed a long discussion about the access and width of roads in the village and the impact of 25 additional dwellings.

Additional points to be included in the objection statement were:

- At the end of the objection statement there should be reference drawn, and there should be a copy provided to ESC, the statement presented to the Parish Council on behalf of 35 village signatories.
- Clarity was needed about maintenance of the communal areas and boundary edges.
- The lack of access for residents to schools and early development should be highlighted.

There was further discussion about road issues and additional points to be included were:

- It should be noted that the recorded volume of vehicles passing through the village had substantially increased since the Local Plan was drafted.
- The Parish Council should record a complaint and require a statement and an apology from East Suffolk Council Planning Dept. about why there was a delay in this application being put on the Public Access system.

There was a discussion about the inclusion, in the event of the development being agreed in principle by ESC, of clauses being made which would enable residents with local connections to have first refusal to the affordable homes provided, assuming they meet the criteria. A vote was taken (4 in favour, 1 abstained and so the vote was carried).

The Clerk would draft the response and email it to Parish Councillors for final approval before being submitted to ESC.

**6. Items for the next Agenda** Community Partnership and Playing field update.

**7. Date of next scheduled meeting** 7<sup>th</sup> March 2023.

The meeting closed at 9.45pm.

Mrs C Frost - Parish Clerk. Tuddenham St Martin

### **Appendix 1. Statement presented to 28<sup>th</sup> December 2022 Parish Council meeting on behalf of 35 signatories.**

We wish to make the following objections to the proposed development on Keightley Way.

Attached to this statement is a list of signatures we wish to be taken into account when the parish council comments on proposed works. We believe this demonstrates the high level of opposition to this plan throughout the whole village, not just Keightley Way.

We trust the parish council act as representatives and advocates of the local community's objections and concerns in discussing the proposals and the following objections and comments.

We believe this development to be at a great detriment to the local rural community, the residents and parish council work so hard to protect.

The proposed development will profoundly and irrevocably alter the entire village in Tuddenham and in particular Keightley Way, The Hill and Westerfield Lane.

25 proposed new houses in a village with very few village amenities, poor public transport, small footpaths and very small narrow roads would make living in the area very different and profoundly worse for some, in fact, many residents have already considered selling up due to the proposals.

The village is already used as a main through way for traffic into Ipswich, something the parish council go to great pains to control and any more traffic would cause serious traffic issues on already overloaded and narrow roads.

We understand that development is important and houses are much needed but this plan in its current form is unsuitable and overwhelmingly opposed by those already living here.

These are the specific views of all residents who wish to comment but were unable to attend this meeting.

### 1. Accessibility.

The proposed route for main access is through Keightley Way. A road with predominantly on-road parking, all residents who currently live in Keightley Way will attest to the difficulty of parking and passing currently.

In fact the parish council have addressed this particular issue on more than one occasion posting "considerate parking" notes through all the houses on Keightley Way.

East Suffolk highways design recommendations state that Carriageways for access to between 25 and 50 houses must be at least 4.8m in width. Although Keightley Way is this exactly, 5.5m before the paddocks 4.8m after, the effect of how it is used will cause serious traffic problems due to how narrow it is. Residents comment that Keightley Way in every way possible is not suitable for main access to this development.

An extra 40+ cars on this road will turn Keightley Way into an impassable, busy and dangerous narrow road with no parking for existing residents and make already very difficult access for emergency vehicles, oil tankers, lorries etc almost impossible.

The Hill, adjacent to Keightley Way is practically a one-way road with no useable footpath and no way to widen the road, again discussed at parish council meetings. Any more traffic flow would make this road impassable for vehicles to enter Keightley Way and pose a serious risk to pedestrians, people with mobility issues, cyclists, other motorists, oil and grocery delivery lorries not to mention the large number of heavy vehicles that will be part of the construction of the development.

We deem the idea of access into the new development via Keightley dangerous, short-sighted and negligent in its planning and proposal.

Residents in The Paddocks and High Street particularly have strongly objected to Keightley Way becoming a main through way due to deliveries of oil and building materials being almost impossible, causing some deliveries to be cancelled and causing damage to property due to the existing poor access into Keightley Way.

### 2.

The disruption caused by building works will be sustained and substantial. A number of residents have expressed concern about working nights and the significant disruption that this would cause their sleep during the day. This must be taken into consideration.

### 3. Quiet Lane

Westerfield Lane was designated a "Quiet Lane". This development will increase issues such as traffic flow, litter and bank damage considerably and destroy this beautiful local asset. It will no longer be in fact a Quiet Lane.

### 4. Existing objections.

The previous objections to the initial proposal need to be fully taken into account during this phase of the consultation process.

We would hope the parish council would assist and advocate for the local community in this matter. Residents have also said that they have made objections to the Parish Council and received no feedback or updates. Why has the Parish Council not gone further to keep the local residents fully apprised of where their historic objections have gone?

### 5. Devaluation of property

All residents have expressed the utmost concern on the devaluation of their property on Keightley Way due to it becoming a main road into the new estate and thus a less desirable place to live. Residents have commented that they moved to Keightley Way to live on a quiet street, safe for their children to play and not a busy main road, this will again have a detrimental effect on the whole village and not just Keightley Way.

How will the residents be compensated if this development goes ahead?

## 6. Look and sustainability of proposed new builds

The plan that has been submitted shows several styles, none of which is in keeping with the local area and is considered an eyesore by many residents. It is felt that Newbuild style houses are not in keeping with the local aesthetic.

Residents were not involved in any part of the design process again alienating the community from this plan. No discussion or description about how the development will be sustainable was on the plans issued. For obvious reasons development on rural areas is less sustainable than urban therefore shouldn't developers be held to as high account as possible for sustainability?

The current proposal makes no mention of sustainability.

Rural homes often appeal to young families and the elderly. There is also no discussion or description about accessibility in the existing plans or how the houses will be adapted for the life span of the residents.

## 7. The manner that planning was announced.

Planning notices appeared only 14 days before the deadline for comment, a parish council meeting organised 2 days before this deadline. We do not consider this fair warning and not in keeping with community spirit and has already weakened trust in local land ownership, and the representation of the parish council. We recognise there were some attempts in Facebook and via notice boards but this was considered too little too late.

## 8. Parish Council representation.

A number of residents have said that after expressing objections at historic Parish Council meetings they no longer received any email correspondence, all residents have discussed how no information reaches them in terms of Parish Council.

Whilst it's accepted that some responsibility lies on the individual it is incumbent as representatives of the residents of the village for the Parish Council to make sure that residents know what will happen in their village.

## 9. Transport

We are almost completely reliant on cars to leave Tuddenham, there is already very poor access to public transport and the use of The Hill as a main access point would make accessing public transport even more difficult. Especially for the elderly, disabled residents and families with young children.

## 10. Continual road- works on The Hill and Tuddenham High Street.

As all residents of Tuddenham know the main road continually requires works which sometimes totally close off the village.

How will Tuddenham cope with 35-40 extra vehicles daily? This will make an area of outstanding beauty and a protected Conservation Area one continual traffic jam affecting the whole village, not just Keightley Way.

## 11. Sewage

The plan shows the sewage from the proposed development being pumped to the main outlet on Keightley Way, as this was designed for the current housing stock, is the existing infrastructure capable of taking on this significant increase in sewage and how will this affect the current residents?

As Tuddenham residents we hope that all our concerns, objections, worries and fears are taken into account and fairly represented by Parish Councillors in a transparent and objective way when the Parish Council makes any recommendation or comment on the proposals to the Local Authority.

As residents we consider the Parish Council to be representatives of the local community advocating their wishes to the Local Authority and hope this continues.