

Minutes of the Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council meeting held on 25th July 2023 commencing at 7.30pm at the village hall.

Present: Mrs J Ellinor, Ms P Procter, Mr D Lugo, Mrs K Lindsay, Mr J Bird, Mr C Hedgley and Mr D Clery (District Councillors) and Mrs C Frost (Clerk). There were approximately 12 members of the public at the meeting.

1. **Election of Chair for the purpose of this meeting** Mrs Ellinor proposed Ms Procter. This was seconded by Mr Bird and **unanimously approved**.
2. **Chairman's Welcome and Apologies** Ms Procter welcomed everyone present to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Mr Pipe (Parish Council Chair), Mr Brightwell (Parish Council Vice-Chair) and Mr Blake (Parish Councillor). These were approved. Apologies were also received from Cllr Bryce (County Councillor) who would need to leave the meeting early to attend another meeting.
Ms Procter paid tribute to and reported the sad news of Steve Hudson, who had been a District and County Councillor and had died on 18th July. Steve had lived in the village for a number of years, and his partner had been in touch to say how very proud Steve was to have served and represent the people of Tuddenham and the other villages in his constituency and enjoyed his time doing this. The Parish Council wished to record their appreciation of Steve's support for the Parish Council whilst in his role as a Councillor.
3. **Public Forum** Mrs Ellinor had received a request from Mr Brightwell to ask a question as a member of the public. It was about the importance of the proximity of the Keightley Way land, allocated for development, to the playing field and playground in relation to the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment. Has the Parish Council been approached for access to the playground from the allocated site? Mr Brightwell had seen evidence that more than one exit from a playground would create a dangerous or unsafe environment for children. The District Councillors were asked for input. This was discussed. The Parish Council had not been approached for access to the playground from the allocated site. The Parish Council could consider adding a question to the comments to submit to East Suffolk Council. No additional Items were raised.
4. **To receive declarations of interest** There were none.
5. **Planning Matters, including:**
 - (a) Amendments made to planning application DC/22/3748/FUL. Residential Development for 25 new dwellings in Keightley Way.
Ms Procter explained this application was being considered again following the latest amendments submitted to East Suffolk Council. Ms Procter also explained that the meeting would be temporarily adjourned in order to receive public comments. After the temporary adjournment, and after taking into account the public comments, the meeting would reconvene for the Parish Council to consider the comments to submit to the District Council for their decision on the application.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned in order to receive public comments.
These included:
 - Has there been any response to the original objections?
 - Disappointed that no response to previous objections or any of the issues raised.
 - Revised layout is horrendous.
 - More houses have now been set against the existing houses.The existing parking issues and prospective increase in parking issues was discussed.
 - The landscaping has been looked at in isolation and not taken into account the location of the allocated land in relation to the existing houses or village.
 - Keightley Way already has too many parked cars.
 - The road is not wide enough.
 - The Applicant has not paid any attention to the Parish Council response.
 - There has been no direct feedback.
 - The development makes a joke of Westerfield Lane being adopted as a Quiet Lane.
 - Parking on The Street is an issue.

- Residents on The Street and The Hill receive notices not to use the pavement for parking cars but are then also asked to partially park on the pavement when a large vehicle needs to travel on The Hill.
- Some residents are known to drive down The Hill to access any services as they feel vulnerable to traffic when walking due to no footway.
- It's a car dominant village due to lack of bus service.

The comments from Suffolk County Council (SCC) Highways were discussed, including their request that a holding objection being maintained until clarification was received about points they had raised and until these had been accepted by SCC Highways.

A Parish Councillor had asked prior to the meeting, if there was an update from the County Councillor following the 4th July meeting about more detail of what and how SCC Highways would use the additional CIL funding iro £100,000. Additionally, when would the concerns and highways suggestions made by the Parish Council in their submission be considered. The Clerk reported that it had been understood that the County Councillor had intended being at this meeting and had been emailed beforehand to check if there was an update about how the CIL money would be spent. No reply had been received. The Clerk had spoken with the Planning Officer and it had been confirmed that the concerns and highways suggestions made by the Parish Council in their submission will be considered when the application decision is determined by the Planning Officer or Committee. Highways may have already seen the Parish Council comments, including the highway concerns, and may have already taken these into account when submitting their own Consultee comments, but the Parish Council may wish to highlight them specifically to SCC Highways and request that they are taken into account when submitting their own Consultee comments to the latest amendments. There was further discussion that SCC Highways had already informed the Parish Council that no footway was feasible on The Hill, yet this was being requested as part of the comments from SCC Highways.

The comments continued and included:

- The amended application does not solve any of the issues raised. It's worse than the earlier plan.
- The village already has green spaces.
- Parking issues will not be addressed by the revised application.

There was discussion about the lack of parking provision from the 3 plans submitted, which were:

Original plan = Overall parking 69 spaces (48 Open market, 16 Parking to Affordable dwellings & 5 Visitor Parking)

Second plan = Overall parking 70 spaces (48 Open market, 16 Parking to Affordable dwellings & 6 Visitor Parking)

Latest plan = Overall parking 68 spaces (45 Open market, 16 Parking to Affordable dwellings & 7 Visitor Parking).

- Serious concerns of access, including during construction.

The pond in the corner of the allocation site was discussed, which would be used a part of the surface water drainage.

- Would Anglian Water take responsibility of the SUDs?
- The ditch is deep in water during the winter. Will there be adequate safety?

It was reported that the pond would be attenuated as part of the new development.

- Who will maintain the green and SUDs areas? There's no spare capacity in the village.
- If anything, the first plan was better than these amendments.
- Will the properties be freehold?
- There are already problems in the village with maintenance of land not in specific ownership.

A discussion followed about the maintenance responsibility for the various areas in the development site, as well as the grounds maintenance already carried out by village volunteers in existing areas of the village.

- We need comprehensive information on who will be responsible for maintenance of land.
- How is the issue about the lack of a footway from Keightley Way to the main area of the village and amenities going to be resolved?
- It would be good to hear from the Developer directly.

There followed a discussion about the suggested alternative access to the site during construction.

- Could we contact the Developer to explain the development?
- There needs to be parking provided for construction traffic if the development goes ahead. There is no parking available in The Street, The Hill or Keightley Way – already at capacity.
- Reassert that a site visit is needed to consider this application. A remote decision from plans would not take into account the specific problems with the location.

A discussion followed about whether the affordable housing would be affordable. The demand for affordable housing was also discussed.

- There seemed to be no rationale to the other sites rejected by East Suffolk Council as part of the Local Plan. A discussion followed about the alternative sites.

Ms Procter reconvened the meeting for the Parish Council. Some members of the public left the meeting and Ms Procter reminded everyone present that they could still submit their own comments to ESC. **It was unanimously approved to move the remaining order of Items** before consideration of the comments to submit to East Suffolk Council, in order to facilitate attendance at the meeting.

(b) Application DC/23/2761/TCA. 1 Oak – Overall crown reduction by up to 2.5 metres, 1 Fir – Fell, 1 Sycamore – Fell – at a property in The Street. The Tree Notice was discussed, including the advice received from the Tree Warden. Mr Bird proposed no comments. This was seconded by Mr Lugo and unanimously approved.

(a) Amendments made to planning application DC/22/3748/FUL. Residential Development for 25 new dwellings in Keightley Way.

Parish Councillors considered the village comments put forward earlier. In answer to questions, Mr Hedgley reported that it was likely that the decision for this application would be determined by the Planning Committee, a site visit could be requested and for approach to Councillor Bryce for a highways site visit.

Mr Hedgley and Mr Clery gave their apologies and left the meeting.

There was discussion about what to take forward and consider comments to submit to ESC. Parish Councillor comments included:

- Extremely disappointed that none of the points raised previously have been acknowledged or addressed in any way.

There followed a discussion about the lack of parking provision.

- Concern that the Landscaping Team have looked at the site in isolation and not in the context of its situation within a rural village.
- The first plan sits better.
- Access and parking for construction needs to be addressed.
- Re: parking – the original comments from the Parish Council suggested communal parking to alleviate existing parking issues in Keightley Way. This was more achievable in the first plan and not taken into account with the amendments.
- The amended plan provides fewer parking spaces.
- Planning should be betterment.
- Every new development has produced more parking.
- Would like to see specific details of how SCC Highways will spend the CIL money to join up the new development with the main part of the village and provide connectivity.

A discussion followed about parking and connectivity issues.

It was unanimously approved the Clerk would draft a response and email it to Parish Councillors attending the meeting for it to be agreed prior to it being submitted to ESC. It would include the following:

- The Parish Council strongly objects to the application and is extremely disappointed that none of the points raised previously have been acknowledged or addressed in any way. This is particularly comments regarding parking as this is a serious concern in the village, especially in Keightley Way.
- The Landscaping Team have looked at the site in isolation and not in context of its situation within a rural village. Mrs Ellinor agreed to email wording for this section to the Clerk ready for the Draft.
- The original comments from the Parish Council suggested communal parking to alleviate existing parking issues in Keightley Way. This was more achievable in the first plan and not taken into account with the amendments. The amended plan provides fewer parking spaces.
- Request specific details of how SCC Highways will spend the CIL money to join up the site with the rest of the village.

It was also unanimously approved that the Clerk would email Parish Councillors at the meeting with drafts for approval on the following:

- Approach landowner for alternative access during construction, following the concerns raised.
- Approach the Developer to give a presentation to the Parish Council and residents of the building proposal of the site.
- Forward to SCC Highways a copy of the Parish Council comments submitted March 2023 to ESC and ask for them to be taken into account when SCC Highways responds to the application amendments as a statutory consultee.

6. Items for the next Agenda

- To consider 20's plenty on any of the village highways
- Parish Councillor Training
- To consider the purchase of the replacement Speed Indicator Device (SID) in the region of £3,500.

7. Date of next scheduled meeting 5th September 2023.

The meeting closed at 9.25pm.

Mrs C Frost - Parish Clerk. Tuddenham St Martin