

Minutes of the Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council preliminary meeting between members of the Parish Council and representatives of Bennett Homes and Ashenden Architecture.

The meeting was held on 19th September 2023 commencing at 8pm at the village hall, and the purpose of the meeting was to agree an Agenda or List of Issues for a future public presentation or exhibition from the developer about the Keightley Way development at a later date to be agreed.

Present: Mrs J Ellinor, Ms P Procter, Mrs K Lindsay, Mr J Bird, Mr C Hedgley (District Councillor), Mr E Clarke-Gifford (Bennett Homes), and Mrs C Frost (Clerk). Mr P Ashenden (Ashenden Architecture) was present via Zoom due to being unwell. There were 2 members of the public at the meeting.

Abbreviations for comments: Combination of Parish Councillors &/or Cllr Hedgley (**PC/CH**). Mr Clarke-Gifford & Mr Ashenden (**ECG/PA**).

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 and introduced those present. Apologies had been received from Mr Lugo. Ms Procter explained that the meeting was to highlight issues that had been raised during the application process for this development, to open a dialogue with the developer in preparation for a future public presentation by the developer, and prepare for a relationship with the developer so that snags may be easier ironed out during the build, in the event of permission being granted by East Suffolk Council. There would be no public participation due to the special nature of the meeting. The recording from the Zoom facility, which was being used for one person present due to illness, would be deleted after the meeting.
3. **To receive declarations of interest from the Parish Council members** There were none
4. **To agree an Agenda or List of Issues for a public presentation or exhibition to village residents about the Keightley Way development.**

In reply to a question, Mr Clarke-Gifford and Mr Ashenden did not have any additional Items for consideration. Ms Procter reported that the comments put forward by residents and the Parish Council about the development, including objections, were available to public view on the East Suffolk Council Planning portal for this application. There was extensive discussion about the issues and this included:

 - a) Is there another access route into the site?

(**PC/CH**) A request for an alternative access to the site during construction had been communicated to the landowner. The landowner has expressed concern about the impact on wildlife in connection with the proposed alternative route, but it is up for discussion.

(**ECG/PA**) Access to the site from Keightley Way was part of the allocation and had been deemed suitable by Suffolk County Council (SCC) Highways in this instance. There will be no alternative access.

(**PC/CH**) What about alternative access during construction?

(**ECG/PA**) This has been discussed with the landowner, who has expressed concerns about wildlife from the alternative route and it could be problematic. From the parish perspective if the application were to be approved, we would then need to discharge a condition called a delivery method statement and this is another opportunity for the parish and consultees to review our proposals and how we would access the site during construction. This would cover such things as parking on site, our mitigation about the main road, and times for deliveries to the construction site.

(**PC/CH**) Would suggest that you would need to know more than just concerns about wildlife for the alternative construction route. There does not seem to be much wildlife there. This seems to be a convenient excuse for declining the request. A lot of passionate concern has been raised by residents about access to the site, including from residents who are shift workers.

Discussion continued and included:
Perhaps a Liaison Committee could be set up?

(**ECG/PA**) Perhaps the public presentation would be more focused on how, if we were to get permission granted, we would mitigate the concerns of access to the residents and how the construction process would go ahead.

(PC/CH) Is it physically possible to have another entrance during construction? If so, why not? The current reason seems inadequate.

(ECG/PA) A number of conditions will have to be addressed, including possibly, access to the site.

(PC/CH) At the Committee meeting stage, there is an opportunity for the Parish Council to propose additional conditions such as access to the site during construction, if permission is granted.

(PC/CH) A big criticism is that the development has been looked at in isolation and not looked at in connection with the existing parking issues, type of village or surrounding area.

The access issue is in the hands of the landowners and not the developer.

(PC/CH) Perhaps the presentation from the developer would show what concerns the Parish Council have raised and also the beginnings of the process that would follow on in terms of the conditions to address those concerns.

The type of presentation meeting and how access to the site would be addressed was discussed further.

(PC/CH) Presumably, the landowner would be at the presentation as it would not be a Parish Council meeting?

(PC/CH) If a temporary alternative access was provided for the construction period by the landowner, would the developer use it?

(ECG/PA) If it was an option and there was serious concern raised, it would be used subject to approval from ESC and the landowner.

(ECG/PA) Appreciate that construction access is a problem but it will be a shorter route to the actual site and on tarmac if via Keightley Way. If access is via the back of the site (across fields), it will be longer route to the site and messier impact on Westerfield Lane. There will be more mud on highway from field access no matter how much gravel is put down. Plus, there will be winter months for the construction which will result in a mucky access in spite of wheel washing.

(PC/CH) If there is no alternative route during construction there will be a physical problem to access the site at certain times of the day due to parking problems that already exist in Keightley Way.

b) What action will be taken to mitigate highways issues on The Hill?

(PC/CH) Possible for no site access via The Hill?

(ECG/PA) SCC Highways have asked for £100,000 for pedestrian facilities from the site to local amenities. The parish could lobby SCC Highways for how this will be spent.

(PC/CH) We have asked about how this will be spent (via our County Councillor) with no answer and no idea of how this amount was arrived at.

(ECG/PA) Developer dealings with SCC Highways will just be for the adoption of the development associated road and not the link to the rest of the village.

(PC/CH) This has been raised many times with Highways. We have previously been advised by SCC Highways that it is not possible to install footway access on The Hill due to restricted width of the highway, but SCC Highways are asking for £100,000 for this purpose.

The Parish Council should continue to pursue SCC Highways about how this money will be spent to mitigate highways issues from the development.

Perhaps SCC Highways could be included in the presentation to residents to explain what will happen about The Hill?

If SCC Highways could also attend (be invited to) the presentation, they could give details of what they would do to ease this development, should it go through, into the village. Possibly an action for the Parish Council to liaise with SCC Highways when a presentation date by the developer is known?

c) Parking spaces provided at the development and the location of the Public Open Space

(PC/CH) There are inadequate parking spaces at the new development on the back of existing serious parking problems in the area.

(PC/CH) The development gives the legal minimum of spaces with tandem parking and garages included, but garages are usually used for storage rather than parking. This will exacerbate existing problems. There is already a lack of parking in this area and parked cars have been keyed. Are more spaces possible?

(ECG/PA) Appreciate parking issues but the spaces provided in this scheme comply with SCC parking standards. If we could, we would add more but it is not physically possible to add more parking spaces with the SUDs and drainage needed at the site. There are already more parking spaces than the minimum requirement.

Mr Ashenden temporarily left the meeting due to Zoom time limits.

There was further explanation and discussion about the concern that the current design does not allow for additional parking from Keightley Way and the negative impact there will be on Keightley Way due to lack of

parking provided by the development, especially in the most recent layout. There will be no way to mitigate the parking problems.

Mr Ashenden rejoined the meeting.

(ECG/PA) The ESC Landscape Team requested the change of layout from the original plan and there has been frustration that the Planning Dept. was unable to support the previous layout of the development. The original layout provided more of a buffer between the existing dwellings and the new development, The latest layout is however more efficient for sustainable drainage.

(PC/CH) The original layout, which was changed following comments from the ESC Landscape Team, was a better layout for existing dwellings in Keightley Way. The latest layout does not take into account the setting in which it is located, surrounded by fields and adjoining existing dwellings.

(ECG/PG) The revised layout was driven by ESC Landscape Officer. Initial design was to create a buffer. Some positives about the latest layout are that it does make it more inclusive within the development, more of a usable open space, will create a more interesting and attractive entrance, and does substantially help with drainage.

d) Where will contractor vans and lorries park during the build?

(ECG/PA) Ordinarily, Bennett Homes have site staff parking so there is no requirement for parking elsewhere. This is subject to approval by ESC.

(PC/CH) What is the maximum number of workers expected at any one time?

(ECG/PA) Don't know. There was a discussion about expected numbers.

The discussion moved to details about the current state of the application, the stages of the application process, and what stages of an application trigger Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments. It was understood that SCC Highways have raised concern and a holding objection at the moment.

(ECG/PA) The holding objection from SCC Highways is being addressed and details are about to be submitted to the Planning Officer. It is understood that this application will most likely go to the Planning Committee for determination. If approval is granted, the development will be put on hold until Section 106 is sorted. CIL payments will be paid on trigger points during construction.

(ECG/PA) The construction method statement will address how the site will be managed. It will give another opportunity for comments, and Bennett Homes would most likely give a presentation at this stage of the development.

(PC/CH) It is most likely that the application will be determined by Planning Committee, rather than delegated to the Planning Officer. A Parish Council member and a resident could attend the Committee meeting to put forward concerns, and also propose conditions in the event of permission being granted, such as The Hill not being used.

e) The possibility of setting up of a Liaison Committee in the event of permission being granted by East Suffolk Council

After discussion, it was considered a good idea for residents to have a focal point to raise any ongoing issues or queries during the build. Rather than issues being raised separately by residents, perhaps 2 Parish Council members and 1 resident could become the conduit to liaise with Bennett Homes if the development goes ahead? Perhaps a dedicated email address could be set up to receive queries/issues? The Clerk stated that she would not be able to take on this role in addition to her existing workload.

(ECG/PA) In reply to a question, there was confirmation that the latest layout (with the more central Public Open Space) would be the design to go forward to the Planning Dept. for approval.

f) Maintenance of the proposed communal areas and boundary edges?

(ECG/PA) This would be defined at the 106 stage. Bennett Homes would notify SCC or ESC the nominated recipient of the POS. The on-going maintenance of communal areas and boundary edges could possibly be

Bennett Homes own management company. Everything within the red line would be maintained. The perimeter trees have been kept out of private ownership so that they can be maintained in their entirety.
(PC/CH) Re: SUDs – will there be signs to explain what it is for (and so residents will not, for instance, use it to discard grass cuttings)?

(ECG/PA) This depends upon if it is taken over by SCC Highways.

A discussion followed about the SUDs running into a draining ditch which subsequently runs down into the river Fynn. A resident had raised concern however before the meeting that the ditch is blocked and the run off does not reach the river Fynn. Bennett Homes were unaware of this being raised with them previously.

g) Residents with local connections to have first refusal to the affordable homes?

(ECG/PA) This could be raised at the Section 106 stage. Until it gets to that stage, it is difficult to know what the ESC will push for. It is something Bennett Homes could bear in mind and could be a condition of the build.

(PC/CH) The Parish Council had requested this in earlier comments submitted to ESC about the application.

(ECG/PA) Recommend that the Parish Council request this again with ESC Planning.

It was confirmed that details of Section 106 breakdown for the development will be made public.

Everyone was thanked for coming to the meeting, which closed at 9.05pm

Mrs C Frost - Parish Clerk. Tuddenham St Martin